

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
COLLECTED WORKS

THE WORKS OF JOHN WESLEY
VOLUME 9
LETTERS AND ESSAYS
by John Wesley

CONTENTS

1. A Letter to the Author of “The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared.”
2. A Second Letter to Ditto.
3. A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Exeter.
4. A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Baily, of Cork.
5. A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Potter.
6. A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Downes.
7. A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Horne.
8. A Letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Gloucester.
9. A Short Address to the Inhabitants of Ireland.
10. A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Fleury.
11. The Doctrine of Original Sin, according to Scripture, Reason, and Experience.

Preface.

PART FIRST. The Past And Present State Of Mankind.

PART SECOND. The Scriptural Method Of Accounting For This, Defended.

PART THIRD. And Answer To Dr. Taylor’s Supplement.

Section 1. Of Imputed Guilt.

Section 2. Of the Nature and Design of our Afflictions and Mortality.

Section 3. The Argument taken from the Calamities and Sinfulness of Mankind considered.

- Section 4.** Some Consequences of the Doctrine of Original Sin.
- Section 5.** A General Argument taken from what God has declared concerning Mankind, at the Restoration of the World after the Deluge.
- Section 6.** The notion of Adam's being a Federal Head, or Representative of Mankind, considered.
- Section 7.** Of Original Righteousness.
- PART FOURTH.** Extracts From Dr. Watts And Mr. Hebden.
- ESSAY FIRST.** Do The Present Miseries Of Man Alone Prove His Apostasy From God?.
- ESSAY SECOND.** A Plain Explication Of The Doctrine Of Imputed Sin And Imputed Righteousness.
- PART FIFTH.** The Doctrine Of Original Sin.
- PART SIXTH.** The Doctrine Of Original Sin, Explained And Vindicated.
- PART SEVENTH.** The Doctrine Of Original Sin, Extracted From Mr. Boston's Fourfold State Of Man.
- 12.** A Letter to the Rev. Jon Taylor, D. D..
- 13.** An Extract of a Letter to the Rev. Mr. Law.
- 14.** Thoughts upon Jacob Behmen.
- 15.** A Specimen of the Divinity and Philosophy of the highly-illuminated Jacob Behmen.

THE WORKS
OF
JOHN WESLEY
THIRD EDITION
Complete and Unabridged
1872 EDITION
VOLUME 9
LETTERS AND ESSAYS

A LETTER

TO THE AUTHOR OF

“THE ENTHUSIASM OF METHODISTS AND
PAPISTS COMPARED.”

Agedum! Pauca accipe contra.^{f1} — HOR.

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 fanaticisms of the most abominable communion in its most corrupt ages.” (*Preface*, p. 3.)

You endeavor 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,” (*Ibid.* 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 Mahometans 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 pretenses 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 “pretenses 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*, etc. p. 11.) Sir, do you condemn field-preaching *toto genere*, 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 behavior, 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 behavior, 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.” (Pages 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 behavior, 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 behavior.” 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.” (Page 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. Katherine 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 pretense, with gold or costly apparel.” (Page 21.) If this be enthusiasm, let the Apostle look to it. His words are clear and express. If you can find a pretense to set them aside, do. I cannot; nor do I desire it.

11. My seeming contempt of money,” (page 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 traveling, and undertaking dangerous voyages, for the conversion of infidels; together with a declared contempt of all danger, pains, and sufferings; and the designing, loving, and praying for ill usage, persecution, martyrdom, death, and hell.” (Page 27.)

In order to prove this uncommon charge, you produce four scraps of sentences, (page 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 candor or even common humanity.

13. “Sometimes indeed,” you say, “Mr. Wesley complains of the scoffs both of the great vulgar and the small;” (page 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 honor, 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,” (page 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 favor) 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” 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 honor and glory.’” (Page 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,” (page 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, etc., 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 humor, 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 endeavoring to prove?

Quorsum haec tam putida tendant?^{f2}

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.” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.*) 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.” (*Ibid.*) 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.’” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.*) 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.” (Page 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 (page 45) I shall not say anything 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.” (Page 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 Savior.’” 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.” (Page 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” (Page 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 further proof of my enthusiasm you mention “special directions, mission, and calls by immediate revelation.” (Page 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.’” (Pages 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.’” (Page 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 anything of them.” (Page 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 behavior, 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;” (page 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 anything 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" (page 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 (page 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 afterwards," you say, "I speak more distrustfully." (Page 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?

32. 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.” (Page 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 anything of this, as to conclude, in full triumph, that “this new dispensation is a composition of enthusiasm, superstition, and imposture.” (Page 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 an 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*^{f3} — JUVENAL.

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 diocese. But I was not informed that your Lordship showed a deep concern for the honor 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 neighbors." 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 neighboring 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 towards 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 as 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 labored 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 an 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 wrestling 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* “bittersweet 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 pretense 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 endeavor 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 anything, yet your Lordship perceives this does not in any degree affect the point in question: Still it behooves every Christian, nay, every reasonable Heathen, 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.” (~~1804~~ Proverbs 26:4.) 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 endeavoring 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*, preface, 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 a color of opposing enthusiasm; and to increase and give a sanction to the profaneness which already over spreads 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 haeretico comburendo*? ^{f4} 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 honor 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 neighbor, 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. VIII. p. 477.) 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 endeavor 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 Mahometans 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*.)^{f5} 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.” (Pages 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.” (Section iii., p. 12 etc.) 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. I. p. 74.) 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,” etc. (*Ibid.* p. 76, etc.) This whole “string of self-commendation,” as you call it, being there brought, *ex professo*, 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. I. p. 311.) 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?’” (*Ibid.* p. 320.) She did so. And what does this prove?

The fifth passage is this: “In applying which my soul was so enlarged, that me thought 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 pretense, with regard to my brother and me in particular”
 “This pretense, that is, ‘of not employing fit instruments.’” These words are yours, though you insert them as mine. The pretense 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 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-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 than 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 proofs, inward feeling, I am convinced of pride, etc.’” Sir, be pleased to decipher that etc. 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. I. p. 72.)

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. I. p. 266.) 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. (Page 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 everything 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. VIII. p. 412.)

Having largely answered your next objection relating to what I still term “a signal instance of God’s particular providence,” (*Ibid.* pp. 410, 452,) 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.” (Page 51, etc.) 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 traveling 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. I. p. 313,) 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. I. p. 271, “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 defense 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 constrain even poor Horace’s *bellua multorum capitem*^{f6} 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;” (Section viii., p. 75, etc. ;) 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 dullness takes place.”

12. As wildly do you talk of the doubts and fears incident to those who are “weak in faith.” (Section ix., p. 79, etc.) 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 “rising and falling” 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 anything out of anything,) 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. I. p. 103;) 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 sometime 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 laborers 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 an hypocrite have I been (if this be so) for near twice ten years! I 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, completion, yea, (if need were,) the very color of my hair.

15. In your next section, you are to give an account of the “spiritual succors and advantages received either during these trials or very soon after.” (Section x. p. 92, etc.) 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 honor to cite any of my words in this section.

16. “The unsteadiness of the Methodists, both in sentiments and practice,” (Section xi. p. 95, etc.) 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 colors; 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 of 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 practice 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 favorite 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. ^{f7}

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*: ^{f8} “But it is a considerable offense 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. I. p. 160.)

“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 afterwards, ‘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, etc., 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, etc., into certain rules of conduct?” or anywhere 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 anything.

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 further rule, to be brought to the only certain test, the law and the testimony.” (Vol. I. p. 206.)

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 favorite 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, etc.) 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 *spirat tragicum satis*^{f9} charges the Methodists “with skepticism and infidelity, with doubts and denials of the truth of Revelation, and Atheism itself.” (Section xiv. p. 110, etc.) 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 18,) 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 laboring 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 afterwards 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. I. p. 27.)

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. I p. 74.)

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. I. p. 162.)

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, longsuffering, 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. I. p. 162.)

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. VIII. p. 202.)

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 anything 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 anything at all of your private devotions. But I suppose I may inquire, without offense, 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.” (Section xv. p. 115, etc.) 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 threadbare already: “By the most infallible of proofs, inward feeling, I am convinced of levity and luxuriancy 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.” (Section xvi. p. 119, etc.) 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. VIII. p. 409.) “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.” (Section xvii. p. 123, etc.)

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 favor) 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 favorable 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 shameless 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. I. p. 219.)

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 labored attempts to show the “uncharitable spirit” of the Methodists; who, for anything 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;” (Section 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 behavior 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 pretense, 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 behavior 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. I. p. 252.)

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 reached particular, and I universal, redemption;) “and therefore he would not join with me, but publicly preach against me.” (Section xix. p. 341, etc.)

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 rancor.

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 rancor or fierceness. Still, therefore, you miss the mark.

You quote, Fifthly, these words: “I spent an hour with Mr. Stonehouse. O what *πιθανολογια*, ‘persuasiveness of speech,’ is here! Surely all the deceivableness of unrighteousness.” (Vol. I. p. 290.) But there was no fierceness or rancor 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 rancor. We had a long conference; but not a fierce one. (Vol. I. p. 293.)

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 rancor 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*,^{f10} 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. I. p. 227.)

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.” (*Ibid.* p. 248.) 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.” (*Ibid.* p. 255.)

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 determined 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 knees. 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.” (*Ibid.*)

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 prove 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 disputations; — not likely to come to any true foundation.” (*Ibid.* p. 259.)

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.” (*Ibid.* p. 269.)

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.” (*Ibid.* p. 280.)

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 inexperienced, 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 labored to heal the jealousies and misunderstandings which had arisen.” (Vol. I. p. 293.)

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.” (*Ibid.* p. 294.)

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.” (*Ibid.* p. 295.)

The Fourth, “February 21. I inquired concerning the divisions and offenses 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.” (*Ibid.* p. 299.)

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 Minister of God, for their backbiting and evil-speaking, I declare the persons above mentioned to be no longer members of this society’” (*Ibid.* p. 301.)

“And we had great reason to bless God, that, after fifty two were withdrawn, we have still upwards of ninety left.” (*Ibid.* p. 302.)

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,” afterwards “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 quarreled. 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 fantacized 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 quarreled with them." Sir, I never quarreled 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 fantacized 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 apprised 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, etc.) 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.

(2.) “The doctrine of assurance of pardon and salvation, present and future, causes a false security, to the neglect of future endeavors.” 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 endeavors after universal holiness.

(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.

(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.

(5.) “The Moravian Methodists trample down morality, and multitudes of the Wesleyans have been infected.” *The Moravian Methodists!* You may as well say, the Presbyterian Papists. The Moravians have no connection with the Methodists. Therefore, whatever 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 neighbor.

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. I. p. 273.) 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;” (*Ibid.* p. 274;) 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 neighbor.” (Vol. I. p. 225.)

And this you term, “disparaging good works!” Sir, these things, considered barely as to the *opus operatum*, 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 learned 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. I. p. 258.)

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. I. p. 258,) 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 Mahometanism.

40. Tedious as it is to wade through so many dirty pages, I will follow you step by step, a little farther. Your Eleventh proof, that we “undermine morality and good works,” is drawn from the following passage: —

“I know one ‘under the law’ is even as I was for near twice ten years. Every one when he begins to see his fallen state, and to feel the wrath of God abiding on him, relapses into the sin that most easily besets him, soon after repenting of it. Sometimes he avoids, and at many other times he cannot persuade himself to avoid, the occasions of it. Hence his relapses are frequent, and, of consequence, his heart is hardened more and more. Nor can he, with all his sincerity, avoid any one of these four marks of hypocrisy, till, ‘being justified by faith,’ he ‘hath peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.’” (Vol. I. p. 222.)

You, Sir, are no competent judge in the cause. But to any who has experienced what St. Paul speaks in his seventh chapter to the Romans, I willingly submit this whole question. You know by experience, that if anger was the sin that did so easily beset you, you relapsed into it for days, or months, or years, soon after repenting of it. Sometimes you avoided the occasions of it; at other times you did not. Hence your relapses were frequent, and your heart was hardened more and more: And yet all this time you was sincerely striving against sin; you could say, without hypocrisy, “The thing which I do, I allow not; the evil which I would not, that I do. To will is even now present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.”

But the Jesuits, you think, “could scarce have granted salvation upon easier terms. Have no fear, ye Methodists.” Sir, I do not grant salvation, as you call it, upon so easy terms. I believe a man in this state is in a state of damnation. “Have no fear!” say you? Yea, but those who are thus “under the law” are in fear all the day long. “Was there ever so pleasing a scheme?” Pleasing with a vengeance! As pleasing as to be in the belly of hell. So totally do you mistake the whole matter, not knowing what you speak, nor whereof you affirm.

You are, indeed, somewhat pitiable in speaking wrong on this head, because you do it in ignorance. But this plea cannot be allowed when you gravely advance that trite, threadbare objection concerning the Lord’s supper, without taking any notice that I have answered it again and again, both to Mr. Church and to the late Lord Bishop of London.

41. Your Thirteenth proof is this: “Mr. Wesley has taught us that infirmities are no sins.” Sir, you have taught me to wonder at nothing you assert; else I should wonder at this. The words I suppose you refer to, stand in the sermon “On Salvation by Faith;” though you do not choose to show your reader where they may be found: “He that is by faith born of God sinneth not,

(1.) By any habitual sin: Nor,

(2.) By any wilful sin: Nor,

(3.) By any sinful desire; for he continually desireth the holy and perfect will of God: Nor,

(4.) Doth he sin by infirmities, whether in act, word, or thought; for his infirmities have no concurrence of his will, and, without this, they are not properly sins.” And this, you seriously declare, “is a loop-hole to creep out of every moral and religious obligation!”

In the same paragraph, you say I have strongly affirmed that “all our works and tempers are evil continually; that our whole heart is altogether corrupt and abominable, and consequently our whole life; all our works, the most specious of them, our righteousness, our prayers, needing an atonement themselves.” (Vol. I. pp. 76, 97, 161, 214.)

I do strongly affirm this. But of whom? In all these places, but the last, of myself only. In every one, but this, I speak in the singular number, and of myself when confusedly an unbeliever. And of whom do I speak in that last place? Of unbelievers, and them only. The words are, “All our tempers and works in our natural state are only evil continually.”

Now, Sir, where is your loop-hole to creep out? If you have none, I fear every impartial man will pass sentence upon you, that you have no regard either to moral or religious obligations.

I have now weighed every argument you have brought, to prove that the “Methodists undermine morality and good works.” A grievous charge indeed! But the more inexcusable is he who advances it, but is not able to make it good in any one single instance. Pardon my pertness, Sir, in not barely affirming, (that is your manner,) but proving, this: Nay, and in

telling you, that you cannot make amends to God, to me, or to the world, without a retraction as public as your calumny.

42. You add, “How the case stands, in fact, as to the number of converts among the Methodists, and real reformation of life to the certain and known duties of the gospel, is matter of difficult determination.” Not at all. What is easier to be determined, than,

(1.) That A. B. of Exeter, or Tiverton, was for many years a notorious drunkard, common-swearer, or Sabbath-breaker?

(2.) That he is not so now; that he is really reformed from drunkenness, swearing, Sabbath-breaking, to sobriety and the other certain and known duties of the gospel?

“But from what inquiry” you “can make, there is no reason to think them, for the generality, better than their neighbors.” *Better than their neighbors?* Why, are they no worse than their neighbors? Then, what have you been doing all this time? But whether they are better or worse than their neighbors, they are undeniably better than themselves: I mean, better than they were before they heard this preaching “in the certain and known duties of the gospel.”

But you desire us to “consider their black art of calumny; their uncharitableness; their excessive pride and vanity; their skepticism, doubts, and disbelief of God and Christ; their disorderly practices, and contempt of authority; their bitter envying and inveterate broils among themselves; their coolness for good works.” Sir, we will consider all these, when you have proved them. Till then this is mere *brutum fulmen*.^{f11}

43. You proceed: “If we take Mr. Wesley’s own account, it falls very short of any considerable reformation.” You mean, if we take that part of his account which you are pleased to transcribe. *Atticam elegantiam!*^{f12} But let any impartial man read my whole account, and then judge.

However, hence you infer that “the new reformers have made but a slow and slight progress in the reformation of manners.”

As a full answer to this I need only transcribe a page or two from the last “Appeal,” pp. 237, 238, etc.: —

“God begins a glorious work in our land. You set yourself against it with 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 have 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 labored 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 draw 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 honor 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, etc.) 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 sags, where a Methodist was receiving the sacrament, God was pleased to let him see a crucified Savior.” 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 an hindrance to religion; and much less, that “teaching and believing the fundamental errors of Popery, with the whole train of their abominations and idolatries.” (practiced, 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. I. p. 220.) 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 further 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 concession between the Methodists and Mahometans.

“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 Charterhouse school.

But “a Jesuit’s or enthusiast’s declaring against Popery is no test of their sincerity.” Most sure; nor is a nameless persons 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 anything 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 you 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 favors 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 neighbor 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.

A

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 ^{f13} related to a matter of fact published on your Lordship's authority, which I endeavored to falsify, and your Lordship now again endeavors 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. 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 neighbors.’ 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 neighboring 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.” (Page 7.) I believe it; and consequently, that the want of exactness in this point rests on Mrs. Morgan, not on your Lordship.

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 wave 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. (Page 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. (Page 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 parlor; 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 hers such things as were not fit to be spoken;” Page 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.” (Page 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. Afterwards 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." (Pages 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. BALLY, OF CORK.

IN ANSWER TO A LETTER TO THE REV. JOHN WESLEY.

Reverend Sir,

Limerick, June 8, 1750.

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*? ^{f14}

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 favor; 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 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. ^{f15}

I shall first state the facts on which the present controversy turns; and then consider the most material parts of your performance.

I.

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 honor 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-houses 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, fearing 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.

3. “JOHN STOCKADE, 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.

4. “DANIEL SULLIVAN, of Cork, baker, deposes,

“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 afterwards 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 an 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 STOCKADE 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 endeavored 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 afterwards 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 an 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.

“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 neighbors 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 neighbors, 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 William’s,” etc.

“We find and present Robert Swindle,” etc.

“We find and present Jonathan Reeves,” etc.

“We find and present James Wheatley,” etc.

“We find and present John Larwood,” etc.

“We find and present Joseph M’Auliff,” etc.

“We find and present Charles Skelton,” etc.

“We find and present William Tooker,” etc.

“We find and present Daniel Sullivan,” etc.

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!”^{f16} their chief declaring to them all, he had full liberty now to do whatever he would, even to 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, endeavoring 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 endeavored 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 honor 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 pretense 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 Pembrock, 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 any 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 honor the King. I earnestly desire to be at peace with all men. I have not willingly given any offense, either to the Magistrates, the Clergy, or any of the inhabitants of the city of Cork; neither do I desire anything 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, Wheatley, 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. (Page 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 honor and conscience.

You next aver, that Mr. Reeves “asked a young woman, whether she had a mind to go to hell with her father.” (Page 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.’” (Page 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 ~~same~~ 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.” (Pages 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 behavior at church, turning 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 Wheatley, you pronounce in the lump, that they are “a parcel of vagabond, illiterate babblers;” (pages 3, 4;) of whom “everybody 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 case. 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 sins 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.” (Pages 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.” 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 born 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.” (Page 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 colors 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 honor 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?” (Page 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, First, you charge me with “a frontless assurance, and a well-dissembled hypocrisy.” (Page 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 an “harebrained enthusiast.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 8.) An heavy charge, but without all color 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.” (Page 21.) “Two thousand pence a week! a fine yearly revenue from assurance and salvation tickets!” (Page 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 an 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 living for your yearly penny contributions.” (Page 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 if “the honor” 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? ^{f17}

And especially, while there are so many drawbacks, so many dead flies in the pot of ointment. Sheer honor 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 honor or dishonor? 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 honor 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 anything to do with that. Why, if so, I should rather leave you the honor, and myself sleep in a whole skin. On that supposition I quite agree with the epigrammatist: —

*Virgilii in tumulto, divini praemia vatis,
Explicat en viridem laurea laeta comam.
Quid te defunctum juvat haec? Felicior olim
Sub patulae fagi tegmine vivus eras.* ^{f18}

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.” (Page 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 Ithacus velit et magno mercentur Atridae. ^{f19}

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, “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 honor above their brethren.” (Pages 29, 30.)

What do you mean? If you mean anything 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 “endeavoring to secure the peace of the city.” (Page 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 “endeavoring 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 afflict their temporal interest.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 ye 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 honor 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 sons 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 honor 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 offense, 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 endeavored to hinder me from calling sinners to repentance in that open and public manner; but hitherto it has been all lost labor. 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 honorable 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 anything 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, laborers, 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 either age or sex; not sparing even those of tender years; no, nor women, though great with child; but, with more than Pagan or Mahometan 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 honor of our nation? I appeal unto Caesar; 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 honorable abroad? Men of Ireland, judge! Nay, and is not 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 neighbor 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 today 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.” (Pages 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.” (Page 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 ardor 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.” (Pages 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 anything 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. (*Ibid.*) 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.” (Page 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 inspirations?” 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;” (Page 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, raillery 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.” (Pages 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 as 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 endeavors 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 favor of the gospel, and the profession of it is under the protection and encouragement of the civil power?” *The prejudices of mankind are in favor 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 favor 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 favor 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 favor 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 pretense, 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 further 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.” (Pages 27, 28.)

High sounding words! But, blessed be God, they are only *brutum fulmen*: They make much noise, but do not wound. “To what purpose could any further 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 an 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 an 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.” (Page 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,

Lakenheath, November 7, 1758.

John Wesley.

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.” (Page 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*,
f20 — 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.” (Page 56.) A little candor 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.” (Pages 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*,^{f21} 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.” (Page 6.) “A couple of young, raw, aspiring twigs of the ministry dreamed of a special and supernatural call to this.” (Page 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.” (Pages 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.” (Page 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. VI. p. 4.)

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 nosses*:^{f22} “They outstripped, if possible, even Montanus, for external sanctity and severity of discipline.” (Page 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 an impoverishment of their families.” (Page 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 honor of conversing with you. Or could you (as the legend says of St. Pabomius) “smell an 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 everything 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.” Insomuch, 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 wolflings 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Pages 101, 102.) “These doctrines are unreasonable and ridiculous, clashing with our natural ideas of the divine perfections, with the end of religion, with the honor 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.” (Pages 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 everything 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 laboring 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 concenterd in the Methodists; particularly those of the Simonians, Gnostics, Antinomies,” (as widely distant from each other as Predestinarians from Calvinists!) “Valentinians, Donatists, and Montanists.” (Pages 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. VIII. pp. 483, 484.)

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 an 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 thousand 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,” etc., etc, (page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 labors. 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 dispatched 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 contra-distinction to others, as the regenerate, the children of God, and as having arrived at sinless perfection.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 labor. 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 as implicitly in their Preachers, as the Papists in their Pope, Councils, or Church.” (Page 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: “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.” (Page 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.” (Page 22.) Pray, Sir, favor 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 favored with very large oblations from persons of better figure and fortune; and especially from many believing wives, who had learned to practice 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 favored 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 honorable 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 anything 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 an healthful mind. As to those “many believing wives who practice pious frauds on their unbelieving husbands,” I know

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 abode. 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. ^{f23}

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,

JOHN WESLEY.

LONDON, November 17, 1759.

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 Foundry,” 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. (⁴¹²⁵Matthew 12:37.) 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) ‘or the remission of the sins that are past;’ saying, ‘I will be merciful to thy unrighteousness,

and thine iniquities I will remember no more.’ (⌘⁴¹²⁵ Romans 3:25; ⌘⁴¹⁸² Hebrews 8:12.)

“I believe the condition of this is faith. (⌘⁴⁰¹⁵ Romans 4:5, etc.) 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: (⌘⁴¹⁶⁶ Luke 6:43:) 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. (⌘⁴¹²⁴ Hebrews 12:14.)

“It is allowed, also, that repentance, and ‘fruits meet for repentance,’ go before faith. (⌘⁴¹¹⁵ Mark 1:15; ⌘⁴¹⁸⁸ Matthew 3:8.) 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; (⌘⁴¹⁸⁴ Matthew 6:14,15;) ceasing from evil, doing good; (⌘⁴¹⁸⁸ Luke 3:8,9, etc.;;) using the ordinances of God, and, in general, obeying him according to the measure of grace which we have received. (⌘⁴¹⁰⁰ Matthew 7:7; ⌘⁴¹⁵⁹ 25:29.) But these I cannot as yet term good works; because they do not spring from faith and the love of God.” (*Farther Appeal*. Vol. VIII. pp. 46, 47.)

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!” (Page 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, from express testimonies of Scripture. So ^{<354>}Isaiah 1:16,17: ‘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 ^{<354>}Ezekiel 33:14-16: 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, ^{<412>}Matthew 11:28, (*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.”” (^{<412>}Acts 10:35.) 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 anything. “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.’” (^{<412>}1 John 1:7) 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.” (Pages 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.” (Page 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 all together. Neither doth faith shut out good works, necessarily to be done afterwards, of duty towards God.

“That we are justified only by this faith in Christ, speak all the ancient authors; specially 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* of things not seen; which is far more than a bare asset, and yet *toto genere* 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;” (Page 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;” (page 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?” (Pages 20, 21, 22.)

“The works secluded 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 by 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.” (Page 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 anything 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.’” (Page 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' 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!" (Page 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.* ^{f24}

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.” (*Preface*, p. 11.) I will endeavor 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.

I.

First. Concerning me. It is true I am here dealing in *crambe repetita*,^{f25} 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 ~~SUBJ~~ James 3:17.” (Page 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 whole any or all of them are found.” (Page 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.” (Page 119.)

The miraculous gifts bestowed upon the Apostles are enumerated in two places: First, ⁴¹⁶⁷Mark 16:17,18: “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, ⁴¹⁷⁸1 Corinthians 12:8-10: “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 1, 1740. Some or other of the children of Belial had labored 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.” (Page 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 is still; ‘for his goods were in peace.’”

5. “April 29, 1752. I preached at Durham to a quiet, stupid congregation.” (Page 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.)

8. “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 anyone, unaccountably spreading itself to the rest, so that exceeding few were able to escape it.” (Pages 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” (page 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.” (*Ibid.*)
 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,” (page 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.” (Page 127.)
- “But here the symptoms of grace and of perdition are interwoven and confounded with one another.” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.*) They did so; which made me say,

8. “I fear we have grieved the Spirit of the jealous God, by questioning his work.” (*Ibid.*)

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.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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 me thought I could have cried out, (in another sense than poor vain Archimedes,) ‘Give me where to stand, and I will shake the earth.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 132.)

4. “The longer I spoke, the more strength I had; till at twelve, I was as one refreshed with wine.” (Page 133.)

5. “I explained the nature of inward religion, words flowing upon me faster than I could speak.” (*Ibid.*)

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 anything but pray and give thanks.” (*Ibid.*) 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.” (*Ibid.*)

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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.*) I believe they did, as it was a calm day, and the hill rose gradually like a theater.
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. (Page 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 please him; not that I make myself either “a great saint or a great Physician.” (Page 137.)
4. “R. A. was freed at once, without any human means, from a distemper naturally incurable.” (Page 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 I was sent.” (*Ibid.*) 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.” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.*)

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.” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.*) 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 145.)

4. “The case of Mr. W——n was dreadful indeed, and too notorious to be denied.” (*Ibid.*)

5. “One of the chief of those who came to make the disturbance on the first instant hanged himself.” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.*)

7. “Mr. C. spoke so much in favor of the rioters, that they were all discharged. A few days after, walking over the same field, he dropped down, and spoke no more.” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.*) 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 149.) I claim no *extraordinary gift* at all; nor has anything to the contrary been proved yet, so much as in a single instance.

“We come now to the application of this sovereign test, ~~SUBT~~ James 3:17.” 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, anything 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.

I.

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.” (Page 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:

(2.) That orthodoxy, or right opinion, is at best but a very slender part of religion; if it call be allowed to be any part of it at all.” (Page 157.)

After premising that it is our bounden duty to labor 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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: (~~4:32~~ Ephesians 5:9:) “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,” (~~4:32~~ 4:32,) — opposite to “bitterness, wrath, anger, clamor, 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 particular 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*. 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 hindrance, 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.” (Page 160.)

“(As to the affair of Abbe 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.)” (Page 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.” (Page 162.) But still it is true, that “God generally speaking, begins his work at the heart.” (*Ibid.*) 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.’” (Page 162.)

Mr. D. was never a proselyte of mine; nor did I ever see him before or since. I endeavored 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.” (Page 163.) Frequently, but not always. The jailer’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 England and in America, I do not so much as “insinuate that the understanding has nothing to do in the work.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 anything that has yet been said, may teach the soundest doctrine in the world.

(3.) “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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 honor 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 behavior than was usual with those of their age and station.”
(Preface to “the Character of a Methodist.”)

I need only add, that this nickname 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*,^{f26} 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.” (Page 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 sprang.*

“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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 174-177.) “But this Mr. W. calls, ‘the mystery of iniquity, and the offspring of hell.’” (Page 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.’” (Pages 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 dishonor 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 dishonor 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 charter 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. (Pages 181-186.)

But “Mr. W. wanted to be persecuted.” (Page 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;” (^{STRD}2 Timothy 3:12;) 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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” (^{STRD}Ephesians 4:29.)

(3.) Mr. Wesley “resolved never to laugh, nor to speak a tittle of worldly things;” (page 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.” (Page 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 labors 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,” (Page 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.” (Page 196.)

4. “The Fourth mark is, ‘full of mercy and good fruits.’ Let us inquire into the ‘mercy and good fruits’ of Mr. W.” (Page 198.)

(1.) And, First: “He has no mercy on his opposers. They pass with him under on other title, than that of the devil’s servants, and the devil’s children.” (*Ibid.*) 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.” (Page 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.’” (Page 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.’” (Page 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 laboring with all his might to hinder the word of God, had afterwards 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.” (Page 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. I. p. 397.) 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; all our labor 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 neighbors, chiefly by giving alms; but that a man might both be harmless, use the means of grace, and do much good, and yet; have not 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.” (Pages 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 an one cry after Jesus of Nazareth, till he saith,' Thy faith hath made thee whole.'" (*Journal*, Vol. I. p. 407.)

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 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." (Page 209.)

(5.) "I desired one to visit Mrs. G in Bedlam, put in by her husband, as a madwoman." but she never was mad in any degree, as he himself afterwards acknowledged.

(6.) "One was so deeply convinced of her ungodliness, that she cried out day and night, 'Lord, save, or I perish!' All the neighbors 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.” (Page 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 Savior.

“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.” (Page 211:)

“A poor woman (on Wednesday, September 17, 1740) said, it was four years (namely, in September 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.” (Page 212.) Certainly I do, both repentance and faith. “And which therefore we may call the good fruits of his ministry.” May God increase them an 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.” (Page 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. (Pages 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 dispense 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 pretenses.”

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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.

(3.) 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 favorite saints, whom he has vindicated from the opprobrium.” (Page 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. O what a pity it is, this well-meaning man should ever speak without an interpreter!” (Page 223.)

Let this passage likewise stand as it is, and who can guess how it is to prove my partiality? But by a slight-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.” (Page 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 Keelmal’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.” (Pages 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 anything 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.” (Page 230.) “But Christ himself establishes the power of working miracles, as the great criterion of a divine mission.” (Page 231.) True, of a mission to be the Savior 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.’” (Pages 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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, nor 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?” (Page 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: “Everything 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.” (Page 236.)

“Now, these were the very symptoms which he had before ascribed to the Spirit of God.” (Page 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*” ^{f27} 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 everywhere 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 opportunity 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.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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." (Page 244.) *Bona verba!* 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 laborers 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;" (page 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." (Pages 252, 253.) Where? I do not know. Let the passages be cited; else, let me speak for it even so much, it will prove nothing. "At last he was forced to have recourse to what he had so much scorned, I mean, prudence." (Page 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 labored,' 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 to Mr. Gr—— to play the hypocrite with him." (*Ibid.*) 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." (Page 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 practiced 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 entreated, 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.’” (Page 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.’” (Page 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 “Sow 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 cooperate with man, in establishing his faith, and in

perfecting his obedience; or, in other words, should sanctify him to redemption.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 Polish exorcist, than I can believe the tale of an 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.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.’” (Page 340.) Is he not, then, everywhere, 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 55.)

A vehement paradox this! But it is not proved yet, and probably never will.

“The labors of those who have attempted to defend the purity of Scripture Greek have been very idly employed.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 fervor, though violent, is rarely lasting; never so long as to establish the new system into an 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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?” (Page 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.’ (~~4138~~ 1 Corinthians 13:8, etc.)”

“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.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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 vigor 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 vigor and maturity in their successors, then miracles shall cease.” (Page 102.) But I fear that time is not yet come. I doubt, none that are now alive enjoy more of the vigor 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.” (Page 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 there 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 center 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.” (Page 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 Mahometans 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 further 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.” (Page 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 further 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 honor.” *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 endeavor once more to give you a distinct, full, and determinate answer.

“(1.) 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.

“(2.) 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 neighbors 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.

“(3.) 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 it 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 favor, 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 counselor.’ 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 pretenses.’ 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*; 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 pretenses? 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?’ (⁽¹¹⁴⁾Exodus 14:21,22.) Nay,

*The wounded dragon raged in vain;
And, fierce the utmost plagues to brave,
Madly he dared the parting main,
And sink beneath the o’erwhelming wave.*

Was all this an effectual proof of the truth of their pretenses 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;’ (~~ouch~~ Numbers 16:14;) 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 pretenses?

“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 pretenses? Only till ‘there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium;’ and then they

‘stoned him’ (as they supposed) ‘to death!’ (~~4417~~ Acts 14:7, etc.) 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 θελη 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.’ (~~4417~~ 1 John 2:27.) 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 bind 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, **τεράτα ψευδους**, ‘lying wonders,’ diabolical miracles, 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 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 tomorrow. 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 Foundry, 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 anything for him, and the rest will believe anything.’ 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 determine at 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 then 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 an hundred places; one which cannot be accounted for by the ordinary course of any natural causes whatsoever; one which cannot be ascribed, with any color 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. VIII. pages 460-468.)

“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 candor.’ 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, when 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 honor to our great Master, among those who are not called by his name? Does it recommend Christianity to the Jews, the Mahometans, 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 labor 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 neighbor as ourselves, and therefore to do unto every man as we would he should do unto us.” (*Second Letter to Dr. Church*, Vol. VIII. pages 470-472.)

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.’ (~~6184~~ Romans 8:14.) 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.’ (~~3200~~ Zechariah 12:10) Whereas then, ‘this is the confidence we have in Him, that, if we ask anything 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.’ (~~6180~~ Romans 8:26,27.) ‘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.’ (~~6346~~ John 14:16,26.) 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. (~~6183~~ Romans 8:34.) And we have ‘another Paraclete,’ saith our Savior, (~~6346~~ John 14:16; ~~6182~~ Romans 8:27) ‘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 “reveling” 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 Savior 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.” (*Homil 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 that giveth eloquence and utterance in preaching the gospel, which engendereth a burning zeal towards 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 you.’ To this agreeth St. John: ‘The anointing which ye have received’ (he meaneth the Holy Ghost) ‘abideth in you.’ (~~1~~ 1 John 2:27) 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 14:16) 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 16:13) And (N. B.) where the Holy Ghost doth instruct and teach, there is no delay at all in learning.” (*Ibid.*)

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 14:16.)
- (2.) That every Christian receives him, as “the Spirit of Truth,” (promised John 16:13,) 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.” (*Ibid.* 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 honor. He only ministereth spiritual strength to the powers of the soul and body. And if we have any gift whereby we may profit our neighbor, all is wrought by this one and, selfsame Spirit.” (*Homily on Rogation Week. Part III.*)

Every proposition which I have anywhere 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 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 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.” (Pages 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. VI., p. 71.)

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 behavior 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 Foundry, 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 behavior 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. VIII. p. 472.)

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 anything 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 “honor to whom honor 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,

JOHN WESLEY.

November 26, 1762.

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 favorably: 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, waving 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 neighbor, 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,) superadded 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.

*Composition jus, fasque animo, sanctosque recessus
Mentis, et incoctum generoso pectus honesto.* ^{f28}

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 center 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 towards 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 over spread 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 on 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*,)^{f29} 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 labor 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 practice 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 neighbor 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 anything, 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 tinnerns 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 in 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 imposed 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 goodwill 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 labor for peace: But what I speak thereof, they make themselves ready for battle. ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 120:7.

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 favor, 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 anything 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.” (~~409~~ Acts 20:29,30.) Having shown that St. 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. (Pages 5-8.) Very true; but what is this to the point? O, much more than some are aware of. This 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, ‘ravening 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.” (Page 8.)

Round assertions! Let us consider them one by one:

(1.) “These are styled by Christ ‘ravening wolves;’ by St. Paul, ‘grievous wolves.’” True; but how does it appear that these names are applicable to the Methodists? Why, they “read 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 honor? 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 an 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 pretenses.” (Page 9.) This is another chance; 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 Mahometanism. As groundless, as senselessly, shamelessly false, is the assertion following: “To reflect their ecstasies and fanatic pretenses to revelation is cried up as a crime of the blackest dye.” 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.” (Page 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 Mahometan 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.” (Page 12.) Certainly the Methodists do not: This is another bad 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 faith covered over with thorns.” (Page 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.’” (Page 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 goodwill, 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.” (Pages 2-4.)

This is all happening 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 anything 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 practice publicly.

“3. That, after such trial, they be authorized to practice 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 practice:

“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 an 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 practice?

“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 wave 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.

“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 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 an 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 *οὕτω 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*. 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 wave 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 an 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. VIII. p. 233.)

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.” (Page 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 Savior.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 honor to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron?’” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Pages 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 offenses among you; for they serve not the Lord, but their own bellies.” (Page 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 neighbor as themselves! the walking in justice, mercy, and truth! the doing to all as they would be done to! *Felices errore suo!*^{f30} 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, ardors, and ecstasies.” (Page 19.) Who tells them so? Not I: Not Mr. Bourke: Not any in connection with me. Sir, you yourself either do or ought to know the contrary. Whether therefore these are, or are not, “signs of the Spirit,” (Page 20,) see you to it; it is nothing to me; any more than whether the Spirit does or does not “show itself in groaning 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 anything 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.

Limerick, 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 everywhere speaks as one in good humor. 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 favorite 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, ^{f31} 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 barefaced 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 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 *θεραπεία ψυχης*, “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 honorable 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 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 honor to our cause, nor is 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. O 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 1.

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, endeavor 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?

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, according 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~~ Genesis 6:5,12,13.) 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~~ Genesis 7:1.) 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 works 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.” ^{f32}

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.” (~~CHAP~~ Genesis 11:4,9.) 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. (⁽¹¹¹⁾Genesis 12:1,2.) Nor is there any reason to believe, that the rest of mankind were improved either in wisdom or virtue, when “Lot and Abraham separated themselves, and Lot pitched his tent toward Sodom.” (⁽¹¹²⁾Genesis 13:11,12.) 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;” (⁽¹¹³⁾Genesis 13:13;) 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.” (⁽¹¹⁴⁾Genesis 19:24.)

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,” (⁽¹¹⁵⁾Genesis 50:20,) 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.” (⁽¹¹⁶⁾Psalms

147:20.) 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~~ Psalm 78:8,10; ~~Psalm~~ 106:7; ~~Exodus~~ Exodus 14:11,12;) the very place where he had so signally delivered them. “They made a calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten image,” (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 56:19,) 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 behavior during those whole forty years that they sojourned in the wilderness! even while he “led them in the daytime with a cloud, and all the night with a light of fire!” (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 78:14.) 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 cunnus teterrima belli
Causa; sed ignotis perierunt mortibus omnes
Quos venerem incertam rapientes more ferarum,
Viribus editior caedebat, 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:
 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 cibilia propter,
 Unguibus et pugnīs, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
 Pugnant armīs, quae 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 overlived Joshua.” (^{408B}Joshua 24:31.) 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.” (^{409D}Acts 7:42,43.)

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.” (^{408B}Psalms 78:34,37.) 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.” (^{411B}1 Kings 19:18.) 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 pretense 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 sepulchers, 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!” (⁴²³⁴Matthew 23:14, etc.) And to these very men, after they had murdered the Just One, his faithful follower declared, “Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye.” (⁴¹⁵¹Acts 7:51) 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 leveled 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 this 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 the 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.” (⁴¹²Romans 1:21, etc.) 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 sapientia 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, —

*Haec satis est orare Jovem, quae donat et aufert:
Det vitam, det opes; aequum 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!” (⁴¹²Romans 1:21, etc.)

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, —*

*“That 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 dishonor 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, honorable Roman matrons (so

little were they ashamed!) wore their *priapi* 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!

Formosum 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 honor 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 favorite of Rome and of the Muses! Hear him explaining himself a little more fully on this tender point: —

*Eheu! quam 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 anything 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: —

Pasiphaen nivei solatur amore juvenci!

“He comforts Pasiphae with the love of her milk-white bull!” *Nihil supra!*

^{f33} 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*, ^{f34} 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 coloring 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 ἀστοργοί, *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 sepulcher. 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 misere superstitiosae 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 indict 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 grayheaded 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 aemula*; “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 endeavoring 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 villainy 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 Caesarve priorem,
Pompeiusve parem.*

*“Nor Caesar 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 Caesar? 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 Caesar?

*“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*. Who was this Vercingetorix? As brave a man, and (considering his years) as great a General, as even Caesar. What was his crime? The love of his parents, wife, children, country; and sacrificing all things in the defense of them. And how did Caesar 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 broke 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 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 wave 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 Mahometan, and only five Christian. Let us take as fair and impartial a survey as we can of the Heathens first, and then of the Mahometans 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 honorable 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 pray'd 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 pretense 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 Mahometanism 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 lovesick 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 anything 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 behavior 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 over-reaching 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 anything 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 consequence 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 neighbor, 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 labor; 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 travelers 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 favor, — 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 understanding; 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 honored 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 over-reaching," is the natural bent and genius of the Chinese. Gain is their God; they prefer this to everything 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 Mahometans 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 favorable opinion both of Mahomet 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 Mahometans not only condemn all who cannot swallow them to everlasting fire, — not only appropriate to themselves the title of Mussulmen, 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. Mahometans 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 Mussulman 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 Mahomet 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 are now to the Christian world. But we must not judge 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 Mahometans.

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 honor; I take only my pay;" took a small piece of silver, and retired.

This was *a man of honor* 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 labor. But in the midst of their meal conscience awaked. 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 neighboring

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 for 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 anyone, 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 modern and ancient 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 villainies of Romish nations.”

9. Have we not? Are Protestant nations nothing concerned in those melancholy reflections of Mr. Cowley? — “If twenty thousand naked Americans were not able to resist the assaults of but twenty well-armed Spaniards, how is it possible for one honest man to defend himself against twenty thousand knaves, who are all furnished *cap-a-pie* 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 civillest, 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 everything 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 practicing 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 honor 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 neighbor 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 towards 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 Counselors 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 color for a coat, whether black, white, or gray; 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 a 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 neighbors 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 they possibly 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, Mahometan, 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 strewed 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 praecipites cingebant oppida fossae;
Non galeae, non ensis erat. Sine militis usu
Mollia securae peragebant otia gentes.*

*“Steep ditches did not then the towns 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 everything 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 put their clothes on and off, if they have any besides a blanket; but other knowledge they have none, unless is 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* and *Pater Noster*; 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) that 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.^{f35} 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 brook.
The Christian savages remain;
Strangers, yea, enemies to God,
The 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 northeast passage. Is there, then, any possibility that they should practice 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 savor 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 unaccustomed goods,) is a thief of the first order, a highwayman or pickpocket 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 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 merchant men, or men of war? What do the men in them think or know about religion? What do they practice; 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 peddlers 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 practice?

“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 offense 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 pretense, to defraud His Majesty of his just right? How many of them will not be deterred from doing their duty either by fear or favor, regard no threatening 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 honor 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 not? 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 tomorrow. 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*, 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 honor. But I have lately had more experience. Whoever wrongs the widow and fatherless, knows not what honor or honesty means. And how very few are there that would 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 honor, either of him who made the agreement, or him who gave back the articles to him?

That there is honor, nay, and honesty, to be found in another body of men, among the gentlemen of the law, I firmly believe, whether Attorneys, Solicitors, or Counselors. But are they not thinly spread? Do the generality of Attorneys and Solicitors in Chancery love their neighbor as themselves, and do to others what (if the circumstances were changed) they would have others do to them? Do the generality of Counselors walk by this rule, and by the rules of justice, mercy, and truth? Do they use their utmost endeavors, 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'd think very differently from your Master, who made no exception of time or nation when he uttered that weighty sentence, “How difficulty 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 illa
Fortuna 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 anything 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 thousands 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 and 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 endeavor

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 neighbors.

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 you not 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 afterwards wish you had not said? do nothing which you wish you had not done? Do you never speak anything contrary to truth or love? Is that right? Let your own conscience determine. Do you never do anything 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 has 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 behavior: 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 hers live with you? And do they, too, exercise your patience? Is there nothing in their temper or behavior that gives you pain? nothing which you wish to have altered? Are you a parent yourself? 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 behavior 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 laborers 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 labor? 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 neighbors 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 towards you? And are they, (as far as you see or know,) in all other respects, reasonable and religious men? How many of your neighbors answer this character? Would it require a large house to contain them?

But you have intercourse, not with the next neighbors 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 more honest 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 our 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 trust this Honorable, if not Right Honorable, 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, laborers, neighbors; of tradesmen, Gentry, Nobility. What then can we expect from Papists? what from Jews, Mahometans, 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 antique contraxit tempora veris,
Perque hyemes, aestusque, et inaequales 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 venae peioris in aevum
Omne nefas: Fugere pudor, verumque, fidesque;
In quorum subiere locum, fraudesque, dolique,
Insidiaeque, 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 inquiri in annos;
Victa jacet pietas; et Virgo caede madentes
Ultima coelestium terras Astraea 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 parna 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 everything; 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 no way desirable; others which ought to be avoided, yea, abhorred, as 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 neighbor, your acquaintance, or one you casually talk with, labors, 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 necessities, 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 labors. 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 neighbors. For they are not content; their “eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor” their “ear with hearing.” Endeavoring 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 shape; 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 2

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 eundum 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 nowise, 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, Mahometan, 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 practice 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;” (⁴⁹⁵²1 Corinthians 15:22, compared with ⁴⁹⁵¹Genesis 2 and 3;) 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.” (~~410~~ Romans 5:12.)

But you aver, that “no evil but temporal death came upon men in consequence of Adam’s sin.” ^{f36} And this you endeavor to prove by considering the chief scriptures which are supposed to relate thereto.

The first you mention is ~~417~~ Genesis 2:17: “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.” (Page 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 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 Edition, page 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 Genesis 3, from verse 7 to 24. (Pages 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.” (Page 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.’ (⁽¹⁰²²⁾Exodus 32:25)” Certainly, naked does not mean guilty here; but either stripped of their ornaments, (⁽¹⁰³⁵⁾33:5, 6,) or of their swords, or their upper garment. “Thy nakedness shall be uncovered; yea, thy shame shall be seen.” (⁽²³⁰⁸⁾Isaiah 47:3.) (Page 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.” (⁽¹⁰⁴⁵⁾Revelation 16:15.) 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.’ (⁽¹⁰⁰⁸⁾Genesis 3:8.) They had no such fear while they were innocent; but now they were afraid to stand before their Judge.” (Page 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 hasted 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 unhumbled 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.” (Page 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*, page 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." (Page 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." (Page 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 anything 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~~Genesis 9:25, 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.” (Page 15.)

“The serpent is cursed, ~~GEN~~ Genesis 3:14, 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 18.)

Here, observe,

(1.) “A curse is pronounced on the serpent and on the ground; but no curse upon the woman and the man.” (Page 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 noting all things which are” contained “in the law to do them.” Vainly, therefore, do you subjoin, “Though they are subjected to sorrow, labor, 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.

(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.” (Page 20.) “This dissolution alone” is expressed in those words. But how does it appear, that nothing more is imputed? 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 ⁴⁶⁵¹1 Corinthians 15:21, 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.

(2.) “It is undeniable, that all mankind ‘die in Adam;’ all are mortal, in consequence of his sin.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 offense, so also is the free gift. For if through the offense 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’ offense ‘to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offenses unto justification.

“For if by one man’s offense 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 offense 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.’ (~~ROM~~ Romans 5:12-19.)” (Page 26.)

On this you observe:

(1.) That this passage “speaks of temporal death, and no other.” (Page 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 aforementioned death; for the ‘condemnation’ inflicted by the ‘judgment’ of God (Verse 16,) is the same thing with ‘being dead.’ (Verse 15.)” (Page 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.’” (Page 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, (^{CHPT}Genesis 3:17, 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 offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation.’” (Page 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 offense of one judgment

came upon all men to condemnation,’ answer in sense to those, (Verse 17,) ‘By one man’s offense death reigned by one.’” (*Ibid.*) 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:” (Pages 31, 32:) For if it would follow from hence, that, “By the offense 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Pages 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.” (Page 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, are 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;” (page 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 ‘offense 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.” (Page 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, “Who so 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 willful, 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 signed against law, making death the penalty of their sin, as Adam did.” (Page 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.” (Page 43.) It does; and thereby overthrows your whole assertion. “No; for,

(i.) 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,

(ii.) “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,

(iii.) “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 offense, so is the free gift. For if through the offense of one many be dead, much more the grace’ (or favor) ‘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.” (Pages 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 offense to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offenses unto justification;’ (Verse 16;) that is, the grace of God in Christ discharges mankind from the consequences of Adam’s one offense.” Does it entirely discharge them from these consequences? from sorrow, and labor, 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’” (Page 29, *et seq.*) “Were made sinners,” you aver means only, “were made mortal.” If so, the counterpart, “if made righteous,” can only mean, “made mortal.” 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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, labor, 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 offense” only; the acquittal is from “many offenses.”
- (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."

"Further, the phrase, 'being made righteous,' as well as 'being made sinners,' is a Hebrew way of speaking." (Page 49.) I do not allow that: Both the phrases, καθιστασθαι δίκαιοι, 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;" (page 44;) and, in explaining those very words, "The free gift is of many offenses 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 guilt," "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 ~~18th~~ 1 Corinthians 15:21,22," 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:" (Page 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 offense of his.” (Page 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** (page 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 offense of Adam; who can doubt but, ‘All have sinned,’ means the same with, ‘All are made sinners?’” (Pages 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 offense of one that many are dead.’ (Verse 15.) ‘By one offense 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 offense 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 offense 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, offense, and disobedience: They all suffer by one that sinned. (Verse 16.) ‘By the offense 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 favor 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 offense 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 offenses 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.’ (Verse 17.)” (*Jennings’s Vindication.*)

17. Your paraphrase on the text, (*Taylor’s Doctrine, etc.*, pages 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.” (Page 64.) No; “He shall save his people from their sins;” this is the first and fundamental stepage

(2.) You have very grievously mistaken the meaning of four texts in John 6: “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 everyone 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.” (Verse 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?” (page 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*, page 36, etc.)

(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, etc.*, page 70.)

“To set this in a clear light, I ask another question: What was it that gave the glorious Personage, emblemized by ‘the Lamb,’ (~~an~~ Revelation 5:1, etc.,) 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.”
(Pages 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, labored, 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 honor, and the glory, and the blessing?” (~~612~~ Revelation 5:12.) And is this act the original and the sole ground, why “all men” must “honor him even as they honor 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 honor, 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 “honor him even as they honor the Father,” are they not doing him too much honor? “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 “honored 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 everything with God. True virtue, or the right exercise of reason, is true worth, and the only valuable consideration which prevails with God.” (Page 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 nostrae 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 honor the Son, even as you honor 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.” (Pages 87, 88.) To this I never subscribed; but I think it is in the main a very excellent composition, which I shall therefore cheerfully endeavor 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.” (Page 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.’ (^{<41726>}Acts 17:26.)” (Pages 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*, page 49, etc.) 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 ^{<1026>}Genesis 2:16, 17, where death is threatened to Adam in case of his sinning; then from ^{<4152>}Romans 5:12-20, and ^{<4151>}1 Corinthians 15:21, 22, where we are expressly told that “all men die in Adam;” and that, “by his offense, 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 Genesis 2: 16, 17, compared with ^{<4155>}Romans 5:15-20.

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.” (Pages 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 5, or 1 Corinthians 15, ‘that all mankind 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 offense of one’ brought death into the world; whereas, had all mankind sinned in Adam when he sinned, then that offense would not have been ‘the offense of one,’ but of millions.” (Page 95.) It might be, in one sense, the offense of millions, and in another, “the offense 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 offense, 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.” (Page 96.)

To prove this, they cite ~~ROM~~ Romans 5:12; a proof which all the art of man cannot evade; and ~~ROM~~ Romans 3:23, “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.” (Page 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 came 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*, page 50, etc.)

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 his 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*, etc., page 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.” (Page 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, Romans. 3:10-20. 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.” (Page 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 afterwards point 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 ~~from~~ Ephesians 2:1-3: “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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 110.) Why not? This does not follow from anything 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?” (Page 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.” (Romans 1:19-21.) They had; but how

does it appear that this was the merely natural light of their own unassisted reason? If they had assistances 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.” (Page 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, γεννησιον τεκνον, ‘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, φυσει τεκνα, ‘genuine children of wrath;’ not to signify they were related to wrath by their natural birth, but by their sin and disobedience.” (Page 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 anyway 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 offense of Adam,” is only begging the question once more; though, it is true, they had afterwards 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 premises, *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.” (Page 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 ~~from~~ Romans 5:6: “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.” (Page 115.) From the beginning of the Epistle to the ~~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 ~~the~~ chapter 3:9: ‘What then? Are we,’ Jews, ‘better than they,’ Gentiles?” (Page 116, etc.) 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 man kind 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 favor as the Jews.” (Page 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: (Chapter ~~the~~ 5:1:) ‘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 color 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,” (page 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.’” (Page 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.” (Page 120.)

If this was the case of 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.” (Page 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.” (~~8:7~~ Romans 8:7, 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 opposition 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.” (~~ROM~~ Genesis 6:5.) And below: “The earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.” (Verse 11.) (Page 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.” (Page 123.) This alone was never supposed to be the reason; but their actual wickedness added thereto.

You add: “It maybe 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.’” (^{<0082>}Genesis 8:21.) But the Hebrew particle **א** 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*, (Page 124,) is always applied to *childhood* or *tender age*; (^{<2076>}Isaiah 7:16;) **נע** signifies *a little child*: And none of the texts you have cited prove the contrary. Heman, the author of the eighty-eighth Psalm, was doubtless “afflicted from his youth,” or childhood. The Babylonians (mentioned ^{<2472>}Isaiah 47:12) 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, (^{<2473>}3:24, 25,) “Shame hath devoured the labor 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.” (Page 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*, page 68, etc.)

11. That this doctrine has been long “held in the Church of Rome,” (*Taylor’s Doctrine*, etc., page 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 (¹~~3~~1:14) 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,” (page 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.” (¹~~2~~Matthew 15:19.)

“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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 130.)

In proof of this they urge: “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me. (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 51:5.)” (Page 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 ^{<910>}Psalm 90:2; 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 **חִמְתִּי** properly signifies, *warmed me.*” You should say, *literally* signifies. But it signifies *conceived me*, nevertheless. And so it is taken, ^{<910>}Genesis 30:38,39,41, etc.; ^{<910>}31:10. “Nay, it signifies there the *act of copulation*. So several translators render it.” (Page 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 fetus is either forming or actually formed. Throw a plum or a pear at a woman before conception, and it will not mark the fetus 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.” (Page 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 **חָנַן** signifies to nurse, or anything 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 anything or nothing.

So ^{ERR}Psalm 58:3: “‘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 ^{ERR}Isaiah 49:1, “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 was 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, ^{ERR}Job 31:18. But it is manifest, that it is to be literally taken, ^{ERR}Isaiah 49:1: “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 “an hyperbolic 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.” (Page 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 foetus 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.” (Page 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;” (page 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?” (*Ibid.*) For those very reasons which you suggest:

(1.) Because it is grossly absurd, to suppose that Christ speaks of what he then held in his hand, 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, in the only foundation of true piety.

14. The next proof is, “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.” (³⁴⁴Job 14:4.)

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.” (Page 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: (Page 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 sowest 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;’” (page 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 he yet 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~~ Job 15:1.)

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.” (Page 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?’” (~~Job~~ Job 5:17.)” 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?’” (~~Job~~ Job 25:4.)”

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 tests 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!" (25:6.) In how much higher and stricter a 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?" (~~Scripture~~ Job 4:17, etc.)" (Page 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;" (~~Scripture~~ Job 15:16, etc.) 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 labor, 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.’” (~~RRB~~ John 3:6)” (Page 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*, page 78, etc.) 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;” (~~RRB~~ Romans 8:1;) 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;” (~~RRB~~ Galatians 5:17;) if flesh means nothing but the pure and uncorrupted powers of human nature?

“But this text (~~RRB~~ John 3:3) 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.’” (Page 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 means 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 foetus which has sinful dispositions, he produces those dispositions.” (Page 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 foetus, but all the motion in the universe. It is his power which so violently expands the air, on the discharge of a pistol or cannon. 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 foetus;) 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 foetus 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~~ Genesis 3:8, 10, 24,;) so as ‘we are by nature children of wrath,’ (~~EPH~~ Ephesians 2:2, 3) bond-slaves to Satan, and justly liable to all punishments, (~~2TIM~~ 2 Timothy 2:26,) in this world, and that which is to come. (~~GEN~~ Genesis 2:17; ~~ROM~~ Romans 5:23.)”

In proof of the first clause of this proposition, they cite ~~GEN~~ Genesis 3:8, 10, 24. On this you observe: “Adam and Eve by their sin did forfeit communion with God. But God did not take the forfeiture.” (Page 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.’” (Page 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," — **Ἀθεοι**, *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 anything extraordinary in it," (which you judge can hardly be allowed!) "it belongs to the redundancy of grace, which has no relation to anything we lost by Adam." (Page 149.) That that whole passage his relation to what we lost in Adam, has been shown already. But what conception 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." (**ⲕⲟⲩⲛ** Genesis 3:24.)

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, (~~and~~ Ephesians 2:2, 3,) we have considered before.” (Page 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.” (Page 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, O 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 everywhere 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 Savior 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~~ Timothy 2:26.)" (Page 153.)

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.'" (Page 153.)

Well, the proof. "The word ζῳγρεω signifies, *to revive*; and so here, to restore men to life and salvation." As a proof of this sense of the word, you cite ~~4~~ Luke 5:10. 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 ζῳγρεω is what it will by no means bear.

You say, indeed, "It always means, *to take alive*, or *save alive*." (Page 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." (Page 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?” (Page 155.) 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~~ Romans 4:23: “The wages of sin is death; “ (pages 157, 158;) its due reward; death, temporal, spiritual, and eternal. God grant that we may never feel it so!

20. You conclude this Part: “I cannot see that we have advanced one step further than where we were at the conclusion of the First Part; namely, That the consequences of Adam’s first sin upon us are labor, sorrow, and mortality, and no other.” (Page 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 fervor. 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 vapor. 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 labor 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 pretense 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, *January 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 degree of ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, debauchery.”
(Page 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 honor, and immortality.”

“(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.” (Page 169.) To those who believe in Christ they are. But above four-fifths of the world are Mahometans 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 nowhere 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.” (Page 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 a 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." (Page 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." (~~1029~~ Genesis 2:19.) 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." (Page 172.)

You proceed: "Surely his eating the forbidden fruit is no evidence of superior abilities." (Page 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.” (Page 175.) “And yet these same suppose him to have been guilty of the vilest act that ever was committed.” (Page 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, labor, 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 1:27}Genesis 1:27.) But whatever that phrase means here, it doubtless means the same in ^{GEN 9:6}Genesis 9:6: ‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: For in the image of God made he man.’” (Page 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 ^{GEN 5:3}Genesis 5:3, 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 began 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.’ (¹⁰⁰Colossians 3:10.)

“‘Put on the new man, which after the image of God is created in righteousness and true holiness.’ (¹⁰⁰Ephesians 4:24.)” (Page 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.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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, *practice* 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.” (page 181.)

On ¹⁸¹²Romans 2:14, 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.” (Page 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 ¹⁸¹²Ecclesiastes 7:29, “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.” (Pages 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 ¹⁸¹²Genesis 5:2: “God called their name Adam in the day when they were created.” And in the day that they fell, whoever reads Genesis 3, 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.” (Page 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 anything,) 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 our 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.” (Page 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?” (Pages 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?” (Page 192.) Then they begin, when they first show wrong tempers; such as plain, undeniable forwardness, 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 endeavored 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 labor 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:” (~~2716~~ Proverbs 22:6) 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.” (Page 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?’ (~~3012~~ Hebrews 7:9.)”

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,” (page 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.’ (~~3102~~ Romans 7:23.) And does not this prove, that we come into the world with sinful propensities?” (Page 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.” (Page 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.

(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?

(3.) “He does not speak of himself, or any regenerate man, but of a Jew under the power of sin.” (*Ibid.*) 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 heart;” 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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,” (page 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.” (Page 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 I 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 Romans 7: 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?” (~~21~~17:9.)” (Page 224.) On this you descant: (One instance of a thousand of your artful manner of declaiming, in order to forestall 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 **πιθανολογια** “persuasiveness of speech!” After reading this, I was

much inclined to believe, without going a step further, that this test 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 6.)” (Page 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 desperately 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;” (Page 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.” (Page 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 anything in that chapter, infer, that we came into the world with sinful dispositions derived from Adam; for the Apostle says nothing about Adam.” (Page 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, to 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.” (Page 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 accessory, 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*, page 110.)

“2. How, then, are we born into the world?”

You answer, “as void of actual knowledge as the brutes.” (*Taylor’s Doctrine, etc.*, page 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~~ Job 11:12,) 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 anything 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 then 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." (Page 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 perfection; 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 practice 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.” (Page 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, (~~cf~~ Romans 5:18, 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.” (Page 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 offense, *so* is the free gift. For if through the offense 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.” (~~cf~~ Romans 5:15.) “For not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment was by one offense to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offenses 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 offense, *death*” spiritual and temporal, leading 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." (Page 239.) It has, upon them that are justified and sanctified; but not upon all mankind. "And which has respect, not to his one offense," — (not to that only,) — "but also to the 'many offenses' 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.'" (Page 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 ~~AND~~ Romans 5:12-19, and ~~AND~~ 1 Corinthians 15:21, 22) always assign the actual wickedness of mankind as the reason of Christ's coming into the world." (Page 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." (Page 166, etc.) Afterwards, (chapter 3,) he treats of the depravity and corruption of all mankind; and then proceeds (chapter 5.) to show, that we are all "made sinners by Adam," and that "by his offense 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.” (Page 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.’ (Page 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;’ (~~and~~ John 16:12;) 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 Matthew 23. 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*, page 116, etc.)

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 ~~23rd~~ 23rd of St. Matthew, and the ~~3rd~~ 3rd of St. John.
3. Wherever he speaks of “saving that which was lost,” he in effect speaks of this; especially ~~18th~~ Matthew 18:11, 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*, etc., page 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 Savior, 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.”

(Pages 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 vix sunt totidem quot
Thebarum partae, 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 mala gentibus intulit;
Post ignem aetherea domo
Subductum, macies, et nova febrium
Terris incubuit cohors:
Semotique prius tarda necessitas
Lethi corripuit gradum.*

*“Prometheus first provk’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 could not say one word of Adam, but endeavor 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!”

2. REGENERATION.

“Why must we be ‘born again?’” (Page 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.” (Page 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 endeavors 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;’” (page 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.” (Page 247.)

“2. He will finally admit none into it who are not disposed to relish and promote the happiness of it.” (Page 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 favor 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?” (Page 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.” (Pages 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.” (Pages 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 further trial?” That there might be room for further 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.” (Page 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 endeavors; but this does not suppose any natural pravity of our minds.” (Page 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 endeavors? How very slender a part in sanctification will you allow to the Spirit of God! You seem very fearful of doing him too much honor, of taking from man the glory due to his name.

Accordingly, you say, “His aids are so far from supposing the previous 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 endeavors, 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 3:6.) 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 endeavors will suffice for attaining all habits of virtue.” (*Jennings’s Vindication*, page 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, etc.*, page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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?” (Page 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.” (Page 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?” (Page 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 neighbor 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 it 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?” (Pages 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 persons 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?” (Page 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 3.

ANSWER TO DR. TAYLOR'S SUPPLEMENT.

YOU subjoin 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*, page 7.)

Were, then, the iniquities and sins which were put upon the scapegoat, 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 scapegoat; (⁽¹⁸⁶²⁾ Leviticus 16:21;) 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 anything 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 born 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 scapegoat was a figure of Him “on whom the Lord laid the iniquities of us all.” (⁽²⁸¹⁶⁾ Isaiah 53:6.) “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*, page 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.” (Pages 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.” (Pages 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.” (Page 16.) 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.” (Pages 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 22.) Just the contrary appears, namely, that guilt was imputed to the scapegoat, to the children of wicked parents, and to our blessed Lord himself, without any personal sin. The distinction, therefore, is sound and scriptural.

SECTION 2.

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,” (page 23,) this circumstance does not alter their nature; they are punishments still.

Let “afflictions, calamities, and death itself, be means of improving in virtue,” (page 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 anyway 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.” (Page 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. (Page 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.” (Page 27.) You are sensible, if we did, all mankind 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 3.

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.” (Pages 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?” (Page 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,” (page 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 labor? 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?” (Page 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.” (Pages 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 everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.” (Genesis 1:31.)

“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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 everything 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.” (Page 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?’” (Page 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!” (Page 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.’” (Page 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." (Page 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." (Pages 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. (Pages 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." (Page 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 an 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.”

(Pages 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 over-spreading the earth, does. Nor is your argument drawn from the sin of the angels, (page 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 begin 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 coeval 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 anything 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, anything 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?” (Pages 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 4.

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

“**B**Y 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.” (Pages 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.” (Pages 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.’” (Pages 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," **κακία** "be ye children," (⁴⁶¹1 Corinthians 14:20) — untaught, inexperienced; or by those of David, "My soul is even as a weaned child." (⁴⁶²Psalms 131:2.)

"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 5

A GENERAL AGREEMENT TAKEN FROM WHAT GOD HAS DECLARED CONCERNING MANKIND AT THE RESTORATION OF THE WORLD AFTER THE DELUGE.

"**T**HERE 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.' (⁴⁶³Genesis 1:28.)" (Page 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 excellence 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." (Page 85.)
- 1.** "And God blessed Noah and his sons." (⁴⁶⁴Genesis 9:1.) 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 savor;” 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.

2. Verses 2, 3. “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.” (Page 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 labor 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 man’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” (τοὺς γεγονοτάς, not *are made*) “after the similitude of God.” (ΣΗΒ 3:9.) 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.” (Page 87.) *Expressly, more emphatically, more extensively!* Where I am sure, not in the Bible.

However, you pompously add, (*sicut tuus est mos*, ^{f37}) “This is to me a clear and undoubted demonstration, —

“1. That ‘the judgment which came upon all men to condemnation,’ did noways 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.” (Page 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 anything 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;” (page 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.” (Pages 90-93.) Be this so or not, it cannot be concluded from anything 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 6

THE NOTION OF ADAM’S BEING A FEDERAL HEAD OR REPRESENTATIVE OF MANKIND CONSIDERED. ^{f38}

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 noways 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 behavior 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 offense; 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 further 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.'*" (~~435~~ 1 Corinthians 15:47.) *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 offense of one, many are dead; — the judgment was by one to condemnation; — by one man's offense death reigned by one; — by the offense 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 caviling 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.” (Page 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.” (Pages 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~~ Romans 7:9: “‘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 vigor,” — (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.” (Page 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. Watt’s method of explaining it, it appears, from clear Scripture, and from your own words, that Adam was the representative of mankind.

SECTION 7

OF THE FORMATION OF OUR NATURE IN THE WOMB. F39

BEFORE I say anything 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 my hypothesis which is advanced; but 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.” (Page 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*, 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~~ Genesis 2:2,3.) “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;” (~~SOUP~~ Hebrews 4:3, 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.” (Page 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 dishonorable to God, to suppose he is displeased at us for what he himself has infused into our nature.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 far as to keep himself pure and innocent?” you answer by another question, “How came Adam not to keep himself pure and innocent?” (Page 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 8

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." (Pages 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." (~~SUB~~ Colossians 3:9, 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 4:22-24.)

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.” (Pages 150, 151.)

This you prove,

1. From Ephesians 2:15: “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 Colossians 3:8-12; 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 practice 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 labor 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 Ephesians 4:22, 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.”

(^{<400>}Ephesians 4:20-24.) 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.” (Page 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 ^{<400>}Ephesians 2:15, 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 what 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.” (Page 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 ^{<400>}2 Corinthians 4:16, ‘renewing’ relates only to a vicious course of life;” (Page 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:” (^{<400>}Romans 12:2:) 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.” (^{<400>}Titus 3:3-5.) Do these words imply nothing, but “a vicious course of

life?” no inward corruption at all? ““But after that the lovingkindness and love of God our Savior 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 the 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.’” (Page 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 ~~2079~~ Ecclesiastes 7:29: “God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions.” (pages 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.” (^{<1825>}Deuteronomy 12:25.) It is taken in the very same sense, verse 28; 13:18, and 21:9. In all these texts, it undeniably implies, *morally good*, or *righteous*.
2. “A God of truth and without iniquity; just and right is he.” (^{<1830>}Deuteronomy 32:4.) “Good and upright is the Lord.” (^{<1830>}Psalm 25:8.)
3. “The word of the Lord is right.” (^{<1830>}Psalm 33:4.) “The ways of the Lord are right.” (^{<3449>}Hosea 14:9.)
4. “Be glad and rejoice, ye righteous.” (^{<1830>}Psalm 32:11.) “Rejoice in the Lord, O ye righteous.” (^{<1830>}Psalm 33:1.) 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.” (Page 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*, page 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 reasoning 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 practicing "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 ~~and~~ Isaiah 26:12.

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." (Pages 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 over come 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. (Page 166.)

I have set down your argument at large, that it may appear in its full strength. Now, let us view it more closely:

1. "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 bowels of his mind must have been quite finished, and actually exercised.” (Page 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 indifference to good or evil, then his being put into such an union with flesh and blood, among a thousand temptations, would have been an over-balance 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 over-balance on the side of vice; or,

(2.) That to place a new-made creature in a situation where there was such an over-balance, 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.” (Pages 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 preponderate? 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 (~~402~~ Ephesians 4:24; ~~410~~ Colossians 3:10) are considered together, their obvious meaning will strike an honest and unbiased 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 endeavored to prove the contrary; and he does not offer to point out any one mistake in my interpretations." (Page 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." (Page 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." (Page 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, etc.?*

You answer: “He did expose innocent Adam to a peril and misery greater than all these put together, even to a tempting devil.” (Pages 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.” (Pages 194, 195.) I answer, there is a possibility of the event; but the probability of it is 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." (Page 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 include 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 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 thoroughly, 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; afterwards, both wicked Cain and good Seth begat sons and daughters. Now, was it not just as probable, one could 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 favor 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 nowise 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 man while they are in their fallen state, as destitute of God’s favor, and without hope.*

You answer: “How can men be destitute of God’s favor, when he has vouchsafed them a redeemer? “ (Page 207.) By destitute of God’s favor, 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 to 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?" (Page 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." (Page 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." (Page 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." (Page 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 carcase.

PART 4

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 Doctors 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 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.

“**M**AN 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.” (Page 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 afterwards 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 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.” (Page 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 objection 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.” (Page 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.’” (Page 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 chiefs 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 (~~4:24~~ 4:24) 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 9.)

“It is also probable that he was endued with a 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.” (Page 10.)

“Neither can we conceive that anything 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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, 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.” (Page 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 travelers! What stupendous cliffs and promontories rise, — high and hideous to behold! What dreadful precipices, — which make us giddy to look down, are ready to betray us into destruction! What immense extent 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 deaths and graves to unwary travelers! What huge ruinous caverns, deep and wide, big enough to bury whole cities!” (Page 14.)

“What restless 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.” (Page 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.’” (Page 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 father 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?” (Page 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.” (Pages 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!” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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?” (Page 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 been 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?” (Page 24.)

“What are the immense flights of locusts which darken the sky, and lay the fields desolate? What are the armies of hornets or mosquitoes that frequently make a pleasant land almost intolerable? If they are found in the heats of Africa, 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 favorites of Heaven as God at first made us.” (Page 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 favor 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.” (Page 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 further 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 29.) “Would the great and good God have appointed intellectual animals, had they been sinless, to be propagated in such in 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 favor with that God who created them, and pronounced a blessing upon them in their propagation? ^{f40}

“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 childbirth 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 childbearing are added to it: And daily experience proves, this curse is not taken away by the blessing repeated to Noah.” (Page 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 labor. 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.” (Page 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 labor, 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 labors and wants, hunger and weariness, blows and burdens without end. Did God appoint this for innocents” (Page 31.)

“Is the momentary pleasure of eating and drinking a recompense for incessant labor? 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.”(Page 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 childbearing is not inflicted as a curse; that the labors of life were increased, but not as a curse; that death was not a curse.’ I would fail 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 criminally 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.’” (Page 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 practiced among the greatest part of

the world; and yet believe the blessed God would put such wretched, polluted workmanship out of his pure hands?" (Page 34.)

"Can we survey the desperate impiety and profaneness, the swearing, and cursing, and wild blasphemy, that is practiced, 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 villainy 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?" (Page 35.)

"That far the greatest number of men are evil, was the known sentiment of the wiser Heathens." (Page 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 laeta arva tenemus.

And in this life, Horace remarks of men in general, —

Nitimur in vetitum semper, cupimusque regata.

‘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, —

Cereus in vitium flecti, monitoribus asper.

Seneca says just the same, —

Pejora juvenes facile praecepta audiunt.

‘Young men readily hearken to evil counsels: They are soft as wax to be molded into vice, but rough and rugged to their best monitors.’” (Page 38.)

“Juvenal abounds with the same accounts of human nature: —

Quae 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 imitandi Turpibus et pravis omnes sumus. ^{f41}

“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!” (Pages 39, 41.)

“How little knowledge or thought of God, their creator and Governor, is found in children when they can distinguish good and evil!” (Page 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 practice 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?" (Page 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." (Page 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 hindrance do they find within themselves!" (Page 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! Insomuch, that 'there is not a just man upon earth, who,' through his whole life, 'doeth good and sinneth not.'" (Page 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.’” (Page 47.)

“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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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, honor, 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 neighbor, 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?’” (Page 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.” (Page 51.)

“Now, would a just, a wise, and a merciful God have formed intellectual creatures in such a wretched state, with powers capacities so much below their duties, that they break his law daily and continually, and are not able to help it?” (Page 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 ally one of them? Would a God who adjusts the proportion 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?” (Page 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.” (Page 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 favor of God.” (page 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 favor 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 anything in life worth living for?” (Page 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 over spread 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?" (Page 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?" (Page 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 disjoined, and their flesh painfully battered by the fall of houses; perhaps buried alive in the ruins of entire towns or villages, while their neighbors 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?" (Page 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." (Page 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 practicing 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 favor of their Maker?" (Page 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." (Pages 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." (Page 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.” (Page 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?” (Page 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?”(Page 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." (Page 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." (Page 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." (Pages 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 possibilities 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 anyone, 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.” (Page 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 a 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 splendor 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?’” (Pages 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.” (Page 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 neighbors, to murder the reputation of the absent. This is their mirth and recreation; these their reliefs against the common miseries of human life!” (Page 83.)

“But would a race of innocent beings fly to such mean and foolish, or criminal, refuges from pain as these? Would thy 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 neighbors, 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 the manner of existence there! They walk over the busy stage of life, they toil and labor, 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 then?” (Pages 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.” (Page 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, is 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 practiced 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 willful madness.” (Pages 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?” (Page 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 colors 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 ferment 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?" (Page 92.)

QUESTION 2.

"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." (Page 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." (Page 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.' (¹⁵¹²Romans 5:12) 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." (Page 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.'" (Page 159.)

"2. God created man at first in a holy and happy state, — in his own likeness, and in his favor. 'And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness.' (⁰⁰⁰²Genesis 1:26) 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, be side 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.’ (Ephesians 4:24) So Solomon assures us, God ‘made man upright.’ And Moses says, when God had finished all his creation, God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.’ It was all according to his idea and his will, and well pleasing in his sight. Man, the last of his creatures, as well as all the rest, ‘was very good;’ was holy and happy.” (Pages 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 Genesis 5:1-3, 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*.” (Page 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.” (Page 163.)

“5. As Adam was under a law whose sanction threatened death upon disobedience, so doubtless God favored him with a covenant of life, and a promise of life and immortality upon his obedience.” (Page 164.)

“6. Adam broke the law of his maker, lost his image and his favor, 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 endeavored to ‘hide himself from the presence of the Lord.’” (Page 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 all unclean? Not one.’ And David says the same thing: ‘Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.’” (Pages 170, 171.)

“This is not an hyperbolical 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 favor 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;’ (~~ISA~~ 14:1) 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;’ (~~ROM~~ Job 5:7) 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.” (Pages 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~~ twelfth verse of the fifth chapter of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans; on which I observe,” (Page 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?’” (Pages 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.” (Page 179.)

“In the eighteenth verse the expression is very strong: ‘By the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.’ All the children of Adam, young and old, are condemned for his one offense. But farther: —

“4. In the original it is not, ‘By the offense of one; ‘but,’ By one offense.’ By the single offense 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 offense is represented as condemning through Adam, and stands in opposition to the ‘many offenses’ 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 Adam, the last Adam.’ (Corinthians. 15:45-47) As one was the spring of life, so the other was the spring of death, to all his seed or offspring.”(Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 sustenance 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 childbirth 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.” (Page 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 daily, 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 the evident, that the blessing given to Adam in innocence, 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 favor of God, as Adam did while he was innocent." (Pages 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 1.

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 capacious altae
Deerat adhuc, et quod dominari in caetera posset.
Natus homo est! Sive hunc divino semine cretum
Ille opifex rerum mundi melioris origo
Finit in effigiem moderantum cuncta deorum.
Pronague cum spectent animalia caetera terram;
Os homini sublime dedit; coelumque 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?” (pages 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 theater 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 tampered 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.” (Page 362.)

SECTION 2

A PARTICULAR VIEW OF THE MISERIES OF MAN.

“**B**UT, to wave 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?” (Page 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 transient glimpses here and there, than anything 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 that 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!” (Page 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?” (Page 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!” (Page 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 everywhere 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 garner 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.” (Pages 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 favor 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?” (Page 370.)

“Follow mankind to the age of public appearance upon the stage of the world, and what shall we find there, but infinite cares, labors, 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!” (Page 371.)

“Let us follow on the track 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 neighbors and kindred, do they not often produce as much vexation as satisfaction; not, indeed, of themselves, but by reason of the endless humors and follies, errors and passions, of mankind?” (Page 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.” (Page 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 over-balanced by the maladies or miseries, the fears or sorrow, 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.” (Pages 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?” (Page 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.’

(²⁰¹²Ecclesiastes 4:2) And, indeed, it appears that the miseries of life are so numerous as to over balance 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.” (Pages 380, 381.)

SECTION 3

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, 1. 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 heartache and the thousand natural shocks
That flesh is heir to, were a consummation
Devoutly to be wished. 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 undiscovered country, from whose border
No traveler 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.” (Page 384, 385.)

*Proxima deinde tenent maesti loca, qui sibi lethum
Insontes peperere manu, lucemque perosi
Projecere animas. Quam vellent aethere in alto
Nunc et pauperiem et duros perferre labores!
Fata obstant: Duraque palus innabilis unda
Alligat, et novies Styx interfusa coeracet.*

*‘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.” (Page 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?’” (Page 389.)

“3. 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.” (Page 389.)

SECTION 4

THE APOSTASY OF MAN PROVED BY SCRIPTURE AND REASON.

“**B**UT whether or not 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 endeavor to show, both from the express testimony of Scripture, from the necessity of renewing grace, and from a survey of the heathen world.” (Pages 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;’ (Genesis 4:5) yea, ‘evil from his youth.’ (Genesis 8:21) ‘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.’ (^{194D}Psalm 14:2, 3) ‘There is not a just man upon earth, who doeth good, and sinneth not.’ (^{207D}Ecclesiastes 7:20) ‘All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way;’ (^{250D}Isaiah 53:6) 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.’ (^{680D}Romans 3:10, 12, 19, 23) ‘If one died for all, then were all dead;’ (^{474D}2 Corinthians 5:14) 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 favor and image of God, and future happiness. ‘Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.’ (^{488B}John 3:3, 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;’ (^{491D}Ephesians 2:10) they must be ‘quickened,’ or raised again, from their ‘death in trespasses and sins;’ (Ephesians 2:5) 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 favor, 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 favor, 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?” (Pages 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 Africa, 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 favor; who are drenched in gross impieties and superstitions, who are continually guilty of national immoralities, and practice idolatry, malice, and lewdness, fraud and falsehood, with scarce any regret or restraint.” (Page 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 much thick darkness, to the knowledge, the fear, and love of Him that made them?

Dreadful truth indeed! Yet, so far I can see, certain and incontestable. Such, I fear, is the ease of those of the human race who cover at present the far greatest part of the globe.” (Page 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 held 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?’” (Page 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!’” (Page 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?" (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 431.)

“Now, if, among the histories of nations, we find anything 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 practiced 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, be guilt, or liableness 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 liableness to punishment, is so transferred to him, that he suffers banishment or poverty on account of it.” (Pages 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 ⁽¹²²¹⁾Genesis 22:116: ‘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 ⁽¹²⁵³⁾Numbers 25:13: ‘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.” (Page 437.)

“Thus the sin of Achan was so imputed to his children, that they were all stoned on account of it. (^{<10724>}Joshua 7:24) In like manner, the covetousness of Gehazi was imputed to his posterity, (^{<1172>}2 Kings 5:27) when God by his Prophet pronounced that the leprosy should cleave unto him and to his seed for ever.” (Page 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 liableness to punishment; and sometimes the punishment itself, whether it fall upon the original criminal, or upon others on his account.” (Page 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 ^{<1172>}Job 33:26: ‘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:’ (^{<3010>}Hosea 10:12) 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.” (Page 440.)

“So ^{<5101>}Romans 10:4: ‘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.’ (^{<1172>}Galatians 2:21) This particularly holds where the word λογίζομαι, or *impute*, is joined with righteousness. As ^{<5101>}Romans 4:3: Abraham ‘believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness.’ ‘His faith is counted to him for righteousness.’ (^{<5101>}Romans 4:5) 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;’ (³⁹⁰¹ Job 34:1) 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 liableness 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 refitting what we never asserted.” (Page 441.)

“3. The Scripture does not, that I remember, anywhere 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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, was 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 5

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 scarcer 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.”  Ecclesiastes 7:29.

“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.*” (Page 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.’” (Page 4.)

“The Hebrew word (שׁוּב) 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 like wise 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*; (^{<1818>}Psalm 25:8) with *righteous*; (^{<1913>}Psalm 119:137) with *true and good*; (^{<1818>}Nehemiah 9:13) 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; (^{<1818>}Psalm 34:10; ^{<1818>}Job 33:3) and uprightness of way, or conversation; (^{<1818>}Psalm 37:14) and often elsewhere. ‘The upright man,’ throughout the Scripture, is a truly good man; a man of integrity, a holy person. In ^{<1818>}Job 1:1, 8; 2:3, upright is the same with *perfect*, (as in ^{<1818>}Psalm 37:37, and many other places,) and is explained by, one ‘who feareth God and escheweth evil.’ In ^{<1818>}Job 8:6, 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,) ^{<1818>}Proverbs 10:29: ‘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.’ (^{<1818>}11:3) ‘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.’ (²¹⁵⁸15:8) ‘wicked man hardeneth his face; but as for the upright, he directeth his way.’ (²¹²²21:29) 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.”(Pages 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.” (page 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 endeavor,’ is bold indeed! To prove the contrary, and justify Solomon’s assertion, I offer a few plain arguments.” (Page 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 ⁴¹⁰²Ephesians 4:22, 24, and ⁵¹⁰⁹Colossians 3:9, 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. (~~SIN~~Colossians 3:10) But if ‘to be created after God,’ or sin 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.’” (Pages 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 concreted 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.” (Page 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 Independent on the Lord of all? But this disposition is uprightness. Therefore God ‘made man upright.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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?’” (Page 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, that 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 there with his title to God's favor, 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." (Pages 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." ~~OLD~~ Genesis 2:16, 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 favor, and happy life of communion with God." (Pages 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 favor, 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." (Pages 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.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 34.)

“**2.** From ~~REF~~ 1 Corinthians 15:22: ‘In Adam all die.’ Here the Apostle speaks, not of both our parents, but of Adam singly, (as also Romans 5,) 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.” (Pages 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, ~~REF~~ Romans 5:12, 14, etc., 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. “What which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” ~~REF~~ John 3:5, 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 endeavor,

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 clear 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 separate 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 in wrought 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 anything 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; (^{ROM} Galatians 5:16, 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 prone 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 practice 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 casual influence on death, as the obedience of Christ has on eternal life.

“3. We are 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 offense 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 fulfillment 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.” (Pages 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 6.)

“(1.) Man’s original righteousness has been largely proved. Let me add only an argument *ad hominem*. 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 endeavor,’ falls to the ground.” (Pages, 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 tests in which *jasher*, or the substantive *josh*, occurs, there are very few which do not confirm our interpretation of ²⁰¹⁷² Ecclesiastes 7:29 ‘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.” (Page 11.)

“To evade the argument from ~~ROM~~ Ephesians 4:24, 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, (~~ROM~~ Romans 6:6) 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.” (Pages 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 Isaiah 53, which contains a summary of the Scripture doctrine upon this head. ‘He hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows.’ The word *nasa* (*born*) signifies,

(1.) *To take up* somewhat, as on one’s shoulders:

(2.) *To bear or carry* something weighty, 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 suffering 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.” (Pages 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 do 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.” (Pages 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 scapegoat, 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!” (Pages 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 apprised 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 trifling observation, ‘that God inflicted no curse on our first parents?’ (~~GEN~~ Genesis 3:16-18) 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~~ Deuteronomy 27:15, etc.; 28:16, etc.; ~~JER~~ Jeremiah 17:5; ~~ZEC~~ Zechariah 5:3.” (Pages 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 Socinians 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 everything 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 honor 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 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.” (Pages 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.” (Page 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 forever!” (Page 83.)

PART 6

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 Hillary, 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 Hillary’s time, St. Augustine, and other Christian writers, brought it into common use.”(Pages 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 born a clear testimony.” (Page 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." (Page 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 favor 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~~ Genesis 3) 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 favor and image of God." (Pages 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 offense 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 favor and their original righteousness were both lost." (Page 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 be circumstances, of man's first transgression." (Pages 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;’ (~~CHR~~ Ephesians 4:18) St. John, ‘eternal life abiding in us.’ (~~CHR~~ 1 John 3:15) 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.’ (~~ROM~~ Ephesians 2:3) 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.’ (Pages 25-28.)

“(3.) ‘Children of wrath,’ is an 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.’ (Page 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 s 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 are children of wrath by nature,’ this, according to the constant sense of the words, Drust mean, We were so from our birth.” (Page 31.)

“It is affirmed,

(ii.) That ‘because the original words stand thus, **τεκνα φυσει 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 φυσει** are, *children by birth*; or, such as are born so, in distinction from those who became such afterward.

“It is affirmed,

(iii.) ‘That **φυσει**, *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 ^{<K15>}Galatians 2:15: ‘We who are Jews by nature,’ **φυσει Ιουδαιοι**; that is, *We who are born Jews*, in contradistinction to proselytes. ‘Ye did service to them which by nature are no gods;’ (^{<K18>}Galatians 4:8) **μη φυσει ουσι θεοις** persons or things which are partakers of no *divine nature*. ‘The Gentiles do by nature the things contained in the law;’ (^{<K14>}Romans 2:14) that is, by their own natural powers, without a written law. Neither here, nor anywhere else, does the word **φυσει** signify no more than *really* or *truly*.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.

“~~CHURCH~~ Genesis 5:3: 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.” (Pages 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.’ (~~CHURCH~~ Genesis 6:5) 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 marvelous 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.” (Page 37.)

“I will not again curse the ground anymore 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.’ (Genesis 8:21) 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 (יָצַח) — *imagination*— (as was observed before) includes the thoughts, affections, inclinations, with everything which the son, 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 (אֲףֹ) 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.’” (Page 39.)

“Although affliction cometh not forth of the dust; yet man is born to trouble, as the sparks fly upward.’ (Job 5:6, 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 affective; 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.’” (Page 40.)

“‘Vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass’s colt;’ (^{<8112>}Job 11:12) 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 practice what is evil.” (Pages 43, 44.)

“^{<8146>}Job 14:4, and ^{<8154>}15:14. 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. (14:1-3) 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.’” (Pages 45,46.)

“‘Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.’ (~~PS~~ Psalm 51:5) 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.” (Pages 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;’ (~~PS~~ Psalm 58:3, 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.” (Pages 51, 52.)

“‘Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him.’ (◀1725 Proverbs 22:15) ‘The rod and reproof give wisdom: But a child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame.’ (◀1745 29:15) 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 ill 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.’ (◀1758 Matthew 15:18 19; ◀1772 Mark 7:20-23) 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.” (Pages 55, 56.)

“◀1782 Romans 5:12-19. 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.” (Page 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 offense of one many are dead; the judgment was by one to condemnation; death reigned by one. By the offense 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 likes on our first father alone, as bringing sin and death on all his posterity.” (Page 67.)

“(2.) ‘The sin, transgression, offense, 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 offense 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.” (Page 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 ‘offense 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.”(Page 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.” (Page 73.)

“‘By man came death: In Adam all die.’ (~~451~~1 Corinthians 15:21, 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 this primitive slate 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.” (Pages 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 ~~4341~~Job 14:4; ~~4515~~Psalms 51:5; ~~4583~~58:3;

✠R12 Romans 5:12, etc.; ✠R12 1 Corinthians 15:22; ✠R12 Ephesians 2:3.

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.” (Page 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 Savior of infants, or he is not; if he is not, how is he ‘the Savior 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 gospel, 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 born 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.” (Page 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 Irenaeus 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.' (*Irenaeus*, 1. 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.* 1. 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 Testimony Animae.*) Cyprian is express in his Epistle to Fidus. Origin 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.'" (Page 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, Hillary; 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 born 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." (Page 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 fulfill 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 “goodwill 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!* ^{f42} (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 favored, 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 συ ει εκεινων και συ, τεκνον;* ^{f43} Are *you* disserving the cause of inward religion, laboring to destroy the inward kingdom of God, sapping the foundations 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 7

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, unrelating 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. ^{f44} 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 ended 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 fulfill 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 strewed,’ 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, race 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 towards 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,’ (^{<0027>}Genesis 1:27) which consists in ‘knowledge, righteousness, and holiness.’ (^{<0010>}Colossians 3:10; ^{<0024>}Ephesians 4:24) All that God made ‘was very good,’ according to their several natures. (^{<0031>}Genesis 1:31) And so man was morally good, being ‘made after the image’ of Him who is ‘good and upright.’ (^{<0258>}Psalms 25:8) 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 favorite 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 everything 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 honor,’ having ‘all things put under his feet.’

“Again: As he had perfect tranquillity in his own breast, 80 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~~ Genesis 5:3) 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.’”

“(2.) That text, ‘Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.’ (^{<840>}Job 14:4) 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.’ (^{<840>}John 3:6) 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’ (^{<840>}Colossians 2:11) 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?’ Until 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 unpleasing 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.’ (¹⁸²¹⁷Job 21:17) 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, willfulness, and awareness 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 outbreaks 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 sheath their swords in one another’s bowels! Since Cain shed Abel’s blood, the world has been turned into a slaughterhouse 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 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. Through 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 neighbor, he may remove; but should he go into a wilderness, or pinch 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!

2nd. 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.

3rd. 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 anything, 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}Genesis 3:6) 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 all 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 oar first parents wandered from God, their posterity have a natural disease, which Solomon calls, ‘the wandering of desire;’ literally, ‘the walking of the soul.’

(^{ECCL}Ecclesiastes 6:9) This is a sort of diabolical trance, 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?’ (~~OR~~ Genesis 3:8) 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.

“1. 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}Genesis 3:15) 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 them. And even with them it was near setting, when God called Abraham ‘from serving other gods.’ (^{GEN}Genesis 24:15) God gave him a more full revelation, which he communicated to his family: (^{GEN}Genesis 18:19) 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 Jesus 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 incontestable 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 incontestable 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; all 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 lap his accounts or telling his money. If he answers you not all 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 neighbor 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 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 an 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 envy do the lame, 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 awareness 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 awareness 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 willful; 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 wilderness, 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 righteousness.’

“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 afterwards. 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) towards 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 forwardly 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 love 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 eyesore 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 Savior? 'So said Hazael, in another case. Yet how did he act? Many call him dear, to whom their sins are ten times dearer than their Savior. 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.

“2nd. 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 just 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 over spread 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 threads 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 diverse 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 tell 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 soar. ‘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 in to 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, and 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 drought 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 defense of the corrupt will, say, He shall not. And thus we stand out against God, till we are created anew in 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 for 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 incitement 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, deadborn; yea, and ‘filthy,’ (Psalm 14:3) 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 shouldest 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?’ (^{<3000>}Zechariah 7:6) Thy civil actions are sin: ‘The ploughing of the wicked is sin.’ (^{<1200>}Proverbs 21:4) 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 labor, 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 anything. 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 labor 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 mark 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 oddly, 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,’ (^{scrib}Colossians 2:11) 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 fullness 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.) Thereby 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 watercourse 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 fullness 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 forever 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 this 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 forever, 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 out; 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 preeminence 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.” (*Spirit of Prayer*, Part II., p. 33) ^{f45}

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.” (Page 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.” (Page 34.)

“Nature is the outward manifestation of the invisible glories of God.” (Part II., p. 62.)

Is not the last of these definitions contradictory to all that precede?

If desire is the very being of nature; if it is a torment, an 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.” (Page 59.)

“There is an eternal nature, as universal and as unlimited as God.” (Page 64.)

Is then nature God? Or are there two eternal, universe as, infinite beings?

“Nothing is before eternal nature but God.” (*Ibid.*)

“*Nothing but!*” Is anything 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 espressos for one and the same thing.” (Page 181.)

“Nature has all evil and no evil in it.” (Page 192.) Yea,

“Nature, self, or darkness, has not only no evil in it, but is the only ground of all good.” (*Ibid.*)

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 aequae ignotum*?^{f46} “For God is triune, and nature is triune.” “*Nature is triune!*” 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 anything 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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, etc.)

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 anything of this be proved? — Why thus:

First. “‘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.” (Page 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?” (*Ibid.*)

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.” (Page 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.” (Pages 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.” (*Ibid.*)

If it was sin that brought fire in 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.” (Page 60.)

“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.” (Page 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 everything 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.” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.* 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, colors, 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? ^{f47}

“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.” (Page 33.) *Appears* — to whom? Nothing appears to me, but the proving *ignotum per ignotius*.^{f48}

“All life is a desire.” (*Spirit of Love*, Part II., P. 198.) “Every desire, 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.” (*Ibid.*) 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.” (*Ibid.*) *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.” (Page 24) I wait the proof of this.

“God brought gross matter out of the sinful properties of nature, that there by the fallen angels might lose all their power over them.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 49.) Where is the proof? “Which changes the properties of nature into an heavenly state.” (Page 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.” (Page 52.) Can either Behmen or Spinoze prove this?

3. Of Adam in paradise.

“Paradise is an heavenly birth of life.” (*Spirit of Prayer* Part I., p. 6.) How does this definition explain the thing defined?

“Adam had at first both an 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.” (Page 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 inactive 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 66.)

Indeed, we are not told here, that angels are hermaphrodites. No, nor anything 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;” (^{Q18} Luke 20:35, 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.” (Genesis 1:24, 25.) Does anything 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 saken 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 them 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.” (Page 75.) We have no shadow of proof for all this.

“This state of inability is called his falling into a deep sleep.” (Page 76.) How does this agree with, “The Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam?” (Genesis 2:21)

“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.” (Page 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.”

(~~499~~ Matthew 19:4, 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.” (Page 88.) Does this account do honor 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 96.)

This is the marvelous in the highest degree, and affords many questions not very easy to be answered. But, waving all these, can anything 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~~ Genesis 2:7-9) 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 so 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!* ^{f49} 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.” (Page 189.) Ah, poor consequence! Would not the same text just as well prove transubstantiation?

“Light and darkness do everything, whether good or evil, that is done in man. Light is all power, light is all things and nothing.”
(*Ibid.*)

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 a substantiality in it.” (Page 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 throughout;) 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 born to spend so many words on so egregious trifles, but that they are mischievous trifles: —

Hae nagee seria ducent
In mala. ^{f50}

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, 1. 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.” (Page 60.) “All that God does is, and must be, done in and by the powers of nature.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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!” (Page 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 anything else but that which the units contained in it make it to be, so no body can be anything else but the coagulation or sum total of those properties of nature that are coagulated in it.” (Page 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 anywhere, it must be everywhere.” (*Spirit of Prayer*, Part I., p. 27.) So it is, as sure as the just God is everywhere.

“(2.) Wrath and pain dwell only in the creatures.” (Page 28.) Pain is only in creatures. Of wrath, we are to inquire farther.

“(3.) To say, God never 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!” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 anything 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.*) 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 nowhere else but in thickness, hardness, and darkness.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 everything 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.’” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (~~0007~~Genesis 2:17) “And, the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not die.” (3:4) “And the woman, being deceived,” did eat; (~~5024~~1 Timothy 2:14) “and gave unto her husband, and he did eat.” (~~0006~~Genesis 3:6) “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.” (Page 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.” (Page 481.) 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;” (~~3009~~ Amos 4:9) and say, “Now, how is it possible for words to give stronger proof?” (*Ibid.*) 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.” (Page 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 this 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 yon.” (^{<3185>}Zephaniah 3:5) “Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne.” (^{<1844>}Psalms 89:14) “Wilt thou condemn him that is most just?” (^{<1847>}Job 34:17) “He is excellent in power, and in plenty of justice.” (^{<1872>}37:23) “Just and true are thy ways, O King of saints.” (^{<1818>}Revelation 15:3) “Thou art just in all that is brought upon us.” (^{<1818>}Nehemiah 9:33) “There is no God beside me, a just God and a Savior.” (^{<2851>}Isaiah 45:21) “Whom God hath set forth, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.” (^{<1825>}Romans 3:25, 26)

(2.) “The Lord heard their words, and was wroth.” (^{<1831>}Deuteronomy 1:34) “The Lord was wroth with me for your sakes.” (^{<1836>}3:26) “I was wroth with my people.” (^{<2406>}Isaiah 47:6) “For his covetousness I was wroth.” (^{<2577>}57:17) “And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel.” (^{<0217>}Numbers 25:3) “His wrath is against them that forsake him.” (^{<1822>}Ezra 8:22) “Thou art very wroth with us.” (^{<2152>}Lamentations 5:22) “Thou art wroth, for we have sinned.” (^{<2445>}Isaiah 44:5) “Who may stand in thy sight when thou art angry?” (^{<1911>}Psalms 74:7) “I have mingled my drink with weeping, because of thine indignation and thy wrath.” (^{<1919>}102:9, 10) “In my wrath I smote thee.” (^{<2101>}Isaiah 60:10) “He hath visited in his anger.” (^{<1845>}Job 24:15) “God distributeth sorrows in his anger.” (^{<1917>}21:17) “I have seen affliction by the rod of his wrath.” (^{<2101>}Lamentations 3:1) “I swear in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest.” (^{<1951>}Psalms 95:11) “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.” (^{<1989>}78:49, 50.) “At his wrath the earth shall tremble.” (^{<2100>}Jeremiah 10:10) “The land is desolate because of his anger.” (^{<2038>}25:38) “By his anger they are consumed.” (^{<1949>}Job 4:9) “The Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall devour them.” (^{<1919>}Psalms 21:9) “The Lord turned not from his wrath.” (^{<1223>}2 Kings 23:26) “For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still.” (^{<2155>}Isaiah 5:25) “The Lord is slow to anger, and of great kindness; he will not always

chide, neither keepeth he his anger for ever.” (~~4408~~ Psalm 103:8, 9) “The Lord turned from the fierceness of his anger.” (~~4612~~ Joshua 7:26) “In wrath remember mercy.” (~~3881~~ Habakkuk 3:2) “Though thou wast angry, thine anger is turned away.” (~~2311~~ Isaiah 12:1) “Many a time turned he his anger away.” (~~3588~~ Psalm 78:38)

(3.) “I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity.” (~~2331~~ Isaiah 13:11) “Behold, the Lord cometh to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity.” (~~2351~~ 26:21) “Is not destruction to the wicked, and a strange punishment to the workers of iniquity?” (~~8918~~ Job 31:3) “I will punish you according to the fruit of your doings.” (~~2014~~ Jeremiah 21:14) “I will punish you for all your iniquities.” (~~3082~~ Amos 3:2) “If ye will not hearken unto me, then I: will punish you seven times more for your sins.” (~~4288~~ Leviticus 26:18) “I will punish all that oppress them.” (~~2801~~ Jeremiah 30:20)

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 sanctification, 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 91.)

“There is no wrath in God, no fictitious atonement, no folly of debtor and creditor.” (Page 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.” (☞^{101B} Matthew 6:9, 12.) “And Jesus said, There was a certain creditor which had two debtors.” ☞^{101B} Luke 7:41.) “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, afterwards, 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.” (☞^{101B} Matthew 18:23, etc.)

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.” (Pages 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.” (Page 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.” (Page (132.)

Had he not this power before? Otherwise, how was he **O ων**, *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: — ^{f51}

“(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 1:7) This alone ‘cleanseth us from all sin.’ (1 John 1:7) And herein ‘was the love of God manifested towards us, that he sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.’ (1 John 4:9,10) So was the Lord ‘our righteousness;’ (Jeremiah 23:6) 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 anything 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 Timothy 2:6) and ‘by himself purged our sins.’ (Hebrews 1:3) ‘He loved us, and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God.’ (Ephesians 5:2) So we read, God ‘raised him from the dead; who was delivered for our offenses, 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.’ (Romans 5:9) Yet it is true, this doctrine finds no place in those who are proud of heart, who love their own reasoning, 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 anything 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.’ (²⁵⁵¹Isaiah 53:11) Him God hath constituted the ‘surety of that better covenant,’ (³¹²²Hebrews 7:22) — 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 interposes 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.’ (⁴¹²¹2 Corinthians 5:21) 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!' (^(~~ROM~~) John 10:14,15) For them 'was he taken from prison and from judgment, and cut off out of the land of the living.' (^(~~ISA~~) Isaiah 53:8) Now doth God herein 'commend his love towards' 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~~) Romans 8:3, 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~~) Isaiah 53:10) 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 son! 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~~) Romans 3:25)

And that precious sacrifice offered on the cross is the very center and marrow of the gospel. To that one offering whereby our great High Priest 'hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,' (^{<3014>}Hebrews 10:14) 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.' (^{<3017>}Colossians 2:17) 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.' (^{<3018>}Hebrews 9:12) In consequence of this we are accepted, 'through the offering of the body of Christ once for all.' (^{<3019>}10:10) 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, all 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' there 'unto God by his blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation.' (^{<3020>}Revelation 5:9)

"(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;' (^{<3021>}Galatians 3:13) the other of St. Peter, — 'Who himself bore our sins in his own body on the tree.' (^{<3022>}1 Peter 2:24) 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 favor 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 Mahometans.

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 anything 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.” (*Ibid.*)

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.” (*Ibid.*) 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.” (*Ibid.*)

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.” (Page 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!” (*Ibid.*)

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.” (*Ibid.*)

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 nonentity!

“This,” (angelic spirit and body,) “in Scripture, is called our ‘new’ or ‘inward man.’” (*Ibid.*)

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~~ 2 Corinthians 4:16) 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.” (~~402~~ Ephesians 4:22, 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 leisure of turning to God is the coming of Christ into the soul. This faith will save thee.” (Page 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*, 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. (*Ibid.*) 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." (*Ibid.*) It is so, when "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "This state of fervor melts away all earthly passions and affections, and leaves no inclination in the soul, but to delight in God alone." (*Ibid.*) 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 fervor." "Then its prayer changes again, and continually stands in fullness 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." (page 173.)

Assuredly it is: Fullness 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 fervor are frightened when coldness seizes upon them;" (page 174;) that is, when they lose it, when their love grows cold. And certainly, well they may, if this fervor was to bring them to "fullness of faith, purity of love, and absolute resignation." Well they may be affrighted, if that fervor be lost before "it has done its work."

Indeed, they might be affrighted when it is not lost, if that which follows be true: "Fervor is good, and ought to be loved; but distress and coldness are better. It brings the soul nearer to God than the fervor did." (Pages 175, 176.)

The fervor, you said, brought the soul to "its highest union with God in this life." Can coldness do more? Can it bring us to an union higher than the highest?

To explain this, you say, "The fervor 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." (Page 170.) Either fervor 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 fervor did in a higher degree."

I should not insist so long on these glaring inconsistencies, were not the doctrine you are here laboring 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 fervor 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," labor, 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 fervor 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 this door of thy heart.” (*Spirit of Prayer*, Part I., up. 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 56.)

So Jews, Mahometans, 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 center, the fund or bottom, of thy soul.” (Page 59.)

What; is this? What is either the center, the top, or bottom of a spirit?

“When Adam fell, this center 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 center of his soul.” (Page 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.” (Page 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?” (Page 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 law 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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.” (Page 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 siren 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 marvelous 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.” (Page 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 anything 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 favor 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 antiscritptural) 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?” (Page 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.” (*Ibid.*) 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 elusion.” 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.” (Page 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 supersedes 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 wide 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 natura*, “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 In. 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, etc., 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 sin,’ 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 all 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.” (Page 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 willfully, 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.”

(~~300~~ Hebrews 10:26-31)

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.” (~~600~~ 2 Peter 2:4-9) 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.” (~~700~~ Daniel 12:2) 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.” (~~800~~ Romans 2:5-9) 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.” (~~900~~ Matthew 25:41) 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.” (~~500~~ 2 Thessalonians 1:9) 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 forever 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 colors? 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. Everything 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 honored 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, in digested; supported neither by Scripture nor reason, nor anything but his own *ipse dixit*.

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 this 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 thee, — 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 ill 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 anything 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 triune, and nature is triune." (*Nature triune!* 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 anything 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 there 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 anything, 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 neighbor 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 anything 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 Savior.

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 we're 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 SPECIMEN

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 everything 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 LORDS PRAYER.

“Unser vater Im himmel:

“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 center 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 center ‘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.

“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* have the whole center; 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 center.

“**54. Ge:** With this syllable it goes into the sill. *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 center 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 center. 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 today:

“**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. *Ltch*: 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 afterwards 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, etc.)

Now here I fix my foot. Upon this ground I join issue with every admirer of Jacob 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.

FOOTNOTES

- ft1. Thus translated by Boscawen: —
“Now hear what briefly I reply.” — EDIT.
- ft2. Thus translated from the Latin of Horace by Francis: —
*“Whither tends
 This putid stuff?” — EDIT.*
- ft3. Thus translated by Gifford: —
“Again Crispinus comes!” — EDIT.
- ft4. Concerning the burning of heretics. — EDIT.
- ft5. Vol. VIII. pp.205-209 of the present Edition. — EDIT.
- ft6. Rendered by Boscawen, — “A many-headed beast.” — EDIT.
- ft7. One that affects the droll, and loves to raise a horse-laugh.
- ft8. Rising to more exalted strains — EDIT.
- ft9. This quotation from Horace is thus translated by Francis:
“It breathes the spirit of the tragic scene.” — EDIT
- ft10. As though you had accomplished some mighty affair. — EDIT.
- ft11. Harmless artillery. — EDIT.
- ft12. Attic elegance. — EDIT.
- ft13. The Bishop of Exeter’s Letter, pp. 2, 3.
- ft14. The letter thus subscribed was published at Cork, on May 30th last.
- ft15. Celebrated parts of Cork.
- ft16. 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.”*
- ft17. What is *glory*, without *profit* too?
- ft18.

*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!*

- ft19. This quotation from the Aeneid of Virgil is thus translated by Beresford: —

*This Ithacus desires,
And Atreus' sons with vast rewards shall buy.” — EDIT.*

- ft20. With authority enough. — EDIT.

- ft21. This quotation from Horace is thus translated by Boscauwen: —

*“What time, by his instructions cheer'd,
He bade me train his sapient beard.” — EDIT.*

- ft22. This accommodated quotation from Persius may be thus rendered: —
“As if you had the most intimate knowledge of us.” — EDIT.

- ft23. You are not upon a level with Bishop Warburton. Let every man know his own size.

- ft24. Such as escaped my notice; or such as may be placed to the account of human infirmity.

- ft25. Thus translated from Juvenal by Gifford: —
“The selfsame subject, in the selfsame words.” — EDIT.

- ft26. On this account. — EDIT.

- ft27. The one thing needful — EDIT.

- ft28. This quotation from Persius is thus translated by Drummond: —
*“Let me present a mind,
Which civil and religious duties bind;
A guileless heart, which no dark secrets knows,
But with the generous love of virtue glows.” — EDIT.*

- ft29. It is the lot of humanity to be ignorant of many things, and liable to error. — EDIT.

- ft30. Happy in their error — EDIT.

- ft31. 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.

- ft32. Mr. Hervey's Theron and Aspasio: Dial. 11.
- ft33. Nothing can exceed this. — EDIT.
- ft34. A thousand arts of annoyance. — EDIT.
- ft35. By a late Act of Parliament, there is a happy alteration made in this particular.
- ft36. 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.
- ft37. After your usual manner. — EDIT.
- ft38. Page 94
- ft39. Page 129.
- ft40. "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 making. Undoubtedly he has; and is so, how unjust, how cruel, is that censure!"
- ft41. These quotations from Juvenal are thus translated by Gifford:—
*"What day so sacred, which no guilt profanes?" — "Nature still,
 Incapable of change, and fix'd in ill,
 Recurs to her old habits: — never yet
 Could sinner to his sin a period set.*
- When did the flush of modest blood inflame
 The cheek once harden'd to the sense of shame?
 Or when the offender, since the birth of time,
 Retire, contented with a single crime?"*
*"For youth is facile, and its yielding will
 Receives, with fatal ease, the print of ill." —EDIT*
- ft42. The more inward things of the kingdom of God.—EDIT.
- ft43. What! art *thou* one of them too! *Thou*, my son!—EDIT.
- ft44. From Mr. Boston's "Fourfold State of Man."
- ft45. Mr. Law's words are enclosed all along in commas.
- ft46. To prove an unknown proposition by one equally unknown.—EDIT.
- ft47. See the *Spectator*.

- ft48. The proving of an unknown proposition by one still less known. —
EDIT.
- ft49. The example is pleasing.— EDIT.
- ft50. This quotation from Horace is thus translated by Boscawen: —
“These trifles serious mischief breed.” — *EDIT.*
- ft51. Ammae Mariae a Schurman [Ευκληρια](#), *Pars* II., p. 118, etc.

PUBLISHERS NOTES

CONTACTING AGES SOFTWARE

For more information regarding the AGES Digital Library, whether it be about pricing structure, trades for labor or books, current listings, policies — or if you wish to offer suggestions — please write us at...

AGES SOFTWARE • PO BOX 1926 • ALBANY OR 97321-0509

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE DIGITAL LIBRARY?

The Library consists of books and other literature of enduring value to the Christian community. Our goal since the beginning has been to “make the words of the wise available to all —inexpensively.” We have had in mind the student, teacher, pastor, missionary, evangelist and church worker who needs a high quality reference library, one that is portable, practical and low in cost.

ON WHAT BASIS WERE THEY SELECTED?

Volumes in the Library have been added based on several criteria: usefulness, user request, breadth of content or reputation. This has meant that the collection is eclectic and may include works that contain positions with which we at AGES Software do not agree. This paradox is consistent with our design, however: any useful library consists of books on a wide variety of subjects and sometimes includes information for reference purposes only. The AGES Digital Library hopefully will reflect — as its components are released — the necessary breadth and depth for a solid personal library.

HOW WERE THESE VOLUMES PREPARED?

Most of the books and documents have been scanned or typed from works that have entered the public domain. Some have been reproduced by special arrangement with the current publisher or holder of the copyright. They have been put in a format that can be readily used by computer users everywhere.

ARE THESE EXACT COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL WORKS?

Usually not. In the process of preparing the Library, we at AGES Software have taken the liberty to make certain edits to the text. As we discovered errors in spelling, certain archaic forms, typographical mistakes or omissions in the original we have done our best to correct them. Our intention has been to remove anything that might obscure the meaning or otherwise detract from the usefulness of a book for the modern reader. We have, however, attempted to retain the essential content and thoughts of the original — even when we found ourselves in disagreement.

WHY IS THE DIGITAL LIBRARY COPYRIGHTED?

While much of the content is in the public domain, the transcription, form and edits of these works took many people many hours to accomplish. We ask each purchaser to respect this labor and refrain from giving away copies of this or any volume of the Library without written permission from AGES Software. Our policy, however, is to work with each individual or organization to see that the price of Digital Library volumes not be a hindrance in their reaching the hands of those who need them. If price is an obstacle, please contact us at the address above and present your situation.