

BRISTOL STEWARD'S DIARY (1752–54)

Editorial Introduction:

This document provides a transcript of a bound manuscript diary that is part of the Frank Baker Collection of Wesleyana and British Methodism (Box SF9), Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Duke University, Durham, NC.

This diary was kept by a man (almost certainly single) who cared for the bookroom at John Wesley's Chapel in Bristol and assisted in reading over proofs of books that John Wesley published at Bristol printers. The document does not give the name of the author. It may well be the Nicholas Norton who is described as serving this role in a contemporaneous journal extract of William Dyer.¹

The diary contains scattered entries beginning in October 1752 and ending in October 1754. It provides an important window into practices and controversies within the Methodist community in Bristol and beyond during this period.

The transcription which follows was prepared by Thomas R. Albin from the original manuscript. Albin has maintained the spelling, punctuation, capitalization, line length, and pagination of the manuscript in the transcription. Material that was crossed out in the manuscript is retained in the transcript, but printed in ~~strikeout~~ font. Some annotation has been added by Randy L. Maddox. All material in [brackets] was added by the editors.

While some of the author's abbreviations/contractions are expanded, those used often are left as in the original. These would include the following:

Br (or B.)	Brother
cd	could
shd	should
wch	which
wd	would
wt	what
Xt	Christ
ye	the
ym	them
yn	then
ys	this
yt	that

¹See the quotation of this extract in "Sidelights upon the 'New Room,' Bristol, from William Dyer's Diary," *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* 28 (1932): 120–29; here, 122. In the box with the original manuscript at Duke is a set of cards prepared by a doctoral student during the initial cataloguing of the collection which attributes the diary to Thomas Butts. When Baker learned of this attribution he rejected it, based on comparison with a known Butts' letter and because Butts was Wesley's "book steward" in *London* during this time.

On the inside front cover of the manuscript volume the following material is written, then crossed out:

~~Jan[uar]y 11. Lent Mr James Rogers
Sermons. Do. Dr. Kennel's Creed.
To James Rouquest A French Gram~~

On the inside back cover of the manuscript volume the following material appears:

John Smith	Jan[uar]y 20. 1752
Herb. Palmer	Lent I.N.d iz
Whole Duty	
Pascal	
Charnock.	

A Diary

Perhaps nothing is more pernicious to y[e]
Soul of Man than ye whiling away Time
without any serious examination. This may
be one Reason why so many People have
scarce any memory at all. They pass away
their Hours, without ever thinking of ym.
They Treasure up nothing because they
scarce regard any Thing. One Day succeeds another,
and each is spent in ye same thoughtless
Inactivity. The Man dreams from
Morning to Night, and retains not one
Occurrence during the whole Space.
To prevent this from being my own Case
I have determined (with Divine Permission)
to keep an exact Register, how I improve
the Hours allotted me, to work out my
Salvation in; ~~fear of temptations yt present~~
~~themselves to me~~ interspersed with my own ref[lec]
tions as I go along. One Reason that in
duced me to it was my joining my[self?]²

²Edge frayed and unreadable.

[in] a closer Union with a few of ye Brethren
whence a stricter Examination of my own ways
became highly expedient. And I cd find nothing
so well calculated to give this insight,
as ye writing down ye Occurrences of each
day particularly. Such is my Reason for
undertaking so tedious a Task. May the
Design answer my Intention.

1752 Sund[ay].
Oct[obe]r 1.

After Breakfast, I walked with Br Little to
Bath to hear Mr Chapman. Our conversation
for the most Part, was far from edifying. We
did not really keep a Sabbath to the LORD!
Worldly Conversation mixing with Spiritual,
forsakd the Word, and it became unfruitful.
Mr Chapman being at Bristol, Mr Grig
preachd. The Sermon, how good soever, w[a]s
[no]thing to me. I had lost my Way. I had
[left] ye clear Gospel at home, consequently.
met with no refreshment abroad. One Disappointment
followd another, and I came
_____ ³ crisis, far less strong than I set out.

³Bottom of page tattered and the last line unreadable except for the final words.

[October 1752]

Mond[ay] 2. Spent the morning in folding Books. After Dinner walked with Br Rouq[uet] from Kingswood to Bristol. At Five went to Br Jones, and stayd to drink Tea. A little after, I walkd with a friend toward Kingsw[oo]d. Our Conversation turnd on ye lawfulness of providing for ye moderate subsistence of our Families, after our Death. I agreed with him, yt the Scripture was to be ye only Judge in this matter. That Mens Opinions nor Prachir [preachers] were to be allowed Innocent, no farther than as they were regulated by yt un-erring Rule. So far we kept within the Bounds of Xtianity. But falling after wards into Particulars, I Fear we were not clear of evil-speaking. O! when shall I speak only to edification? LORD, hasten this Hour, I beseech Thee. I find little Reason to Boast considering the many Advantages I am possessd of! And if my Soul is so little alive to GOD, though continually under ye Word, what can I possi[bly]⁴ expect but I should be deprived of it?

⁴Page tattered and the text that follows almost unreadable.

[October 1752]

Tuesd[ay]. 3. Arose at five. At 7 went to Br. Hands to Breakfast. Our conversation was concerning ye different Sects of Dissenters. That few had little good in them, but much Bigotry & Superstition. The Quaker Spirit too often, utterly subversive of Xtian love. May I never imitate it. From Nine to Ten I read Proofs. To Eleven I writ exercises Then went with Sarah Colston to see Mr Watkins. Found him compos'd waiting for ye Consolation of Israel. Had very little Life in Prayer. my Soul being still Dead and comfortless. I fear, I have grievd the Spirit of GOD by not watching. ~~unto~~ ~~all~~ ~~sin~~. LORD rouse my drowsy Powers, lest I sleep ye sleep of Death! Dined about One. After Dinner wrote ye remainder of my Exercise. At 3. went to Br Jones. About 5. accompanied him into the Fields. In our return

⁵

⁵The bottom of page frayed so badly that the final sentence is unreadable.

[October 1752]

Fryd. [Friday] 6. Rose a little after 4. At 5. Preaching began. Walkd to Bristol at 6. From 7 to 9 read Proofs. To 10. did occasional Business. Writ to Eleven. Was with Brother Jones from Eleven to Twelve. Writ till ½ Hour after 1. Was at Intercession till near 3. Then Dined. Afterwards writ till between 4. & 5. Walkd to 6. Writ and read to 7. At Preaching ~~&c. Bands~~ till near 9. ~~Soon after~~ Then commended myself to GOD. I cannot but observe, how careful ye LORD is, lest any yt trust in Him should be confounded. A Thing having pressd me down much. I commended my cause to the Almighty and toDay He shewd me yt I shd not trust in Him for nought. A Friend offerd me opportunely the Thing desired, but I wait for clearer Light.

[October 1752]

Sat. 7. Rose at Five. Writ & etc. from 6. to 8.
Breakfasted & shavd till Nine. Wrote
& Read till Eleven. Stayd with Br Jones
till Twelve. Walkd with Jemmy Rouq[ue]t
till One. ~~Writ to 4.~~ Then Dined. Writ & c.
from 2. to 4. Walkd till near 5. Retird
for about 1/2 an Hour. Then went with
Br Shelton to ye Hall. Suppd & writ to 8.
Soon after retird to rest. I am one Day
nearer Eternity, but how little nearer
the mind that was in Xt!

Sund[ay]. 8. Heard Br Jones preach an
excellent Sermon at Five. Read & c.
to 7. Went out to Breakfast. From
thence at Nine, set out for Kingswd.
The Power of GOD was present with me.
I longd to depart & to be with Xt. The
Spirit made Intercessions with Groans
not utterable. O how did the lingering

[October 1752]

minutes move! To slow by far, to reach
my ardent wishes. Sacrament was
just began. Yet before my receiving
yt Holy Fervour was clear abated & a
strange Deadness had overspread my
Soul. The consecrated Elements were,
to me, Bread & Wine! This utterly confounds
yt fond Notion of ye Papist's,
Hoc est corpus meum; unless understood
spiritually. I cannot be insensible,
yt I have many Times receivd it
without partaking of ye Body & Blood
of Xt. May I do so no more. Conversd
till Dinner Time. Read &c. from 1. to 2.
At 3. set out for Bristol. Stayd with a
Friend till Preaching Time. Br Skelton
Preachd. I know not why, but I cannot Benefit
by these "Gospel Preachers." If this is a
Mark of ye non Elect certainly, I am of yt
Number. Yet, I believe I am not. Nor do I
Believe any are.

[October 1752]

Suppd near Nine. And soon after retired.

Mond. 9. Rose at Five. After Preaching,
I writ to 7. Went to a Friend to Breakfast
and staid near Nine. Writ to 10. Read
& corrected Proofs till 12. Walkd, about
Business, till 1. Then Dined. From 2.
to 4, writ. Went with Br Jones to Br Masons
and drank Tea. Came to his House,
& staid with him consulting about a particular
Text of Scripture, till Eight.
Sat up till Ten.

Tues. 10. Rose at Five. Read proofs
&c. to 8. Writ till 10. Waited on Br
Jones & staid to 12. Dined soon after.
Was selling of Books and answering
Questions &c. till 2. Read from 2 to 4, &
Mr Wesley's Predestination calmly considered.⁶
It might justly have been calld, the Antidote

⁶John Wesley published *Predestination Calmly Considered* in 1752.

[October 1752]

of Reprobation. For it tears it up
Root and Branch. Some think “though
there is no Decree of Reprobation, yet
nevertheless there may be an Election of
Grace:” “Though there be a possibility
yt all may be saved, yet there are some
absolutely chosen.” For my Part, I have
the same objection to this as to the other.
If mankind were equally fallen, For GOD to give
irresistible Grace to some, and only
Grace yt might be resisted to others,
wd be still dealing partially with His
Creatures and shewing Himself ~~speaker of sermons~~ [?⁷]
an Arbitrary dispenser of His Favors.
Indeed it is allowd by some, yt He might justly have passd
by all (considerd separate from the
Atonement made by the Son of GOD.)
Supposing ys, yet. I cannot reconcile
His Justice to shew more abundant Favour
to some than others, when Xt satisfied

⁷Text difficult to read.

[October 1752]

for all alike. If ~~“GOD is Love”~~, he must
~~be Love to all equally~~ When GOD says,
“He is Loving to every Man & His Mercy
is over all His Works;” to make Him more
abundant Loving to some than others,
is to make a vain Distinction, yt Scripture
gives no Ground for. The inspird
Pen yt says, ~~“in Adam all died;”~~ “He tasted death for every
Man” says, as espresly ~~in Xt may all be made
alive.”~~ “He willeth all to be saved &c.”
Here is no distinction in the ~~Death;~~ Attonement
made; nor is there any in the ~~Resurrection~~ Desire
of Salvation. The same possibility of ~~Living~~
attaing Heaven is allowd to all. If the Scriptures
are true “GOD is no respecter of Persons;”
therefore cannot (unconditionally)
signalize some above their Brethren.
~~Besides, the~~ Besides, the Sanctions
in ye Bible are mostly, if not always, general.
~~Writ from 4. to 5.~~
The Promises is general: The

[October 1752]

Threatnings general. And even
after Men have Believd, ye Cautions
against falling away are general. From
hence it undeniably follows, yt if ever
our LORD or any of the Apostles,
did make any Distinction in the Promises
or Threatnings deliverd 'twas
as considering ~~them~~ the hearers as Accepting
or not accepting. Believing or
unbelieving. If Men will sophistically
drag in one Scripture to confute
another, they may cease wondering
at ye increase of Infidelity.
For who can believe both Sides of
a Contradiction? Therefore if it be
allowd yt the Scripture speaks Things
utterly irreconcilable, it must be hit
up as a meer (tho' I cannot say, cunningly
devis'd) Fable. Thus do some defend the
Christian Revelation!

[October 1752]

Writ from four to 5. From 6 to 1/2 hour after,
did occasional Business. From 8. to 9.
spent in conversation with Mr Skelton.
Many Things do I more & more see, yt
are contrary to Christianity, in ye People
call'd Methodists. Nor can I withstand
the Contagion. Impertinent Chit Chat,
withers all our Strength, & often brings
me, at least, under Condemnation. If
an Idle Word is contrary to the Law
of GOD, for any One to tell me I need
not come into condemnation even while
I am often, if not mostly guilty of thus
breaking the Law; is quite silly & Childish.
If ye law is in force, the breakers of
it must be under ye Curse. And though
we are again justified ye moment we
believe in Xt, yet yt we can be justified
and yet openly break either of the Commandments,

[October 1752]

at one and ye same Time, is absolutely impossible. As none are justified but Believers. So, that we cannot believe and break the Commandments at one and ye same instant, will appear plain if we consider yt.

“He yt believeth is not condemned ~~already~~.”
But every breaker of ye Commandment, is condemnd:

Therefore, no breaker of the Commandment does, or can believe.

For ye two first we have the infallible Oracles of GOD; therefore, the consequent follows of Course. The Thing then to be proved is, yt the Law as a Rule, is laid aside wholly; or else, yt no one yt ever once believed, can come under Condemnation. When any one has fully provd these two Propositions, I will then allow a Man may sin, & yet not be condemnd.

[October 1752]

Wed:d. 11. Rose at 5. After Preaching,
I accompanied Br Rouquet to Br
Jones. Stayd and Breakfasted; came Home
about 1/2 Hour after 8. Did occasional
Business till Nine. Writ to 10. Writ
to Eleven. Went to Br Jones & staid
till 12. At 1. Dined. At 2. went to
Br Jones & staid to near 4. Writ
Read in the Latin Testament,
till near 5. Retired till 6. Went
to the Hall with Br Jones. At 7.
Supp'd. The Bands met at 8.
At 9. retired.

Thurs. 12. Arose to Preaching.
From 7. to 8, did occasional Business.
Breakfasted soon after. Writ from 9.
to 10. Read Proofs till 12. Dined near 1.

[October 1752]

Did occasional Business till 3.
Corrected Proofs till 5. Writ from 6.
to Preaching. Writ from 8. till past 9.

Fryd. 13. Heard Br Tucker preach a
plain useful Sermon, on the Advice
to ye Church of Sardis. Or rather, to
the Angel (Bishop) of yt Church.
Writ from 7. to 10. Walkd with Br
Tucker &.c. to Eleven. Went to Br
Jones &.c. and staid till near 12.
Writ to Intercession. Dined. Then
spent ye Time to Preaching with a
Friend. After Preaching suppd. Soon
after retired.

Sat. 14. Rose at 5. Br Rouquet Preachd.
At 7. Breakfasted. To 9. did occasional
Business. Writ &.c. to 12. Went with Br

[October 1752]

Skelton to Dinner. There is as some little Dispute about Election &c. But no great Bogotry [sic.] on either Side. Mr Wesley &c. landed this Day from Ireland. After Dinner read Proofs &c. to the Time of Preaching. Went to the Hall & heard Br Haughton. A pretty Sermon enough, and tolerably connected. Went to Br Westels & staid Supper. Found here Br Whitford; a simple open hearted Man for ought I see. Came Home soon after Supper & went to Bed.

Sund. 15. Heard Mr John [Wesley] Preach at 5. Went to Breakfast with Br Skelton at 7. Walkd with him & Br Haughton to Kingwood at 9. Found no Life in the Sacrament. I know not why, but I

[October 1752]

scarce ever do. Mr John Preachd at 2.
on ye same Words as in the morning.
After Sermon I walked to Bristol.
Heard Mr Wesley at 5. The Society met
1/2 Hour after 6. Suppd &c. till Bed
Time. My Mind has been confusd
all this Day. Like Martha I am too careful
about many Things. Yet, I hope, all
Things ~~shall~~ will work together for Good.

Mond. 16. Mr John made an excellent
Sermon at 5, concerning taking up our
Cross. Highly needful in this Society!
Writ my Journal till 7. Breakfasted
about 8. Writ exercise till 10. Went to
the Ship with Br Haughton. & staid till
Dinner Time. Writ till four in the
afternoon. Then waited on Br Jones &
walkd with him &c. till near 6. Suppd &

[October 1752]

conversed to Preaching. At Nine retired.

Tues. 17. Rose at 5. Did occasional Business till Breakfast. Writ from 8. to 11. Went, & staid with Br Jones till 12. Dined at One. Writ again till 3. Read &c. to 5. Preaching began at 1/2 Hour after 6. Suppd at 1/2 Hour after 7. Went to Bed at 9.

Wed. 18. Rose at 5. Breakfasted about 7. Walkd with Mr J.W. to Kingswood; at 1/2 Hour after. He was very Free, and most of my Objections vanishd. Just as we came to the School, Br Rouquet and Br Tobias were going to Babel's Tower to see one yt was sick. When we came to the House, we found her possessd with a dumb Spirit. Her

[October 1752]

Friends cd get nothing from her, nor persuade her to Eat ought. GOD had greatly refreshd, as well as convincd her, in the Sacrament lately. But Satan had still possession, nor wd he quit his hold. Whether GOD will see fit to deliver her or no; Time perhaps, will declare. How strange is it, yt any one shd Dream there are no Demoniacs now. Whereas the instances glare in many Parts of the Kingdom. Nor can we, consistent with Reason, imagine it can possibly be otherwise, till ye whole World is Christianized, and all really become children of GOD. “The GOD of this World, worketh still w[i]th energy, in the Children of Disobedience.”

[October 1752]

At 12. I Dined. Writ part of the Afternoon.
Supp'd at 6. I went to Bed
at 10.

Thurs. 19. Rose about 5. Heard
a surprising Story of a Gentleman
of Bradford near Bath Somersetshire.
He was a Man as vile in his
practice, as immoral in his
Principles. Being taken very ill,
one of our Sisters attended him.
After some Days sickness, he imagin'd
himself better. And at Night
desired his attendant to lie in ye
next Room in order yt he might sleep
without Disturbance. According
to his Desire, she went & lay down.
In a small Space & she heard a violent

[October 1752]

violent noise in the next Room (where the sick Person lay) as if two drunken Men were scuffling, mixt with the most horrid Blasphemies yt Tongues cd possibly utter. Starting off the Bed, she ran to see what was the matter. Entering the Room she found the Gentleman, but no one beside either Man, Woman or Child. He presently accosted her with the most brutal Language, for letting Men in to Murder him. In vain did she deny it, he still persisted, affirming she had combined against his Life. Finding nothing wd do, at length she left him, and returnd to her Bed. Scarce were she laid down ~~but~~ ere the Noise returned. She arose again

[October 1752]

as before, and entring where he was,
found all Things as at first. After
enduring the same Treatment for some
Time, she again left him. Immediately
the Noise was heard again, with
the additional one as of taring new
Cloth. Upon returning he began to
rate at her as before, but she no
longer able to bear it, or stay in the
House, threatned to leave him directly.
Upon this he alterd his Tone, &
consented to tell her the Cause of it.
He told her, yt the Devil had
been to fetch him, & yt he had actually
been in Hell, and see the Torments
of the Damnd. He said all the talk
in Hell was, of a young Gentleman
(of his neighbourhood & at that Time

[October 1752]

in perfect Health.) whom they daily expected. Moreover he said, the Rich were far worse used than the Poor: As there was no respect shown to them, but a greater addition of Misery. He related several Things of the same kind, & how at last he was permitted to ~~return~~ come back again, with an assurance from them, yt he wd soon return and take the Place assignd him. He shewd her likewise his Shirt tore halfway up, which she had heard with her own Ears. And concluded with the Death of the young Gentleman whom the Devils he said, were in daily expectation of. When she urged the unlikeliness of it, as he was yn perfectly well, he said, it matterd

[October 1752]

not, he knew well he wd soon be in yt
Place of Torment. His Relation finishd;
the Spirit indeed quitted the Earthly
Tabernacle, and went as he had
foretold. A few Days after, the
young Gentleman before mentiond
took it in his Head to swim over
a whirlpool: And accomplishd it.
The next Morning, as he was going
to Breakfast, the same whim came
into his Head. His Friends tried all
ways to divert him for it, to no purpose.
He swore he wd be "Damned" if he
did not swim over it. No sooner
had he enterd the River, but he
plungd into the Hole and sunk to
the Bottom, and so fulfilld the Enemy's

[October 1752]

Expectation. These Men, seem to have been both given over by the Al-mighty, & ~~given~~ into the Hands of the Devil, to work his will with them! Their insufferable Wickedness had so hardend their Hearts yt there was no more mercy for them. So dangerous it is, to quench the Spirit of the living GOD! May the LORD deliver me, from their Death! About 7. I walkd to Bristol. Spent the Morning in Writing, and the Afternoon with Br Haughton.

Fryd. 20. Rose at 5. Writ all the Morning. And corrected Proofs &c. all the afternoon. It being

[October 1752]

Watch Night I set up till 12.

Sat. 21. Rose at half Hour after 7.
Did occasional Business to 11. Staid
with Br Jones to 12. Spent the Afternoon
in different Employments.

Sund. 22. After morning Preaching
I walkd to Kingwood. Read in Mr W's
Sermons till Sacrament began.
Dined at 12. Heard Mr Wesley Preach
at Conham at 1/2 Hour after. Service
done, I & Br Williams &c. walkd to
Bristol. The Room was quite filld
at 5. People flock from all Parts to hear
Mr John. Nor do I wonder at ~~ye~~ ~~People~~ those
of the World, preferring him before
any of the other Methodist's Preachers, as his
Talents are far superior to any in connexion

[October 1752]

with him. The depth of his Matter recommends him to Believers, as his graceful Pronunciation and regular Action gain him the esteem of the unconverted. Upon the whole, I believe he is universally allowd to be ye most finishd Divine in England, in this our Day. Nothing material was said in ye Society: The reading when & where ye Classes met, Taking up some Part of ye Time.

From Mond. 23 to Wed. inclusive, was spent in visiting ye Classes.

Thurs. 26. Rose at 5. Did occasional Business to 12. At One Dined. Writ &c. from 2. to 3. Then walkd with Mr J. Wesley to B. Dolmans at the New Wells.

[October 1752]

Our walk was very pleasant, and refreshing, the Discourse by the way entertaining, tho not so spiritual as might have been. Came to Bristol about 5. Went to conduct ye Corpse of S[ister] Mann by to the Room, there to remain during the Preaching. Mr J. W. Preachd out of the Revelations, to a prodigious number of People. The Countess of Huntingdon & several other Persons of Quality were there. After the Sermon the Body was carried & deposited in St James Church-yard. She died in full Triumph, knowing in whom she believd, and to whom she was going. The meeting ye Society afterwards, kept us till 9. of ye Clock. Afterward I suppd and retired.

[Page 29; unnumbered in manuscript]

[October 1752]

Fryd. 27. Rose before 5. Met Classes
&c. to 7. Did occasional Business to 11.
Writ to intercession. Dinnd at 3.
Read to 5. D^o [Ditto = Writ] from 6. to Preaching.
Conversd during the meeting of the
Bands. Retired with Jemmy Rouquet,
about 9.

Sat. 28. Was calld between 4.
and 5. by Mr John. By some talk with J.R
I find there are more craft & Subtilty
among us than becometh Xtians.
Too Few scrupling to hurt their Neighbour,
to Advantage their own Cause!
A Dream of W.S. is much in my
Thoughts. It were this. As he was looking
up to ye Horizon, he beheld two Stars,

[October 1752]

of different Magnitude, as well as splendour. After gazing some Time, will Wonder at their superior brightness, one of ym dropt with a nimbling Noise to the Earth. But the far brighter of the two still shone with an extraordinary lustre. But it was not long ere yt also broke from it Station with a far more violent report into several small Parts, some of which flew towards London. Tis probable ye surprise wakd him. And as soon he cd recollect himself, he began to ponder in his Mind what might be ye occasion of this wonderful Dream & w[ha]t it might import. Immediately it was pressd upon his Mind, yt the 2 Stars were symbolical of two Gospel Lights yt ~~had~~ have lately appeared. That they

[October 1752]

represented two famous Ministers.

That neither of these Lights is yet altogether
obscurd, is true; tho' one
shines far less bright than heretofore.
Whether he will wholly disappear
as the former emblem did, without leaving
any Traces behind, Time itself
will discover. _____⁸

However, As the former Star is already
partly extinct, yt half inclines me
to Believe yt ye latter will assuredly
follow. But first I expect to see ye
utter extinction of the first. His
wholly leaving the Work and burying
himself in a Living. As to ye
latter, I trust GOD will never suffer
him entirely to forsake yt, to wch he
has been so eminently calld.

⁸Most of remaining words are marked thru and unreadable.

[October 1752]

From 6. to 8. did occasional Business.
Then went out to Breakfast with Mr
Wesley. Writ from 9. to One. Went
to Mrs. Wiggington's to Dinner.
Came Home about 1/2 Hour after 2.
Writ to 1/2 Hour after 3. From hence
to Bed Time, was variously employd.

Sund. 29. Sickness prevented my
going to Kingswood; and confined
me in all the Morning. The Afternoon
I made shift to reach to Church,
but might as well have staid at
Home, the Preachers voice being
no ways adequate to my Ear; so yt
the Sermon might have been Horace's
Odes or Virgil's Eneid,
for ought I cd reprehend in it.

[Oct.– Nov. 1752]

Mond. 30. Being still out of Order, I did not rise to take leave of Mr W. who this Day set out for London. The Confusion yt lately revivd am[on]g us, so disorderd my Mind, yt I scarce knew wt to I say said or think did, the remaining Part of the Day. I were beset on every Side, and knew not how to escape. Nor can I give any consistent Acct of wt occur'd or how ~~I passed the Day~~. the Time was wasted.

Tues. 31. Spent the Morning in writing. The Afternoon in different employes.

Wed. Nov. 1. Rose at 5. Did occasional Business to 8. Writ to 11.

[November 1752]

Staid with B. Jones to 12. Accompanied him to Mr Palmer's and tarried till 1. Went with Br Haughton to Mr Williams to Dinner, and return'd at 3. Writ my Journal &c. to 4. Set out soon after for Kingswood. Suppd at 6 – At Chapel 1/2 Hour after. Service ended, our Band met. At 9. retired.

Thurs. Nov. 2. Arose at 3/4 after 4. Service began at 5. Breakfasted a little after 6. Came to Bristol near 9. Read Proofs to 11. Read the acct of ye Irish Rebellion, till Dinner. Continued reading the same Book to 1/2 Hour after 1. Writ Exercise till 4. Went to B. Jones & staid till near Preaching.

[November 1752]

Fryd. Nov. 3. Arose at 5. Corrected a Proof & writ to 9. Writ exercise to 11. Waited on B. Jones, & took a walk till 12. Writ to 1/2 Hour after 1. Was at Intercession, till 1/2 Hour after 2. Then Dined. Went after Dinner to B. Jones and staid to 5. Till 6. was the Hour of Prayer. At 3/4 after, Preaching began. Then supp'd. At 9. retired.

Sat. Nov. 4. Arose at 5. Read till near 7. Went to Breakfast with B. Haughton to B. Masons. Came back about 1/2 Hour after 9. Did occasional Business to near 1/2 Hour after 10. Writ about 1/4 Hour, then went to Longs and staid till near 12.

[November 1752]

Dined about One. Writ &c. to 1/2 H[our]
after 2. Then went to B. Jones & staid
to near 5. From thence I went to
B. Sinnick's [i.e., Cennick], and drank Milk &
Water. Came Home about 6. To 7.
writ my Journal. To Bed Time conversd
&c. As I have often had disputes
with some of the Brethren,
w[ha]t the Life of Faith is, it may not
be altogether improper, to write
down wt I believe, concerning it.
Faith in St Paul's Account, is
“the υπόστασις⁹ of Things
hop'd for, ye ελεγχος ye ελεγχος of
Things not seen.” It is ~~the substance~~, ye Confidence
~~or subsistence of ye Measure of Things~~ hoped, for, and ye
demonstrative Evidence of
~~of all the good Things, yt GOD hath~~ Things invisible. Or a
confident Belief of the

⁹I.e, υπόστασις.

[November 1752]

~~prepared for us, in our Souls. And He~~
good Things Promised & ye supernatural Evidence
~~presents of the Peace of GOD, the Love~~
of their Existence & our Interest in
~~of GOD, joy in the Holy Ghost, with~~
ym. In particular, it is an Evidence of the
~~a portion of the Mind that was in~~
Love of Xt; He hath loved me, and given Himself
~~Xt, in us: for me.~~ Gal. 2:20. But how is this reconcilable
with our Church, her description
of Faith; “a sure confidence yt a Man
hath in GOD, yt his Sins are forgiven,
and he reconciled to the favour of
GOD”? I Believe it will not be difficult
to reconcile ym, yt were never
at variance. This I take to be ye Case
here. Our Church gives a true definition,
as far as she goes, but it is both defective & redundant. Whereas St
Paul’s is much more accurate, full and emphatical.
~~Accordingly,~~ She speaks of
Faith with its accompanying Graces or immediate
effects; and St Paul
only of Faith itself, or the confidence

[November 1752]

receivd yt arises when ye Love of Xt is first reveald
to us: Together wth ye Evidence or Ground of yt Confidence.
Consequently, there is no inconsistency
between ym, tho' one
definition is much more accurate and
descriptive, than ye Other. But may
not a Man have this Confidence, and yet
not its accompanying Graces? Or
may That is, may not a man retain
Faith, and not have Peace, Joy, Love?
Or may not a Man have These, &
yet not know yt he has ym? I answer,
1st, A man may have a Confidence
of the Devil's giving, without these
Graces, but not such a Confidence
in GOD thro' Xt. 2dly. "That a Man
may have these Graces in him, &
yet not know yt he has ym;" is as
impossible (while Sense remains)

[November 1752]

as to have the most acute Pain,
and yet not feel it. But is there no
Trust in Christ, yt is destitute of these?
Yes, yt which every wicked man hath.
Tis true, there is a Trust also yt ev'ry
truly awakend Sinner hath. But it
is not a confidence of wt now is, as is Faith, but
only of wt shall be. Not a lively present an internal
~~language of Sims~~ knowledge of ye Love of Xt, see 2. Peter 1.3,
but ye expectation
of it. This, is in Scripture Language,
is calld Hope. And the very Term
itself implies no more, yn an expectation
of wt shall be. Therefore, if ~~we~~ you
wd condescend to make use of Scripture
Terms, we should not ~~not~~ long
be at a Loss to apprehend your meang.
We may now easily see wt a Life of
Faith is. It is a continual Sense of

[November 1752]

the presence and Favour of GOD: Accompanid wth a
feeling possession of Peace, love, Joy.
Or a continued Confidence in GOD,
thro' Xt, with its attendant Graces.
To ask whether we cannot keep
Faith, without the feeling, continued
possession of Peace, Joy, Love &c. is
as absurd, as to ask whether a
Man may not have Life, and yet
no Blood stirring in his Veins. Tis sure,
where the Life of GOD is, there
is a measure of all these Gifts. And
tho' there are various Degree's in Faith,
yet, the least Degree implies, a
measure of all these Graces, sensibly
perceivd. Therefore if we feel
not these, tis because there is no
abiding Life in us.

[November 1752]

But is no Sin consistent with this Faith? No. It is impossible for a Man to commit or practise outward Sin, while he thus believes. "He yt is Born of GOD, doth not commit Sin." And "whosoever believeth is born of GOD." Nay, every giving way to inward Sin, proportionably weakens, if not wholly destroys Faith. Does every Believer then fulfill the Law? Or is not every Transgression of the Law, Sin? In one Sense, every Believer fulfills the Law, as he loves both GOD and Man. For "Love is the fulfilling of the Law, the end of ye Commandment."

[November 1752]

But in another Sense he does not.
He does not absolutely fulfill
every Thing the Law requires.
Is he not then condemnd? No, not
so long as he does not give way
to inward; or practise outward Sin. Every
involuntary Failing is not Imputed,
in as much as it has no
concurrence with his Will, &
without this it is not properly
Sin.

Sund. Nov. 5. Being exceedingly
sleepy, I did not rise till near 7.
Breakfasted about 8. Read &c.
to 10. Went to St Stephens &
staid Sacrament. A young man

[November 1752]

preachd, whose flighty air did no
honor to his Sermon. The Oxford
Gayity & inconsiderateness is highly
unbecoming the sacred Character!
His Discourse was tolerable; neither
deserving much Applause, nor Condemnation.
On the second Head I
fear'd for the Catholic's. But, in his
application, he very candidly told
us, "tho' their Principles deservd
Detestation, yet our Displeasure
ought not to extend to their Person."
"We shd hate their persecuting, anti-Christian
Tenets, yet love ye Men."
O! yt we might may always practice it.
One Thing I cd not but observe, He
s[ai]d "the Church of England abhorrd
Persecution in matters of Religion."

[November 1752]

I wd all her members did! For my Part,
I doubt whether her constitution itself
can be wholly cleared from giving encouragement
to it. Not if the Canons are
reckoned a Part of it. Some of wch are not
only unscriptural but Anti-christian!
That “Every minister subscribes to all
these, without exception, in his ordination;”
I believe not. Consequently, his “disclaiming
them afterwards, can be no
Part of Perjury!” Dined with B. Sinnick [Cennick].
After Dinner we went to St Mariport
Church and heard a pretty Sermon,
affectionately delivered. The Preacher
was a stranger to me, but his serious
and unaffected Delivery was consistent
with ye Character of a Minister of Jesus.
I was sorry to hear him fall into ye general

[November 1752]

generally receivd error yt all yt are Baptizd & live regular Lives are Christians. Whereas, it can no more be provd from Scripture, yt these are genuine Xtians, yn ye Devils in Hell. This Blunder seems to arise from a misunderstanding of St Paul's Words "For as in Adam all Die, so in Xt shall all be made alive." To wch I object, 1st the latter part of the Text, ought not be translated in ye future Tense, but in ye Paulo post future. Consequently, is not more literally "shall" than, "may be made alive." 2dly Supposing the ~~2. apprehend, the Apostle means neither more, nor less yn yt as we all become motal by Adams sin, so we all are raisd by Xt at ye general Resurrection.~~ Translation right, yet he does not affirm yt all are, but "shall be made alive." 3dly I apprehend, ye Apostle means neither more nor less yn yt as we all became mortal by Adam's sin; so we shall all be raisd by Xt at the general Resurrection. Therefore, neither can we infer from this Scripture, yt all are Christians, yt are so calld, whether Baptizd or unbaptized. How many yt have been Baptizd and lead regular Lives, are habitually Proud, self willd, Boasters,

[November 1752]

Lovers of the World, Lyars, defrauders of yr
Neighbors, &c.? Again: How many yt are
clear of these, as to outward Appearance,
are nevertheless void of the Spirit of GOD,
of the Life of GOD in their Souls, wholly
destitute of the Mind yt was in Xt Jesus?
Now these, the Scriptures in many Places
declare, have no Affinity with ye King
of Heaven, but are of their "Father the
Devil, whose Works (inward, if not outwd)
they do." So little Ground have we from
this Text, to esteem all Christians yt
bare the Name. Our Services began at 5.
Which, with meeting the Society &c. concluded
the Day.

Mond. Nov. 6. Rose at 5. Writ
to near 8. Breakfasted; and writ to near 1.

[November 1752]

Dined. Waited on Felix Farley, about printing the Greek Grammar. Came back about 1. Writ to near 4. Paid Mr Jones 4.1l [shillings?] & 5d. pence yt I had receivd of Mrs Wigginton. Came Home about 5. Read &c. to 6. Walkd with J. Rouquet & conversd to Preaching. Suppd. Retired.

Tues. 7. Rose at 5. Writ to near 1/2 Hour after 7. Washd. At 8. Breakfasted. Walkd with J. Rouquet about Business, till near 10. Writ to 1. Dined. Read to 1/2 H[our] after 2. Writ to 4. Waited on B. J., and staid to 1/4 after 5. Read to 6. B. Jones preached. After Preaching, our Band met. The Rules of the Bands were partly read, with some additional ones since thought necessary to be joind with ym, and each of our Band subscribd to ym,

[November 1752]

by writing his name at ye Bottom. Came Home between 9. & 10. and went to Bed. Of all the Truths of Revelation, nothing is more irksome and uneasy to an uninlightend Spirit than ye Doctrine of Original Sin. The Pride of Man will scarce ever let him acknowledge his own depravity. He will shift every Way, rather than submit to so unwelcome a Truth. Accordingly, in this our Day, innumerable are the Objections against it. Many Volumes are publishd to prove it unworthy of all credit and utterly ~~in-opposition~~ inconsistent with infinite Goodness. Nay, the Scriptures are ransackd from Genesis to the Revelations, to confute it. Even this is not all. All ye passages yt makes for it,

[November 1752]

are so cut and mangled by these refine
enquirers after Shadows, as to have no
Sense or significancy left. If ye English
Translation makes against ym, they
immediatly fly for Succor to the Greek.
Some strag'ling Particle or other quite
alters the Phrase and makes at once,
essential Nonsense! But if yt too will
admit of no sophistical Prevarication,
then ye Reason of Mankind at once solves
ye Difficulty by voting ye Text itself
utterly repugnant to common
Sense! Even when they do not run this
last Length, if the Original Greek fails
yn they take Shelter in the Hebrew. The
inspird Prophet is brought, to contradict
the more enlightend Apostle!
Solomon, or some of the Infidels he
introduces, to confute ye Son of GOD,

[November 1752]

and those followers of His who spake
“only as they were movd by the Holy-
Ghost,” “never till their Time (yt is, in
so full a manner) given”! Their Design
in this is plain. Coud [sic] they make
out ye Contradiction, this consequence
~~will~~ woud [sic] assuredly follow, if the Old Testament
is irreconcilable with ye
New, both cannot be true. We might
then Reason till Dooms-day, without
being able to prove, which speaks
right, and wch wrong. ~~But~~ However, we need
not much disquiet ourselves,
since their Proof of ye Contradiction,
does by no means amount to Demonstration!
But can these Gentlemen
discern no Proof of Original

[November 1752]

Sin in themselves? Have they no indwelling
Pride, Anger, concuptscence
(the seeds of these Vices) often rising
up to trouble ym? I hope, those yt
are so careful "lest GOD shd be Blasphemed,
by the Supposition of His
~~once Mans call? He had Man's part after He had~~
~~form'd Him Holy;~~" man's being deprav'd (tho' it is easy to acc't
for his being so totally corrupt) will be as careful
not to charge GOD with making
of him ~~thus~~ as he now is. But here it seems,
their is an inconsistency in their
Principles! They can readily swallow
yt the infinitely Holy and just GOD,
made Man, (as Holy writ affirms, in
His own Image.) with all these evil
Dispositions about him, tho they abhor
the Blasphemy of supposing Man
so totally Degenerate and corrupt; as it is reflecting

[November 1752]

reflecting upon his Maker! But weh is
the greater Blasphemy, the acknowledging
Man at first made “in ye
Image of GOD,” but by the fall now
totally degenerate & corrupt: Or ye
imagining him with all these Devlish
Tempers in him, to be nearly,
if not altogether ye same, as when he
came first out of the Hands of ye Almighty!
Perhaps, some may say,
they do not acknowledge Man w[a]s
form’d with these Dispositions in
him; but yt actual Sin has occasiond
this Depravity. But how shall we
account for the depravity of Infants
yt have not committed what we call
actual Transgression; an yet we
cannot but see ye same evil Tempers

[November 1752]

in ym? If these ~~came~~ are derivd from their
Parents, (and if not, whence came they?)
what becomes of all Objections to Original
Sin! Every serious Person
yt considers, and sees these Things
daily before his Eyes, will not easily
be persuaded to leave this Article
of out of his Creed, at least till these
Gentlemen have accounted for this
Depravity. Therefore, their voluminous
Performances will not be receivd
as current Sterling, till they
Harmonize more with Mens daily Experience
and the Testimony of Holy Scriptures.

Corrupted Hearts invent such Idle Tales
To cloak Mens Vices: And a this seldom fails
To waft Men's Souls to Hell; with wide
spread Sails!¹⁰

¹⁰There is a large “}” in the right hand margin to indicate that these lines belong together as a stanza of poetry.

[November 1752]

Wed. 8. I proposd getting up at 5.
with B. Rouquet, but accidentally
fell fast Asleep, nor wakd till Sermon
was ended. Writ to 8. Breakfasted.
Write &c. to 11. Corrected a Proof to
1/2 Hour after 1. Did occasional Business
till 3. Waited on B. Jones & c.
staid till 6. Attended him to ye Hall.
Came back about 1/2 Hour after 7.
The Women Bands met at 8. And
I took ye Opportunity of writing my
Dairy. Nothing is more pernicious
to ye Souls of Men than ye Love of ~~mony~~
Mony. St Paul gives his opinion, yt
“it is the Root of all Evil.” And accordingly,
warns all Christians ag[ain]st
it, with all Authority. In the Epistle
to Timothy we have these Words;

[November 1752]

“Having Food and Raiment, let us
be therewith content,” chap 6. v. 8. In the Imperative
Mood; and as binding as any
other Command in Scripture. He adds,
“But they yt will be Rich (literally, as
a learned Author observes, those yt
seek, or desire more mony) fall into
Temptation, and a Snare, and into
many foolish and hurtful Lusts wch
drown Men in Destruction and Perdition.”

His putting the former Part of
this Text, in the plural number, and
ye latter, in ye Indicative Mood & present Tense; has cut
off two loop Holes yt, otherwise perhaps,
some wise Fool might greatly
have delighted himself with. The
Epistle being directed to Timothy,
might have induced some to imagine,

[November 1752]

Ys Text related only to him, had it been in ye Singular Number; but now there is no Shadow of Reason for such a Supposition. Again; had the latter Part of it been in ye ~~Perpetual Time~~ Subjunctive Md and may, instead of do, it wd still have left ym easy and unconcern'd about wt might or might not have been a Snare to ym. But as it is, they must make ye best of it. Our LORDs Doctrine is perfectly agreeable to this, Matt. 7.19. “Lay not up for your selves Treasures upon Earth, where Moths and Rust doth corrupt, and where Thieves break thro’ and steal.” No. It is literally “Treasure not up to your selves $\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\upsilon\rho\upsilon\varsigma$,¹¹ a Treasure.” Or, “make

¹¹I.e., $\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$.

[November 1752]

“nothing ~~nothing~~ on Earth your Treasure.”
“Set not your Heart on any
Thing.” Now, not to Question this Gentlemans
Skill in Greek, I wd only ask,
wt Moth and Rust ~~has~~ have to do with
this? And why our LORD made use
of a Metaphor, yt seems to bear no
Analogy at all to ye Thing spoken
of? And lastly, why almost all
Translators look upon ye Greek
word as plural and translate it
accordingly? For my Part, I apprehend
a Man cannot have a Dozen
of these kind of Treasures at a
Time. ~~A Mans~~ His Heart cannot be
upon his Horse, and his Wife at
one and the same ~~Time~~ Instant.
Till these Things are solved, I must

[November 1752]

still Believe with St Paul, yt a Man
cannot anxiously covet more than he has (supposing
him to have Food to eat & Raiment
to put on) without endangering
his Soul, if not totally destroying
it?

Thurs. 9. Arose at 5. Finding
my self a good deal out of Order after
Preaching. I lay down for about
1/2 an Hour. Not being able to sleep,
I got up again and writ to 7.

For some Time past, I have had
Mr J. W's Tract on Marriage,¹² much
upon my Mind. There are several
Things in it (though it is now wholly
counted as obsolete and fit for nought but

¹²John Wesley published *Thoughts on Marriage and a Single Life* in 1743.

[November 1752]

waste Paper) really worthy of consideration,
not being in ye least invalidated
by all yt has been urg'd
against it. That ye Author was mistaken
in some Points, and has since
acted contrary to his own Advice
is no Reason for discarding ye
whole Performance. It does not
always follow, yt a Tract is wrong
because the Author has thought
proper to retract it; seeing there
is a change for ye worse, as well as
for ye better. It still remains to bring
it to ye Touchstone to examine it
by Scripture; and if it is agreable
therewith, ye Author and a Thousand
more disclaiming it, will have no
force with me. Let them answer to yt.

[November 1752]

That all Parts of yt Tract are consistent
with Scripture, I affirm not.
I Believe one Thing (if there is no more)
is too strongly Worded. Nay,
perhaps ye Assertion itself is utterly
groundless. But what then?
Must I hit up ye whole because of
yt? You might as well say, I must ~~give~~
lay aside ye use of my Understanding,
because I am mistaken
in some Points: Or my Eyes, because
I cannot see all Things clearly.
No: I still must desire to receive
ye Good, tho' I am very willing to cast
aside what, I Believe, is contrary
thereto. So far as seems consistent

[November 1752]

with Scripture, I propose setting down here; and those yt can refute it, are extremely welcome.

“Thoughts on Marriage” &c.

1. I have frequently been asked, Which is to be preferrd, A Married State, or a single Life? A Question touching wch many have run into Extremes, both on one Side and on ye other. Nor have I ever seen any Treatise wrote upon it, which was Just, & agreeable to Holy Writ: And at ye same Time short and so plain yt every Reader of a common ~~understanding~~ Capacity might understand it.

[November 1752]

2. This has induced me to offer to those only, who study to have a Conscience void of Offense, wt I find in Scriptures on ys Head; and yt in as brief and plain a Manner as I can. And I do it ye rather, if haply I may cut off Occasion from ym yt seek Occasion against me, & who have so shamefully misrepresented wt I have spoken on ys, as indeed on all other Subjects.

3. And First, it is clear from Holy Writ, That no Man is to forbid Marriage. Whosoever they are yt do this, they give "heed to seducing Spirits and Doctrines of Devils"

[November 1752]

(1 Tim. 4.1.3) “Have they not read,
yt He yt made ym at ye Beginning
made them Male and Female?” “And

said (even while they remaind in
Paradise) “For this cause shall a Man
leave father & Mother & shall
cleave to his Wife”? Therefore let
no Man forbid what GOD hath
ordaind, lest he be found even to fight against GOD.

4. Nor yet may any one despise
Marriage. For ys is also fighting
against GOD; who hath declared,
“Marriage is honourable in all,”
in all (called to it and in all) Orders and Degrees of Men.
(Heb. 13 vs 4.) To undervalue therefore

[November 1752]

what GOD has ~~declared~~ pronounced
Honourable to think (much more to
speak) lightly of it, is an high Affront
to ye Majesty of GOD, a bold Impeachment
both of his Wisdom and Truth.

5. And as marriage is Honourable,
so, GOD himself being ye Witness,
is ye Bed undefiled. Absolutely
groundless therefore is ye fond Conceit
of those, who being wise far
above wt is written, affirm “That
Adam fell before Eve was created;
“yt her Creation was a Consequence
“of his Fall;and yt he who before
“was neither Male nor Female,
“had then (to use their own unseemly
“Phrase) this Worms carcass

[November 1752]

hung upon him.” To relate this Madman’s Dream is sufficiently to refute it: The whole proceeding on yt utterly false Supposition, That there is some inherent Turpitude, some moral Defilement in wt GOD himself hath declared to be undefiled.

6. If any Doubt of this kind sh’d remain in those who are actually engagd in ye Marriage State, St Paul strikes at ye very Foundation of it, in those plain, decisive Words, Defraud you not one ye other, except it be with Consent, for a Time (1 Cor: 8.5) The Reason whereof he had given before: The Wife hath not Power of her own

[November 1752]

Body but ye Husband; and likewise
also ye Husband hath not Power
of his own Body, but ye Wife. (v 4).
Beware therefore, yt under Pretense
of greater Purity, or of inward, Particular
Revelations, supposed to
be of GOD, Thou disobey not an
undeniable Command of GOD,
given in ye Revelation of Jesus Xt!

7. Neither may Man put asunder
whom GOD hath joind, on any Pretense
whatsoever. We have a standing
Direction in ys Case also (Matt.
19.3 & c.). That it is not lawful
for a Man to put away his Wife

[November 1752]

(nor consequently, a Wife her Husband)
except only for ye Cause of Adultery.
However unholy she may
be in other Respects, it alters
not ye Case. The Command of GOD
is Let not ye Wife depart from ye
Husband; and, Let not ye Husband
put away his Wife. (1 Cor. 7.10. &.c.)
And again, If any Brother (yt is,
Believer) hath a Wife yt believeth
not (if he hath her now; otherwise
let him not take her; Let him not
on any Terms be unequally yoked
with an Unbeliever) and she be
pleas'd to dwell with him, let him
not put her away. And ye Woman

[November 1752]

which hath an Husband yt believeth
not, if he be pleasd to dwell
with her with her, let her not leave him.
All yt can be allowd on either
Hand is this, If ye Unbeliever will
depart let him depart; v. 11.12.13.15.

8. Thus are ye common Questions relating
to a Marriage State, decided by ye
Oracles of GOD. And all this is
perfectly consistent with those
Words of our LORD, (when his
Disciples said unto him, if ye
Case of ye Man with his Wife
be so, it is not good to marry:.)
All Men cannot receive this

[November 1752]

Saying, save they to whom it is given.
For there are some Eunuchs which
were so born, from their Mothers
Womb; and there are some, wch were
made Eunuchs of Men: And there
be Eunuchs which have made
themselves Eunuchs (have abstaind
from Marriage all their Lives, have
remaind single, till Death) for ye
Kingdom of Heaven's Sake.
He yt is able to receive it, let him receive
it. Matt 19.10. &c.

9. Inded ye Romish writers in
general affirm of this “That it
is a Counsel, not a Command”
but their whole Doctrine of “Evangelical

[November 1752]

“Evangelical Counsels, contradistinguished from divine Commands,” is plainly designed to make way for a still worse Doctrine, yt of Works of Supererogation. “It is our Duty (say they) to keep ye Commands of GOD, to keep ye Counsels is Supererogation.” But we allow of no such Distinction as this; because we find it not in Holy Writ. It has not Place in Scripture. And least of all here. For ye Word is Peremptory Χωρείτω. Let him receive it. (Not, he may receive it, if he will.) How could a Command be more clearly exprest?

[November 1752]

10. But an essential Difference between this and many other Commands of GOD (and perhaps ye same may be remarkd concerning all those wch they term Evangelical Counsels) is, That it is not a general Command to All but a Particular one to a Particular Class of Men. And who these are, is specified in ye Text. They are (the οἱ δυνάμενοι Χωρεῖν) Those who are able to receive it. ~~Those who have receivd this Gift of GOD.~~ Those to whom it is given.

11. All Men (as our LORD hath observ'd before) cannot receive ys Saying:

[November 1752]

But they, and they only, to whom
it is given, by ye Giver of every Good
and Perfect Gift: And an unexceptionable
Paraphrase on this Saying
of his LORD, we have in St Pauls
words to ye Corinthians. It is good
for a Man not to touch a Woman.
Nevertheless, to avoid Fornication,
Let every Man have his own Wife,
and let every Woman have her
own Husband. (1 Cor. 7: 1& 2.) I
would yt all Men were even as
I myself. But every Man hath
his proper Gift of GOD. (v. 7). I
say therefore to ye unmarried &

[November 1752]

Widows, it is good for them if they abide
even as I. But if they cannot
contain, let them marry, for it
is better to marry, than to burn, v. 8.
& 9.

12. Hence it plainly appears,
That they who were able to receive
this Saying, are they to whom Contenance is given; they
who having this Gift of GOD,
can avoid Fornication, tho' they
abide even as ye Apostle. They
are able to receive it, who neither
marry nor burn; who can keep
themselves pure in a single
Life. Who ~~have come~~ ye State, walk

[November 1752]

~~how to possess their vessel in~~
sanctification and Honour, without
any Uncleanness either in
Act or Desire; being undefiled
both in Body and Spirit.

13. If anyone should ask “But
who are able to keep themselves
thus pure?” I answer, it will be
exceeding difficult, nay, absolutely
impossible, to point out Particulars,
as Scripture gives no
outward Marks to Judge by. Let
it suffice, yt such there are, or
our LORD had never left such
an Injunction for ym to ~~be received~~ follow; nor

[November 1752]

Commanded them to keep, wt none
ever had. However, thus much
we may say, who ever ~~have~~ has it, need
not be insensible of it, as it never
was ye Design of our LORD, yt any
of his Gifts shoud be hid under
a Bushel. Therefore, let every
One judge himself; and if he find
this is his Case, let him beware
of casting aside this, any more yn
any other of ye Gifts of GOD.

14. But perhaps, it may still be
enquired, whether it is not lawful,
for a Man who knows he has
this Gift of GOD, to change his

[November 1752]

State upon an extraordinary Occasion?
Possibly it may. Outward
Circumstances, in some rare Cases,
may perhaps, dispense ~~with~~ from Obedience
to yt Command. But remember,
this cannot be allowd but
in ye most pressing Necessity.
Some of those likewise yt ~~once had~~ have
ye Gift of Continenence may ~~have~~ yet
made Shipwreck of yt Gift, and
Lust again ~~have~~ ~~may~~ prevail over
them. ~~Had they while ye Power ws~~
~~with yem kep~~ If they do not
keep themselves, if they do not
watch unto Prayer, if they do not

[November 1752]

look up to Jesus Day and Night,
they will soon be weak again, and
like other Men. They have cast
away ye Gift of GOD. Then, to avoid
Fornication, let them Marry (unless
they have Confidence yt they
shall soon recover it) for it is
better to marry than to burn.

15. So then he yt marrieth (in ys
Case) doth well. But he that,
having no Necessity, marrieth
not, doth better. The Ground and
Reason of wch ye Apostle lays down
at large in ye Words yt follow. I wd

[November 1752]

have you without Carefulness (you
yt are able to receive this saying).
Now he yt is unmarried, careth for
ye Things of ye LORD, how he may
please ye LORD. But he yt is married,
careth for ye Things yt are of
ye World, how he may please his
Wife. There is a Difference also
between Wife and a Virgin. The
unmarried Woman careth for ye
Things of ye LORD, yt she may be
Holy both in Body & in Spirit.
But she yt is married careth for
the Things of ye World, how she
may please her Husband. And

[November 1752]

this I speak for your Profit – that
you may attend upon ye LORD without
Distraction, v. 32–35.

16. Art thou calld then, being
bound? Dost thou hear ye Voice
of GOD, being already in a Married
State? Fear not, GOD will support
thee therein. But if thou mayst
be free, use it rather. If thou art
bound to a Wife, seek not to be
loosed. But if thou art loosed
from a Wife, seek not a Wife.
Thou are calld to endure Hardship
as a good Soldier of Jesus Xt. Now
no Man yt warreth (as ye Apostle

[November 1752]

elsewhere observes) 2. Tim. ii.4 intangleth
himself with ye Affairs of
this Life: No wise Man; but rather
layeth aside every Weight, yt he
may run with Patience ye Race set
before him; yt he may have only
one Thing to care for, To please Him
who hath chosen him to be a Soldier;
to fight ye good Fight of Faith,
and lay hold on Eternal Life.

17. Whosoever therefore thou
art, who possesseth yt inestimable
Gift; Know the Liberty wherewith
Xt hath made thee free, &

[November 1752]

stand fast therein. Beware Thou
be not intangled, in foolish & hurtful
Lusts. Thou are now able
to receive this Saying. Be Thou
therefore sober, and watch unto
Prayer. Be not high minded but
Fear. Keep thy Heart with all
Diligence, yt thou lose not ye
Gift of GOD. Blessed art thou,
if Thou continuest as an Eunuch
for ye Kingdom of Heaven's
sake. Thou mayst well rejoyce,
seeing it is given to Thee, to be without
Carefulness. Be exceeding glad;
for Thou art able to wait attend
upon ye LORD without Distraction.

[November 1752]

And see Thou cast not away, neither
sell at any Price, ye Privilege
wch GOD hath given Thee. Care Thou
only for ye Things of ye LORD,
how Thou mayst be Holy both in Body
and in Spirit. Let thine Eye be always
unto Him who hath declared,
Verily, Verily I say unto you, then
is no Man who hath forsaken left Father
and or Mother, or Wife or Children,
– for my Name’s Sake, but he
shall receive an Hundrd Fold, now
in ye present Time, and in ye World
to come, Eternal Life.

.
Finis.

[November 1752]

I have now done wt I proposd wth
ye Tract itself, and shall proceed to
speak to some Objections against it.

1. It is said, yt if Marriage is honourable
in all (all Orders & Degrees of Men) “surely, it can be forbidden
to none.” But how ys is a Consequence,
I do not see. Meats and Drinks (saving
Blood & Things strangled) are
certainly allowable by ye Gospel; and
yet, in particular Cases, they cannot
be touched, without breaking a Divine
Command. So, Marriage is honourable
in all, calld to it; but, not in those
who having ye Gift of Continence, are
by our Saviour commanded not to
cast aside yt Gift.

[November 1752]

Without this Restriction it will
be impossible to reconcile St Paul
with our Saviour, or even with himself.
But ~~does~~ is it not said Paul say, "But
and if thou marry, thou hast not
sinned; and if a Virgin marry, she
hath not sinned." St Paul here,
seems to be speaking of to ye Majority
of ye single Brethren, and tho' he
recommends Celibacy because of
the present Distress, yet, he does
not bind ym to ye Observances of it,
as every One might not be capable
of receiving it, seeing every
Man hath is proper Gift of GOD.

[Page 85; unnumbered in manuscript]

[November 1752]

Yet, even here I cannot believe, he
had any Design to make void ye Commd
of his Master. I give ye same Answr
to ye Objection, yt ~~he did it~~ St Paul spake by Permission,
not by Command. If it be said,
yt ye Apostle only reveald ye Mind
of Xt more plainly, and explaind
wt He had Taught in Parables: I
Answer, the Words is now under Dispute
are as plain as Language can
possibly make them, and there can
be no Reason assignd for laying
them aside, yt will not equally
hold against all yt He Xt ever spake.

[November 1752]

St Paul says likewise, Let every
one Man abide in ye Calling, wherein he
was calld. Yet here, we understand
him with some Restriction. Many
Smugglers &c. have been called;
even as they were going to their Employments,
and yet, they cannot continue in
those employments without disobeying
GOD. So Marriage is honorable
in all, whom Providence
calls to it, and God joins together.

For my Part, I do not believe it
honourable in any, but those
whom GOD hath joind together.

[November 1752]

~~The greater Part of Mankind, I
believe were joind to their Wifes
for Interest, or for ye love of their
Persons & c. And I can no more
call such Matches honourable,
than Meritorious. I know no
Objection beside, yt bears so much
as ye face of an Argument, tho' I
believe, in ye Eye of every Carnal self
Lover there are many behind, yt
are far more Mountainous than
ye Sons of Anak. A Body as formidable
as ye invincible Armada.
But till they put their Heads out
of ye Port, I see no need of going in
Quest after ym.~~

[Page 88; unnumbered in manuscript]

[December 1752]

Sat. Dec. 2. 1752. The occasion
of so great a Chasm, as from Nov.
9th. to Dec. 2d, was a willingness of
adding Mr W's own Emendations,
to ye Tract on Marriage; but as He
seems so backward in sending ym,
I am determind to go on without ym.
Arose at 5. Conversd from 6. to 7.
Writ till 8. Read to 9. Did occasional
Business till near 11. Went
in search of a Book & c. till 1. After
Dinner I read Jenk's "imputed Righteousness"¹³
a good Book, tho' I do not

¹³Benjamin Jenks (1646–1724), *Submission to the Righteousness of God; or, The Necessity of Trusting to a Better Righteousness than our Own* (London: Rogers & Tooke, 1700).

[December 1752]

think all his Arguments, conclusive.
His Proofs of ye necessity of an inherent
Righteousness, as well as an Imputed, are
strong and convincing. His Exhortation to,
or rather Confutation of imagin'd Believers,
is Lively and instructive. On ye
whole, h's well worthy ye perusal of all
yt woud not deceive themselves, touching
ye Nature of Faith and Salvation.

About 4. B. Jones came for me to
go with him to Mr Gees. From thence
we went to Weavers Hall. In our return
we call'd at Mr Longs and bought
Leslie's "Xtianity Demonstrated."¹⁴ An
excellent Book and worthy to be kept
in all Families. His ~~six~~ four Arguments,

¹⁴Charles Leslie (1650–1722), *A Short and Easy Method with the Deists, wherein the Certainty of the Christian Religion is Demonstrated by Infallible proof from Four Rules ... To which is added, a second part to the Jews ... with an answer to the most material of their objections, and prejudices against Christianity* (London: Brome *et al.*, 1699).

[Page 90; unnumbered in manuscript]

[December 1752]

or Marks of ye Truth of Xtianity, I think,
are invincible. His Confutation of ye
Jews is really Demonstration: Nor do
I see how ye Deists can possibly evade
ye force of his Reasoning, notwithstanding
their denial of Revelation, and ~~their~~
multitude of Sophisms. His right of
private Judgment is, in ye general,
both reasonable, and Scriptural.
And I agree with him, yt ye Dissenters
too often wrangle, for Wrangling sake.
After Supper, I read till 12, and then
went to Rest.

Sund. Dec. 3. Arose at 5. Writ
from 6. to near 7. Read &c. to 8. Then

[December 1752]

went out to Breakfast. Then to Manport
Church. The Sermon &c. seemd
to partake of ye coldness of ye Weather.
I shoud be exceedingly puzzeld to tell wch
had ye predominancy, ye Law or ye Gospel.
Inded it seemd to be a Complication
of neither. Saving ye Text, there
was scarce any Thing good in it. The
Man divided his Discourse into four
Heads, but if he had left out first, Second
&c. I had certainly mistaken it
all for one. Nor was ye Delivery one Jot
better than ye medley of I know not
what – for I can by no means call it, Divinity!
While Any Schoolboy wd have read it
as well, if not better. Whoever made yt

[December 1752]

man a Parson, robbd his Country of
a good Porter. Dined at 1. Got Time
to write till near 2. Writ Letters to
near 4. Preaching began at 5. Society
& c. held till 7. Recd a Letter
from Mr Perronet, wherein ye Acid ws
abundantly predominant. It breathed
a thorough Dissatisfaction throughout.
But as ye Clouds of Spleen ~~has~~ have a little
obscured yt Mans Reason, it is rather
excitive of Commiseration, than Displeasure.
Perhaps, when these Vapours
are dissipatd, Charles may again commence
ye Stoic, and be as insuserptible
of Anger, as of Paternal Indulgence.

[December 1752]

Mond. Dec. 4. Arose at 5. Write &c.
to near 7. Breakfasted. Read Proofs
till about 10. Writ to 1. Dined. Went
to ye Custom House, but cd not enter
the Box. Was informd I had acted
illegally in sending ~~the Box~~ it on Board
before an Entry was made. From
3. to 5. Corrected a Proof. Writ &c. to 6.
At 3/4 after Preaching began B.
Downs kept us till past 7. A tolerable
Reasoner, but tedious. Suppd
near Nine. Soon after retired.

Tues. Dec. 5. Arose about 5. Read
my Latin Testament to near 8. Breakfasted.
Went to ye Custom House &

[December 1752]

entered a Box for Ireland. Writ
to Dinner. Prepared for Kingswood,
but changd my Mind before I set
out, and thought it more advisable
to stay at Home. Seald my Letters
for ye Post, and then went to
B. Jones. He being engagd, I returnd
and read Erasmus¹⁵ to 3.
Waited again on Mr Jones and
staid to 4. Read and writ to 5.
I marvel Men of Sense recommd
Erasmus to Children, when there
are so many Books of equal, if not
superior Latin! He is, in my Opinion, an
obscene childish Writer; and Clark
has shewn himself in his Collection

¹⁵Desiderius Erasmus, *Erasmi Colloquia Selecta; or the Select Colloquies of Erasmus*,
edited by John Clarke (York: Charles Bourne, 1723).

[December 1752]

of Colloquies, a Man of as little Judgment
as ye other of Modesty. From 5. to 1/2 H[our]
after 6. was differently employed. Just
before Preaching, I went to B. Hands
to meet our Band. Only he & I were
there, yet we did not separate without
a Blessing. So salutary is “the
Concord of Brethren.” Near Nine
Suppd. About 10. retired.

Wed. Dec. 6. Arose at 5. Shavd
B. Jones & writ to 7. Shavd myself
&c. to 1/2 Hour after 8. Breakfasted.
Kept school to 11. Corrected a Proof
till Dinner. From 2. to 3. corrected
D°. Staid with B. Jones to 4. Read

[Page 96; unnumbered in manuscript]

[December 1752]

to 6. Supp'd. Read to 9. At Family Prayer. Then retired.

Thurs. Dec. 7. Arose at 5 Constrd
from 7 to 8. Did occasional Business
to 11. Waited on B. Jones &
staid till 12. Dined. Went soon
after Dinner to B. Jones, and staid
to near 4. Came to ye Room & met
B. Williams from Cornwall. Went
with him to S. Burks, and returnd
about 6. Conversd to Preaching.
The Society met about 8. Supped.
Retired.

[December 1752]

Fryd. Dec. 8. Arose at 5. Conversd
from 6. to 8. Breakfasted. Walkd wth
B. Enoch Williams till 11. Corrected
Proofs till near 3. Dined. Conversd
&.c. to Preaching. Writ to B. John
Pearse. Writ to supper. Afterwds
retired.

Sat. Dec. 9. Arose at 5. Studied
from 6. to 8. Did occasional Business
to 11. Waited on B. Jones & staid to 12.
Conversd to 1. Dined. Studied &.c. to
1/2 Hour after 2. Took a walk to 3.
Studied to supper. Sat up to near 11.
Retired.

[December 1752]

Sund. Dec. 10. Arose at 5. Heard
B. W Preach. Am clearly convincd,
ye Want of Study ruins aH half our Preachers.
Perhaps one Reason of their
unwillingness to improve themselves,
may arise from a Misunderstanding
of St Johns Words; "Ye have an Unction
from ye Holy One &c. And ye same anointing
Teacheth you all Things." True, but
not without ye Use of all other Helps.
No more than ye Spirit sanctifies without
Prayer, or Hearing ye Word &c. Tis
ye grossest Enthusiasm to think to
attain ye End without ye Means. Whoever
thus vainly Dreams, is fitter

[December 1752]

for a Place in Bedlam then to be a Preacher
of ye Gospel. Without making use
of every Improvement, a Man is no
ways qualified for ye Ministry. The
mere Emanations of his own Mind are
no ways Adequate to such a Work. Be
his natural Talents ever so great,
he will stand in need of all Assistance.
The want of this tis makes their Discourses
so Jejune, trite, & Sapless; the
same dull round notwithstanding ye
many different Texts they speak from.
A Horse in a Mill keeps going on, but
tis in ye same dull Track. So The Congregation
may Feed & Feed, but it must be
upon one Dish still!

[Page 100; unnumbered in manuscript]

[December 1752]

I think Mr W. is highly to Blame,
in taking so many raw, young Fellows
from their Trades; to a Work they are
as utterly unqualified for, as for
Minister of State! Writ to 7.
Breakfasted. Walkd to Kingswood.
Recd ye Sacrament from Mr Charles [Wesley].
Came Home to Dinner. Spent to 5.
diversely. Went to ye Hall and heard
one of our young Preachers. Somew[ha]t
better than ye last. One great Fault
in their Preaching is, allegorizing
so much. They find Wonders, where
never ~~more was~~ any were placed. The plain meaning
of Scripture is cast aside, and their

[December 1752]

Whims substituted in ye Room of it. If
this is allowed, we shall have Scripture have as many meanings
as there are pretended Explainers!

What a Friend observd some Time since
I lookd upon till now, as utterly without
Foundation: viz: A “Cornish Man is never
without conceit.” Or he “never knew a Cornish
Man daunted.” I now believe it. I find ye
weakest of ym as incapable of Advice,
as ye most Gifted. Mr Wesley met ye Society.
Soon after I supped. Then retired.

Mond. Dec. 11. Arose at 5. Mr Wesley
was exceeding lively. His Subject was,
The whole Creation groaneth and traveleth
in Pain, waiting for ye manifestation of ye
Sons of GOD. He first observd, yt ye whole

[December 1752]

Creation by ye fall of Man ~~was~~ is corrupted.
2dly. That it groaneth and waiteth in Expectation
of Deliverance. 3d. That it ~~shoud~~ shall
regain its primitive Beauty, its original
Splendour, by ye Creation of ye new Heavens
and Earth: Or ye recreating these again.

Many are ye Objections urged agst this
literal Explanation of Scripture, by ye
Spiritual Allegorizers, yt bring down,
or raise up every Text to their own enthusiastical
Conceptions. But I subscribe
to it, if it is only on this Account,
yt without this re-Formation of Things,
Satan will have gaind no small Advantage
against ye greater Part of
GOD's workmanship: And ye Creation

[December 1752]

yt was cursd for ye fall of a Man, shall reap
no Advantage by ye Death of ye Son of
GOD! If this inherited part of ye Curse,
why not part of ye Blessing too? Or must
yt wch was sinless in its self, undergo
an eternal Curse, when ye Offender
himself is redeemd and saved? Surely, Satan
himself might object to ye Justice
of it, and marvel at such a Distribution
of punishment!

Writ to 8. Breakfasted. Studied to
10. Staid with B. Jones till 12. Conversd
to 1. Dined. Conversd to 3. Went to see
One sick. From thence to B. Williams
in ye Castle. Came Home about 6.

[December 1752]

Heard today Mr _____ refuses to
answer Taylor.¹⁶ I hope not for ye Reason
he assignd for others refusing ye same
Task, viz. “The mans understanding a
little Hebrew and Greek?” Tis true, tis sage
Policy in a Conquering Enemy, to shun
a second Rencounter; lest ye Scene of
Battle turn, and ye a Vanquisher be robbd
of his Plumes. Mr W— ’s Character
is not so well establishd by his Victory
over Middleton,¹⁷ but he may run ye
risk of loosing it by engaging Taylor!
Besides, who ever can suppose
yt the defending ye fundamental Doctrine
of Xtianity is so much of equal Consequence

¹⁶The author is hoping John Wesley will respond to John Taylor (1694–1761), *The Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin proposed to Free and Candid Examination, in three parts. To which is added a supplement containing some remarks upon two books*, 3rd edition (London: J. Waugh, 1750). Wesley finally did publish his *Doctrine of Original Sin* in response in 1757.

¹⁷I.e., Wesley’s *Letter to Conyers Middleton*, 1749.

[December 1752]

with ye clearing ye Characters of a few weak,
tho pious Fathers! Or who ever imagines,
yt ye very Essentials of Xtianity Religion are worthy
ye same Pains to support ym as was with
ye utmost Reason bestow'd in proving
ye outward Letter of Scripture descended pure & untainted
thro' so many Generations?
“But he it is not deserving of an Answer:”
Then 'tis strangely alterd lately. Not
many Months ago, it sappd the very
vitals of Xtianity. Now tis dwindled
down into a Thing not worth Answering.
Again 'tis said, “It will gain no Proselytes
but formal Xtians, and they may
as well be Deists as not.” If so, a Man is
in as good a State yt looks upon Xt to

[December 1752]

be as great an Impostor as Mahomet
and ye Bible as true as ye Alekoran;
as he yt believes ye Divinity of both,
yet experiences ye Power of neither.
If we were to allow their present State
ye same, yet wt shall we say with regard
to their Future? When Death approaches,
is a ~~Deist~~ an Infidel as ready to flie to Xt for
Salvation, as one yt believes ye Xtian
Revelation? Let us hear wt Mr W---
says elsewhere; “I have known several
Papists, but never yet one Deist reconverted.”
Yet nevertheless “they may
as well be Deists, as formal Xtians!”
If this had been true, his Journals
wd have appeard less pompous, and

[December 1752]

have been less swelld with ye many Numbers
converted! What is, generally ye
means of Conviction? Is it not the
Word? But is it as likely to convince
those yt look upon it as a mere Fable,
as they yt believe it to contain ye ~~Word~~ Will
of GOD? Surely no Man in his Senses
will say so. But how comes it likely to hurt
none but formal Xtians? Are all Believers
then incapable of Falling?
And if not, may they not doubt of ye
Truth of ye Xtian Revelation, as well
as any Thing else? But suppose Believers
are secure; are the convinced
(who are as yet Unbelievers) incapable
likewise of being Deceived? Or are their Convictions

[December 1752]

Convictions as likely to increase by esteeming
ye Bible an errant Falsehood, as
if they receivd it as ye Word of GOD?
If not, why are Infidels left to Triumph,
and ye weak to be turnd out of ye Way,
yet unpitied by their own Shepherds!

However “Mr W is employd much more
usefully, in Writing an Acct of ye revival
of Religion for some years past.”

Worthily employd indeed! In writing
that which in a few Years more perhaps,
scarce any One will believe! But “’tis
all one, whether thy are Infidels or not.”
A dry Narration is like to do great
matters, when ye Divine Oracles are
cast out of Doors! Yet one Thing it may

[December 1752]

serve for, to show wt a great Work was
once carried on by ~~the~~ Messrs _____! [Wesley]
In a few years more perhaps, it may be
highly needful, lest it yt work be altogether
Buried in Oblivion: Since if it goes
on, as of late Years it has begun, there
may be scarce any Traces left of
it! Mr Charles Preached. Afterwards
I wrote my Journal. Supp'd about 9.
Retired about 10.

Tues. Dec. 12. Arose at 5. Writ &c.
to 8. Breakfasted. Corrected a Proof to
near 11. Staid with B. Jones to 12.
Did occasional Business to 1. Dined.
Wrote Letters till 5. Read to Preaching.
Supped. Retired to Bed.

[Page 110; unnumbered in manuscript]

[Blank]

[Page 111; unnumbered in manuscript]

[Blank]

[December 1752]

Wed. Dec. 13. Arose at 5. Writ
&c. to 8. Did occasional Business
to 10. Read Proofs to near Eleven.
Staid with B. Jones to 12. Dined at
1. Did occasional Business to 3.
Walkd with B. Hands to Kingswd.
Retired from 5. to 6. Suppd. Heard
B. Rouquet expound ye 1st C. Gen.
At 8. our Band met. Went to Bed
a little after 9.

Thurs. Dec. 14. Arose a little
after 4. Joind with ye Boys &c. in
Prayer to 5. Went to Chappel.
Spent to Dinner Time in convers &c.

[Page 113; unnumbered in manuscript]

[December 1752]

Walkd to Bristol with B. Williams
&c. Went to B. Sennick's & staid
to near Preaching. The Society met afterwards.
Supped. Retired.

Fryd. Dec. 15. Arose at 5. Heard
B. Barnstable Preach. Writ &c. to 8.
Breakfasted. From 9. to 11. spent
with Mr Farley. To 12. with B. Jones.
To 1/2 Hour after 1. Id'ly. To 1/2 Hour
after 2. at Intercession. Dined at 3.
Studied &c. to Preaching. ~~I am less~~
~~satisfied, with modern~~
~~Ordination &c. I know not from~~
~~whence in Authority arose. I find~~
~~none but pious Bishops or Presbyters in ye Primitive~~

[Page 114; unnumbered in manuscript]

[December 1752]

~~Church empowerd to lay Hands on
any One: Nor on any save holy Persons. Yet, I do not wholly deny
ye validity of Ordination properly administied, though I greatly
doubt it. That many Persons never called to Ordain[ation] are
calld to Preach, I Question not. But
I take yt to be quite another Thing.
Tis true, I no more believe yt unholy
Persons are calld to Preach than
the ministers unholy Bishops are called to Ordain: For in Truth, I
Believe neither One, nor ye other is.~~

Writ to 1/2 Hour after 8. Went to
Bed a little after 9.

Satur. Dec. 16. Arose at 5.
Conn'd over Part of *Janua Linguarum*¹⁸
to 8. Did occasional Business

¹⁸Johann Amos Comenius, *Janua Linguarum reserata aurea* (London: George Miller, 1631).

[December 1752]

to 11. Trottet about ye Town, after a
Book till 12. Variously employd to 1.
Dined. Waitd on Mr ---, and staid
to near 3. Walkd with him to near 4.
Came Home not a little nettled at
his behaviour. When I had reachd
up Stairs, B. Downs told ~~his~~ me His Reason
for refusing ye Metaphysicks, I had
desired to copy out. I was amazed.
What Qibbling and sophistry is
here! And yet this is he, yt never
falls short of Heathen Honesty!
Had I refusd him my Book on Xtianity
and assignd ye same poor, mean, pitiful
Excuse; I should have Thought
myself guilty of a manifest Breach

[December 1752]

of common good Nature, had ye Excuse
had more Truth in it than his had!
Read &c. to Bed Time.

Sund. 17. Arose at 5. Read &c.
to Breakfast. Afterwards walkd to
Kingswood. Received ye Sacramt
from Mr Charles. Came back again
to Dinner. At 2. went to Meeting
and heard Mr Needham. His The Sermon
was nothing extraordinary.
He, with ye generally of his Dissenting
Brethren, seldom finds his
way back out of ye Wood of Sub-divisions
&c. he scarce ever avoids.
To hear them divide, might excite

[December 1752]

a Stranger to expect great Matters:
But whoever does, will be strangely
disappointed. For take but away ye
Brambles, ye rotten Stumps, and
superfluous Branches &c. (yt is all
their unnecessary Divisions & Sub-divisions)
and ye Co[r]pse is extremely
naked; there is scarce solid Timber
enough to form a Mast, much less
to build a whole Ship! If ye bare
telling you where to find such and
such a Text, and ye unnecessary repeating
it, will constitute an Orator, ye
Dissenters bid ye fairest for yt Character
of any Men under ye Sun. But
if you expect a Solution of ~~each~~ one

[December 1752]

of ye promiscuous multitude quoth, I wd advise
you to seek it in their Commentaries,
as you will seldom find it in their
Sermons. In Truth, they are ye greatest
Jumblers together of Texts, but
as indifferent explainers (saving
here and there one) as any People
blesd with ye Light of ye Gospel!

Drank Milk and Water with Mr
Downs. At 5. Mr Charles preached.
The Society met soon after 6. And were
warmly, tho' scarce allowably, exhorted
to several outward Duties.
Supped. Retired.

[December 1752]

Mond. 18. Arose at 5. Did occasional Business to near 8. Breakfasted. Prepared for ye Country; but was prevented going. Read Mr Leslies 4 Marks against ye Deists,¹⁹ and am satisfied with ye Strength of ym. I believe, if we retire into yt Fortress, we may safely stand an Assault, tho seconded with all ye Artillery of ye Enemy. Tis true, tis small, but nevertheless, hitherto impregnable. Dined. Spent ye Afternoon in reading ye same Author. At 3/4 after 6. B. Downs preached. A pretty Sermon enough; but ye Gentleman yt deliverd it, in my Opinion, wd make a better Metaphysician, than Divine.

¹⁹See p. 89 above.

[December 1752]

Tues. 19. Arose before 5. Writ to 7.
Read & etc. to 9. Breakfasted. Corrected
to 11. Did occasional Business to 1.
Dined. Was privately employd to 3.
Was preparing my Things for my
Journey to London, till 4. Read Castalio²⁰
about 1/2 an Hour, then fell asleep.
Waked before 5. Read & c. to
Preaching. Mr C[harles] was again exceeding
lively. His Text was, ye last C. 1 Epis[tle of]
Paul to ye Thess v. 23 “May ye GOD of
Peace sanctify you ὁλοτελεις, wholly, altogether,
entirely: And may He preserve
your entire Spirit, Soul and
Body blameless to ye coming of our
LORD and Saviour Jesus Xt).”

²⁰Sebastian Castellion (1515–63), *Dialogorum sacrorum libri IV: De Praedestinatione, electione, libero arbitrio, fide* (Edinburgh: T. & W. Ruddiman, 1734); Wesley recommended this book to all lay preachers and later published an English extract in the *Arminian Magazine*.

[December 1752]

Can any One calmly read and candidly examine ys Text, and yet doubt. 1st. Whether we are to be sanctified throughout: And 2dly. Whether it is ye Will of GOD to keep us so, when we are so.? Must it not be ye deepest Prejudice, yt can withstand so plain a Text of Scripture? It is in ye form of a Prayer. May ye GOD of Peace Sanctify you wholly: or as Mr Leusden has it, "altogether perfectly." ~~He~~ The Apostle here desires, yt ye Thessalonians may be entirely sanctified; "Their whole Man." And would ~~the Apostle~~ He pray for an impossibility? Was he not possessd of ye Spirit of GOD? I think I have ye Spirit of GOD, 1 Cor. 7.40. And was not yt Spirit to abide with ~~ym~~ (ye Apostles &c.) always? And was He not to make Intercessions for them? How strange

[December 1752]

is it then yt any One holding Divine
Revelation, yt can possibly Doubt its being
ye Will of GOD yt we shoud be wholly
Sanctified! 2dly It is equally as plain,
yt ye Will of GOD is, we should be kept
Holy. May He ~~keep~~ preserve your entire Spirit,
Soul and Body blameless, to ye
coming of our LORD Jesus Xt.

I wd observe one Thing more, yt it
also obviates another Objection
of our Adversaries; viz. That “this
Sanctification however; is not to be expectd
in ys World.” Where can it be then?
Do you imagine ye Apostle prayd
by ye Holy Ghost, yt ~~we~~ they might be Sanctified
and kept Holy in Heaven?

[December 1752]

So plain it is, there is no resting [i.e., resisting] this Text, but thro' willfull Obstinacy. But ye form ~~kept~~ preservd, not only proves ye Apostle meant in this World; but satisfies us also, yt ~~the Apostle~~ He allowd it might be Years before ~~we~~ they finishd their Course. Seeing, there is little Reason to suppose, he desird they might be kept pure a few Minutes before Death. Nor does this Sanctification imply one Jot more, than yt Holiness without wch no Man shall see ye LORD. Or exceed yt strong, yet glorious Command of our LORD, Be ye perfect, as your Father who is in Heaven is perfect. Agreeable to this doctrine

[December 1752]

is yt verse in One of our Hymns:

Of Pardon possess't,
Yet cannot I rest
In ye first Gift; but earnestly covet ye best.²¹

Now ye best Gift some may suppose
to be Heaven. But this I absolutely
deny. Even Heaven itself wd be Hell to me,
supposing I was in it, if I were unholy.
Can we with any shadow of Reason suppose,
yt "Lucifer Son of ye Morning" after
Rebellion was conceivd in him, cd take
any Complacence or delight in ye Adoration
paid, to ye King of Kings? Or
was it Happiness to him to fall prostrate
before the Throne, and in the most
elevatd Strains to sing Hallelujahs

²¹Charles Wesley, *Hymns and Sacred Poems*, 1749, 1:223.

[December 1752]

to One, against whom he had conceivd
an irreconcilable Enmity? No Man
of Sense can ever swallow this Madmans
Dream. Tis not the Place, but the Nature
yt constitutes Happiness. Were I wholly
renewd in the Image of GOD, even Hell
itself wd be Heaven. On the Contrary,
were I unholy, even Heaven itself
would be a real Hell. So true is yt saying
yt "Sin is perfect Misery." Tis so in
ys World. If a man has Thousands of
Gold and Silver, yet if he is unholy,
he is more miserable yn Words can
express. On the contrary, if he is as poor
as Job, yet if ~~he is~~ Holy in Heart, he cannot
but be happy. Holiness and Happiness

[December 1752]

are as inseparable as “Light & Heat.”
if you can separate Light from ye Sun,
then may you separate Holiness &
Happiness, but not till then. So likewise,
when you can disjoin ponderosity
and Matter, you may part Misery
from Sin or unholiness, but not
before. Therefore, if any Tincture
of Sin remain, either in ys World
or in ye next, in proportion is ye
Misery of the Soul. Xt did not come
to cover our Sin, but to take it away.
Nor is He to be lookd upon as a
Pack-Horse to carry our Burden,
but as One yt will destroy, consume
the Burden itself. Even His “imputed

[Page 127; unnumbered in manuscript]

[December 1752]

“imputed Righteousness” without this, wd
stand us in no stead. Satan is never
a whit the Holier when he takes the
garb of an angel; nor should we
be less defild underneath, where
we coverd with a clean white garment
from Head to Foot. So utterly
irreconcilable to Scripture, Experience,
and even common Sense
(as well as impossible) is the notion
of an Imputed, without an imparted
Righteousness!

Wed. 20. Arose at 5. Writ to 8.
Breakfasted. Shavd, Corrected a Proof
&c. to Dinner. Read to 2. Writ to 3.

[Page 128; unnumbered in manuscript]

[December 1752]

Carried out Books to near 4.
Writ to 6. Read to 8. Supped.
At 9. retired.

Thurs. 21. Arose at 8. Variously
employd to 10. Breakfasted. Employd
in necessary Business to 1. After
Dinner set out for London. Reachd
Chippenham yt night. The next
Day got to Reading. From thence
on Saturday came to London.

Fryd. 29. Came to Uxbridge. Found
my Friends exceeding civil. We had
no Differences about Religion.
We were content yt both Sides shd

[December 1752]

keep their own opinions without
Molestation. Yet notwithstanding
my Desire & Endeavor to avoid
Disputation, and my Relations leave
me to myself without Disturbance,
I was nevertheless (from another Quarter
drawn into it in spite of my Teeth.
A young Friend [i.e., a Quaker], sufficiently prejudiced
agst carnal Ordinances, as he
pleasd to Term them, was determind to
try my Strength, and ~~with~~ to yt Purpose
made swift Advances to Attack
me. Finding I cd not Retreat without
engaging, I prepard to receive his
Onset. He began in some Disorder

[December 1752]

not having rangd his Battalions to Advantage; (which I apprehend, was owing to his little Skill in Military affairs) to Attack some of the Advancd Guards. Not considering, yt if he had defeated These, the main Body was still able to resist him. Finding himself repulsd here, instead of renewing the Attack, he wheeld about and fell upon another Party to the right. After exchanging a few shot with these perceiving his forces not invincible, he chose rather to skirmish still than engage with the main Army Body.

[December 1752]

After determining upon this Method,
he sometimes fell upon one Party, sometimes
another; and was rather sufficiently
troublesome, than formidable
to either. This manner of encountering
put me in Mind of the Hircanian
Cavalry, who after every fresh Discharge,
retreat some Hundred Paces,
I suppose, to avoid the Salute of the Enemy.
After both Sides were pretty well
weary with thus beating the air,
the Defensive Party sounded a Retreat,
and retir'd in good Order.

As our Friends the Quakers are so

[December 1752]

exceeding fond of Controversy, and have already declared War; it may not be amiss to set down my Judgment of their Strength, and what Force they are able to bring into the Field. Their main weapons Offensive and Defensive are containd in Rob[er]t Barclay.²² And tis true he has made the best of a bad Cause. Nevertheless, had he been more consistent, he had been more worthy of Estimation. Some of his Arguments are scarce consistent with common Sense, much less wth Scripture. Others are utterly inconclusive; and some leave great Reason

²²Robert Barclay (1648–90), *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity; as the Same is Held Forth and Preached by the People called, in scorn, Quakers* (London: Benjamin Clerk, 1678).

[Page 133; unnumbered in manuscript]

[Dec. 1752–Jan. 1753]

to Doubt, so wise a Man did not believe
a Tittle of what is there so weakly
said. In Fine, Such a Mixture of
solid Argument, ill drawn Conclusions
and manifest Sophistry is seldom
found in any Writer!

Thurs. Jany. 4. Set out with Br_
Jones, and on Saturday Night came
safe to Bristol.

Sun. Jany. 7. Was prevented
going to Church in the Morning. In the
Afternoon went to St. Warburgh's & I heard
a tolerable Sermon. I know not why, but
I never came to Bristol with so much
Reluctance, since the Time I first saw it.

[January 1753]

Mond. Jany. 8. Arose at 5. Writ
&c. to 7. Read B[isho]p Fell on St Paul's
Epistles²³ to 8. By far the best Exposition
now extant. Free from yt tiresome Verboseness,
so abounding in ye other Expositors.
It just serves to clear, not to confound
ye Sense, to explain, not to destroy ye
Apostle's meaning. It does not spiritualize
every plain Text whether it will
bear it or not; nor is it destitute of
spirituality, when ye Sense requires it.
In fine, give me this, and whosoever
will may purchase Henry's, Burket's, &c.
for me! Breakfasted. Did occasional
Business to 9. Corrected to 11. Walkd
&c. to 12. Whilst I was at Uxbridge

²³John Fell (1625–86), *A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all St. Paul's Epistles*.
(London: R. Smith, 1702).

[January 1753]

I was roughly Attackd about Mr W's
"Predestination calmly considered."²⁴ My
Antagonist affirmd He had there
said a great deal, but little to ye Purpose.
That is, he had not convincd
him. And no Marvel; since ye
Predestinarian Motto seems to be,
"non persuadedbis, etiam si persuaseris;"
"Thou shalt not persuade me,
tho' thou dost persuade me." His chief
Objection was, he had not "cleard up
Foreknowledge." And it still remaind
an invincible Truth, "that GOD foresaw
every Soul yt will be saved." I grant it,
but wt do you mean by fore-seeing, or
fore-knowing? If it implies impelling

²⁴Published in 1752.

[January 1753]

or constraining, I absolutely deny yt.
Nor will you ever be able to prove it
from Scripture. If you only mean, He
fore-sees every Soul yt will accept of
Grace, & with yt Power work out its own
Salvation, Mr W never intended to disprove
this, nor was he able if he had
been so ~~intended~~ minded. But this foreknowing
has no connection with
Reprobation or irresistible Grace:
Consequently, when grantd, will no
more prove Predestination than
Judaism. “But Doctor Gill²⁵ is a great
man.” He is so. For bullying his
Antagonists, there are few like him.
Few Writers will make use of yt

²⁵John Gill (1697–1771), *The Doctrine of Predestination Stated, and Set in the Scripture-Light; in opposition to Mr. Wesley’s Predestination Calmly Considered* (London: G. Keith, J. Robinson et al., 1752).

[January 1753]

splenetic Method of Hectoring ~~over his~~ their
Adversaries, as wch he does, without
Sense or Shame. A modest Man wd
first prove his Point, and then calmly
wait ye Issue: But yt is not his Talent.
He must squall Peau, Peau, tho' with
as little Reason as a Dung-hill Cock
yt has been sufficiently beaten, when
returnd to his Mates, crows in token
of Triumph! As to his Performance,
a Man must be totally void of Reason
(supposing him to understand
Argument) yt can Boast of it as any
other yn a weak ill-naturd Defense!

His Temper rises as he gropes along,
And weak, warm Words supply ye Places
of strong!

[January 1753]

Dind at 1. It may perhaps be candid
to take notice of some friendly Inquirers
after Truth, (at Uxbridge) as well
as ye cavilling Casuists. Among
these were a Family of Quakers,
as simple in Behaviour as in
Dress. Being invited to their house,
I had an Opportunity of conversing
with them for a few Hours. The more
I saw, ye more I approvd of, and I am
clearly satisfied ye Spirit of Xt may
be where ye outward Ordinances are
denied. So different are these from
ye tenacious Calvinists! Our conversation
was chiefly concerning
ye leading of ye Spirit. And though

[January 1753]

we differed a little in Judgment, yet each Side shewd they sought ye Truth rather than vain Jangling. Our Difference was this. They apprehended yt ye Light yt is in every Man, by some Termd “Natural Conscience;” by others, “A Ray of ye Divinity;” yet again, by some “Preventing Grace;” ~~was~~ is Xt himself: And consequently, That Xt dwells in every Man. On ye other Hand, ~~we~~ I allowd yt ys Light was from Xt but not Xt Himself. A Ray of His Spirit, but not Xt dwelling in ye Heart. ~~We~~ I confesd yt His Spirit was in some Sense with ym, but not yet in them. And though He ~~His Spirit~~ did strive with all, yet it ~~can~~ cd never be granted yt He dwelt in all.

[January 1753]

This opinion we I gatherd from this Text, "If ye be led by ye Spirit, ye are not under ye Law." Not under ye Dominion of Sin, any more than carnal Ordinances. And from this, When He (ye Spirit) is come, He will lead you into all Truth. But ye Majority of Mankind are not led into all Truth; Therefore ye Spirit is not come. Yet again, So is every One yt is born of ye Spirit. That is born of GOD, as ye preceding Verses shew. The Privileges of such a State are these following: He yt is born of GOD overcometh ye World. Again,

[January 1753]

He yt is born of GOD sinneth not, with many more yt might be ennumerated. But these are enough to shew, yt most Men have not ye Spirit; since they possess not these Privileges. That where ye Spirit of Xt is not, Xt Himself is not; is plain from hence; If any Man have not ye Spirit of Xt he is none of His. That none can have it and not know it, is clear from this Scripture; Know ye not, yt your Bodies are ye Temples of ye Holy Ghost &c. Again, Know ye not yt Jesus Xt is in you, except ye be Reprobates. From hence yn it will plainly appear, yt though every Man has a Light from Xt, yet every One has

[January 1753]

not Xt in him. Writ to 1/2 Hour after
3. Read to near 4. Did occasional
Business to near 6. Read to Preachg.
Suppd. Retired.

Thurs. Jan 9. Laid a Bed to near 8.
The unlawfulness of Women speak[in]g.
in a Public Congregation, being much
upon my Mind, I will here set down
my Thoughts concerning it.

St. Paul writing to ~~his Son Timothy~~ the Corinthians
saith expressly. "Let your Women keep
Silence in ye Churches: For it is not
permitted unto them to speak." Consequently,
they are here forbidden to
dictate. He adds, "And if they

[January 1753]

will learn any Thing, let them ask
their Husbands at Home; for it is
a Shame for Women to speak in ye
Church,” 1 Cor. 14.34.35. As the former
Verse manifestly forbids their speaking
at all; so ye latter more particularly,
their even asking a Question
for their instruction. Nor can any
One, yt will not obstinately shut his
eyes against Conviction, evade ye
Force of either. Again; “Let your
Women learn in Silence with all Subjection.
For I suffer not a Woman to
teach, nor to usurp Authority over ye
Man (which Public Teaching necessarily
implies) but to be in silence,” 1 Tim. 2.11.12.

[January 1753]

“But a Woman labor’d with Paul in the work of ye Gospel.” True! But not as a Public Teacher. Not in ye Way he had forbidden.

“But Joel foretold your Sons and your Daughters shall prophesy.” “And Philip had four Daughters which Prophesied.” “And ye Apostle directs Women to Prophesy; only with their Heads covered.” This is likewise true; but what does he mean by Prophesy? If you say Teaching or exhorting in Public; it is then, when you are assembled together, “Do ye very Thing I have forbidden.” “Usurp Authority over ye Men.” “And no more

[January 1753]

learn in Silence with all Subjection!”

Can you really Believe, ye Apostle directs Women to do this? If not, this cannot be ye meaning of the Word Prophesy, in either of these Places.

It must then mean yt supernatural Gift, ye “foretelling Things to come.” ye discerning “Future Events.”

But what Quaker Woman has this Gift? I Trust none pretend to it. Consequently none can exercise what they have not.

However, if any of their Speakers do pretend to it, their own Effusions will quickly confute such a Pretension and prove to a Demonstration

[January 1753]

they have it not. For supposing ym
to speak Sense (which is not always ye Case,
nor perhaps mostly) yet who can
Dream of their having yt Gift, to
enable ym to speak, what any common
Person might say without? In Fine,
their Revelations, (if such they may
be Termed) do not always so harmonize
with ye written Oracles, as
to induce us to receive them as
the Dictates of one and ye same
(infallible) Spirit! And though some
of them yt do correspond with ye
Word may be allowed to spring
from ye common Operations of ~~GODs~~ ye Holy

[January 1753]

~~Spirit~~ Ghost, yet there is no Reason in ye
World to suppose them ye Offspring
of a Spirit of Prophecy. Therefore,
although these very Words spoken
in a private Manner, might be both
beneficial & useful; yet deliverd in
a Public Capacity, is contrary to all
Order, and against ye express Declaration
of ye Apostle!

Writ to 9. Breakfasted. Writ to 10.
Read a Proof to Dinner. Dined.
Corrected to 4. Went to Mr Farley's.
Drank Milk and Water. Was employd
with B. Sennick. Retird a little. Read
to Preachg. Suppd. Corrected to 10.

[Page 148; unnumbered in manuscript]

[January 1753]

Wed. Jany. 10. Arose at 5. Variously
busied to 7. Writ &c. to 8. Breakfastd.
Counted ye sheets of ye 17th Vol. Lib.²⁶ Etc. to
12. Dined. From 1. to 4. Counting
Sheets. To 5 variously employd.
Read to 6. Work'd till 9. Suppd.
Retired.

Thurs. Jany. 11. Did not rise
till near 8. Breakfasted. Variously
employ'd to 9. From 9. to 11 reading
a Proof. Counting mon[e]y &c. to Dinner.
Cleaning ye Book Room &c. to 4.
Out to Preaching. Suppd. Retired.

²⁶He is working on Wesley's *Christian Library*, eventually a 50 volume set.

[January 1753]

Thurs. Fryd. Jany. 12. Arose at 5. Spent
in conversation with Mr Charles till 7.
Breakfasted. Corrected a Proof to 10.
Wrote exercise. Read over ye Metaphysicks.²⁷
Read part of ye Roman
History.²⁸ At Intercession. Dined.
Read to Preaching, History again.
From meeting ye Bands to near
1. read ye same. And what ~~shall~~
shall I say of these gallant Romans?
That they were a pack of
Cut Throats, Dissemblers, Murderers;
in a Word, properly Heathens!

²⁷Likely Daniel Whitby (1638–1726), *Brevissimum Metaphysicae Compendium, secundeum mentem nominalium* (Oxford: L. Litchfield, 1690), which Wesley recommended to lay preachers.

²⁸Likely Livy's *Roman History*.

[January 1753]

Sat. Jan. 13. Sitting up so late
prevented my rising till near 8.
As I slept so sound, yt I neither
heard ye People, nor ye Hymn.
Breakfasted. Corrected ye Metaphysick's
to 9. Shaved. Learn't Janua
Linguarum²⁹ to Dinner. After, went to
Mr Longs. Came back about 3. Writ
Letters to 4. Drank Milk & Water.
Read Doctor Cave³⁰ to 7. Doctor Church³¹
till 8. Went to shave B. Jones. Suppd.
Retired.

Sund. Jany. 14. Arose 1/2 Hour
after 5. Went to S. Burk's to Breakfast.

²⁹See p. 114 above.

³⁰William Cave (1673–1713), *Primitive Christianity; or, The Religion of Ancient Christians in the First Ages of the Gospel* (London: Richard Chiswell, 1673).

³¹Likely Thomas Church (1707–56), *An Appeal to the Serious and Unprejudiced; or a Second Vindication of the Miraculous Powers ... [in response to] Middleton* (London: Rivington, 1751).

[Page 151; unnumbered in manuscript]

[January 1753]

Walk'd to Kingswood. Came Home to
Dinner. Writ to B. Sellon. Went out
to S. Burk's. Came back to Preaching.
But heard scarce any of ye Sermon,
having fallen so fast asleep, yt
I awakd not till they sang ye Gloria
Patri. Mr C[harles]. gave a very lively Exhortation
to ye Society. Suppd. Read
the Ethics to Bed Time. An exceeding
pretty Thing, but incompleat.

Mond. Jan. 15. Arose at 5. Made
a Fire. Writ to near 1/2 Hour after 6.
Began a Proof. Breakfasted. At
9. ended ye Proof I began. Walk'd out
to 10. Read ye "Bp "Clogher's Answer
to Bolingbroke."³² Some of ye Reasonings

³²Robert Clayton (1695–1758), *A Vindication of the Histories of the Old and New Testament, in Answer to the Objections of the Late Lord Bolingbroke* (London: Bowyer, 1752).

[January 1753]

Reasonings in it are tolerable; but it has
no Spirituality to Boast of. The Author
seems to take a Pleasure in
letting us know he is no Trinitarian;
and in sneering, if not abusing Athanasius.
In short, he is a better
Logician than Divine; and fitter
to write History than Sermons.
Ah poor Church, if such as this
Author, are all thy Pillars &
Bishops! Corrected part of a
Proof. Dined. Finishd ye Proof.
Went to B. Jones & construed
part of my Linguarum. Came
Home & read Clogher to 4. Writ
Exercises &c. to Preaching. Suppd.
retired.

[January 1753]

Tues. Jan. 16. Arose to Preachg.
Sold some Pamphlets. Waited in ye
Kitchen till Mr C. went, then returned
to my Room. Writ & Read to Breakfast.
Afterwards, Read & conr'd [construed]
over my Linguarum to Dinner.
Read Philosophy to Preaching.
Supp'd. Retired.

Wed. Jan. 17. Arose at 1/2 Hour
after 4. Convers'd with Mr Jones to
7. Breakfasted. Read Ans. To Mid---³³
till 1/2 Hour after 9. Corrected to 11.
Read Philosophy to Dinner. Dined.
Read Philosophy &c. to 4. Read
Answer to Middleton to 1/2 after 6.

³³See p. 151 above.

[January 1753]

Corrected to 8. Supp'd. Retired.

Thurs. Jany. 18. Arose at 5.
Walk'd & conversd to 8. Breakfasted.
Did occasional Business to 10.
Went to B. Jones & staid to near
11. Came Home & read a little of
ye Metaphysicks. Dined. Conversd
to 1/2 Hour after 2. Writ exercise
to near 4. Fell fast asleep. Conn'd
over my Lesson. Writ &c. to Preaching.
Corrected a Proof. Supp'd.
retired.

Frid. Jany. 19. Arose at 5.
Made a fire. Convers'd &c. to 8.

[January 1753]

The Conversion of Matthew Lee,³⁴
a Felon lately taken and committed to
Newgate for robbing; has again
furnish'd our Adversaries ye Predestinarians
with ample Arguments for
Predestination &c. "Who can account, says
~~they~~ One, for this mans being converted?"
"Does not this prove irresistible
Grace?" "Why was he taken and
others left?" "Why he was taken," neither
you nor I can tell; yet our not knowing
why does by no means prove Election,
any more than a Kings pardoning
some Rebels at a particular
Time ~~does~~ proves his bearing a Hatred to
all ye rest. Or his having had a firm
Design to save ~~them~~ ~~some~~ them, whatever became

³⁴Wesley published *Some Account of the Life and Death of Matthew Lee* in 1752.

[January 1753]

became of ye Other. Tis true, ye Comparison
is not altogether adequate; since, we can
hardly suppose any Man wd refuse
a Pardon from a temporal Prince,
whereas there are many yt will
not accept of Salvation upon Gospel
Terms; agreeable to these Scripture,
“How often woud I have gatherd you,
as a Hen doth her Chickens under
her wings, and ye would not.”
And, “ye will not come unto me,
yt ye may have Live.” It is a very
bad way of inferring, because
we cannot comprehend GODs Providences
towards us, yt therefore
He acts arbitrarily. And it is no

[January 1753]

less absurd to suppose, yt because
some are miraculously converted,
therefore, “they were eternally chosen.”
It does not follow from either, Nor
are either of ym any Proof at all!

In Truth, we ought to admire ye wonderful
~~works~~ Ways of GOD, but not from
thence draw Conclusions contrary
to express Scripture Testimony.

But to invalidate ye Force of these
Questions, I Answer, perhaps Salvation
had never before been offerd
him: And if son, it follows he cd not
have resisted what had not been
offer'd. As GOD is “gracious & merciful”,
so I take it for granted, He

[January 1753]

offers Salvation when Men are most willing to receive it; or when He has inclined (not forced) their wills to accept it. And no Doubt, but GOD may take a Man at a little before Death, for His; who wd not have accepted but resisted ye very same Grace, if it had been offerd him at any other Time. ~~And thus, though GOD is infinitely Just, yet, He is likewise infinitely Good.~~

On ye other Hand, if we allow yt others were not sav'd, yet, I ansr, they might have withstood their Day of Grace. Salvation might have been offerd them over & over

[January 1753]

again, to no purpose. Nor might there ever have been a Time when they wd accept of it. Nay, for ought we can tell, GOD might offer ym, at ye same Time ye other was saved, ye very same Grace, and yet in vain.

So much upon ye Supposition of their being lost. But again, why may we not as well suppose, yt GOD saved them at ye last moment, though they gave no outward Testimony of it. God might singalize ye one outwardly, to shew His readiness to save ye very “chief of Sinners”; but nevertheless, ye other might be redeem’d as well as he, though they might not testify it to us, lest it

[January 1753]

might occasion any one to presume.
If you say, this is only arguing
on Supposition; tis true, tis so.
But then remember, yours is
no other than mine. I have just
as much Proof as yourself.
But mine has this additional
Strength, That it does not contradict
the Oracles of GOD. I do not
suppose either saved unconditionally.
Therefore, though I magnify
the mercy of GOD, I do not
destroy His Justice. Whereas
whether you suppose “some to
be chosen in Opposition to all
the rest of Mankind;” or some

[January 1753]

“unconditionally through a peculiar
Love of GOD.” Though you do not
hold the unconditional Rejection
of all the rest; yet both one and
ye other are not only not found
in the Oracles of GOD, but absolutely
contrary thereto. So wide is ye
Difference between one and ye
other. Breakfasted. Writ to 11.
Corrected a Proof. At Interession.
Dined. Corrected to near 5. Conversd
to Preaching. Retired.

Sat. 20. Being somewhat indisposd,
did not rise till 8. Breakfasted.
Did occasional Business
to 11. Went to B. Jones &

[January 1753]

staid to 12. Came Home & Dined.
Was differently employd to 4. Went
to see B. Sennick. Came back at 6.
As he was lately at Bridgewater,
he entertaind me with an Account
of ye Reception he met with from
his wife's Father. It was really
middling enough. Whilst he
staid there happend an odd
~~Circumstance~~ Affair yt deserves a Remark,
as it abundantly shews ye gross
stupidity both of People and
Priest: And proves to a Demonstration
the necessity of Laymen
Preaching, lest ~~these~~ such Poor Souls
shou'd perish without Knowledge!

[January 1753]

The Thing is this. Two Gentlemen
had been making Interest against
the next Election, and as is the Diabolical
Custom at such Times,
entertaining ye People (a genteel,
but nevertheless, a mean way of
Bribing of ym; and by which scarce
one Freeholder in ten escapes ye
Guilt of willful Perjury!) in return
for their Promisd Votes. One Man
having drank too much Rum, had
thereby thrown himself into ye very
Agonies of Death; and ye Bystanders
were looking every
Moment when ye stupid Soul
shou'd quit ye Beastly Carcase,
and launch into an awful Eternity.

[January 1753]

In these Circumstances not knowing
what else to do, they determind to send
for ye Parson. Accordingly ye
Priest came. Understanding ye
matter, and ye Brute being at
every return of breath, bawling
out Balsh for ever, Balsh for ever;
though with a voice scarcely to
be heard, ye Parson, true Patriot like, declared yt if he did
Die, he nevertheless died in a
good Cause! O! what a Leader of
Souls was this? What manner
of Spirit must he be of, yt wd hinder
a poor Mechanick from snatching
such Souls out of ye burning!
According to this Mans Divinity,

[January 1753]

Divinity, Patriotism is ye way to Heaven,
and there is no Doubt of ye vilest
Brute, yt is blessd with this wedding
Garment! What is putting
“Darkness for Light,” if this is not?
Conversd chiefly to Bed Time.

Sund. 21. Jany. Arose at 5.
Read to 7. Breakfasted. Walkd to
Kingswood. Came back to Dinner. Went
to Meeting, and was sufeitd with ye gaiety
of ye Congregation, and their impertinent
Civilities to one another. And
cd not but observe, yt they were exceeding
punctual in paying their Tributes
to each other, and then sat down as though

[Page 166; unnumbered in manuscript]

[January 1753]

God was not only to wait last for His
(which is ye usual Method in ye Churches)
but yt He was not worthy of any at all!
O! what is become of yt Text, "Reverence
becometh thine House for ever?"

At 5 our Service began. Society soon
after 6. Supp'd. retired.

Mond. Jany. 22. Arose before 5.
Began meeting ye Classes. Dined.
Writ. Supp'd.

Tues. Jan. 23. Arose at 5.
Continued meeting ye Classes. Dined.
Supp'd.

Wed. Jan. 24. Continued meetg
&c.

[January 1753]

Thurs. Jan. 25. Arose at 5. Conversd
to 7. Writ &c. to 8. Breakfasted.
Corrected a Proof. Studied to 1.
Waited on B. Jones. Went to Longs.
Studied. Supp'd. Retired.

~~Thurs~~ Fryday. Jan. 25 26. Arose at 5. Met
a Class to 1/2 Hour after 6. Studied to 10.
Read &c. to Intercession. Dined.
Examind ye Metaphysics. Supp'd.
Retired.

Saturd. Jan. 27. Arose at 5.
Conversd with S. Hardwick to 8.
Breakfasted. Shaved, cleand my
self &c. to 9. Did occasional Business
to 10. Writ Letters to 1/2 H. after 11.

[Page 168; unnumbered in manuscript]

[January 1753]

I seem to have little or no Doubt, yt
my stay in Bristol will be but Short.
Things appear drawing to a Period,
and Providence begins to open.
Tis true, I know not wherefore I came
nor why or where I go. Yet am I
almost persuaded, my continuances here
will ~~be but short~~ not be lasting. Be it so. Since
GOD alike on Earth as Heaven resides.

Went to Longs and staid to 1. Dined.
Waited on B. Jones and returnd at 4.
Did occasional Business to 5.
Retired a little, then read to 6.
Writ &c. to Bed Time.

[January 1753]

Sund. Jan. 28. Arose At 7. Breakfasted
&c. to 8. At 1/2 Hour after set out for
Kingswood. Came back to Dinner.
Walk'd to Mr Cozen's Chapel but was
disappointed. Came back & went St. Michaels
Church. At 5. our Service
began. Ritired at 8. Sat up till near
10.

Mond. Jany. 29. Arose at 5.
Convers'd with Mr King of Stroud to near 7.
Corrected &c. to 9. Studied to 10. Read
Ecclesiastical History³⁵ to 1. Dined.
Waited on B. Jones & staid to near
4. Read to 5. Ritired a little, then read to Preaching.

³⁵Almost certainly means Samuel Clarke (1599–1682), *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical History, divided into two parts: The first, containing ... lives of the ancient fathers, school-men, first reformers, and modern divines; the second, containing the lives of Christian emperors ...[and] of inferior Christians*, 3rd edition (London: Thomas Sawbridge, 1675); as several biographies were excerpted from this and included in volume 26 of Wesley's *Christian Library*.

[Page 170; unnumbered in manuscript]

[January 1753]

Tues. Jan. 29.³⁶ Arose not till 7.
Breakfasted. Read &c. from 8. to 10.
Wash'd myself. Read to 2. Dined.
Finish'd ~~my~~ the Ecclesiastical History.
In which are several Characters
truly admirable, but many more
truly despicable. The Xtians
indeed were real Hero's; but ye
Roman Bravos (scarce one excepted)
little better than Monsters!
Writ Exercise to 5. Ritired a little.
Perused my Grammar to Bed Time.

Wed. Jan. 30. Not withstanding
my Indisposition, made shifts to
drag myself up to Preaching. But

³⁶Note that the same date is given for Tuesday as for Monday in the manuscript.

[January 1753]

found it no little Cross to keep myself
off ye Bed afterwards. My old Distemper
seems to return apace and weakness
again reigns triumphant. Whether
it is a gradual inward Decay, or ye return
of a particular Fit, I am not wise
enough to determine; but am inclined
to believe ye Former.

GODs Providence with regard to me
is surely a great Deep; unfathomable,
unexplaind. Ever since I left Twickenham³⁷
I have been greatly at a Loss
to comprehend why I did This or That;
or why I staid at Bristol rather
than elsewhere? Yet has my Way been
hedgd up with Thorns, when ever I

³⁷Thomas Butts became active in Methodism in London in the early 1740s. Twickenham is a village near London (now a suburb).

[January 1753]

talkd of leaving it. The many Inconveniences
(not to say, almost insupportable
Burdens) ~~attendants~~ of attending Mr
W's Houses, have been Inducement
enough ~~for~~ to me to think of ~~leaving~~ quitting him.
But I never yet found a favorable
Opportunity, though I have long sought
one. Were I really useful to others
in ye Situation I am in, and Things
somewhat better regulatd than they
are at present, my Interest wd
weigh but little ~~with me~~ nor be
very powerfully prevalent with me,
to change. But when I consider, I
am spending my Time, and growing

[January 1753]

more and more unlikely to get my own
Living; yt I am ~~waisting~~ squandering away what little
Strength and Cloaths I have, and in no
~~likelyhood~~ Expectation of ~~getting~~ finding more; and wt is
worse than all; without scarce Thanks
for my pains, I own I can hardly reconcile
myself to stay, or help crying out, “why
all this waste?”

What a Friend observd some Time
since, is often upon my Mind, viz,
“You will do, says he, as I have done,
spend your Time, and your Mony, your
Cloaths &c. in serving Persons, and then they
will turn you out to get elsewhere,
what you will not find among ~~them~~
ym. _____.”³⁸

³⁸This line appears in the manuscript text.

[January 1753]

If this is ye usual Method, I am not yet too far gone to retreat. Nay, tis possible the present Difference may solve all my Doubts, and rectify all my Scruples. In Expectation of which, I will now cease Scribbling.

Writ to 8. Breakfasted. Went into ye City. Came back again about 11. Corrected a Proof. Dined. Perused my Grammar to 4. Was diversely employd to 5. Retired. Read “Nature display’d”³⁹ to 9.

Thurs. Jan 31. Arose at 5.
Was with Mr C. &c. to nearly 7. Lookd

³⁹Noël Antoine Pluche (1688–1761), *Spectacle de la Nature: or Nature Displayed; being discourses on such particulars of natural history as were thought most proper to excite the curiosity, and form the minds of youth*, 7 vols., translated by Samuel Humphreys (London: Franklin *et al.*, 1733–48).

[Jan.–Feb. 1753]

out Words to 9. Breakfasted. Differently
employd to Dinner. Went into ye
City. Corrected a Proof. Did occasional
Business to 4. Read to 5.
Retired a little. Read to Preaching.
Went to see one Sick. Supp'd. Took
myself to my Cabin.

Frid. Feb. 1. Arose at 5. Heard
B. Powell Preach. Indifferent.
Look'd out Words to about 1/2 H[our] after
8. Breakfasted. Corrected a Proof.
Dined. Supp'd. Retired.

Saturd. Feb. 2. Being ill I did
not rise till 8. Breakfasted.
Did occasional Business to 12.

[February 1753]

Conn'd over my Lesson &c. to 1. Dined.
Read &c. to Preaching.

Sund. Feb. 3. The same Indisposition
kept me on Bed till 8.
Breakfasted. Went to College &
heard an excellent Sermon from one
of ye minor Canons. Rec'd ye Sacrament.
Dined. Went to St. Thomas
but cd understand scarce any Thing.
The Man's voice was loud enough,
but either thro' an impediment
in his Speech or ye Echo of ye Chancel
scarce one Sentence in ten ws distinct.
Drank Tea with a Friend.
Went to the Hall and heard Br

[February 1753]

Westel. Came Home to Society. I more
and more see ye unlikelihood (I might almost say) ye
Impossibility of an extemporary Speaker
not being guilty of Blundering.
One in his publick Expounding said
to Day, "That it was a necessary
Consequence of Salvation from Sin,
by Faith in Xt, yt we were saved from
Sin." That is, Salvation is a necessary
Consequence of Salvation!
I want Proof. And a much greater
Metaphysican in his Exhortation
told us, "That were all ye Stars
Worlds, they were not of equal
value with one Soul." Soon after
forgetting himself, he added. "A Soul

[Page 178; unnumbered in manuscript]

[February 1753]

without Grace cd be allowd to be
but of little, if any Value at all.”
I fear neither Logic, Metaphysics,
Ethics, Philosophy nor Divinity
will bear him out in these different
Assertions!

Mond. Feb. 4. Arose at 8.
Breakfasted. Writ to 1/2 Hour
after 9. Corrected a Proof. Dined.
Went in ye City. Between Drowsiness
&.c. did scarce any Thing to 4.
Wrote Exercise &.c. to Preach[in]g. Corrected
a Proof. Supp'd. Retired.

[February 1753]

Tues. Feb. 5. Arose at 5. Conversd
to Breakfast. Corrected a Proof.
Lookd out Words, &c. to 1. Dined.
Variously employd to Preaching.
Supp'd. retired.

Saturd. 9. Feb. Arose at 5. Writ
&c. to 8. Did occasional Business to
Dinner. Read, writ &c. to supper.
retired.

Sund. Feb. 10. Arose at 5.
Breakfasted. Went to College. Dined.
Went to St. Austins. Supp'd. Retired.

What some have observd concerning
Learning is strictly just; viz.

[February 1753]

[1] If it be a Talent given to an unenlightend ~~mind~~ Person, it often renders ye Man more consummately blind; and more insensible of yt Blindness than he wd have been without it. It generally happens, yt in attaining ~~it~~ Knowledge we imbibe a set of Notions with it, from Authors we are conversant with: And, as is too often the Case, receive ym without examining them. We assent to ~~such & such~~ several Propositions, merely because such an Author proposes them. Whether they are strictly true, is not so much the subject of our Inquiry, as does Mr Lock[e], &c. or some other great Man, affirm them? By this Stupidity we many Times fall into

[February 1753]

gross errors. 2. One brought up at a Seminary of Dissenters, will go near to borrow his Thoughts from Howe, Owen, Saltmarsh and such like Writers; and tis ten to one but he imbibes their Prejudices also, and in so doing, he effectually guards himself against Conviction. Whatever Absurdities may be affirmd by such Writers, he makes his own, and defends as earnestly as though an Angel from Heaven had reveald them. But whatever contradicts these, cannot be lookd upon, by him, other than as a new Gospel. Tis ye same in every other Case. A Quaker is taught to trammel in Robert Barclay's Track, and never looks for

[February 1753]

for another road till this is, as it
were, become habitual to him. Then
what wonder is it if none is like ~~That~~ This?
So again; A ~~Universarian~~ Collegian yt has
been brought up to look upon all
as “out of ye Pale of Salvation, save
those of ye Church;” what marvel is it if
the writings of Schismatics are not
regarded by him? 3. Sometimes we likewise
borrow their very manner of
Expression; and, by this Means, cloath
our Ideas as in Language altogether
unscriptural. ~~But~~ Indeed it wd be
well if this was ye worst. ~~Yet this~~ But in Fact
'tis not ~~the case~~. ~~They are~~ Our language many Times is
not only not found in Scripture, but
directly repugnant to it. And ye

[February 1753]

Divinity itself is not borrowd from ye Bible,
but from our more sublime Teachers.
The Texts yt speak against our favorite
Hypothesis, may with some little softening
and artful Decorations be made to
bend: or at least a little scholastic
Sophistry will blind ye Eyes of ye simple
and unlearn'd and prevent their
distinguishing ye a Flaw in ye Coach
Wheel, in a Cloud of Dust.

4. Are these Thing so? Are they right?
If not, why are we so little open to Conviction?
Ought we not rather to Judge
according to ye Truth of Things,
than to be led blindfold by every perverse
Writer? Surely my Reason can be

[February 1753]

of little service to me, if I must prostitute
it to ye Judgment of Another, let
his Fame be ever so Universal. We
exclaim against ye Folly of ye Romanist
but are seldom wholly free from it. We
often as implicitly follow ye Judgment
of Writers of our own Stamp, as though
we had already voted them in the infallible
Chair. If we have Reason,
let us make us of it, or else set ourselves
upon a level with ye Beasts
yt Perish!

5. Having thus cleared my Way, I
come more immediately to consider ye
Thing I had in view. In a late Dispute

[February 1753]

with a Dissenter, I found him putting Salvation upon a very unscriptural footing. He affirmd “he lookd upon every one in a safe State, yt had a good Hope through Grace.” But where read we so? If you say “in many Holy Men’s Writings, especially among ye Dissenters;” That avails nothing with me. I am not convincd, yt any of those Writers were wiser than GOD. Do ye Scriptures tell me so? If not, I reject it as a bold Assertion without any Truth in it.

6. But how comes it pass yt there is no Difference between an Expectation of a Future Good, and a present possession?

[February 1753]

If so, an Estate in reversion, even while the possessor is living, is ye same as ye actual Enjoyment of it. An expectation of Holiness, Happiness, Heaven, is ye being actually possessd of them. Behold ye Strength of this Argument: I am in expectation of Learning such a Language; therefore, I have already learnt it. Demonstration doubtless!

7. Hope, according to ye Definition of ye Schools, is “~~an~~ The pleasing Expectation of a future GOOD.” ~~supposd to be attainable.”~~
But is Salvation only an Expectation of some Thing future? Is it no real Thing to be at present enjoyd? Is

[February 1753]

no Holiness to come between our
Flight from Earth to Heaven? And is
this only an Expectation? What a
strange Gospel these Men make,
and how deeply are they experienced
in ye Divinity of ye Bible!

8. Perhaps some One may ask object, Are you
above borrowing from any One? Are
you ye only wise Man? Neither one
nor ye other. I wd borrow from all, wt is
consistent with Scripture, but not
one Jot more from ye most famous
Man breathing.

“Not e’en a Word or Look
Can I approve or own:
But by ye Model of yt Book
That sacred Book alone.”⁴⁰

⁴⁰Cf. “Discipline. From Herbert,” st. 3, in Wesley, *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1739), 77.

[February 1753]

9. Here comes in another Objection:
“many Things in Scripture are dark &
intricate, nor are ye best Divines agreed
concerning them.” Very true, but then they
are no Terms of Salvation. That they
are not, I prove thus; “All Things needful
to Salvation are clearly reveald
in Scripture.” If you except against
the proposition you accuse ye Veracity
of GOD, and to Him I must refer you
for Confutation.

10. As I wd not ~~refer~~ send a Man to match
a Colour to a Room without Light;
or one yt wantd to know ye ~~Truth~~ Sense of any
plain Passage, to an ænigma; so neither
wd I refer any one to ye Revelations
to find ye way to ye Kingdom.

[February 1753]

There is no need of mistaken; ye Gospel way is so plain yt "A labouring Man though a Fool, need not err there in."

11. Scripture teaches ~~these~~ three Things as absolutely needful to be⁴¹ to be experiencd by us if ever wd [i.e., we] wd enjoy ye Kingdom of Heaven : viz, "Repentance, Believe Faith, Obedience &c." Repentance is thus described, "Repentance from all dead Works, to serve ye living GOD." 2. Faith is, ye substance, or rather ~~subsistance~~ Confidence of Things hoped for, ye Evidence of Things unseen. 3. Obedience is, ye walking before him in Holiness and Righteousness all ye Days of our Life.

⁴¹This line is repeated twice in the manuscript.

[February 1753]

12. Can any Thing be plainer than this? Wd not ye keeping close to these Scriptures effectually secure us from any Deception? Let us try all Doctrines by ye unerring Rule of GOD's Word, whatever is consistent with it, receive; the inconsistent, reject. As far as any Author corresponds with Scripture, receive him gladly; but follow none for better for worse.

13. One Thing peculiarly requires our strictest Attention, to hit aside all softenings of Scripture. Let us take it as an infallible Rule yt all Teachers yt adulterate, or bring down ye Word of GOD to their Definitions, are so far, false witnesses against GOD.

[February 1753]

Those Expositions yt want Scripture
force are deviations from ye Text.

13.⁴² It still remains, how am I to
know whether I experience Repentance
&c.? We are to judge, not by ye Marks
yt fallible Men have laid down, but
by ye Truths of GOD. The Marks he
has given us in his written Word.

[1] Thus, a Man may know whether
he repents or no, by examining
whether he abstains “from dead Works”
and keeps a “Conscience void of Offence
both towards GOD and toward, Man.”
Does he willfully do nothing yt GOD forbids,
nor willfully omit anything He hath
commanded? Is he heartily sorry for
his Sins past, and are they really become

⁴²The author has mistakenly repeated the number “13” in his numbering.

[February 1753]

abominable? ~~Above all~~ Again, does he feel there is no Health in him? That he has no Power, Life or Goodness in himself? Above all, is he conscious yt he "believes not on ye only Begotten Son of GOD?" Christ tells us, when the Spirit is come, he will convince ye world of Sin, because they believe not in me. Therefore, whosoever have not been convincd, and known ye Time they had no Faith, never yet received Xts Spirit. Consequently, are Heathens to this Hour.

2. We may examine ourselves likewise, whether we be in ye Faith, by its immediate, as well as by its more distant Effects. Thus saith St Paul,

[February 1753]

“He yt Believeth hath Peace with GOD.”
He does not say, he is at Peace with himself or his Neighbours, but he hath Peace with GOD. So our LORD, “He yt Believeth hath everlasting Life.” Not he hath a good Hope yt he shall have it, but he hath it now. So St John, “He yt Believeth hath ye witness in himself.” What this is, St Paul tells us elsewhere “The Spirit of GOD beareth witness with our Spirits, yt we are ye Children of GOD.” Once more; St John tells us in another Place, “we know yt we are of GOD and yt ye whole World lyeth in ye Wicked One.”

[February 1753]

3. For Fear any one shd imagine he might have these Things wrought in him, and not know it, hear wt is sd elsewhere; "Know ye not yt Xt Jesus is in you, except ye be Reprobates? Again, What, know ye not yt your Bodies are the Temples of ye Holy Ghost & .c.? If these Texts do not express our knowing we are in Xt, none can. O, but say you "twas after they believd yt they were seald with ye Spirit of Promise." This hinders not their knowing they were in Xt before. To assert this, wd be to overturn the whole Gospel. For that says, we are justified, or Pardoned thro' Faith.

[February 1753]

But this cannot be true, if we know it
not till we are seald with ye Spirit;
for St Paul testifies, yt unless we have
this Knowledge, we are in a State of
Reprobation. However St John speaking
to Believers says, I write these
Things to you, yt ye may know you
have eternal Life &c. True, but does he
affirm, they knew it not before? Or
cannot a Man know a Truth, comparatively
stronger ye more Evidence he
has of it. For instance, I now know yt GOD
for Xt's sake has forgiven me --
-- But will not this Knowledge
be strength'ned, when I receive a greater
measure of His Spirit? And will
not ye knowing ye experience of ye
Children of GOD, corroborate & confirm
it? This then is quite wide of ye Point.

[February 1753]

4. Again, 2.dly we may know whether we are in ye Faith, by its more distant Effects. 1st. He yt is Xts, hath crucified ye Flesh with its Affections and Lusts. Again, being Dead unto Sin, we are alive unto Righteousness.

2. So St John, He yt believeth is Born of GOD. And he yt is born of GOD, doth not commit Sin. Again, he yt committeth Sin is of ye Devil, but he yt is born of GOD keepeth himself, and yt wicked One toucheth him not. Again; In this ye Children of GOD are manifest, and ye Children of ye Devil. Lastly, He yt is born of GOD overcometh ye World.

[February 1753]

5. Now is it not very easy for any Man to know whether he is in this State or not? Certainly he must be more stupid than a Brute, yt can Doubt of it. Can I not discern whither I feel Ease or Pain? In Fact, tis not for want of Sensation yt Men deceive themselves, but from a Principle of self Love yt persuades them to Hope ye best. And often from a Spirit of Infatuation, yt their Sins have brought upon them. They are sensible, they have not ye Scripture Marks, ~~upon them~~, yet will still vainly Dream they are in GOD's Favour. But to such saith ye Saviour "He yt believeth not is cond shall be Damned." And in another Place tis said, "He yt believeth not is condemnd already, and ye Wrath of GOD abideth upon him."

[February 1753]

6. I hope, I have now sufficiently shewd, yt is ye good Hope through Grace,” does not put a Man in ye Favour of GOD, nor deliver him from the Condemnation of ye Devil. Consequently, tho’ it may be set down as ye Condition of Salvation by some musty Writer, tis never so found in ye Oracles of GOD. I shall go on to answer but one Objection more, and conclude this subject.

7. The “Scriptures, say some, manifestly contradict, itself.” Perhaps, if we attend to ye mere Sound of ye Words, rather than ye Sense, it may seem to do so. But let us examine it closely, and this Objection will vanish.

[February 1753]

In order to it, 'twill be well to remember yt ~~three~~ four Things go together to make a Contradiction. 1st. It must speak of ye same Thing. 2^d. In ye same Sense. & 3^d. with respect to ye same third Thing. & 4^d. At ye same Time. Now examine Scripture by these Rules, and if you find any Contradictions, I am greatly deceived.

8. That wch seems to approach ye nearest a Contradiction is this; St Paul says, "A man is justified by Faith;" St. James, "A Man is justified by Works." I will consider ym a little. 1st. Then, they do not speak of ye same Thing. St Paul says. "That Abraham was justified (or received into GODs Favour) by Faith." St James "That he

[February 1753]

was justified (continued his Justification) by Works. That this must be St James meaning, is plain from hence. That otherwise, he must assert, Abraham was not in ye favour of GOD, till he offerd up his Son Isaac upon ye Altar; which wd not contradict St Paul only, but several other Places.

2dly. They do not speak of ye same Time. St. Paul speaks of Abraham in uncircumcision before Isaac was born; St. James, when he offerd Isaac upon ye Altar.

3'dly. They do not speak of it in ye same Sense. This was observd before. St Paul speaks of Abraham, his first Acceptance wth GOD; St James, of ye continuation of yt Acceptance.

[Feb.–Apr. 1753]

And now, what is become of ye Contradiction?
Tis vanishd like Smoke. And I
am persuaded yt whosoever carefully
compares one Passage with another,
will find Scripture to “abound” with
just such, but no other Contradictions
than this.

Tues. Feb. 12. Arose at 5. Writ to
near 8. Spent ye remainder diversly.

April 24, 1753. Mr Wh— [Whitefield]
having publishd a Sermon
with a Sneer in it against Xtian Perfection;⁴³
I cannot refrain from reviewing
again yt great Gospel Doctrine, &
considering his ~~reasonings~~ Objections ag[ain]st it.

2. That Man was made in ye Image
of GOD, is a Truth allowd by us.

⁴³George Whitefield (1714–70), *The True Nature of Beholding the Lamb of God; and Peter’s Denial of his Lord, opened and explained, in Two Sermons* (London: Strahan, 1753). Cf. pages 209 and 214 below.

[April 1753]

all, and Consequently, perfect in his Degree. So saith ye Scripture And GOD saw all Things yt He had made & behold they were very good. That is, they were free from any Defilement.

3. In this State then was Man created. Holy & unblamable in all Things. It is true, he did not long retrain his Innocence. The Enemy of Souls, by with ye persuasions of his Wife, overcame him & robbd him of yt Purity in wch he was till then, invested; She gave him of ye Tree & he did eat.

4. No sooner had he broken ye divine Command, than ye threat'ned Punishment took place. In ye Day Thou eatest thereof Thou shalt surely

[April 1753]

Die. Thy Soul shall be separated from
GOD, & liable to Death eternal. Thy Body
also, shall return to ye Ground from
whence it was taken, for Dust thou
art & unto Dust thou shalt return.

5. The same infallible Oracle yt acquaints
us with ye Creation & fall of
Man; assures us likewise, that in
Adam we all died; that is; his Crime
reachd even to us. Either ye infection
of Nature yt resulted from it of wch we are partakers
as his Descendants; or ye Guilt
of it (as he was our Representative)
was imputed to us. Whether ye Souls
of all Mankind were really lodged in
Adam (as some think) and so ye more
easily partakers of this ~~Nature~~ Infection, is not
material to know: It may suffice, ¶

[April 1753]

yt Scripture assures us, & our experience agreeth thereto, yt we partook of his Punishment, as (had he stood) we should all have partaken of his Joy.

6. I find none of ye Children of GOD yt Doubt of our inheriting Adam's Curse, or our partaking of his defiled Nature. The Thing they scruple is, whether Xt is able or willing to cleanse us from our contracted Defilements. Whether His Blood reaches as far to cleanse, as Adam's Sin to stain. Or whether His Spirit can (or will) destroy that evil Nature we receivd from our first Parent.

7. Not to insist upon ye Folly of those Gentleman, yt thus limit Omnipotence & bring down ye all powerful GOD to a

[April 1753]

feeble Worm; or set Bounds to infinite
Goodness & null GODs will in our Sanctification:
I shall proceed to Reason
with Them from ye Divine Oracles, &
prove yt in this, we have not followd a
cunningly devised Fable, but speak ye
words of Truth & Soberness.

8. The Promise of GOD (Deut.30.6)
is: I will circumcise thine Heart, &
ye Heart of thy Seed, to love ye LORD thy
GOD with all thy Heart & with all thy
Soul. So again in Ezekiel, then will
I sprinkle clean Water upon you & ye
shall be clean; from all your Filthiness
and from all your Idols will I cleanse
you. I will also save you from all your
uncleannesses. I ye LORD have spoken

[April 1753]

spoken it, I will also do it, Chap 35.

Agreeable to these Promises are ye words of St John, 1 Ep.1 C[hapter]. v. 7, &c. If we walk in ye Light as He is in ye Light, we have fellowship one with another & ye Blood of Jesus Xt His Son cleanseth us from all Sin. Again, If we confess our Sins, He is faithful & Just to forgive us our Sins, & to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

9. That GOD hath thus promised, is not to be contested: But ye Point is, whether ye Believer in whom these Promises are fulfilled, may be said to be Perfect? I apprehend he may. And one Text to ye Purpose is as good as a Thousand. If any Man offend not in Word, ye same is a perfect Man. And our LORDs command is, Be ye therefore perfect, even as your

[April 1753]

Father wch is in Heaven is perfect.
And St Paul advises: Let us go on
to Perfection. So elsewhere, yt ye may
be perfect and entire lacking Nothing.

10. The Phrase Perfection is here
expressly made use of by ye Apostle; &
our LORD absolutely commands us to
attain it. ~~What then is Perfection in a Gospel Sense?~~
If you say ~~it~~ this Perfection does
not imply ~~an exemption~~ a Freedom from Sin; I confront
you with ~~ye Promise in Ezekiel~~
ye Command of our LORD,
& ye express Declaration of St ~~John~~ Johns 1 Ep.4.17. neither
of wch you can deny, without making
ye ~~Promises~~ Oracles of GOD nothing worth, &
His ~~Word a mere Fable~~ ministers gross Deceivers.

If you say, ~~in Scripture~~ it implies
abundantly more than a mere Freedom

[April 1753]

from Sin. I answer, imply wt it will, we are by our LORD expressly commanded to be perfect; & consequently, our asserting it ye Privilege of all Xtians, or yt wch all are calld to, can be no instance of Presumption.

11. Here then is a proper Place to introduce Mr Wh_____ Objections, and for Fear I should mangle his confident Assertions, I will quote Them as they stand.

“To pretend to arrive at a sinless State argues,” 1st. “An Ignorance of ye spiritual Extent of ye moral Law.” 2d. “of ye true Interpretation of GODs word.”

3. “of ye universal Experiences of GODs

[April 1753]

People in all Ages.”

4. “Of ye remaining unmortified Corruptions
of their own desperately wicked
& deceitful Hearts.”⁴⁴

12. Here stands ye Charge, but where
is ye Proof? Till yt is produced, I might
as confidently Answer it does not.
But I rather chuse to confute these
assertions, yn pass ym over in Silence.
To begin with ye first.

To assert Perfection “argues 1st an Ignorance
of ye spiritual Extent of ye
Moral Law.”

1. The utmost Extent of ye Moral Law
yt I read of is, Thou shalt Love ye LORD
thy GOD with all thy Heart, & thy Neighbour
as thy self.

Now how does asserting Perfection,

⁴⁴Whitefield, *True Nature*, p. 5.

[April 1753]

“shew an Ignorance” of this? ~~Now are not~~
~~all Xtians commanded so to Love God~~
~~& their Neighbour~~ Cannot a real Perfect Xtian
thus Love GOD & his Neighbour? And
is not this ye fulfilling of ye Law ? Wt
says Xt, the whole Law is on these two
Commandments hang all ye Law & ye
Prophets. What St Paul? Love is ye
fulfilling of ye Law. Both negative &
positive. Wt St John? If we love one
another, GOD dwelleth in us, & His Love
is perfected in us. But it argues

2dly. “An Ignorance of ye true Interpretation
of GODs Word.” In wt Point? You
shd by all means have specified in ~~what~~
Particulars, as it gives room to think, you
was willing to say something, you cd

[April 1753]

not make out. If you think Perfection contrary to GOD's Word, why did you not confute it? Produce your strong Arguments & lay flourishing aside. But remember ye Bishops Advice "No more Blotting & Blurring."⁴⁵ It argues

3dly. "Ignorance of ye universal Experience of GODs People in all Ages." And no wonder; for he must have a very extensive Knowledge indeed, yt is acquainted wth all their Experiences! But, I Trust, it does not argue an Ignorance of ye Experiences of some of GOD's Children.

What think you of St Johns those of whom he speaks 1 Ep. 4 C. v 17. Because as He (Christ) is, so are we in this present World? Were These ~~perfect~~ sinless or were They not? Or are we or you, Ignorant of their Experience?

⁴⁵Cf. George Lavington (1684–1762), *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared, Part II* (London: Knapton, 1749), xxxviii.

[April 1753]

But supposing it did argue an Ignorance
of ye Experience of GOD's
Children, &c. What Then? Wd this
prove ~~sinless~~ Perfection ever ye less
true? I Thought ye Word of GOD was
not to be brought down to People's
Experience, but their Experience
tried by ye written Word: But you
have corrected my Error! It argues

4thly. An Ignorance of ye "remaining unmortified
Corruption of their own
desperately wicked & deceitful Hearts."
Strange, indeed! That an Expectation
of my being deliverd from Sin, shd
make me ignorant of my now remaining
Corruptions. 'Tis a Wonder, if an
expectation of my going to Heaven

[April 1753]

does not make me conceit my self
already an Angel too. At this rate, I
must never expect ye completion of
GOD's Promises, lest I shd vainly imagine
my self to ~~have~~ possess them!

I think, ye very same Reason will hold
good against a Persons ever ~~waiting~~
expecting Repentance; because it
may lead him to think he already has it.

Also a broken hearted Sinner must
not expect Pardon of Sin, lest he vainly
Dream himself already justified.
Thus potent is Mr Wh--- Argument!
And as true, as Paul's
Preaching on Mars Hill was Field Preaching!
Before I conclude, I cannot help
taking Notice of an Insinuation in
ye latter Sermon of His just publishd,
where after speaking of Peter's Repentance

[April 1753]

He says in a triumphant Expostulation with Satan, "Jesus hath prayed for him (Peter) & therefore his Faith shall not finally fail."⁴⁶ But wd he insinuate here, yt Peter retaind his Faith while he was Blasphemously by denying his LORD & Master? Surely he wd not. And yet this seems to be ye Sense of ye Passage. I Fear, his Zeal ~~agst Perfection~~ for Perseverance has inadvertently driven him into an Insinuation so irreconcilable to Scripture! A Word or two more, & I have done. If this Gentleman wd effectually destroy ye Doctrine of Perfection (yt is, a freedom from committing & a deliverance from ye body of Sin) I cannot but think ye most effectual way to do it, wd be to prove St John's Epistle not

⁴⁶Whitefield, *True Nature*, p. 41.

[April–May 1753]

canonical & to throw it aside, as I
hear ye Count Zinzendorf has yt of St James!
Till then, I Fear, it will be, as
ye remaining Cananites were to ye Israelites,
Pricks in his Eyes & Thorns in his Side.

May 1, 1753. As we are almost
continually disputing about ye Conditions
of ye new Covenant; it may not
be amiss to set down wt I conceive ye
Scripture contains on ye Head. And
1st. First, what are its Conditions with
regard to an Unbeliever: Or wt is absolutely
required in order to his becoming
a Child of GOD. ~~And They are~~ Two Things only.
1st. To repent. 2^{dly}. to Believe.

[May 1753]

Repentance, in order to Faith, or yt self-knowledge
wch disposes ye Soul readily
to accept Salvation: And Faith yt applies
Salvation to ye Soul.

2nd. If you ask ~~if ask~~, “whether a ~~Degree~~ an Intention of abstaining
from Evil & bringing forth Works Fruits meet
for Repentance ~~are~~ is not necessary to Salvation?”

I Answer, yes; but ~~they are~~ it is manifestly
implied in ye Term Repentance.

In asmuch as Repentance not only cannot
subsist without it, but it cannot
be produced without ~~Them~~ it, as ~~they are~~ it is
an essential Part or Property of it.

A House may as well be built without a
Foundation, or a Tree subsist without Sap.

3. If it is demanded secondly, “whether
Works are not joind with Faith in our

[May 1753]

Justification?" I answer, intentionally
They are: that is, ye Soul wills to perform
those Works GOD hath commanded, when
by Justification he hath received a
Power so to do. But then observe, these
Works are ~~rather~~ sure Fruits of Faith
& not Parts of it. "However, is not ye Intention
an essential Part or Property
of Faith?" I dare not say it is not, seeing
there is no true Faith separate from it.

"How then can a Soul be said to be saved
by Grace, if Faith & an Intention of doing
ye Will of GOD is absolutely requisite
in order to ~~our~~ his Justification?"

1. First, as Xt by dying satisfied for all
his Sins.
2. Secondly, as He purchased all Grace
needful to his Salvation,

[May 1753]

3. And Thirdly, as He works all his Works in him by His Spirit.
4. Secondly, what ~~is~~ are ye Conditions absolutely necessary to retain ye Favour of GOD?

1. First, To walk in ye Light.
2. Secondly, To keep Xt's Commandments.
3. Thirdly, what are ye Conditions absolutely necessary for a Backslider, in order to regain ye Favour of GOD?

The same as ~~at ye first~~ to unbelievers, Repentance towards GOD & Faith in our LORD Jesus Xt.

How, “does not Xt say, Repent & do your first Works?” Yes, but not to such as I here speak of. I speak of

[May 1753]

Persons yt have fallen from their Justification;
but yt our LORD did not speak to
such will be easily seen by ~~ye~~ His Charge
against ye Church of Sardis in wch
~~are~~ ye Words Quoted; 2 C. Rev. v.4. Nevertheless,
I have somewhat against Thee, because
Thou hast left thy first Love.
A leaving their first Love & ~~growing slack~~
is ye Thing complaind of, not
their falling from Grace. Nay, when
our LORD speaks to those yt say they
are rich & increasd in Goods &c. i.e.
to those yt having lost their Grace, still
retaind a vain Confidence in ye Place
of it; We find He speaks in a very
different Manner as in Chap. 3. vs 8.

5. I Fear, it has been our unscriptural
manner of Speaking yt has given
so great Offence to many sincere Children

[May 1753]

of GOD. As have you lost yr Faith?
“Then repent and do your first works or
you will everlastingly Perish.” Where read
we this, tis spoken to those yt have lost
justifying Faith? Not in all ye Bible
yt I ever yet saw. ’Tis true, we are to
exhort Them to repent & come to Xt
as at ye first, but this is quite another
Thing. Thus setting Them to work for
Life, is not only unscriptural, but it
absolutely knocks free Grace on ye Head.
If Works are in this Sense necessary,
then has Xt died in vain.

6. What is ye use of Works then? Not
to purchase Pardon, but to retaining
it when once bestowed. Not to retrieve
Justification when lost, but to preserve
it when given. Works are preservers

[May 1753]

of Faith, tho' not purchasers
of it. The Scripture Method is this:
Dost thou now believe? Then keep
Xt's Commandments. Continue you in
my His love. But never does it set us to
make Brick without Straw. To Love
Him unless we know He hath loved us.
I mean, unless we know it now, for wt
we once knew avails not.

7. In short, ye plain Matter is this.
Art Thou an Unbeliever? Repent,
or perish. If Thou repentest? Believe
in Xt for Remission of Sins, if
ever Thou will be saved! Art Thou
a Believer? Walk in ye Light as Xt
is in ye Light and ye Blood of Jesus Xt
shall cleanse Thee from all Sin. Wilt

[May 1753]

Thou retain Faith & grow in ye Knowledge
of GOD &c.? Keep Xt's Commandments,
they being ye outward Means appointed
to keep Faith &c. alive: And as necessary
as Feuel to Fire. Hast Thou lost
thy first Love & art thou growing careless again?
Repent, & do thy first Works, else I
will come unto Thee quickly & remove
my Candlestick out of its Place, except
thou repent. But art thou really
poor, & blind & naked; hast thou lost
all saving Grace? Then I counsel
thee to buy of Me Gold tried in ye Fire,
yt thou mayest be rich; and white Raiment
yt thou mayst be cloathed, & yt ye
Shame of thy Nakedness do not appear,
and anoint thine Eyes with Eye-Salve,
yt thou may'st see: As though He had sd,

[May–July 1753]

Ask of GOD again for yt Repentance
whereby thou mayst see & know thy
Wants, & then come & be cloathd upon
with my Righteousness, yt ye Shame
of thy Nakedness do not appear.

July ye 5. 1753. Nothing has
been a more perplexing Subject to
ye generality of Writers; nor a Point
concerning wch more Blunders have been committed,
than ye treating of & explaining
ye Nature & Properties of Faith.

Few have confined themselves to
ye Acct given in Scripture, & consequently,
neglecting yt Standard of
Truth, their Definitions are as
various as ye Colours in ye Rainbow.

[July 1753]

2. Some affirm, yt Saving Faith implies no more than “an assent to Things credible as credible; or a Belief of Things sufficiently attested.” And seeing ye Truths of Scripture are authentically proposed for our Belief, a firm assent to them, is ye Faith required.

3. But if ys were so, much ye greater Part of those called Xtians wd have saving Faith; since there is scarce one in twenty but believes thus far. But Can this be grantd by any yt are not utter Strangers to their Bible? Do not ye far greater Part of them live in Sin? And does ye Word of GOD give us any Room to call such Believers? On ye contrary, does not

[July 1753]

our LORD expressly affirm, He yt committeth Sin is ye Servant of Sin? And again, ye are of your Father ye Devil, for his Works ye do? To an Apostle he yt committeth Sin is of ye Devil: and is not ye Wages of Sin is Death. A Man must be as blind as a Post, yt cannot see ye incompatibility of these two States. That can reconcile believing & sinning.

4. ~~Again some~~ Others affirm, “yt a Trust in GODs mercy thro Xt, is ye Faith to wch all ye Promises are due.” This is more inexplicable than ye former, as it is next to impossible to know wt they mean by ys Definition. If ys Trust implies nothing more yn Mercy not yet attained or in Possession; I answer, neither is

[July 1753]

ys saving Faith. Hope indeed is properly
an Expectation of some Good,
hereafter to be obtained; but Faith implies
also a prevent Enjoyment. Not a Thing in
Reversion only, but a ~~present~~ an actual Attainment
& Revelation of present Favour.

5. Saving Faith is, according to Scripture,
ye υπόστασις,⁴⁷ ye confidentia or
confidence of Things hoped for,
ye ελεγχος or supernatural Evidence
of Things unseen. Here some snarling
Critic may say, true, it is a
proof of ye real subsistence of heavenly
Things. This is not all ye Apostles
meaning. He does not say, it is a
Proof of future invisible Things only, but of present too:
not in Heaven, but revealed to & in ye Soul. Unless
you say, Faith is does not subsist

⁴⁷I.e., υπόστασις.

[July 1753]

in ye ~~Soul~~ Believer. Besides, yt wd be confounding ye former Part of ye Definition with ye ~~former~~ latter, or rather of making them one & ye same: whereas ye Apostle professedly distinguishes them, and not only says yt Faith is ye confidence of Things hoped for, but also ye evidence of Things unseen. It is an Evidence of ye Love of Xt now manifested to ye Soul, as well as an Evidence of good Things yet to come.

6. To ys agreeth our LORDs Words, “He yt Believeth, hath everlasting Life. He hath it now; he hath ye Earnest of it in his Heart. So ye Apostle, He yt Believeth hath Peace with GOD. He yt believeth hath ye Witness in himself; ye Spirit of GOD beareth witness with his

[July 1753]

Spirit yt he is a Child of GOD.”

7. This being as evident as ye shining of ye Sun, I shall not bestow any more Pains to prove it, but go on to ye Thing I had more immediately in view, viz. to inquire, how long a Man may be said to be a Believer in Xt?

8. Just as long as he is vitally united to Xt. While he continues in His Love. As long as ye Spirit bears witness with his Spirit yt he is a Child of GOD. While he hath everlasting Life, as long as ye Divine Confidence of Things hoped for, remains in his Soul. During ye Time he can cry Abba, Father. While he has

[July 1753]

Communication with ye Father & ye Son.
While he is joind to ye LORD by in one
Spirit. As long as he walks in ye
Light as GOD is in ye Light.

9. Here perhaps some one may
say “Can it be possible yt you exclude
all from believing, yt do not thus
walk in ye Light?” Are none Believers,
but those who have ye Witness
in themselves?

I exclude no Man; but I cannot
find yt Scripture allows any to be
Children of GOD, yt do not walk in
ye Light or have not ye Witness in
themselves.

10. Wt says St John, “If we say yt
we have fellowship with Him (God)
and walk in Darkness, we lie & do
not ye Truth.”

[July 1753]

Again, He yt Believeth on ye Son of GOD
hath ye witness in himself: Consequently,
he is no Believer, yt hath not ye
witness in himself. To yt effect are
ye Words of our LORD, If a man
abide not in me, he is cast forth &c.
Now no Man can abide in Xt longer
than while he believes; seeing,
he yt believeth not shall be damned is condemned already:
and no Man can believe any longer
yn he hath ye Spirit of GOD bearing
witness with his Spirit &c. seeing,
if any Man have not ye Spirit of Xt, his in none of His.

11. So then, you imagine, a Man
may be in Xt, to Day, & in ye Devil
to Morrow.' Indeed, I do; and so

[July 1753]

I must unless I will give up Scripture
& renounce common Sense. Is it any
more repugnant to Reason, to
believe a Man may be spiritually
alive to Day & Dead to Morrow;
than it is to believe a Man yt is
now in perfect Health may be to
morrow in his Coffin? Neither is
it any more repugnant to Scripture;
since there is scarce a hapter
yt doth not proclaim it.

12. In short, can a Man be in
Xt before he believes? You will not
say yt; you dare not. How then can
you possible conceal him in Xt, any
longer than he does believe? Is not ye
condition ye same as ever it was?

[July 1753]

13. "But are not ye Promises of GOD, yea & amen?" In Xt they are; but not out of Him. But who are ye Promises made to? Believers only: and only while they continue to Believe. ~~And~~ Therefore if any Man cease to believe, he is no longer an Heir of ye Promises.

14. Beware therefore, all ye yt fear ye LORD, how ye talk of ye unchangableness of GOD, will ye drop into Hell. ~~But~~ Learn to be more consistent in wt you say; and remember, yt if GOD ever made any Conditions, or requird any, he requires ye same now. If those (yt afterwards are ye Elect) while unbelieving are not Children of GOD, no more are

[July 1753]

they Children after they have believed unless they continue in ye Faith. I defy all ye Men upon Earth (if they allow believing ye Condition of Salvation) to prove yt a Child of GOD cannot fall. Observe, I do not talk of a Believer's being lost, of a Child of GOD, perishing, or ye Elect ~~their~~ being damned; I do not talk such nonsense: What I assert is, yt a Believer may become an Unbeliever, a Child of GOD, a Child of ye Devil, ye Elect, reprobate: i.e. they may make shipwreck of ye Faith & thereby perish.

15. That any Men are saved unconditionally, ye wisest Man under Heaven never yet was able to

[July 1753]

prove from Scripture, nor ever will.
They may jangle till Dooms-day, but
if they understand any Thing of argument,
they may soon see, there is
no Proof in Scripture for it.

16. The Truth is this. A Man, whether
convinced or unconvinced,
before believing, is no Child of GOD:
The Believer (as a Believer) is Elect
according to ye Foreknowledge of GOD:
The Promises are yea & amen, to every
Believer.

Universal Holiness is ye Condition
of everlasting Happiness. And,
Persevering is ye Condition of universal
Holiness.

17. From ~~hence~~ what has been said,
it appears, yt wt Faith soever a Man

[July 1753]

may have (either before or after
Justification) without he walks in
ye Light & has ye witness of ye Spirit,
it is either ye Gift of ye Devil or a
mere Delusion of Fancy.

P.S. I cannot help adding, yt ye
most adequate Type (allow'd I believe
by all) of a Believers State,
in ye whole Bible, is ye City of Refuge.
We find ye Manslayer was in
no safety, till he were ~~safe~~ within
its Walls; but no sooner did he enter
but his Life was inviolate.
So an Unbeliever is in no safety,
till he is united to Xt, but no sooner
is he ~~united~~ joined to Him, but there
is no Condemnation for to him.
But

[July 1753]

But was there no Gate for ye Manslayer
to go out, as well as come in
at? Was he chaind Neck & Heels
within Side ye Walls? You know he
was not. And Shemei (who for cursing
David was orderd by his Son to remain
in one of these Cities) found to his
Sorrow, yt for setting his Foot ye other
side of ye Wall he brought ye threatened
Punishment upon him. So true also
it is, yt a Man while continuing in
Xt is safe, but if he once steps aside
from Him, he is again in ye Power of
Satan and a Captive of ye Prince of
Darkness.

[July 1753]

July 11, 1753. Of all ye Truths of Xtianity, few are more contestd yn ye Doctrine of ye Remission of Sins, and ye Assurance of Faith Knowledge of it by Faith. If one were to judge from ye Body of Professors, one might imagine, yt these essential Articles were not only renderd obsolete, but yt they had no existence in ye Bible. The very Air & Behaviour of People at ye mentioning of ym, might induce a Bible Xtian to believe himself in China or Japan. What can more expose a Man to ye ridicule & contempt of ye English, than ye acknowledging himself to be either a present Possessor, or an Expectant of ye fulfillment of these promised Blessings

[July 1753]

in his Soul? If any one is so bold
as to make such a Confession, will
he not be Anathematizd as a
Monster; and shunnd by all reasonable
Men, as a walking Infection?

2. And yet sure it is. Nothing
can be plainer, yn yt all Scriptural
Xtianity depends upon ye
Truth of these. Take away these
two main Links, and ye Gospel
Chain drops all to Pieces at once.
Without Remission of Sins, there
is no Love (seeing, we love Him,
because He has first love us.)
And without ye Assurance of Knowledge of it by
Faith, there is no Remission
of Sins, seeing ~~an-before-time~~ it is only he yt hath

[July 1753]

~~they~~ ye witness in himself, whose Sins are forgiven. ~~it can be no~~
motive to us to love Him.

3. It may not therefore, be altogether
lost Labour, if I set down
a few of those Texts, with which
ye Bible abounds, in Proof of
these Points.

1. With regard to Remission
of Sins. For ys is my Blood (as a Sign
thereof) of ye new Testament,
wch is shed for many for ye Remission
of Sins. Observe, ys is
ye End for wch Xt shed his Blood.
John Baptized in ye Wilderness,
and preachd ye Baptism
of Repentance, for ye Remission
of Sins. And thou Child, shalt
be called ye Prophet of ye highest;
for thou shalt go before
ye Face of ye LORD, to prepare

[July 1753]

his Ways: To give Knowledge
of Salvation to His People,
by ye Remission of their Sins.
We see here, yt ye very Office of
ye Baptist was to give knowledge
to ~~GODs People~~ ye Jews, of ye (approaching) Remission
of their Sins. That Repentance
& Remission of Sins shd be preachd
in His name, among all Nations.
Then Peter said unto them, Repent
& be baptised every one of you, for
ye Remission of Sins. To Him give
all ye Prophets Witness, yt through
His Name, whosoever (at any Time)
believeth in Him, shall receive
Remission of Sins. Whom GOD
hath set forth to be a Propitiation
thro' Faith in His Blood, to declare
His Righteousness, for ye Remission
of Sins yt are past. We cannot but

[July 1753]

perceive, in ye two last verses
quoted, yt Remission of Sins is conferrd
on every Child of GOD, and yt
only by Faith.

2. I shall ~~not~~ now set down a few Texts,
yt speak ye same Thing in somewhat
different Language. There is forgiveness
with Thee; yt Thou mayst
be feared. Him hath GOD exalted
with His right Hand, to be a Prince
& a Saviour, for to give Repentance
unto Israel, & forgiveness of Sins.
Mark; this was ye very Design
of Xt's Exaltation. Be it known
unto you therefore, Men & Brethren,
yt through this Man is preachd
unto you forgiveness of Sins. Delivering
thee from ye People & from ye
Gentiles, unto whom I now send
Thee. To turn them from open

[July 1753]

their Eyes & to turn them from Darkness to Light, & from ye Power of Satan unto GOD, yt they may receive forgiveness of Sins, & an Inheritance amg them yt are sanctified, by Faith yt is in me.

This was Paul's Commission; and so it is stih ye Commission at ys Day of every Gospel Minister.

In whom we have Redemption through His Blood, ye forgiveness of Sins.

Here ye Body of Ephesian Believers, as well as St Paul, are said to have forgiveness of Sins. The very same does he assert of ye Body of Colossians, and in ye very same Words. This much then, may suffice to prove, yt all Believers have ye Remission or forgiveness of Sins. I now go on to prove,

2. The Assurance of Knowledge of it by Faith; or ye knowledge consciousness all real Xtians have, of ys Remission or forgiveness.

[July 1753]

O continue thy loving Kindness to ym
yt know Thee. Blessed are is ye People yt
know ye joyful Sound: They shall
walk, O LORD, in ye Light of thy Countenance.
And thou shalt know yt I
ye LORD am thy Saviour & thy Redeemer,
ye mighty one of Jacob. And
I will give them an Heart to know me,
and they shall be my People, & I will
be their GOD. They shall all know
me, from ye least to ye greatest of ym,
saith ye LORD: Now follows ye Token
whereby they shall know Him: For
I will forgive their Iniquity, and I
will remember their Sin no more.
They shall know yt I ye LORD their
GOD am with, & yt they are my
People, saith ye LORD GOD. In yt Day
I will even betroth thee unto me in
faithfulness, & thou shalt know ye LORD.

[July 1753]

And I will say unto them wch were
not a my People, thou art my People
& they shall say: Thou art my GOD.
That ye Knowledge here spoken of, is
an internal Knowledge, ye far greater
part of these Texts put beyond Dispute;
as ye Light of GOD's Countenance,
ye love kindness of ye LORD, & ye
Heart Knowledge of ~~ye LORD~~ Him, &c. can
never be otherwise understood.
But ys will appear, when we come into
ye new Testament, with greater Evidence.

2. And when he pulleth forth his
Sheep, He goeth before them &
the Sheep follow him: For they know
his voice. I am ye good Shepherd,
and know my Sheep, & am known
of mine. Observe, their Knowledge
of Him, is of ye same kind as His

[July 1753]

Knowledge of them, tho² differing in
Degree. Therefore let all ye House of
Israel know assuredly (let ym have
no Doubt of it) yt GOD has made yt
same Jesus, whom ye Crucified, both
LORD & Xt. That ye might know ye
Love of Xt yt passeth Knowledge.
Which Believe & know ye Truth; inwardly
Experience it. Here followeth
ye same Thing, in other Words:
In yt Day thou shalt say:
That ye may
know Him & ye Power of His resurrection.

Here followeth ye same Thing in
other Words. And we desire, yt
every one of you do shew ye same Diligence,
to ye full assurance of
Hope unto ye End.

3. Again; This is Life Eternal,
yt they might know Thee ye only
true GOD, & Jesus Xt, whom Thou
hast sent. These Things have I

[July 1753]

written unto you yt believe on ye
Name of ye Son of GOD; yt ye may know
yt ye have eternal Life. That is, If
yt ye know it more perfectly.
~~upon examination you find ye Marks~~
~~there laid down in yr own Souls yt~~
~~ye may be confirmd & strengthened~~
~~thereby.~~ Let us draw nigh with full
Assurance of Faith. In yt Day thou shalt
know yt I am in ye Father & you in
me & I in you.

1. The more to confirm this I will add
ye Experience of some of ye Children of GOD,
as it is set down in ye Scriptures.
I know yt my Redeemer Liveth, saith
Job, chap. 19. v 25. My LORD & my GOD
saith St Thomas. I know whom I have
Hhave believed, saith Paul, 2. Tim. 1.12. We know
we have passd from Death unto Life;
Saith St John, speaking of ye Believers
to whom he writes. together

[July 1753]

with himself. Again, Hereby we know
yt He abideth in us, by ye Spirit yt He
hath given us. Hereby we know yt we
dwell in Him & He in us, because
He hath given us of His Spirit.
once more, We know yt we are of
GOD. So St Paul speaking of ye
Ephesians saith, In whom we have
Redemption thro' His Blood, ye
forgiveness of Sins. The very same
he saith of ye Colossian Believers,
and in ye very same Words.

2. Surely we need no more to convince
us of ye Truth of these Things, as ye
Oracles of GOD are so clear in these
Points, yt he yt runneth may read
them. ~~The very same~~ But I wd observe
a few Things more, before I conclude.

3. Our Saviour saith of Himself,
The Spirit of ye LORD is upon me

[July 1753]

because He hath anointed me to preach
ye Gospel to ye Poor, He hath sent me to
heal ye broken Hearted, to preach Deliverance
to ye Captives, & recovering
of Sight to ye Blind, to set at Liberty
ym that are bruised. To preach ye
acceptable Year of ye LORD. Agreeable
to ys Commission, He cries, is any Man
athirst, let him come unto me and
drink. Whosoever will, let him take
of ye Water of Life freely. As tho' He
had said, does anyone thirst for
Pardon & Salvation, let him come
unto me & be satisfied. Let him freely
take of ye water yt I shall give him, &
it shall be in him as a Well of Water,
springing up unto eternal life.

4. Again; He yt hungreth and
thristeth after Righteousness

[July 1753]

shall be filled. Hunger & Thirst,
we all know are Appetites yt will be satisfied
with nothing, but ye Things
hungred & thirsted after. And The longer
ye desird Good is delayd, so much
the more are they whetted and
inflamed. Nay, to such a Height
do they sometimes grow, as to deprive
us of all Ease & Comfort till
they are satisfied. It is ye same in
Spiritual Things. Many Times is ye Soul
so inflamed with fervent Longings
and ardent Breathings after GOD,
and his Righteousness, yt Nothing
beside can satisfy it. It cries “give
me Xt or else I die.” But, He yt thus
hungreth & thirsteth shall be filled.

Now can we apprehend yt wn
these Appetites are satisfied,

[July 1753]

the Man can be insensible of ys
Change? Can his Hunger & Thirst be
taken away, & he not know it? It
is utterly contrary to common Sense
as well as to our LORDs words. He
yt cometh unto Me, shall never Hunger;
& he yt believeth on Me shall
never Thirst. That is, he shall find
a continual supply.

5. ~~Once more.~~ Again: Come unto Me, all ye
yt Labour & are heavy laden, & I
will give you rest. We cannot but
observe here 1st. yt none are invited
to Xt but they yt ~~very~~ labour & are heavy laden. 2. The
Promise annext, I will give you rest.

A Man yt is labouring under ye Guilt
of Sin will find it a Burden not easy
to be borne. He will be glad at any

[July 1753]

rate to have it removed. So Saith
Solomon, ye Spirit of a Man may
sustain his (bodily) Infirmities; but
a wounded Spirit, who can bear?
It is in ys Sense our LORD promises
rest. Rest to ye sinsick Souls.
The removal of all their Guilt,
ye taking away all their Misery.
Cannot a Soul know ye Change
also? Can ye Guilt of his Sins be taken
away, & ye Power of ym destroyd, &
he insensible of it? We may as
well conceit a Man cannot see ye
Sun, or feel hot burning Pincers
in his Flesh.

6. Once more. Blessed are they yt
mourn, for they shall be comforted.
That mourn for ye Kingdom of
GOD. That grieve because Xt is not

[July 1753]

reveald in them. That Sigh for an
absent GOD: That ys is ye Sense of ye
Text is plain; seeing, those yt mourn
on a Worldly account, GOD declares,
shall lie down in Sorrow. Those yt
so mourn for GOD, shall be comforted.
GOD shall appoint them Beauty
for Ashes, & ye Spirit of Joy for ye
Spirit of Heaviness. The Comforter
shall come; and in yt Day you
shall know yt Xt is in ye Father, and
you in Him, & He in you. And in
yt Day thou shalt say, O LORD I will
Praise Thee: Tho' Thou wast angry
with me, thine anger is turned away,
& Thou comfortest me. Behold GOD is
my Salvation. I will Trust, & not be
afraid; for ye LORD Jehovah is my
Strength & my Song. He also is become
my Salvation.

[July 1753]

7. I Hope, from wt has been said, it abundantly appears, yt ye Children of GOD do know their Acceptance of Him; yt they feel their Sins blotted out, ye Spirit of GOD bearing Witness with their Spirits, yt they are the Children of GOD. The Reason why so many deny ye Gift of GOD is, because they never felt it. And ye Reason why they never received it is, they never knew their want of it. They never felt themselves Lost. They never were convinced of Sin. And it is no Marvel, they never were convinced of Righteousness. As Xt came not to call ye Righteous, but Sinners to Repentance. He was not sent, but to ye lost sheep.

8. Before I conclude, I wd just speak of ye Degrees of Faith, as

[July 1753]

many know not wt we mean by Assurance.

1. The least Measure of saving Faith implies a⁴⁸ confidence of ye Love of Xt. He hath lov'd me, & given Himself for me, Gal. 2:20.

This is clear & evident wⁿ first ~~given~~ bestowed; when Xt first speaks to ye Heart: But afterwards, often dimm'd, & partly obscured with Doubts & Fears. This is properly ye Faith of a Babe in Xt.

2. The full assurance of Faith implies such a⁴⁹ settled confidence of my being reconciled to GOD, as excludes all Doubt & Fear. This is properly ye Faith of a Young Man, and a Father in Xt. With ys Difference, yt a Father in Xt has

3. The full Assurance of Hope. A Divine certainty, yt he shall endure

⁴⁸There is some deleted text here that is unreadable.

⁴⁹There is some deleted text here that is unreadable.

[July–Aug. 1753]

to ye End. Thus you see, altho’
we divide Faith into ye Assurance, &
ye full Assurance; yet it is one & ye
same Thing. Whereas ye Dissenters,
by their unscriptural Distinction of
“Faith of adherence, & Faith of assurance,”
evidently make two.
Not only contradicting ye Apostle,
who declares, there is one
Faith in one LORD: but also,
laying a Stumbling Block in
ye way of Salvation, by persuading
Men to rest in a Trust destitute
of Remission of Sins.

Tuesday, Augt.28.1753. I wrote ye
following Paragraphs for Mr W[esley]’s
Inspection.

A certain learned Gentleman,

[August 1753]

at his Entrance upon his Ontology, hath these Words: “Material Being or Existence may be distinguishd into 1st. Incorporeal or Spiritual. 2. Corporeal. The Distinction of Beings into Material & Immaterial, I take to be absurd & inartificial; because all Being must be of Realities, & not Non-Entities; & Realities being positive Things, must consist of matter Something; & yt is universally ye same in ye Essence of all real Existences, & is wt we call Substances or Matter.”⁵⁰ ~~therefore wholly material.~~²²

I cannot agree with ys Gentleman in this. I apprehend, ye Absurdity lies his Definition, & not in yt he excepts to. 1st. How does ~~not~~ it follow, yt altho’ Being must be of Realities & not Non-Entities, & those must be positive Things; yt therefore yt Something

⁵⁰Benjamin Martin (1705–82), *Bibliotheca Technologica; or, a Philological Library of Literary Arts and Sciences* (London: Noon, 1737), 230.

[August 1753]

must be ye same in ye Essence of all real Existences? ~~Or supposing it must,~~
must ye Essence of all real Existence
be one & ye same? 2. How does it follow,
yt all Being must be Matter,
because it must be real? Are there
no Realities but what are material?

In ye same material Strain this Gentleman
defines Spirit, to be a Substance,
of a most subtle & insensible Texture
& form, possessd of all ye Faculties
& Power of Mind & Intellect. And
according to Him, Body is a gross
Substance, obvious & perceptible by
ye Animal Senses, & indifferent to
ye Power of thinking.

“The principal Differences consist
in yt 1st. The Substance of Spirits

[August 1753]

is fine & subtle; but yt of Bodies is of gross Texture. 2. The Form of Spirits is insensible to us. 3. All Spirits are cogitative. 4. Spirits are not ye Subjects of human Knowledge or Converse.”⁵¹

Agreeably to these learnd Distinctions, we are to regulate our Idea of GOD! Accordingly we are told, yt “GOD is infinitely ye most perfect of all Spirits.” That is, He is a Substance of ye most perfect, subtle & insensible Texture & Form of all material Existences.

But I want to know 1st. How ys material GOD came first into Existence; 2. how ye more gross Substance called ye Body, was produced & by whom? And here, lest we shoud contradict what is grantd elsewhere, viz. and

⁵¹Martin, *Bibliotheca Technologica*, 231–32.

[August 1753]

suppose Matter its own Producer,
we are to meditate deeply on this
Query, whether ~~in~~ ys Matter
be not necessarily eternal & uncreate?

Now, supposing ys true of ye most
subtle & insensible Substance, yet
must we suppose yt ye more gross,
(whose Power & Properties are undoubtedly
Different) was eternal &
uncreate too? Strange indeed!

This seems as absurd to me, as
~~absurd~~ as ye mere "Ens Rationis
or Phoenix yt Ontologists as ~~you~~ he
calls it, viz. ye Existence of Souls!"⁵²

II We are not only to suppose yt
Matter was uncreate & eternal,
but also yt it is "capable of Motion
& of ye Power of thinking from ye Divine
Being."⁵³

And as a Proof of it, it is demanded

⁵²Martin, *Bibliotheca Technologica*, 234.

⁵³Ibid.

[August 1753]

demanded, whether “Moses’s Rod
was not mere Matter one Moment,
& a cogitative Animal ye next?”⁵⁴ Whether
Moses’s Serpent differd from all
other Serpents, I know not; but I can
scarce swallow, yt all other Serpents
are cogitative Animals. ~~too~~. It is
Pity, ys Gentleman had not given
us a Specimen of his ys Serpents Thoughts, yt we
might determine whether they were
rational or not!

Again; “Is not Dust, mere matter!
And did not GOD convert it to Animals
by endowing it with Life &
Thought?”⁵⁵ No wonder Serpents are
endowd with Cogitation, wn even
Lice are not destitute of it. I marvel
they have not ye Gift of Speech
too since Balaam’s Ass spoke!
This one Defect, doubtless, hinders

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Ibid.

[August 1753]

ys Gentleman from making them
expert Logicians & learnd Ontologists!

Not to ramble further, I must remark
concerning ye second Head,
yt I should have no Objection to
Matter's being capable of motion,
was it to be produced by any other
than a material GOD. But I own, ys
stagger me greatly! I cannot yet
perceive, how Matter can influence
Matter; or ye most subtle Substance
agitate ye more gross.

I can account for Motion & Rest
upon his Scheme, but only one way (nor ever shall, till
~~the Gentleman~~ he tells me ye Difference
between mere Matter & ye more subtle
Substance, &c. & their different
Powers & Properties) viz. yt they
were equally uncreate with ~~ye~~ Matter itself!

[August 1753]

I think upon ye whole, if we grant
first. That ye more subtle, & also ye more
gross Substance of Matter, were
equally uncreate & eternal; 2d. That
their Motion or Rest, were equally
uncreate & eternal too; (wch to me,
seems ye only way of reconciling
this Scheme with common Sense)
it will go near to follow, yt ye whole
work of Creation was a mere Figment
of Moses, a Sisyphus yt
had no Existence but in his
Brain: For as to one particle of Matter (or several
united) ~~Particles of Matter united~~.
forming others into ye Shape of
Trees, Beasts, Birds, &c. I look
upon it “as more chimerical, yn ye
Tales of ye Fairies!

[October 1753]

Oct 5. 1753. Whether ~~Mankind~~ Believers can ever perfectly fulfill ye Moral Law is a Point greatly disputed. Few, but are willing ~~to~~ rather to sit down short, ~~of it~~, yn to agonize to attain what is by most deemed ~~to~~ impracticable. They have such an extended view of ye Law, even with regard to Xtians, ~~yt~~ as utterly damps ~~any one~~ many in their Endeavours after it. They seem to take it for granted, yt ye Law requires ye same Degree of Perfection from Men now, as it did of Adam in a State of Innocence. And accordingly, a Friend of mine, insists upon it, “yt a Believer tho’ continually exerting all ye Grace GOD hath

[October 1753]

bestowd upon him, wholly abstain[in]g
from every Thing GOD hath forbidden
and doing every Thing (so far as his
Knowledge reaches, and his measure
of Grace enables to) yt GOD hath
commanded; is never ye less condemned
by ye Law." I cannot agree to ys. Nor
do I understand imputed Righteousness
only as a Scene to secure me
from ye Law. A Long white Robe, it
seems, to cover o'er
The Load of Guilt, contractd ~~long~~ just before!

2. In order to justify my present
sentiments, and ~~to over turn those~~
~~of my adversary~~, I will briefly observe,
wt ye Law required of Adam
and then offer my Reasons why,
I think, ye Law does not require

[October 1753]

the same of Believers. But before
I proceed I must beg leave to lay
down a few Postulata.

1. That Adam himself (in ye utmost
extent our Adversaries understand
it) was not capable of fulfilling
ye Law: As he was lower yn ye Angels,
and yet yt was a Law even
to ym. Again, because he was in
a State not absolutely perfect, but
in one admitting of Improvement;
and yet had he improvd to ye utmost,
he had not exceeded wt ye Law
(or Will of GOD) required.

2. That ye Law, strictly speaking,
requird no more of Adam, for
ye present, yn ye Power GOD had
given him, enabled him to do.
For notwithstanding there was is

[October 1753]

no exceeding ye Purity of ye Law, ~~wth~~
considerd ~~with regard to GOD, yet wth~~ as ye Will of GOD, yet
with
regard to Man, wd not require more
of him yn he was able to perform.

I. Then, ye Law required perfect
and uninterrupted Obedience.
An Obedience proportiond to his Mans
growing Capacity. Its Tenor was,
This do and thou shalt Live.
Perfectly obey all my Commandments,
and walk in ye same to ye
End of thy Trial. Turn not to ye
right Hand, nor to ye left. Increase
daily in ye Knowledge and Love of
thy Benefactor, till He shall
translate thee to His more immediate
Presence to dwell wth Him
forever.

[October 1753]

II. I now come to assign ye Reasons
why I think Believers are not
called to ye same Degree of obedience.

1. Their ability is not ye same.
Adam was altogether Sinless &
undefiled, consequently, his faculties
~~was~~ were no Ways enervated
or weakened. But it is different
wth Believers; for altho' all Guilt
is washed away from them, yet
ye weakness yt former Sins occasioned
is not wholly taken away. ~~nor are~~

2. Adam was free from inward
Corruption. So are not Believers;
for altho' they sin not, yet a
Body of Corruption still remains
within them.

[October 1753]

3. Adam was not subject to Diseases.
But Believers often find ye
corruptible weighing down ye Incorruptible
Part.

4. Paradise afforded no Lets
or Hindrances to Adam; but
ys World affords scarce any Thing
else to Believers.

III. For these and many more
Reasons, yt may be assigned, I think
ye Law does not require ye same
Obedience from Believers, yt it
did from Adam in a State of Innocence.
But perhaps you will
say, is not ys bringing ye Law
down to Mens Capacities? And

[October 1753]

will it not follow yt Unbelievers
may at ys rate keep ye Law?

I answer to ye First, ye Law does
not change its Nature, tho' it requires
no more of Believers yn
they are able to perform. Any more
yn it changed its Nature, wn it required
of Adam a less Degree of
Perfection, yn of ye Seraphim.

To ye Second, I say, yt though
ye Law makes an Abatement of
Degrees, yet it requires many
Things an Unbeliever never can
perform. It absolutely requires
Love and Holiness &c. altho not
ye same Degree in Men as Angels,
nor perhaps, in some Believers
as in others.

[October 1753]

If it is otherwise, I see not how different
Rewards can be conferred
in an after State, unless we suppose,
yt some Men exceed ye Requirements
of ye Law, and others not!

But here comes another Objection.
Does not ys destroy Xts Righteousness
& knock Free-Grace on ye Head?
I see not yt it does: Since every Degree
of Ability to fulfill ye Law
springs from Free-Grace, and is ye
purchase of ye Blood of Xt.

Neither does it make ye continued
Virtue of Xts Death less
necessary; since every Deviation
needs ye same Atonement.

Lastly, ye Intercession of Xt, is also,
equally necessary; as Believers

[October 1753]

need ye same Power to preserve ym
according to my Explanation of
ye Law, as upon yours.

Upon ye whole, if my Opinion
throws out any Thing, it is rigid
Calvinism, and Rank Antinomianism,
and they are by far better
lost yn kept.

IV. As to ye Law, I believe it
requires of Believers no more
yn to Love ye LORD their GOD
with all their Heart, Soul,
Mind, & Strength; i.e. to ye utmost Extent
of their present Power: And their
neighbours as ymselves. Whether
Men ye generality of Believers do ys, is another
Question: But whether thy do
or not, so much ye Law requires,
and I think no more.

[October 1753]

Oct. 8, 1753. "Faith, say some, necessarily
brings forth good works."

What do you mean? That it inevitably
or unavoidably brings ym forth?

Such, as a Learned Author observes,
is ye meaning of ye Latin word Necessarius.

If so, I absolutely deny it.

Many Times have I felt a Measure
of Faith in Xt, and at yt Moment knew
knew yt Xt loved me and gave Himself
for me. I also felt ye Love of GOD shed
abroad in my Heart. And with ys, a
Conviction yt I ought immediately to
do such or such a Thing. Notwithstanding
this Faith and this Love, my own
will has been so strong, yt I have resisted,
and left undone ye Thing yt
I ought to have done. Now yn, why

[October 1753]

did not Faith unavoidably bring
forth ys good Work? Because, say
you, “by your resisting you weakened
Faith,” and made it effete and Languid.
So, yt unavoidable Producer of good
Works, cd not withstand a little Resistance!
This “Resemblancer of
Fire” is damped by a little of ye humid
Element. Supposing, I go on to resist,
wt is ye Consequence? “You destroy yr
Faith.” Do I so? Will you stand to ys?
Does such a continued Resistance
destroy Faith? Why then shd you
Scuple a Man’s being a Child of
~~ye Devil~~ GOD to Day & a Child of ye
Devil ye next? Are we Children of
GOD any longer yn while we believe?
Or must ys Resistance be like ye Powder

[October 1753]

Powder-Plot,⁵⁶ years in hatching? I think, I may resist many Times in an Hour, & consequently, by ys continued Resistance, destroy my Faith, and thereby become a Child of ye Devil. I apprehend ys was a Consequence you did not fore-see: And doubtless you have here over-leaped yr Bounds!

1. The same Person objected likewise, to my saying, yt all yt committed practised Sin were Children of ye Devil. And to disprove it said “yt St John wrote to Xtians much farther Advanced in Grace yn either he or I was.” Let us consider St Johns words wth ye Context.

2. In ye 12th and 13th verses of ye 2^d Chapter

⁵⁶An attempt by a group of Catholics to kill King James I in 1605.

[October 1753]

are these words, I write unto you,
little Children, because yr Sins are
forgiven you. I write unto you,
young Men, because you have over
come ye Wicked One. I write unto
you, Fathers, because you have
known Him yt is from ye beginning.
You see here, St John describes
ye three Stages of a Xtian. The
weakest in Grace he stiles Children,
ye more grown, Young Men,
and ye highest in Grace, Fathers.
And so far is he from speaking
only to & of fathers in Xt, in wt
he asserts concerning committing ye practizing
or not committing practicing Sin; yt it
may be doubted, whether he speaks
to or of ym at all.

[October 1753]

3. In ye 2^d Verse are these Words, My little Children, these Things write I unto you, yt you Sin not, or yt you may not Sin. So, Chap. 3. v 7. Little Children, let no Man deceive you; he yt doth practiseth Righteousness, is Righteous, even as He (Xt) is Righteous.
v. 8. He yt committeth practiseth Sin, is of ye Devil; For ys purpose ye Son of GOD was manifested, yt He might destroy, or abolish, ye Works of ye Devil. Whosoever is born of GOD, doth not commit practise Sin; for His seed remaineth in him: And he cannot Sin, because he is born of GOD. In this ye Children of GOD are manifest, and ye Children of ye Devil.

4. And lest any Sinner against his own Soul shd come in wth ye subterfuge

[October 1753]

subterfuge “of ~~living in~~ practising gross Sin
or ~~habitual wickedness,~~” &c. ye
Apostle fixes his own meaning,
and tells you in plain Terms, wt
he means by Sin. Verse ye 4. Whosoever
(without any Restriction)
committeth practiseth Sin, transgresseth also
ye Law: For Sin is ye Transgression
of ye Law. You see here, every Transgression
of ye Law, is said to be Sin.
He goes on, v 5. And ye know yt
he was manifestd to take away
(not to cover) our Sins; and in
him was no Sin. What is ye Consequence
he draws from ys?

Whosoever Everyone (v 6.) abideth abiding in Him
sinneth not: Whosoever sinneth Everyone sinning
doth hath not seen Him, neither known Him.
~~So a learned Author observes~~

[October 1753]

~~observes, it ought to be rendered,
otherwise it is not true, nor Nothing
to ye Apostles purpose. But be ys
as it may, I have Proof enough with
out it. Again, Chap. 5. v. 17. ye Apostle
tells you wt he means by Sin;
All unrighteousness is Sin. (of every
kind.) And ye Conclusion is,
That Whosoever is born of GOD,
~~doth~~ sinneth not; ~~commit Sin,~~ but he yt is
begotten of GOD, keepeth himself,
and yt Wicked One toucheth him not.~~

5. What Loop-Hole can you find
to creep out at now? Cannot you
say, turning ye Tables, yt ye Term
little Children means ye highest
in Grace, and Fathers, ye lowest?

[October 1753]

For Fear lest you shd be quite Nonplussed,
I will venture to put an
Objection in yr Mouth, and ye
only plausible One yt I know of.
Viz. “Does not ye Apostle use ye
Term little Children, either as
an endearing Epithet in common,
without any Design of distinguishing
their different States by it;
or as becoming him, who had begotten
them to Xt?”

6. Whether He was their Spiritual
Father, I know not; but he yt as
it will, I apprehend, neither
Reason will hold good in ye present
Case. That he professedly
contradistinguishes little Children,
from young Men and Fathers

[October 1753]

Fathers in ye 2^d Chapter is undeniable.
And yt he shoud afterwards
conclude them all under yt Appellation,
without taking any Notice
of it, is altogether unlikely.
Whether we may suppose ye Apostles
were Logicians, I know not;
but they must have been errant Sophists
to deal in Equivocal Terms,
wthout defining ym. Those yt can
swallow ys, have my free Liberty!

7. Lest some may not think St
John a sufficient Judge, I will
add a Word or two to his Testimony.
~~and conclude~~. St Paul
writing to ye Romans says, Chap. 6.

[October 1753]

v. 2. How shall we yt are dead to Sin
Live any longer therein? Observe, dead to Sin.
Could they yn ~~commit~~ practise it?
V. 6. Knowing yt our old Man (the
carnal Nature) is crucified wth Him,
yt ye Body of Sin might be destroyed,
yt henceforth we should not serve Sin.
Let not Sin therefore reign in
ye Mortal Body, &c. For Sin shall
not have dominion over you, for
you are not under ye Law, but
under Grace. Now who knows
not, that Sin does reign, and has
Dominion over a ye Man practicing it? ~~every~~
~~Time he doth commit it?~~

8. ye same Privilege of Believers,
St Peter asserts, 1. Epist
4 Chapt. & ye 1st v. He yt hath suffered

[October 1753]

suffered in ye Flesh, hath ceasd from
Sin. Ceased from it, How? Why, ceased
~~committing~~ from practising it. For in no other Sense
can he be understood. But once
for all. I will add our LORDs Testimony
concerning it; He yt ~~committeth~~ practiseth
Sin is ye ~~Servant~~ Slave of Sin.
And we know, ye ~~Servant~~ Slave abideth
not in ye House forever. And yt
ye Wages of Sin is Death. From
ye whole yn it appears, yt every one
yt transgresseth transgressing ye Law, sinneth:
yt he yt ~~committeth~~ practiseth Sin is ye ~~Servant~~ Slave
of Sin; yt He yt ~~committeth~~ practiseth
Sin is of ye Devil: and lastly,
yt ye Wages (or reward of every
one yt dieth in) Sin, is Death

[October 1753]

eternal. I here set my Foot; and challenge all ye Sin contenders for in ye Kingdom, to disprove it.

9. Nothing is plainer yn yt ye one Essential, absolutely necessary Qualification for Heaven, is Holiness. Without holiness, no Man shall see ye LORD. And equally plain is it, yt Faith is ye Essential, absolutely Necessary Means of attaining it, He yt Believet not shall be damned. Equally absurd therefore is it, for a Man either to conceit himself in ye Favour of GOD, without Faith, or yt he has Faith, if he has not Holiness. These hath GOD joined

[October 1753]

joined together, and let no man put
ym assunder.

10. But shd a Man yt once had Faith
in our LORD Jesus Xt, and a measure
of yt Holiness wch is its inseparable
Companion, still conceit he has
Faith, notwithstanding he finds himself
utterly destitute of yt Holiness?

Wd not ys be as absurd, as for a Man
now in a deep Consumption, to conceit
yt Nothing ailed him, because
he was once in perfect Health?
Might not his weakness of Body,
his pale and languid Looks, if he
was not senseless, teach him ye
contrary? So ye Want of yt Power
over Sin, yt always accompanies
true Faith, and stays while yt stays,

[October 1753]

might convince any Man yt is
not twice dead, of his want of yt
Grace without wch he cannot be
saved. For though I dare not
say, yt Faith necessarily (inevitably
or unavoidably) brings
forth good Works, yet I will say
yt where Holiness is not, Faith
is not. Seeing, tho' it does not
irresistibly compel me to do good,
yet it always brings a Power
wth it, whereby I may do good.
And no sooner do we by Sinning destroy
yt power, than we destroy Faith
also.

[April 1754]

April 1754

Many Times have I had a Desire
of writing on a particular Point,
but ye great Difficulty of speaking Scripturally,
or indeed intelligibly, has
prevented me. I mean, On The abstruse
Attribute of Foreknowledge.

2. That GOD, ye selfsubsisting omniscient,
omnipresent Author of all
Things, foresees whatsoever will ~~come~~
happen in future Ages, as well as
wt has already been perpetrated;
is a Truth no wise Man will contest.
But ye Point to be considerd is, whether
ys Foreseeing necessitates ye
Facts.

3. For my Part, I acknowledge, ye
Conclusion seems to me, to have nothing
to do with ye Premises. There
is no necessary Dependence subsistd

[April 1754]

between ym. This will easily appear,
by considering Foreknowledge in another
Respect. For Example. An
Astronomer foresees, at such a certain
Time, there will be an Eclipse of ye
Sun. In wch one Third Part ~~will~~ of his
Light will be totally obscurd from
us. Now ys Foreseeing, all Men will
grant, does not in ye least necessitate
ye Thing foreseen.

4. But it may perhaps be objected,
We do not speak of a Foreknowledge,
yt may be arrived at by ye
Help of mathematical Figures
& Deductions, necessitating ye
Thing Foreknown.

Suppose you do not. An intuitive
Power of Foreseeing or Foreknowing
no more necessitates ye Thing Foreseen

[April 1754]

Foreseen or Foreknown, yn such a
Knowledge or Sight attained by ye
Help of Astronomical Calculations. For Instance.
A Surgeon may intuitively foresee yt a Man
wth a mortification in his Leg will
not live over ye Night (unless cured
by miracle). Yet ys Fore-sight does
not even hasten his ye Mans Death.

5. Again; some may say, That Foreknowledge
in Man, however attained,
is essentially different from Foreknowledge
in GOD. And yt we can
not conclude, yt because one does
not produce necessarily ye Thing
Foreseen, ye other does not; wthout
being guilty of ye very Thing we
charge ym wth, viz. of drawing wrong
Conclusions from right Premisses.

[April 1754]

This will be seen by wt follows.
To take their Argument.
Whatsoever GOD foresees he necessitates.
But he foresees all Manner of Wickedness:
Ys He necessitates all Manner of Wickedness.
If you allow ys, & can prove it from
Scripture, I will yn grant, yt there
is an Essential Difference between
GOD's foreseeing a Thing,
and Mans foreseeing it: But
if you deny yt GOD is ye primary
Efficient Cause of Evil; I defy you to
prove, yt ye Knowledge in One
necessitates ye Thing, while ye
other does not.

6. However 'tis affirmed, That "God
foresees every Soul yt will be
saved, & yt these are they yt in
Scripture are Termed Elect."

[April 1754]

I grant, they are so Termed; yet, not as exclusive of Others who once were equally Elect wth themselves, tho' now fallen again into ye Condemnation of ye Devil. Neither is called Elect from a captious unconditional Decree of Preference, but as foreseeing their submitting to ye Gospel Conditions of Salvation, while others rejected them.

So likewise, "He foresees Every Soul yt will be lost, & these in Scripture are stiled Reprobates."

True. But they are not rejected because of a Diabolical "Purpose of Reprobation," but for their not accepting (or not continuing to accept

[April 1754]

accept) ye Gospel Terms,
or Method of Deliverance.

7. The last Objection is “Seeing
GOD foresaw ye Devils wou’d
fall, & many Souls be damned,”
why did He make them, if not
to shew His Sovereignty?”

I answer, That They might partake
of His Holiness, & as an essential
Consequence, of His
Happiness. Their abuse of
GOD’s gracious Intention
towards ym, justifies their Condemnation
& leaves no Room
for ye Imputation of Severity
to ye their Creator of ym. GOD being Essentially
Holy, can take no Delight
in any Thing, but so far as it

[April 1754]

it participates of His Nature.
Yet, after He has formed Beings
in His own Likeness, some of His
Essential Attributes stand in
direct Opposition against His
those very Creatures wⁿ divested
of His Image. But all are not
lost. “There are who Faith prefer,
tho’ few, & Piety to GOD.”⁵⁷
Now these undoubtedly answer
ye End of their Creation, & bring
Glory to their Maker. But if
Adam, to speak only of Mankind, had never been created, these
cd never have sprang from his
Loins, & consequently, cd never
have partook of ye Happiness
wch they will now enjoy to all Eternity.

⁵⁷Milton, *Paradise Lost*, vi.143–44.

[April 1754]

That GOD cd have supplid ~~their~~ his
Place wth others, I grant; or preserved
~~ym~~ him from falling by irresistible
Power; but whether
ys latter cd have been effected consistent
wth Justice, may be difficult
to determine: I am
sure, it cd not without destroying
~~their~~ Man's essential Property, a
Liberty to chuse ye Evil & renounce
ye Good.

8. Upon ye Whole, if we cannot
altogether comprehend
why GOD does ys, or does not
yt; yet this is no Reason
why we shd suppose Him to
act Tyrannically. To have

[April 1754]

have formed Creatures, merely
to destroy yem. Nor can we
~~make~~ form such a Supposition,
without making ye Almighty
ye cause of all Sin, & all ye Evil
yt ever ~~were~~ was in ye World. Wt,
shall not ye Judge of all ye
Earth do right? Assuredly He
will, maugre all ye Hatred of
Devils & Blasphemy of ye
Multitude.

9. I apprehened ye Difficulty
of assenting to all ys, lies in our
not understanding considering ye Attributes
of ye Almighty, and ye Essential

[April 1754]

Qualifications necessary to ye participating
of His Favour Heaven.

10. 1st. The Attributes of ye Almighty.
Nothing has been more
common yn to suppose, yt one of these
must may swallow up ye other.
That Justice must may supersede
Mercy. Or Mercy destroy Justice. Whereas, in Truth, they
are equally poised. All His
Attributes harmonize together,
nor is it possible, for either
to exceed.

11. 2nd. The Qualifications absolutely
necessary to ye partaking
of His Favour Heaven. Many have imagined
yt a Decree of ye Almighty,
in favour of such some Individuals,

[April 1754]

has cancelled all Qualifications
on Man's part, or yt all necessary
Requirements will irresistible follow
such a Determination Decree. To which
I answer;

1st. To suppose, That such a Decree
has cancelled all Qualifications
on Mans Part, is to
suppose, That GOD's Nature is changed.
Else how can Holiness unite
wth Unholiness?

2. To suppose, That all necessary
Qualifications irresistably
follow such a Determination, is
to suppose, He GOD contradicts Himself.
Since He declared long ago
by Moses. I have ys Day set before
you Life & Death: yt chuse
Life yt you may live. And by our

[April 1754]

LORD, Ye will not come unto me yt
ye may have Life. Besides, How will
you reconcile it to Justice, To drag
Men to Heaven whether they will
or no? Or so to over power them wth
Goodness, as to leave them no
choice remaining?

12. At length, perhaps, it may
be demanded, wt yn are ye Qualifications
absolutely necessary
to entitle any one to ye Favour of God
ye participating of Heaven?

One Qualification only, namely, Holiness.
That Men may partake of, or
arrive to, this, there is required,
1st. A willingness to be saved;
If ye be willing & Obedient, ye
shall eat of ye good of ye Land, a
Type of Heaven.

[April 1754]

2. A Consciousness of our Want
of GODs Mercy; Except ye repent,
ye shall all likewise perish.

3. A Knowledge of our Acceptance
wth GOD; Know ye not, yt Xt Jesus
is in you except ye be Reprobates.

4. Perseverance in well doing; He
yt endureth to ye End, ye same shall
be saved.

13. In Fine: I Assert these Things:

1. That GOD cannot give Heaven,
to any unholy Being.

2. That fallen Man cannot attain
Holiness, but thro' a Mediator.

3. That Xt is ye only mediator between GOD & Man.

4. That His merits will avail

[April 1754]

for none but Believers.

5. That no one does Believe, yt
has not Power over inward & outward
Sin.

6. That no one ever did believe,
yt did not first repent.

Q. 1. That Men may in some
measure repent & yet never believe.

2. That a Believer now may lose
his Faith, & so become an Unbeliever
& perish.

[May 1754]

Ray Mills May 24.1754

It is a common Saying. That it is exceeding difficult to reconcile some Mens Nostrums wth ye Bible: I add, or their different Positions one with another. That few understand ye Scriptures, is nothing marvelous, as ye same Spirit yt dictated them is required to ye right understanding ym; but yt Men of Sense, in some respects, shd vehemently maintain contrary Propositions in one & ye same Page is truly surprising. Yet ye frequency of it has well nigh destroyed ye wonder, and made all Observations of it altogether needless. I scarce read one Book in ten, wherein ye writer does not advance Things as reconcilable as Reprobation and infinite Justice; and as analogous as Snow & Tar Water. And what is more strange,

[May 1754]

they wonder any one can be so blind
as not to see their Appositeness!

2. An instance of this I found in
Mr Fawcets Sermons, & in his “critical
Explanation of ye 9th of ye
Romans.”⁵⁸ In his Introduction to ye latter he
says, “The Apostles grand Design
throughout ye whole is, to explain
& establish ye Xtian Doctrine of
Justification, or ye Righteousness
of GOD, wch is of by Faith of Jesus
Xt unto all, & upon all yem yt believe.
It was by ys Method, Abraham
was justified, & not by keeping
ye Law of Circumcision.”⁵⁹ And
wt wonder? Since ye Law of Circumcision
was not instituted till several
years after. Before I pass
further, I must observe, yt Saint Paul

⁵⁸J. Fawcett, *Sermons* (London: John Noon, 1749); J. Fawcett, *A Critical Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, as Far as is Supposed to Related to the Doctrine of Predestination* (London: J. Noon, 1752).

⁵⁹Fawcett, *Exposition*, 1–2.

[May 1754]

Paul, by ye Law, does not mean ceremonial,
but ye moral; as is plain in
by ye 19th verse of ye 3^d Chapter; What
Things ye Lay saith, it saith to them
yt are under ye Law: That every Mouth
may be stopped, & all ye World may
become guilty before GOD. Therefore
by ye Deeds of ye Law, shall no
Flesh be justified in his Sight:
For by ye Law is ye Knowledge of
Sin. Now all ye World were not under
ye ceremonial Law; consequently,
ye non Observance of it cd not
make them guilty before GOD.
That it is not ye ceremonial Law he meant,
appears also from his Conclusion,
yt by it is (only) ye Knowledge
of Sin; since it is ye moral only
& not ye ceremonial yt
and by ye portion
of his in ye 31. v, Do we then
make void ye Law thro' Faith? GOD

[May 1754]

forbid: Yea, we establish ye Law.
Since it is It being evident ye Ceremonial
Law is not established, but clearly
overthrown by Faith.

3. ~~He goes on~~ To return. In ye 22^d Page, he says, “For
ye are all ye Children of GOD,
says ye Apostle, by Faith in Xt
Jesus. And if ye be Xt’s (by Faith)
yn are ye Abraham’s Seed, & Heirs
according to ye Promise.”⁶⁰ Yet in ye
30th he adds, “Not yt human Endeavours,
wn rightly & properly
managed, will nothing avail to
our Justification; but Justification
is not is not by ye Works of ye Law
therefore, must be sought for on
ye Terms of Mercy.”⁶¹ This is mere
Gibberish! Justification is not
by ye Works of ye Law, but is by
human Endeavours! Or human

⁶⁰Fawcett, *Exposition*, 22.

⁶¹Ibid., 30.

[May 1754]

Endeavours is no part of ye
Law, but of ye Terms of Mercy!

4. I suppose, you mean, Justification
is not by ye Works of ye ceremonial
Law, but by human Endeavours
under ye Gospel. ~~But must not~~
~~men be accepted,~~ before we have
already seen, ye Apostle does not
mean by ye Works of ye Law, ye Works
of ye Ceremonial, but of ye Moral. And
human Endeavours are as much
works of ye Law under ye Xtian,
as under ye Jewish Dispensation.

5. However, let us observe yr
Proof of it. This is, ye Apostle's
Exhortation to ye Corinthians,
So run yt ye may obtain. That
ye may obtain wt? Not Justification,

[May 1754]

or, "acceptance" wth GOD; this they
had found long before, since he
calls them, sanctified in Xt Jesus,
& again, of GOD are ye in
Xt Jesus; but yt ye may obtain ye Prize; viz, ye incorruptible
Crown mentioned v. 25. So ~~much for yr~~ Proof of little
does ys prove yt Justification ~~being~~ is
by human Endeavours! ~~Upon~~
~~ye rohd~~ It is mere stuff, for any
one to hit out ye Doctrine of Justification
by Works before Xt came,
& yet to allow it afterwards. The
way for fallen Man to regain ye
Favour & Image of GOD, must
be one & ye same from ye beginning.
And if it is by Works under
ye Gospel, ~~yn all before Xt came~~
I mean here by Works since Xt came
in ye Flesh, yn all before Xt came are
utterly perished! So wisely do

[May 1754]

some Men speak of ye Things yt ye know not. On ye contrary, If Abraham ws Justified wthout ye Works of ye Gospel anymore yn those ye Law (as he certainly was) so are Believers; since to us also; Faith shall be imputed for Righteousness, if we believe on him yt raised up Jesus our LORD from ye Dead.

6. But ~~some one~~ perhaps you may say, That Abraham wn Justified, ws not under ye Law, but under ye Gospel. I grant it. Yet was he not Justified by Works, but by Faith. This therefore makes against you & not for you.; since all under one Dispensation, must be justified one & ye same way. Let it be observed here, yt ye Gospel spoken of, is different from ye same

[May 1754]

Word in ye ~~same~~ former Paragraph; The one means, ye Dispensation supposed by some Men to have been instituted wⁿ Xt came in ye Flesh; ye other, yt Dispensation all Men have been under since ye Promise made to Adam, The Seed of ye Woman shall bruise ye serpent's Head.

7. That ye Moral part of Law is ~~in full~~ incorporated ~~Force under~~ into ye Gospel Covenant, is so plain from our LORDs Words, I am not come to destroy ye Law, but to fulfill; yt I shall not bestow any Pains to prove it. And mankind are as equally capable of fulfilling it before Justification, since Xt came, as before; consequently, notwithstanding some Mens Pother, Mankind can never be justified by it.

[May 1754]

May 24.1754

“What say some, has been ye great stumbling Block in ye Way of ye Methodists?” I answer, Some of ye Teachers contradicting their Doctrine by their Lives. If you want to know particulars, I will Instance in one or two. 1. In their marrying. 2. In their marrying Fortunes. 3. In their marrying Unbelievers.

1. In their marrying, after having spoken explicitly to ye contrary. And wn they had given sufficition Indications of their ability to receive our LORDs saying, He yt can receive it, let him receive it, viz. He yt can be an Eunuch for ye Kingdom of Heaven’s sake, let him.

2. In marrying Fortunes, after having expatiated largely on

[May 1754]

ye blessedness of Poverty, ye great
Danger of Riches, ye necessity of
self denial, & of following our
Lord in Contempt & Disgrace &c. &c.

3. In marrying unbelievers, not
regarding ~~our Lords~~ ye Apostle's Words, Be
not unequally yoked wth Unbelievers;
& come out from among
them, & be ye separate &c.

4. It is ys has opened a Floodgate
yt has deluged many. Many who
before were full of ye Holy Ghost
& of Power, have, in ys way, forsaken
their own Mercies & sought
Happiness in ye Creature. This
is demonstrable from their Fruits.
Their Lives aloud declare it.
And our LORD has given us
an infallible Rule to Judge by,
By their fruits ye shall know yem.

[May 1754]

5. That Marriage is an Evil in itself
I know not; nor yt it is always expedient.
That some are called to it,
I allow; but yt some are not, I think
equally plain. That ye Benefits of
it are great & many to all called
to it, I Believe: but yt ye Danger
of it to all not called to it is great
& momentous, I Believe likewise.

6. If any desire my Objections
to Marriage, I will here give some of them
wth all plainness. 1. It is no infallible
preservative against
Lust. This many have confessed.
Nay, many have found it an Inciter
to it. And those who before were
troubled wth evil Desires sometimes
were afterwards troubled much
oftener & more strongly. I think
ys is fully exemplified in Persons
married Persons, who of all men others (except

[May 1754]

it be widows or widowers) are, I Believe,
ye most lustful. 2. Its inseparable
concomitant is Care. All yt
marry will assuredly increase
Sorrow. 3. It abundantly increases
ye Difficulty of keeping a
Conscience void of Offence. As
it is much more difficult to
do ones Duty to many, yn one.
4. It involves a Man, if he neglects
his Duty, in a Sea of Guilt,
wch otherwise he wd be free from.
Since his Wife's and Childrens
Crimes are implied to him, according
to ye old Saying; If you
warn them not, they shall perish
in their Iniquity, but their
Blood will I require at thy
Hands. 5. It necessarily engages
a Man in Worldly pursuits.
A family is not ~~in all~~ easily maintained.
6. It is often, a great Temptation
to Idolatry. Few love as

[May 1754]

Xt enjoins. 7. A Disparity of Temper
~~will~~ between Persons so united,
will infallibly lead to Misery.
8. A Difference of Constitution
will either bring Diseases or a
Disunion of Affection. That
is, if one be more lustful yn ye
other. 9. It is next to impossible
to know a ~~woman~~ Person before ~~ye are~~
marriage. This many have found
to their Cost. 10. A Disparity of
Bodily Organs wd go near to disappoint
all ye Ends of Marriage.

7. These are a few of my Objections
to Marriage & such as, I think,
are not to be slighted. If
any not regarding, or not
considering these Things, will
rush into a Thicket, it is no
wonder if they feel ~~the~~ Smart
of from ye Thorns & Briars. Their

[May 1754]

torn Flesh may perhaps, convince
them, yt tho' Marriage
is honourable in all (all orders
& degrees of Men) yet every
Individual is not called to it.
Or as ye Oxford Divines have it,
“Though all married Men ought
to make Marriage honourable
by their Lives & Conversations,”
yet all are not called
to be married Men. However, this holds good only
wth regard to ye Few; ye Majority of Mankind are
undoubtedly called to marry: And ye earlier ye better.
8. But some perhaps, may enquire,
wt is properly an Unbeliever?
According to ye
Apostle, it is one destitute
of yt Faith wch is ye Substance Confidence
of Things hoped for, ye Evidence
of Things not seen. And
ys as much concludes against
ye generality of those called
Xtians, as against ye Heathens.

[May 1754]

Utterly vain therefore, is ye Assertion
of some Men, yt ye Apostle only
spake of Heathens. Unless they
can prove ye Apostle allows a ~~man~~ any
to be Believers without ye Faith.
He does not oppose Xtians &
Heathens, but Men having
Faith to Women having none.

9. And ys Rule, I think, must hold
~~in some~~ wth Unbelievers
also, as ye Reason for
it in both is one and ye same.
I mean, Let not a convinced
Person marry one unconvinced,
a Person having Desires,
marry one yt has none. Lest
ye one draw ye other, first into
carelessness (of wch there is exceeding
great Danger) & afterwards
into gross outward Sin.

[October 1754]

Oct. 13.1754

A Controversy concerning Church Government &c., having lately broke out am[on]g ye Methodists, Church has induced me to read Bp Stillingfleet's Irenicum.⁶² In wch, I think, he proves ye following Things.

- I. 1. That neither Xt nor his Apostles left any one Model of Church Government .
2. That ye Terms Bishop & Presbyter were originally Synonymous.
3. That their Office was one & ye same.
4. That Elders originally ~~was~~ were no other yn Presbyters.
5. That there is no unquestionable Line of Succession even of Persons, much less succession of Power.
6. That a Church is ye Body of real Xtians in any Place.
7. That Bishops, in ye present acceptation of ye Word, were added afterwards for ye good of ye Church.

⁶²Edward Stillingfleet (1635–99), *Irenicum, A Weapon Salve for the Church's Wounds*. London: Henry Mortlock, 1660. Quotes on the next ten pages are all taken from this work.

[October 1754]

8. That after B[isho]ps were instituted, many Churches had none.
9. That ye Word πρεσβύτερος imported a Power of Ordination, but not ye Word επισκοπος.
10. That Metropolitan Bps ws determined by ye Council of Antioch.
11. That ye Caemeteria was ye original of Church Buildings, or Buildgs called Churches.
12. That it is lawful for Ministers to receive Tythes.
13. That laying on of Hands may be retained as a Rite of solemn Prayer.
14. Lastly, That Episcopacy is no ways unlawful.
2. To each of these I shall add Part of his Proofs.
 1. That neither Xt nor any of his Apostles left any one model of Church Government.
 - 1.⁶³ No particular Form laid down in Scripture. The general Rules there found, equally hold whether ye Power of Ordination lie in a Bishop wth

⁶³The author mistakenly repeats the number “1” in his ordering.

[October 1754]

Presbyters, or in Presbyters acting wth equal Power. 2. Apostolical Practise not fully known; but generally believed to be according to ye Custom of ye Jewish Synagogue. Totum regimen Ecclesiarum Christi conformatum fuit ad Synagogaram exemplar saith Grotius. Praesides & curatores Ecclesiarum ad instar Presbyterorum Synagogae Judaicae constitutos fuisse constat; Salmastus.

1. Their manner of ordaining was by imposition of Hands: By wch ye persons were qualified either to be members of ye Sanhedrins, or Teachers of ye Law. The Words used to ye latter were to ys purpose, Eccetistu ordinatus.
2. The Persons authorized to do it. Everyone regularly ordained, had ye Power of ordaining; Maimonides. Every one was want to ordain his own Disciples; Rabbi Abba Bar Jonah. But in Hillel's Time, none cd ordain wthout ye Prince of ye Sanhedrin.

[October 1754]

3.⁶⁴ The Jews never ordained without three Persons. Ordination of Presbyters by laying on of Hands must be done by three at ye least; Misnah. They did not ordain any by imposition of Hands into a power of Indicature without three; Maimonides. He adds, of which three, one at least must be ordained himself.

3. It is probable, ye Apostles did not tie themselves to any fixed course. 4. Supposing they did, it will not follow yt we must observe it. So much for ye first Proposition.

3.Q. That ye Terms Bishop & Presbyter were originally Synonymous. In Episcopo & Presbyter continetur; saith Jerome. That both signify one Thing yt is an equality is asserted also by Theodoret, on 1. Tim. 3.1 And ye Apostle, Acts 20.28. Phil. 1.1. Titus 1.5. 1. Tim. 3.1, doth by Bishops mean nothing else but Presbyters; otherwise it would be impossible for all to govern one City.

⁶⁴The author uses “3” for all three of the sections on this page.

[October 1754]

That ye Words are Promiscuously
taken is asserted also by Chrysostome,
Oecumenius & Theophylact, in
Phil. 1. and in Acts 20.28. So yt a Bishop
is sometimes called a Presbyter,
& a Presbyter a Bishop.

4.3 That their Office was one and ye same.
Jerome tells us Communi Presbyterorum
concilio Ecclesiae gubernabantur;
in Titus 1.1. And Gratian
himself confesses; Sacra ordines
dicimus Diaconatum et Presbyteratum;
hos quidem solos Ecclesia primitiva habuisse dicitur. The
clearest Evidence of ys is in ye Church
of Alexandria; Nam et Alexandria
à Marco Evangelista usque ad
Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos,
Presbyteri semper unum ex
se electum, in excelsiori gradu
collocatum, Episcopum nomina
bant; Jerome. We may add wt

[October 1754]

Eutychius Patriarch of Alexandria
saith, That ye twelve Presbyters constituted
by Mark upon ye vacancy
of yt See, chose one out of their Number
head over ye rest, & laid their
Hands on him & blessd him &
made him Patriarch. Orig. P. 29.
To yt Effect speaks Antonius de
Rassellis, Every Presbyter & Presbyters
did ordain indifferently.
& thence arose Schisms; Ross. depot.
imper. & Papae. P. 4. c18. Even after ye
distinction of Bishops & ym came into use, ye personal
Succession is sometimes
attributed to Presbyters.
Quapropterüs qui in Ecclesiâ sunt Presbyteris
obaudire oportet, his qui
successionem habent, ab Apostolis,
sicut ostendimus, qui cum Episcopatus
successione, charisma veritatis
certum secundum placitum
patris acceperunt; Irenaeus Lib. 4.
Here he not only Asserts ye succession
of Presbyters to ye Apostles,
but likewise attributes ye successio

[October 1754]

Episcopatus to these very Presbyters.

Again: Tales Presbyteros

motrit [or niotrit] Ecclesia de quibus et Propheta

ait, Et dabo principes tuos in

pace, et Episcopos tuos et justitia.

Here he even calls them Bishops.

To close ys. Even Ignatius himself

says That Presbyters succeeded

in ye place of ye Bench of ye Apostles.

1. Ep. ad Mag. p. 33.

5. 4. That Elders originally were
Presbyters. Ignatius says, The
Presbyters are ye Sanhedrinof ye
Church appointed by GOD; & ye
Bench of ye Apostles sitting together
for ruling ye Affairs of ye
Church. Ep. cd Tral.C.6. Origin
calls it., A College in every City
of GODs appointing; Victor Bp
of Rome, Collegium nostrum:
Tertullian, Probatos Seniores;
Cyprian, Cleri nostri sacrum
venerandumque confessum.

[October 1754]

Hilary, Seniores sine quorum consilio
nihil agebatur in Ecclesia;

And ye Author de 7 ordinibus ad Rusticum,
calls ye Presbyters, negotiorum iudices. We are not to
suppose yt all these did equally
attend to one part of ye Work,
but all according to their abilities
laid out themselves in overseeing
& guiding ye Church. So

1. Tim. 5.17. The elders yt rule well
are worthy of double honour, especially
they yt labour in ye Word &
Doctrine. Not yt it ~~implied~~ implies distin[c]t
Elders from Pastors of Churches,
but yt those yt are employed
most in converting others, are
worthy of more honour yn those
yt rule a Flock already converted.
So Chrysostome resolves it; The
fixed Officers were inferior to
those yt went about Preaching.
That ye Apostle did not intend
Elders distint from ordained Presbyters,
is clear from ye Argument ye greatest

[October 1754]

Friends to Lay-Elders draw out
of ye Epistle, from ye Promiscuous
acceptation of ye Words πρεσβύτερος
and επισκοπος. ~~in ys very Epistle~~ The
Argument runs thus: The Presbyters
spoken of by Paul are Scripture
Bishops: But Lay-Elders are
not scripture Bishops; ys Lay-Elders
~~Lay-Elders~~ are not are not Presbyters.
~~are not Lay-Elders~~ The major is
their own, from 1. Tim. 3.1 compared
wth 4.14. Those Paul calls
Presbyters in one Place, are called
Bishops in another. And Bishops must be διδακτικός fit
to teach, therefore, no Lay Elders.
Now Timothy was at Ephesus,
therefore if Lay-Elders were any
where they shd be there. The contenders
for Lay-Elders plead yt
those spoken of Acts 20.17. were
ye Elders of Ephesus, to whom
Paul spake there words, Take
heed, therefore unto yrselves,

[October 1754]

and all ye flock over which GOD
hath made you. Bishops or Overseers.
Here ye Names are again confounded,
so he yt was an Elder was
a Bishop too, and thr Office was a pastoral
charge over a Flock. Paul
sent in indefinitely for ye Elders of
ye Church of Ephesus: All ye Elders
yt came were Pastors of churches;
yt ye Elders of ye Church of Ephesus
were not Lay-Elders. Agreeable
to this are ye words of Cyprian,
Origen & Clement of Alexandria.
Origen saith, Omnes Episcopi
at que omnes Presbyteri vel Diaconi
erudiunt nos, & erudientes
adhibent correptionam, & verbis
austerioribus inerepent. Cyprian
saith, Et erediderem quidem Presbyteros
& Diaconos qui illie presentes
sunt, moners vos & instruere
plenissime circa Evangelii legem,
sicut semper ab antecessore
bus nostris factum est. And
Clemens Alexanderinus saith

[Page 325; unnumbered in manuscript]

[October 1754]

~~the Words~~ to ys effect, A Presbyter is one yt
is ordained or appointed to instruct
others in order to their amendment.

In after Times, there was a Council
held who absolutely decree
against all Lay Persons meddling
in Church Affairs; concil Hispil.
2. decreat 9. A canon directly leveled
against all Lay Chancellours
in Bishops Courts & such Officials:
And wth ye same force it sweep
away all Lay Elders.

6.5. That there is no unquestionable
line of succession even
of Persons, much less a succession of Power

Eusebius

[pages 326–344 in the manuscript booklet are blank]