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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Br (or B.)</td>
<td>Brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd</td>
<td>could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shd</td>
<td>should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wch</td>
<td>which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wd</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wt</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xt</td>
<td>Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ye</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ym</td>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yn</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ys</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yt</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ye 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 reflec
tions as I go along. One Reason that in duced me to it was my joining my[sel?]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].  

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.
Mond[ay] 2. Spent the morning in folding Books. After Dinner walked with Br [Rouquet] from Kingswood to Bristol. At Five went to Br Jones, and stayd to drink Tea. A little after, I walked with a friend toward Kingswoo[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] expect but I should be deprived of it?

*Page tattered and the text that follows almost unreadable.*
Tuesday. 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 griev’d 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

5The bottom of page frayed so badly that the final sentence is unreadable.
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 Routt 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
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.
Suppd near Nine. And soon after retired.


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

6 John Wesley published *Predestination Calmly Considered* in 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 [?] 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

\[7\]Text difficult to read.
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 inspir’d Pen yt says, “in Adam all died; “He tasted death for every Man” says, as expressly 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 attaining Heaven is allow’d to all. If the Scriptures are true “GOD is no respecter of Persons;” therefore cannot (unconditionally) signalize some above their Brethren. Besides, the Sanctions in ye Bible are mostly, if not always, general. Writ from 4. to 5. The Promises is general: The
Threatnings general. And even after Men have Believ'd, 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 deliver'd '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 devise’d) Fable. Thus do some defend the Christian Revelation!
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 calld 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,
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.

Did occasional Business till 3.
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.

At 7. Breakfasted. To 9. did occasional
Business. Writ &c. to 12. Went with Br
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.

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.

conversed to Preaching. At Nine retired.


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
Friends cd get nothing from her, nor persuade her to Eat ought. GOD had greatly refreshd, as well as convinced 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.”

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 imagind 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
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
as before, and entering 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, threatened to leave him directly. Upon this he altered 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 Damned. He said all the talk in Hell was, of a young Gentleman (of his neighbourhood & at that Time
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 assign'd 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
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 accomplisht 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
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
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
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.
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.

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 become 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,
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
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.
From 6. to 8. did occasional Business. Then went out to Breakfast with Mr Wesley. Writ from 9. to One. Went to Mrs. Wigginton’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.
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 occurr’d or how I passed the Day. the Time was wasted.

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

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.


Sat. Nov. 4. Arose at 5. Read till near 7. Went to Breakfast wth 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.
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 ὑπόστασις9 of Things hop’d for, ye ἐλεγχος ye ἐλεγχος 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, ὑπόστασις.
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
receiv’d 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)
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 
language of Sins 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 
wd condescend to make use of Scripture 
Terms, we should not not 
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
the presence and Favour of GOD: Accompanied with 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 perceived. Therefore if we feel not these, tis because there is no abiding Life in us.
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, proportionally 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.”
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.

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 deserv’d
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.”
I wd all her members did! For my Part,
I doubt whether her constitution itself
can be wholly cleard from giving encouragement
to it. Not if the Canons are
reckond 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
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 mortal 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,
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.

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,
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,
are so cut and mangled by these refind enquirers after Shadows, as to have no Sense or significance left. If ye English Translation makes against ym, they immediately 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,
and those followers of His who spake
“only as they were moved by the Holy-
Ghost,” “never till their Time (yet is, in
so full a manner) given”! Their Design
in this is plain. Could [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
Sin in themselves? Have they no indwelling
Pride, Anger, concupiscence
(the seeds of these Vices) often rising
up to trouble ym? I hope, those yt
are so careful “lest GOD shd be Blasphem’d,
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
reflecting upon his Maker! But which 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 Allmighty!
Perhaps, some may say,
they do not acknowledge Man w[a]s
form’d with these Dispositions in
him; but ye actual Sin has occasiond
this Depravity. But how shall we
account for the depravity of Infants
ye have not committed what we call
actual Transgression; an yet we
cannot but see ye same evil Tempers
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.
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;
“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,
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 unconcernd 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 θησαυροῦς,¹¹ a Treasure.” Or, “make

¹¹I.e., θησαυρός.
“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
Till these Things are solved, I must
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, 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.
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 agreeable therewith, ye Author and a Thousand more disclaiming it, will have no force with me. Let them answer to yt.
That all Parts of ye 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
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 Treatice 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.
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”
(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
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
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
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.
(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
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
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
“Evangelical Counsels, contradistiguishd 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 Xoreittw. Let him receive it. (Not, he may receive it, if he will.) How could a Command be more clearly exprest?
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 δύναμεν Χωρεῖν) Those who are able to receive it. Those who have received this Gift of GOD. Those to whom it is given.

11. All Men (as our LORD hath observ’d before) cannot receive ys Saying:
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 &
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 Continence 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
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 shoud 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 receivd follow; nor
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
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 Continence 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
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.
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
this I speak for your Profit – that you may attend upon ye LORD without Distraction, v. 32–35.

16. Art thou called 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 called to endure Hardship as a good Soldier of Jesus Xt. Now no Man yt warreth (as ye Apostle.
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 possessest yt inestimable Gift; Know the Liberty wherewith Xt hath made thee free, &
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 rejoice,
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.
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 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.
I have now done wt I proposd wth ye Tract itself, and shall proced 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.
Without this Restriction it will be impossible to reconcile St Paul with our Saviour, or even with himself. But does it not say 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.
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 reveal’d ye Mind of Xt more plainly, and explain’d 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 assign’d for laying them aside, yt will not equally hold against all yt He Xt ever spake.
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.
The greater Part of Mankind, I believe were join'd 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.
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”\textsuperscript{13}
a good Book, tho’ I do not

\textsuperscript{13}Benjamin 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).
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 calld at Mr Longs and bought Leslie’s “Xtianity Demonstrated.” 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).
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
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
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.

[Page 94; unnumbered in manuscript]

[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 return'd and read Erasmus\textsuperscript{15} 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

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


Sund. Dec. 10. Arose at 5. Heard B. W Preach. Am clearly convinced, ye Want of Study ruins 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
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!
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. Somewhat better than ye last. One great Fault in their Preaching is, allegorizing so much. They find Wonders, where never was any were placed. The plain meaning of Scripture is cast aside, and their
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
Creation by ye fall of Man was is corrupted.
2dly. That it groaneth and waiteth in Expectation
of Deliverance. 3d. That it 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 enthusistical
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
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!

Heard today Mr ______ refuses to answer Taylor.\footnote{The 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, 3\textsuperscript{rd} edition (London: J. Waugh, 1750). Wesley finally did publish his Doctrine of Original Sin in response in 1757.} 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\footnote{I.e., Wesley’s Letter to Conyers Middleton, 1749.}, but he may run ye risk of losing it by engaging Taylor! Besides, who ever can suppose yt the defending ye fundamental Doctrine of Xtianity is so much of equal Consequence.
with ye clearing ye Characters of a few weak,  
Tho pious Fathers! Or who ever imagines,  
Yt ye very Essentials of Xtiony 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 Xtiony. 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
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
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
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
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.


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

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 administried, though I greatly doubt it. That many Persons never called to Ordination are called to Preach, I Question not. But I take yt to be quite another Thing. Tis true, I no more believe yt unholy Persons are called 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.


---

to 11. Trotted 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 Xitianity 
and assignd ye same poor, mean, pitiful 
Excuse; I should have Thought 
myself guilty of a manifest Breach
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
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
of ye promiscuous multitude quotd, 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 blessd 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, exhortd to several outward Duties. Supped. Retired.
Mond. 18. Arose at 5. Did occasional Business to near 8. Breakfasted. Prepared for ye Country; but was prevented going. Read Mr Leslie's 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.
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 ὅλοτέλειείς, 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*. 
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.”

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
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?
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
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

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
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
“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!

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

Thurs. 21. Arose at 8. Various
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
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 pleased 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
not having rangd his Battalions to Advantage; (which I apprehend, was owing to his little Skill in Military affairs) to Attack some of the Advanced 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.
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
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 Robert 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).
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.
Mond. Jany. 8. Arose at 5. Writ &c. to 7. Read Bishop Fell on St Paul’s Epistles 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

---

I was roughly Attackd about Mr W’s “Predestination calmly considered.” My Antagonist affirm’d He had there said a great deal, but little to ye Purpose. That is, he had not convinc’d 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 remain’d 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.
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 Gill is a great
man.” He is so. For bullying his
Antagonists, there are few like him.
Few Writers will make use of yt

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 Pean, Pean, 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!
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
we differed a little in Judgment, yet each
Side shewed 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 confessd
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 ed never be granted yt He dwelt in all.
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,
He yt is born of GOD sinneth not, with many more yt might be enumerated. 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
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.

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
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.
“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
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
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
Spirit Ghost, yet there is no Reason in ye World to suppose them ye Offspring of a Spirit of Prophesy. 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!


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


\textsuperscript{29}See p. 114 above.


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


---

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.


33See p. 151 above.
Corrected to 8. Supp’d. Retired.

Walk’d & convers’d to 8. Breakfasted.  
Did occasional Business to 10.  
Went to B. Jones & staid to near 11.  

Frid. Jany. 19. Arose at 5.  
Made a fire. Convers’d &c. to 8.
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.
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 arbitrarly. And it is no
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
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 offer’d
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
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
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
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
“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.

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!
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.
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,
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
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

Began meeting ye Classes. Dined.
Writ. Supp’d.

Continued meeting ye Classes. Dined.
Supp’d.

&c.


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.
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.


---

35 Almost 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*. 
Tues. Jan. 29.\textsuperscript{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 Xrians
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.

my Indisposition, made shifts to
drag myself up to Preaching. But

\textsuperscript{36}Note that the same date is given for Tuesday as for Monday in the manuscript.
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 Twickenham 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).
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 me to think of leaving 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
more and more unlikely to get my own
Living; yt I am wasting squandering away what little
Strength and Cloaths I have, and in no
likelihood 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. ____________.”

38This line appears in the manuscript text.
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.


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).


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
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 \textbf{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
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.
Went in ye City. Between Drowsiness &.c. did scarce any Thing to 4.


What some have observd concerning Learning is strictly just; viz.
[Page 180; unnumbered in manuscript]

[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
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 affirmed by such Writers, he makes his own, and defends as earnestly as though an Angel from Heaven had reveal'd them. But whatever contradicts these, cannot be look'd 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
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 Universal 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 ‘tis not the case. They are Our language many Times is not only not found in Scripture, but directly repugnant to it. And ye
Divinity itself is not borrowd from ye Bible, but from our more sublime Teachers. The Texts yt speak against our favorite Hypothosis, 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 unlearnd 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
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 cleard my Way, I come more immediately to consider ye Thing I had in view. In a late Dispute
with a Dissenter, I found him putting Salvation upon a very unscriptural footing. He affirm’d “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 with me. I am not convinced, 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?
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 “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
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.”

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 reveal’d 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.
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 be to be experienced 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.
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.
Those Expositions yt want Scripture force are deviations from ye Text.

13. 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.
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
of the "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 convinced, and known ye Time they had no Faith,
ever 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,
“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.”
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.
But this cannot be true, if we know it not till we are sealed 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.
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.
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 condemned shall be Damned.” And in another Place tis said, “He yt believeth not is condemned already, and ye Wrath of GOD abideth upon him.”
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.
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. 2d. In ye same Sense. & 3d. with respect to ye same third Thing. & 4th 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
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.
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.


April 24, 1753. Mr Wh— [Whitefield] having publishd a Sermon with a Sneer in it against Xtian Perfection;\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{43}George 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.
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 & robld 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
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, us
yt Scripture assures us, & our experience agreeeth 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
 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
spoken it, I will also do it. Chap 35.

Agreeable to these Promises are ye words of St John, 1 Ep.1 C[apter]. 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
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 Freedm
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
People in all Ages.”

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

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,

“shew an Ignorance” of this? Now are not all Xtinas commanded so to Love God & their Neighbour Cannot a real Perfect Xtion 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
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.” 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 John’s 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?

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
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does not make me conceive 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
He says in a triumphant Expostulation with Satan, “Jesus hath prayed for him (Peter) & therefore his Faith shall not finally fail.” 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 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

---

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. 2dly. to Believe.
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 join'd with Faith in our
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,
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
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 complain'd 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 retain'd 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
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 retaing
it when once bestowed. Not to retrieve
Justification when lost, but to preserve
it when given. Works are preservers
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
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,
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.
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 Xtiens 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
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 attaind or in Possession; I answer, neither is
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 ὑπόστασις, 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
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
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
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.
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
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 conceil him in Xt, any longer than he does believe? Is not ye condition ye same as ever it was?
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
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
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
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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
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 11, 1753. Of all ye Truths of Xtainity, 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 Xtain 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
in his Soul? If any one is so bold
as to make such a Confession, will
he not be Anathemazd 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
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
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
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
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 still 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.
O continue thy loving Kindness to ye.
Yt know Thee. Blessed are 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.
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
Knowledge of them, tho' differing in Degree. Therefore let all ye House of Israel know assuredly (let ye have no Doubt of it) yt GOD has made yt same Jesus, whom ye Crucifed, 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
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 confirmed & 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  
I have 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
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. 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
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 hungeth and thirsteth after Righteousness.
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,
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
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
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.
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
many know not wt we mean by **Assurance**.

1. The least Measure of-saving Faith
implies a 48 confidence of ye Love of Xt. He
hath lovd 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 a 49 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.
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,
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.”

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.

---

50 Benjamin Martin (1705–82), Bibliotheca Technologica; or, a Philological Library of Literary Arts and Sciences (London: Noon, 1737), 230.
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, possesd 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
is fine & subtle; but of Bodies is of gross Texture. 2. The Form of Spirits is insensible to us. 3. All Spirits are cogitative. 4. Spirits are not the Subjects of human Knowledge or Converse.”

Agreeably to these learned 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 should contradict what is grantd elsewhere, viz. and

---

51Martin, Bibliotheca Technologica, 231–32.
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!”

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.”

And as a Proof of it, it is demanded

[Page 259; unnumbered in manuscript]
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52Martin, Bibliotheca Technologica, 234.

53Ibid.
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.
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
staggers 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!
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!
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, yn to agonize to attain what is by most deemed 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
bestowd upon him, wholly abstain[ing]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 Screen 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
the same of Believers. But before I proceed I must beg leave to lay down a few Postulata.

1. That Adam himself (in the utmost extent our Adversaries understand it) was not capable of fulfilling ye Law: As he was lower than ye Angels, and yet ye Law 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 improved to the utmost, he had not exceeded what the Law (or Will of GOD) required.

2. That ye Law, strictly speaking, required no more of Adam for ye present, than ye Power GOD had given him, enabled him to do. For notwithstanding there was is
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, et 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.
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 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.
3. Adam was not subject to Diseases.
But Believes often find ye
corrupible 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
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 Believes
as in others.
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
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.
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
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 Scruple 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
Powder-Plot,\textsuperscript{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 12\textsuperscript{th} and 13\textsuperscript{th} verses of ye 2\textsuperscript{d} Chapter

\textsuperscript{56}An attempt by a group of Catholics to kill King James I in 1605.
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.
3. In ye 2d 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
subterfuge “of living in practising gross Sin or habitual wickedness,” &c. ye Apostle fixes his own meaning, and tells you in lain 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
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?
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
Fathers in ye 2d 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, without 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.
v. 2. How shall we yet be dead to Sin
Live any longer therein? Observe, dead to Sin.
Could they yet commit or practise it?
V. 6. Knowing yet our old Man (the
carnal Nature) is crucified with Him,
yet the Body of Sin might be destroyed,
yet 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 yet hath suffered
suffered in ye Flesh, hath ceased 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 LORD's Testimony concerning it; He who committeth practiseth Sin is ye Servant Slave of Sin.

And we know, ye Servant Slave abideth not in ye House forever. And ye Wages of Sin is Death. From ye whole yn it appears, yt every one transgresseth transgressing ye Law, sinneth; yt he who committeth practiseth Sin is ye Servant Slave of Sin; yt He who committeth practiseth Sin is of ye Devil: and lastly, yt ye Wages (or reward of every one yt dieth in) Sin, is Death.
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 Believeth 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
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,
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.
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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
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
Foreseen or Foreknown, yn such a Knowledge or Sight attaind 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; without being guilty of ye very Thing we charge ym wth, viz. of drawing wrong Conclusions from right Premisses.
This will be seen by what 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 Term'd Elect.”
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
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
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.
That GOD cd have supplid their his
Place wth others, I grant; or preserved
yn 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
have formed Creatures, merely to destroy ye. 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 apprehended ye Difficulty of assenting to all ys, lies in our not understanding considering ye Attributes of ye Almighty, and ye Essential
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 may swallow up ye other. That Justice may superseed 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.
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
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, 1". A willingness to be saved; If ye be willing & Obedient, ye shall eat of ye good of ye Land, a Type of Heaven.
2. A Consciousness of our Want of GOD's 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
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.
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,
they wonder any one can be so blind as not to see their Appositeness!

2. An instance of this I found in Mr Fawcet’s Sermons, & in his “critical Explanation of ye 9th of ye Romans.” 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.” 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.
Paul, by ye Law, does not mean ceremonial, 
but ye moral; as is plain in 
by ye 19th verse of ye 3d 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
forbid: Yea, we establish ye Law. Since it is evident ye Ceremonial Law is not established, but clearly overthrown by Faith.

3. He goes on to return. In ye 22d 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.” Yet in ye 30th he adds, “Not yt human Endeavours, wn rightly & properly managed, will nothing avail to our Justification; but Justification is not by ye Works of ye Law therefore, must be sought for on ye Terms of Mercy.” This is mere Gibberish! Justification is not by ye Works of ye Law, but is by human Endeavours! Or human

---
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61Ibid., 30.
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.
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 yt Proof of little
does ys prove yt Justification being is
by human Endeavours! Upon
yer rhod 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, yr all before Xt came
I mean here by Works since Xt came
in ye Flesh, yr all before Xt came are
utterly perished! So wisely do
some Men speak of ye Things yt ye know not. On ye contrary, If Abraham ws Justified without 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 someone 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
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 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 suficient 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
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.
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
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
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 ve 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
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.
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.
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. 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.

Edward 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.
8. That after Bishops were instituted, many Churches had none.
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

63 The author mistakenly repeats the number “1” in his ordering.
Presbyters, or in Presbyters acting with
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.
3. 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 tye 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.

---
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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 gubernabantiur;
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 usqiiad
Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos,
Presbyteri semper unum ex
se electum, in excelsiori gradu
collocatum, Episcopum nomina
bant; Jerome. We may add wt
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 Rasellis, 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 oporlet, 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 succession.
Episcopatus to these very Presbyters.
Again: Tales Presbyteros
motrit [or niotrit] Ecclesia de quibus et Prophetiae
dit, 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.

5. 4. That Elders originally were
Presbyters. Ignatius says, The
Presbyters are ye Sanhedrin of ye
Church appointed by GOD; & ye
Bench of ye Apostles sitting together
for ruling ye Affairs of ye
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.
Hilary, Seniores sine quorum consilio
nihil agebatur in Ecclesia;
And ye Author de 7 ordinibus ad Rusticum,
calls ye Presbyters, negotiorum judices. 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 implies distinct
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 distinct from ordained Presbyters,
is clear from ye Argument ye greatest
Friends to Lay-Elders draw out
of ye Epistle, from ye Promiscuous acceptation of ye Words πρεσβύτερος and επισκόπος. 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 διδακτικος 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.
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.
Clement Alexanderinus saith
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 swept away all Lay Elders.

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

Eusebius