
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



Zelotes and Honestus reconciled:

O R,

An Equal Cheek to Pharisaism and Antinomianism
continued:

B E I N G

THE SECOND PART OF THE SCRIPTURE-SCALE



To weigh the gold of gospel-truth, to balance a multitude of opposite scriptures, to prove the gospel-marriage of *Free-grace* and *Free-will*, and restore primitive harmony to the gospel of the day.

By a lover of the whole truth as it is in Jesus.

How is the most fine gold changed! — Take heed that ye be not
‘deceived: for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ’
DOCTRINAL: — ‘I am Christ’ **MORAL:** — *But*, ‘To the law,
‘and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word,
‘it is because there is no light in them’ [*or at least because*] *their*
‘wine is mixed with water, and *their* silver is’ [*partly*] ‘become
‘dross.’ BIBLE.

“Si non est Dei *gratia*, quomodo *salvat* mundum? Si non est *liberum*
arbitrium, quomodo *judicat* mundum?” *Aug.*

S H R E W S B U R Y:

Printed by J. EDDOWES: and sold at the *Foundery*, and by
J. BUCKLAND, in Pater-noster-Row, London, 1775.

[Price EIGHTEEN-PENCE,]

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

THE reader is desired to turn to the end of the book, where he will find an Appendix intitled,

A K E Y

To the controversy, which is intended to be ended by the Scripture-Scales.

That Appendix may be considered as a supplement to the preface, and to the *Explanation of some terms used in these sheets.*

Just published, price Six-pence,

The FICTITIOUS and the GENUINE CREED :

Being a Creed for Arminians, composed by Richard Hill, Esq; to which is opposed A Creed for those who believe that Christ *tasted death for every man.*

By the Author of the Checks to Antinomianism.

London: Printed by R. Hawes, (No. 34.) in Lamb-street, near Spital-Square, 1775.

A L S O

Ready for the Press, by the same Author,

An E S S A Y on the Twin-Doctrines of *Christian Imperfection* and a *Death Purgatory*;

Being a full Answer to "A Creed for Perfectionists."

P R E F A C E.

THE Reconciler invites the contending parties to end the controversy; and, in order to this, he beseeches them not to involve the question in clouds of evasive cavils, or personal reflections; but to come to the point, and break, if they can, either the one or the other of his Scripture-Scales; And, if they cannot, to admit them both, and, by that means, to give glory to God and the Truth, and be reconciled to all the Gospel, and to one another.

B EING fully persuaded that christianity suffers greatly by the opposite mistakes of the mere *Solidians*, and of the mere *Moralists*; we embrace the truths and reject the errors, which are maintained by these contrary parties. For, by equally admitting the *doctrines of grace*, and the *doctrines of justice*;—by equally contending for *faith* and for *morality*, we adopt what is truly excellent in each system; we reconcile *Zelotes* and *Honestus*; we bear our testimony against their contentious partiality; and, to the best of our knowledge, we maintain the *whole truth* as it is in Jesus. If we are mistaken, we shall be thankful to those who will set us right. Plain scriptures, close arguments, and friendly expostulations, are the weapons we chuse. We humbly hope, that the unprejudiced reader, will find no other in these pages: And to engage our opponents to use such only, we present to them the following Petition.

For Candor's sake;—for Truth's sake;—for Peace's sake;—for the Reader's sake;—and, above all, for the sake of Christ, and the honour of christianity; whoever ye are, that shall next enter the lists against us, do not withdraw the controversy by uncharitably attacking our persons, and absurdly judging our spirits, instead of weighing our arguments, and considering the scriptures which we produce. Nor pass

over fifty solid reasons, and an hundred plain passages, to cavil about non-essentials, and to lay the *stress* of your answer upon mistakes, which do not affect the *strength* of the cause, and which we are ready to correct, as soon as they shall be pointed out.

Keep close to the question: do not divert the reader's mind, by starting from the point in hand upon the most frivolous occasions; nor raise dust to obscure what is to be cleared up. An example will illustrate my meaning. Mr. *Sellon*, in vindicating the Church of England from the charge of Calvinism, observes, that her catechism is quite anti-calvinistic, and that we ought to judge of her doctrine by *her own* catechism, and not by *Penet's* Calvinian catechism, which *poor young king Edward* was prevailed upon to recommend some time after the establishment of our church. Mr. *Toplady*, in his *Historic Proof*, instead of considering the question, which is, whether it is not fitter to gather the doctrine of our church from her own *anti-Calvinian* catechism, than from *Penet's Calvinian* catechism; Mr. *Toplady*, I say, in his answer to Mr. *Sellon*, fastens upon the phrase *poor young king Edward*, and works it to such a degree, that he raises from it clouds of shining dust, and pillars of black smoke; filling, if I remember right, a whole section with the praises of King *Edward*, and with reflections upon Mr. *Sellon*: And in this bright cloud of praise, and dark cloud of dispraise, the question is so entirely lost, that I doubt if one in an hundred of his readers has the least idea of it, after reading two or three of the many pages, which he has written on this head. By such means as this, it is, that he has made a ten or twelve Shilling book, in which the church of England is condemned to wear the badge of the church of Geneva. And the Calvinists conclude, Mr. *Toplady* has *proved*, that she is bound to wear it; for they have paid dear for the *Proof*:

That very gentleman, if fame is to be credited, has some thoughts of attacking the *Checks*. If he favours me with *just* remarks upon my mistakes (for I have probably made more than one; tho' I hope none

P R E F A C E.

none is of a capital nature) he shall have my sincere thanks: But, if he involves the question in clouds of personal reflections, and of idle digressions; he will only give me an opportunity of initiating the public more and more into the mysteries of *Logica Genevensis*. I therefore intreat him, if he thinks me worthy of his notice, to remember that the *capital* questions—the questions, on which the fall of the Calvinian, or of the anti-Calvinian doctrines of grace turn, are not, Whether I am a fool and a knave; and whether I have made some mistakes in attacking antinomianism: but, Whether those mistakes affect the truth of the *anti-solifidian* and *anti-pharisaic* gospel, which we defend;—Whether the two gospel-axioms are not equally true;—Whether our *second* scale is not as scriptural as the *first*;—Whether the doctrines of *justice* and *obedience* are not as important in their places, as the doctrines of *grace* and *mercy*;—Whether the plan of reconciliation laid down in Sec. xvii, and the marriage of *Free-grace* and *Free-will*, described in Sect. xxiv, are not truly evangelical;—Whether God can judge the world in *righteousness* and *wisdom*, if man is NOT a free, unneccessitated agent;—Whether the justification of *obedient believers* by the WORKS OF FAITH, is not as scriptural as the justification of *sinners* by FAITH itself;—Whether the *eternal* salvation of *adults* is not of *remunerative justice*, as well as of *free-grace*;—Whether *that* salvation does not SECONDARILY depend on the evangelical, derived worthiness of obedient, persevering believers; as it PRIMARILY depends on the original and proper merits of our atoning and interceding Redeemer;—Whether man is in a state of probation; or, if you please, Whether the Calvinian doctrines of *finished salvation*, and *finished damnation* are true; Whether there is not a day of *initial* salvation for *all* mankind, according to various dispensations of divine grace;—Whether Christ did not taste death for every man, and purchase a day of *initial* redemption and salvation for *all sinners*, and a day of *eternal* redemption and salvation for *all persevering* believers;—Whether *all* the sins of *real* apostates;

or *foully-fallen* believers shall so work for their good, that none of them shall ever be damned for any crime he shall commit;—Whether they shall *all* sing louder in heaven for their greatest falls on earth;—Whether our absolute, *personal* reprobation from eternal life, is of God's *free-wrath* thro' the *decreed, necessary* sin of Adam; or of God's *just-wrath* thro' our own *obstinate, avoidable* perseverance in sin;—Whether our doctrines of *non-necessitating* grace, and of *just-wrath*, do not exalt *all* the divine perfections; and Whether the Calvinian doctrines of *necessitating* grace and *free-wrath*, do not pour contempt upon *all* the attributes of God, his *Sovereignty* not excepted.

These are the important questions, which I have *principally* debated with the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Shirley, Rich. Hill, Esq; the Rev. Mr. Hill, the Rev. Mr. Berridge, and the Rev. Mr. Toplady. Some less essential collateral questions I have touched upon, such as, Whether Judas was an absolutely-graceless hypocrite, when our Lord raised him to apostolic honours;—Whether some of the most judicious Calvinists have not, *at times*, done justice to the doctrine of *Free-will* and † co-operation, &c. These and the like questions I call *collateral*, because they are only occasionally brought in; and because the walls which defend our doctrines of grace stand firm without them. We hope therefore, that if Mr. Toplady, and the other divines who defend the ramparts of mystical Geneva, should ever attack the *Checks*, they will erect their main batteries against our towers, and not against some insignificant part of the scaffolding, which we could entirely take down, without endangering our *Jerusalem* in the least.—Should you refuse to grant our reasonable request; should you take up
the

† The Rev. Mr. WHITEFIELD in his answer to the Bishop of London's pastoral letter, says, "That prayer is NOT the SINGLE work of the Spirit, without any CO-OPERATION OF OUR OWN, I readily confess.—Whoever affirmed, that there was NO CO-OPERATION OF OUR OWN MINDS, together with the impulse of the Spirit of God?"—Now, that MANY are short of salvation merely by
NOT

the pen to perplex, and not to solve the question; to blacken our character, and not to illustrate the obscure parts of the truth; you must give us leave to look upon your controversial attempt as an *evasive show of defence*, contrived to keep a defenceless, tottering error upon it's legs, before an injudicious, bigoted populace.

If you will do us, and the public justice, come to close quarters, and put an end to the controversy by candidly receiving our *Scripture-Scales*, or by plainly showing that they are false. Our doctrine *entirely* depends upon the *two* gospel axioms, and their *necessary* consequences, which now hang out to public view in our *Gospel-balances*. Nothing therefore can be more easy than to point out our error, if our system is erroneous. But, if our Scales are just; if our doctrines of *Grace* and *Justice*,—of *Free-grace* and *Free-will* are TRUE: it is evident that the *Solidians* and the *Moralists* are both in the wrong, and that we are, *upon the whole*, in the right. I say *upon the whole*, because *insignificant* mistakes can no more affect the strength of our cause, than a cracked slate, or a broken pane can affect the solidity of a palace, which is firmly built upon a rock.

Therefore, if you are an admirer of *Zelotes*, and a *Solidian* opposer of *Free-will*, of the law of liberty, and of the remunerative justification of a believer by the works of faith; raise no dust: candidly give up antinomianism; break the two pillars.

NOT CO-OPERATING WITH THE SPIRIT'S IMPULSE, is evident, if we may credit these words of the same reverend author. "There is a great difference between GOOD DESIRES, and good habits. MANY have the one, who NEVER ATTAIN to the other. MANY" [thro' the Spirit's impulse] "have GOOD DESIRES to subdue sin: and yet RESTING" [thro' want of co-operation] "in those GOOD desires, sin has ALWAYS the dominion over them." *WHIT. WORKS*, Vol. iv. page 7, 11.—Mr. *Whitefield* grants in these two passages all that I contend for in these pages, respecting the doctrine of our concurrence or co-operation with the Spirit of free-grace, that is, respecting the doctrine of *Free-will*: And yet his warmest admirers will probably be my warmest opposers. But why?—Because I aim at [what Mr. *Whitefield* sometimes overlooked] *Consistency*.

pillars on which it stands; *necessitating Free-grace*, and *forcible Free-wrath*: Or prove, if you can, that our **SECOND SCALE**, which is directly contrary to your doctrines of grace, is irrational, and that we have forged or misquoted the passages which compose it.— But, if you are a follower of *Honestus*, and a neglector of *Free-grace*, and salvation by faith in Jesus Christ; be a candid and *honest* disputant. Come at once to the grand question; and terminate the controversy, either by receiving our **FIRST SCALE**, which is *directly contrary* to your scheme of doctrine: Or by proving, that **THIS SCALE**, is directly contrary to Reason and Scripture, and that we have misquoted or mistaken *most* of the passages which enter into its composition. I say *most*, tho' I could say *all*: For if *only* two passages properly taken in connexion with the context, the avowed doctrine of a sacred writer, and the general drift of the scriptures;— if *only* two such passages, I say, *fairly* and *truly* support each section of our *Scripture-scales*, they hang *firmly*, and can no more, upon the whole, be invalidated, than the *scripture* itself, which, as our Lord informs us, **CANNOT BE BROKEN**. John x. 35.

I take the Searcher of hearts, and my judicious, unprejudiced readers to witness, that, thro' the whole of this controversy, far from concealing the most plausible objections, or avoiding the strongest arguments which are, or may be advanced against our reconciling doctrine, I have carefully searched them out, and endeavoured to encounter them as openly as *David* did *Goliath*. Had our opponents followed this method, I doubt not but the controversy would have ended long ago in the destruction of our prejudices, and in the rectifying of our mistakes—Oh, if we all preferred the unspeakable pleasure of finding out the truth, to the pitiful honour of pleasing a party, or of vindicating our own mistakes; how soon would the useful fan of scriptural, logical, and brotherly controversy, *purge the floor* of the church! How soon would the light of truth, and the flame of love, *burn the chaff* of error, and the thorns of prejudice.

prejudice *with fire unquenchable!* May the past triumphs of bigotry suffice! and, instead of sacrificing any more to that detestable idol, may we all henceforth do whatever lies in us, to hasten a general reconciliation, that we may all share together in the choicest blessings, which God can bestow upon his peculiar people;—the Spirit of pure, evangelical truth; and of fervent, brotherly love!

Madeley, March 30, 1775.

AN EXPLANATION

Of some Terms used in these Sheets.

THE word *Solifidian* is defined, and the characters of *Zelotes*, *Honestus*, and *Lorenzo* are drawn in the ADVERTISEMENT prefixed to the *first* part of this work. It is proper to explain here a few more words, or characters.

PHARISAISM is the religion of a *pharisee*.

A PHARISEE is a loose or strict professor of *natural* or *revealed* religion, who so depends upon the system of religion which he has adopted, or upon his attachment to the school or church he belongs to; [whether it be the school of Plato, Confucius, or Socinus;—whether it be the church of *Jerusalem*, *Rome*, *England*, or *Scotland*];—who lays such a stress on his religious or moral duties,—and has so good an opinion of his *present* harmlessness and obedience, or of his *future* reformation and good works, as to overlook his natural impotence and guilt, and to be insensible of the need and happiness of *being justified freely* [as a sinner] *by God's grace thro' the redemption that is in Jesus Christ*; Rom. iii. 24.—You may know him: (1) By his contempt of, or coldness for, the Redeemer and his free-grace:—(2) By the antichristian, unscriptural confidence, which he reposes in his *best endeavours*; and in the self-righteous exertions of his
own

own free-will:—Or (3) by the jests he passes upon, or the indifference he betrays for, the convincing, comforting, assisting, and sanctifying influences of God's Holy Spirit.

ANTINOMIANISM is the religion of an *Antinomian*.

AN ANTINOMIAN is a christian who is [*anti nomon*]. AGAINST THE LAW of Christ, as well as AGAINST THE LAW of Moses: He allows Christ's law to be a *rule of LIFE*, but not a *rule of JUDGMENT* for believers, and thus he destroys that law at a stroke, as a *law*; it being evident that a *rule*, by the *personal* observance or non-observance of which Christ's subjects can never be acquitted; or condemned, is not a *law* for them. Hence he asserts that christians shall no more be justified before God by their personal obedience to the law of Christ, than by their personal obedience to the ceremonial law of Moses. Nay, he believes, that the best christians perpetually break *Christ's law*; that no body ever kept it but Christ himself; and that we shall be justified or condemned before God in the great day, not as we shall personally be found to have finally kept or finally broken Christ's law; but, as God shall be found to have before the foundation of the world arbitrarily laid, or *not* laid to our account, the merit of Christ's keeping his own law. Thus, he hopes to stand in the great day merely by what he calls "*Christ's imputed righteousness*;" excluding with abhorrence from our final justification the evangelical worthiness of our own personal, sincere obedience of repentance and faith;—a precious obedience this, which he calls *dung, dross, and filthy rags*; just as if it was the insincere obedience of self-righteous pride, and pharisaic hypocrisy. Nevertheless, tho' he thus excludes the evangelical, derived worthiness of the works of faith from our eternal justification and salvation, HE DOES good works, if he is [in other respects] a good man. Nay, in this case, he *piques himself* to do them; thinking he is peculiarly obliged to make people believe, that, *immoral* as his sentiments are, they draw after them the greatest
beac-

benevolence and the strictest morality: But *Fulsome* shows the contrary.

FULSOME represents a *consistent* antinomian—that is, one who is such in *practice*, as well as in *theory*. He warmly espouses *Zelotes's* doctrine of *finished salvation*; believing that, before the foundation of the world, we were all Calvinistically, i. e. personally *ordained to eternal life IN CHRIST, or to eternal death IN ADAM*, without the least respect to our own works, that is, to our own tempers and conduct. Hence he draws this just inference: “If Christ never died for me, and I am CALVINISTICALLY-reprobated, my best endeavours to be finally justified, and eternally saved, will never alter the decree of reprobation, which was made against me from all eternity. On the other hand, if I am CALVINISTICALLY-elected, and if Christ *absolutely secured*, yea FINISHED my eternal salvation on the cross; no sins can ever blot my name out of the book of life. God, *in the day of his* almighty power, will irresistibly convert or reconvert my soul; and then, the greater my crimes shall have been, the more they will set off divine mercy and power in forgiving and turning such a sinner as me; and I shall only sing in heaven louder than less sinners will have cause to do.” Thus reasons *Fulsome*, and, like a wise man, he is determined, *if he is an absolute REPROBATE*, to have what pleasure he can before God pulls him down to hell *in the day of his power*; Or, *if he is an absolute ELECT*, he thinks it reasonable comfortably to wait for *the day of God's power*, in which day he shall be irresistibly turned, and *absolutely* fitted to sing louder in heaven the praises of CALVINISTICALLY-DISTINGUISHING love:—a love this, which [if the antinomian gospel of the day be true] eternally justifies the chief of sinners, without any personal or inherent worthiness.

INITIAL SALVATION is a phrase which sometimes occurs in these sheets. The plain reader is desired to understand by it, *Salvation begun*, or, an inferior state of acceptance and present Salvation: In this
state

Rate sinners are actually saved from hell, admitted to a degree of favour, and graciously entrusted with one or more talents of grace, that is, of means, power, and ability to work out their own [eternal] salvation, in due subordination to God, who consistently with our liberty, works in us both to will and to do, according to the dispensation of the heathens, jews, or christians, of his good pleasure

By the ELECTION OF GRACE, understand the free, and merely gratuitous choice, which God [AS A WISE AND SOVEREIGN BENEFACITOR] arbitrarily makes of this, that, or the other man, to bestow upon him one, two, or five talents of *Free-grace*.

Opposed to *this election*, you have an ABSOLUTE REPROBATION, which does not draw damnation after it, but only rejection from a superior number of talents. In this sense God reprobated *Enoch* and *David*:—*Enoch*, with respect to the peculiar blessings of *judaism*; and *David*, with regard to the still more peculiar blessings of *christianity*. But altho' neither of them had a share in the election of God's MOST peculiar grace; that is, altho' neither was chosen and called to the blessings of *christianity*; their lot was never cast with those *imaginary* "poor creatures," whom Calvin and his followers affirm to have been from all eternity reprobated with a reprobation, which infallibly draws eternal damnation after it. For *Enoch* and *David* made their election to the rewards of their dispensations sure by the timely and voluntary obedience of faith. And so might all those who obstinately bury their talent or talents to the last.

By FUTURE CONTINGENCIES, understand those things, which will, or will not be done; as the free, *unnecessitated* will of man shall chuse to do them or not.

By SEMINAL EXISTENCE, understand the existence that we had in Adam's loins before Eve had conceived; or the kind of being, which the prince of Wales had in the loins of the King, before the Queen came to England.

THE SECOND PART
OF THE
SCRIPTURE SCALES.
SECTION XIV.

Containing the scripture-doctrine of the perseverance of the saints.

I Promised the Reader, that Zelotes and Honestus should soon meet again, to fight their last battle; and that I may be as good as my word, I bring them a second time upon the stage of controversy. I have no pleasure in seeing them contend with each other; but I hope, that when they shall have shot all their arrows, and spent all their strength, they will quietly sit down, and listen to proposals of reconciliation: They have had already many engagements, but they seem determined that *this* shall be the sharpest. Their challenge is about the doctrine of *perseverance*. Zelotes asserts that the perseverance of believers depends entirely upon God's almighty grace, which nothing can frustrate; and that, of consequence, no believer can *finally* fall. Honestus on the other hand maintains, that continuing in the faith depends *chiefly*, if not *entirely*, upon the believer's free-will; and that of consequence *total* perseverance is, *partly*, if not *altogether*, as uncertain as the fluctuations of the human heart. The reconciling truth lies between those two extremes, as appears from the following propositions, in which I sum up the scripture-doctrine of perseverance.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1. God makes us glorious promises to encourage us to persevere. | } | 2. Those promises are neither compulsory nor absolute. |
| God | | We |
- R

1. God on his part gives us his *gracious* help.

1. FREE-GRACE always does its part.

1. Final perseverance depends FIRST, on the final, *gracious* concurrence of *free-grace* with free-will.

1. As *free-grace* has in all things the pre-eminence over free-will, we must lay much more stress upon GOD'S faithfulness, than upon OUR OWN. The spouse COMES out of the wilderness leaning upon her Beloved, and not upon herself.

1 The believer stands upon two legs (if I may so speak) GOD'S faithfulness and HIS OWN. The one is always sound, nor can he rest too much upon it, if he does but walk *strait* as a wise christian; and does not foolishly *hop* as an antinomian, who goes only upon his *right* leg; or as a pharisee, who moves entirely upon the *left*.

and he can again run the way of GOD'S commandments.

1. When gospel ministers speak of OUR FAITHFULNESS, they chiefly mean

→ (1) Our faithfulness in *repenting,*

2. We must on our part *faithfully* use the help of God.

2 FREE-WILL DOES NOT always do its part.

2. Final perseverance depends SECONDLY, on the final, *faithful* concurrence of *free-will* with *free-grace*.

2. But to infer from thence, that the spouse is to be CARRIED by her Beloved every step of the way, is unscriptural. He gently DRAWS her, and she runs. He gives her his arm, and she leans. But far from DRAGGING her by main force, he bids her *remember Lot's wife*.

2. The believer's *left* leg (I mean HIS OWN faithfulness) is subject to many humours, sores, and bad accidents; especially when he does not use it at all; or when he lays too much stress upon it, to save his other leg. If it is broken, he is already fallen; and if he is out of hell, he must lean as much as he can upon his *right* leg, till the *left* begins to heal,

2. To aim chiefly at being faithful in external works, means of grace, and forms of godliness, is the high road

repenting, that is, in renouncing our sins and pharisaic righteousness; and in improving the talent of light, which shows us our natural depravity, daily imperfections, total helplessness, and constant need of an humble recourse to, and dependance on divine grace. — And (2) Our faithfulness in believing (even in hope against hope) God's redeeming love to sinners in Christ; in humbly apprehending, as returning prodigals, the gratuitous forgiveness of sins thro' the blood of the Lamb; in cheerfully claiming, as impotent creatures, the help that is laid on the Saviour for us; and in constantly coming at his word, to take of the water of life freely. And so far as Zelotes recommends this evangelical disposition of mind, without opening a back-door to antinomianism, by covertly pleading for sin, and dealing about his imaginary decrees of forcible grace and sovereign wrath, he cannot be too highly commended.

1. If Zelotes will do justice to the doctrine of perseverance,

road to pharisaism, and insincere obedience. I grant, that he who is humbly faithful in little things, is faithful also in much; and that he, who slothfully neglects little helps, will soon fall into great sins: But the professors of christianity cannot be too frequently told, that if they are not first faithful in maintaining true poverty of spirit, deep self-humiliation before God, and high thoughts of Christ's blood and righteousness; they will soon slide into laodicean pharisaism: and, Jehu-like, they will make more of their own partial, external, selfish faithfulness, than of divine grace, and the spirit's power: A most dangerous and common error this, into which the followers of Honestus are very prone to run, and so far as he leads them into it, or encourages them in it, he deserves to be highly blamed; and Zelotes, in this respect, hath undoubtedly the advantage over him.

2. Would Honestus kindly meet Zelotes half way, he

R 2 must

severance, he must speak of the obedience of faith, that is, of genuine, sincere obedience, as the oracles of God do. He must not blush to display the glorious rewards, with which God hath promised to crown it. He must boldly declare, that for want of it *the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience* — upon fallen believers, who *have no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God*. Eph. v. 5.—In a word, instead of emasculating ‘*Sergeant if, who valiantly guards the doctrine of perseverance,*’ he should show him all the respect, that Christ himself does in the gospel.

must speak of free-grace, and of Christ’s obedience unto death as the scriptures do. He must glory in displaying divine faithfulness, and placing it in the most conspicuous and engaging light. He must not be ashamed to point out the great rewards of the faith which inherits promises, gives glory to God, and out of weakness makes us strong to take up our cross, and to run the race of obedience. — In a word, he must teach his *willing* hearers to depend every day more and more upon Christ; and to lay as much stress upon his *promises*, as they ever did upon his *threatenings*.

To sum all up in two propositions.

1. The *infallible* perseverance of *obedient* believers, is a most sweet and evangelical doctrine, which cannot be pressed with too much earnestness and constancy upon sincere christians, for their comfort, encouragement, and establishment.

2. The *infallible* perseverance of *disobedient* believers, is a most dangerous and unscriptural doctrine, which cannot be pressed with too much assiduity and tenderness upon antinomian professors for their re-awakening and sanctification.



To see the truth of these propositions, we need only throw with candor into the scripture-scales, the weights

weights which Zelotes and Honestus unmercifully throw at each other; taking particular care not to break, as they do, the *golden beam* of evangelical harmony, by means of which the opposite scales, and weights, exactly balance each other.

1. The Weights of FREE-GRACE thrown by Zelotes.

1. The Lord shall ESTABLISH thee an HOLY people to himself, as he hath SWORN unto thee, Deut. xxviii. 9.

1. Know therefore the LORD thy God: he is God, the faithful God, who keepeth COVENANT. Deut. vii. 9.

1. He hath made with me an EVERLASTING COVENANT, ordered in all things and SURE: for this is ALL my salvation and ALL my desire. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5.

fire was kindled in Jacob, and anger also came up against Israel; BECAUSE they BELIEVED NOT in God, and TRUSTED NOT in HIS SALVATION, &c. The wrath of God came upon them, &c. and SMOTE DOWN the chosen of Israel. Psalm lxxviii. 10, 21, 23, 31.

[Hence it appears, that part of the *everlasting covenant ordered in all things and SURE*, is, that those who break it presumptuously, and do not repent, as David did, before it is too late, shall SURELY be *smitten down and destroyed*.]

2. The Weights of FREE-WILL thrown by Honestus.

2. If thou shalt KEEP the commandments of the Lord thy God, and WALK in HIS ways. *Ibid.*

2. But THEY &c. have transgressed the COVENANT. — THEY CONTINUED NOT in my COVENANT, and I regarded them not. Hof. vi. 7. Heb. viii. 9.

2. THEY have broken the EVERLASTING COVENANT; therefore hath the curse devoured the earth. Is. xxiv. 5. — THEY kept not the COVENANT OF GOD, and REFUSED to walk in his law, &c. so a

1. With him [the Father of lights] is NO variableness, neither shadow of TURNING. James i. 17.—I am the Lord, I CHANGE NOT: [*I still bear with sinners during the day of their visitation:*] therefore ye, sons of Jacob, are not consumed. Mal. iii. 6.

[*Observe here, that, altho' God's essence, and the principles of his conduct towards man, never change; yet, as He loves righteousness, and hates iniquity; and as He is the Rewarder of the righteous, and the Punisher of the wicked; he must shew himself pleased or displeas'd, a Rewarder or a Punisher, as moral agents turn from sin to righteousness, or from righteousness to sin. Without this kind of change ad extra, he could not be holy and just:—he could not be the Judge of all the earth:—he could not be God*]

2. The angel of his presence SAVED them: in his LOVE and PITY he remembered them. BUT THEY rebelled, and vexed his holy spirit; THEREFORE he WAS TURNED to be their ENEMY. Is. lxiii. 9, 10.—The Lord God of Israel saith: I said indeed, that thy house, and the house of thy father, should walk before me FOR EVER: BUT NOW, be it far from me; FOR, &c. they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed. 1 Sam. ii. 30.—And the word of the Lord came to Jonah, saying, Preach unto Nineveh the preaching that I BID thee:—And Jonah cried and said, Yet forty days, and Nineveh SHALL BE overthrown. So the people of Nineveh believed God, &c. For the king sat in ashes, and caused it to be proclaimed, &c. Cry mightily to God, yea let every one TURN from his evil way, &c. Who can

tell if God will TURN and repent, that we perish not. And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way: And God repented of the evil, which HE HAD SAID, that he would do unto them, and he DID IT NOT. Jonah iii. i, &c. [*From the preceding remarkable passages it is evident, that, except in a few cases, the promises and threatenings of God, so long as the day of grace and trial lasts, are conditional; and that*

that, even when they wear the most ABSOLUTE aspect, the condition is generally implied.]

1. THE GIFTS and CALLING of God are without REPENTANCE. ROM. xi. 29. — [The apostle evidently speaks these words of God's gifts to, and calling of the Jewish nation. The Lord is so far from *repenting* (PROPERLY speaking) of his having once called the Jews to the *Mosaic* covenant of *peculiarity*, that he is ready *nationally* to re-admit them to his *peculiar* favour, when they shall *nationally* repent, embrace the gospel of Christ, and so make their sincere *calling* to the christian covenant sure by believing. But does this prove that God forces repentance upon every Jew, and that when the Jews will *nationally* repent, God will absolutely and irresistibly work out their salvation for them? If Zelotes thinks so, I desire him to look into the scale of Honestus.]

1. We [—*who hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering*] — are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul. Heb. x. 39. — We believe, that, THROUGH THE GRACE OF

SHALL

2. I GAVE her time to repent, and she repented not. Rev. ii. 21. — Because I have CALLED, and ye refused, &c. I also will mock — when your DESTRUCTION cometh as a whirlwind. Prov. i. 24, &c. — The Lord [*to speak FIGURATIVELY and after the manner of men*] REPENTED that he had made Saul king over Israel. 1 Sam. xv. 35. [*That is, when Saul proved unfaithful, the Lord rejected him in as positive a manner as a king would reject a minister, or break a general, when he repents of his having raised them to offices, of which they now show themselves absolutely unworthy.*]

2. *If* that, which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, 1 John ii. 24. — *If* ye continue in the faith, Col. i. 23 — *If* ye continue in his goodness, Rom. xi. 22. — *If* ye do these things, 2 Peter i. 10. — *If* we hold fast the confidence firm unto the end,

SHALL BE SAVED. Acts | end, Heb. iii. 6. — For
XV. 11. | he that shall endure unto

THE END, the same shall
be saved. Mat. xxiv. 13.—[Should *Zelotes* endeavour
to set aside these, and the like scriptures, by saying,
that each contains a *christian* IF, and not a *jewish* IF,
i. e. a *description*, and not a *condition*; I refer him to
Equal Check, Part I. p. 104, where that trifling objec-
tion is answered,]

1. If his [*David's*] chil-
dren FORSAKE my law,
&c. then will I visit their
transgression with the rod,
&c. nevertheless my lov-
ing kindness will I not
UTTERLY take from HIM
[*David*, by utterly casting
off his posterity] nor suffer
my truth to fail [as it
would do, if I appointed
that the *Messiah* should
come of another family.]
Pf. lxxxix. 30, &c.

1. Thus saith the Lord,
&c. O Israel, fear not
for I have redeemed thee;
I have called thee by thy
name, thou art mine.
When thou passest thro'
the

2. And thou, Solomon
my son, know thou the
God of thy father, and
serve him with a perfect
heart, and a willing mind:
for the Lord searcheth all
hearts, and understandeth
all the imaginations of
the thoughts; If thou
seek him he will † be
found of thee; but IF
thou FORSAKE him, he
will cast thee OFF FOR-
EVER. Take heed now.
1 Chr. xxviii. 9.

2. And the spirit of
God came upon Azariah,
and he went out to meet
Aza, and said unto him,
Hear ye me, Aza and ALL
Judah: The Lord is with
you,

† When *Isaiab* saith, *I was found of them that sought me not*, &c.
Rom. x. 23, he does not contradict his own exhortation to *seek the
Lord while he may be found*: That noble testimony to the doctrine of
grace does not militate against the doctrine of liberty. But it proves,
(1) That free-grace is always before hand with free-will, and (2)
That as God freely called the *Jews* to the *Mosaic* covenant of *pecu-
liarity*; so he gratuitously calls the *Gentiles* to the *Christian* covenant
of *peculiarity*; neither *Jews* nor *Gentiles* having previously sought that
inestimable favour. But when God has *so far* revealed himself either
to Jew or Gentile, as to say, *Seek ye my face*, wo to him who does
not answer in truth, and in time, *Thy face, Lord, will I seek*.

the waters, I will be with **THEE**; and thro' the rivers, they shall not overflow **THEE**: when thou walkest through the fire, **THOU** shalt not be burnt, &c. Is. xliii. 1, 2.

1. ALL the PROMISES of God IN HIM [*Christ*] are YEA, and in him AMEN. 2 Cor. i. 20.—[*And so are all the MENACES: for he is the faithful Witness, and the Mediator of the new covenant, which has its threatenings, as well as its promises: as appears from the opposite words, spoken by Christ himself.*]

their public and national, as well as private and personal accomplishment.] Rev. ii. 5, 15, 16, 23.—iii. 16.

1. God willing more abundantly to show to the heirs of promise [*i. e. to obedient believers*] the IMMUTABILITY of his counsel, confirmed it by an OATH: that by two IMMUTABLE things [*the word and oath of the Lord*] in which it was IMPOSSIBLE for God to lie, we might have a STRONG consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us Heb. vi. 17, 18.

1. And thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall

you, WHILE YE be with him; and IF YE seek him, he will be found of you; but: IF YE forsake him, he will forsake you. 2 Chr. xv. 1, 2.

2. Remember whence thou ART FALLEN, repent, and do thy first works, or else I will REMOVE thy candlestick.—I will FIGHT with the sword of my mouth against them, that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans.—I will kill her children with death.—I will spue thee out of my mouth. [*Awful threatenings these, which had*

2. As truly AS I LIVE, saith the Lord, &c. your carcases shall fall in this wilderness; and all that, &c. have murmured against me, DOUBTLESS YE SHALL NOT come into the land, concerning which I SWARE TO MAKE YOU dwell therein, save Caleb and Joshua, &c. Ye shall bear your iniquities, &c. and ye shall know my BREACH OF PROMISE. Numb. xiv. 28—34.

2. My mother and my brethren [*i. e. MY PEOPLE*]

shall SAVE HIS PEOPLE from their sins. Mat. i. 21. [PEOPLE] are these, who hear the word of God, and KEEP it, Mat. xii. 50. I will DESTROY MY [backsliding] PEOPLE, since THEY RETURN NOT. Jer. xv. 7.

1. I will take you to me for a people, and be to you a GOD. Ex. vi. 7. 2. But if thine heart TURN AWAY, so that thou wilt not hear, &c. I denounce unto you this day,

that ye shall SURELY PERISH. Deut. xxx. 17, 18.— Indeed the hand of the Lord was against them [when they disobeyed] to DESTROY them, &c. until they were CONSUMED. Deut. ii. 15. — Now all these things, &c. are written for OUR admonition. I Cor. x. 11.

1. The Lord thy God hath CHOSEN THEE to be a SPECIAL PEOPLE unto himself. — He brought forth HIS PEOPLE with joy, and HIS CHOSEN with gladness. Deut. xiv. 2. — Pf. cv. 43. 2. And the Lord spake to Moses, saying, Get you up from among this congregation [this SPECIAL, CHOSEN people] that I may consume them in a moment. Num. xvi. 45.

1. My [faithful] people shall NEVER be ASHAMED. Joel ii. 27. 2. Thou [my unfaithful people] hadst a whore's forehead: thou refusedst to be ASHAMED. Jer. iii. 3.

1. The work of righteousness shall be PEACE, quietness, and assurance FOR EVER: and MY PEOPLE shall dwell in a peaceable habitation, and in SURE dwellings, and in quiet resting-places. Is. xxxii. 17, 18. 2. EVERY ONE of the house of Israel, that SEPARATETH HIMSELF from me, saith the Lord, I will CUT HIM OFF from the midst of MY people. Ez. xiv. 7. There is NO PEACE to the WICKED. Is. lvii. 21.

1. The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the EVERLASTING ARMS, &c. ISRAEL shall dwell in SAFETY alone, &c. 2. That the house of Israel may GO NO MORE ASTRAY from me, &c. but that they MAY BE my people. Ez. xiv. 11. — OBBY

&c. Happy art thou, O Israel: who is like unto thee, O people SAVED BY THE LORD; the shield of thy help. Dent. xxxiii. 27, &c.

— OBEY my voice, and ye shall be MY PEOPLE. Jer. vii. 23. — Wo unto them [Israel and Ephraim] FOR they have fled from me: DESTRUCTION unto them, BECAUSE they have

transgressed against me.— They RETURN NOT to the Most High. Hof. vii. 13, 16.

1. The Lord will PITY his people. Joel ii. 18.

2. The Lord shall JUDGE his people. Heb. x. 30. JUDGMENT MUST

begin at the House of God. 1 Pet. iv. 17.

1. Hath God [absolutely] cast away his people [the Jews?] God forbid! God has not cast away his people, whom he foreknew [as believing; the Jews being as welcome to believe in Christ as the Gentiles.] Rom. xi. 1, 2.

2. Ye are a CHOSEN [choice] generation, &c. which in time past WERE NOT a people, but ARE NOW the people of God: which HAD NOT obtained mercy, but NOW HAVE obtained mercy [by believing.] 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10.

1. Zion said, The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me. Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea they may forget, yet WILL I NOT forget thee. Is. xlix. 14, 15.

2. Therefore the children of Israel could not stand before their enemies, &c. because they were ACCURSED: neither will I be with you ANY MORE [said the Lord] EXCEPT ye destroy the accursed thing from amongst you. Josh. vii. 12.

1, Jesus having loved his own [disciples] he LOVED them UNTO THE END [of his stay in this world, except him that was once his own familiar friend, in whom he trusted,

2 I will call her BELOVED, who WAS NOT beloved. — Jesus loved HIM [the young ruler, who went away sorrowing] — I will love them NO MORE. Rom. ix. 25. Mar. x.

trusted, Judas, whom our Lord himself excepts. John xvii. 12. See page 101.] John xiii. 1.—I have loved thee with an EVERLASTING LOVE, [or with THE LOVE with which I loved thee OF OLD, when I brought thee out of Egypt] therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee. Jer. xxxi. 3. [Compare the word everlasting in the original, with these words, when Israel was a child, when I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. Hof. xi. 1.]

1. Truly God is good to ISRAEL. Pf. lxxiii. 1.—This God is OUR God FOR EVER and ever; he will be our guide even UNTO DEATH. Pf. xlviii. 24.

OF GOD and man. Pf. xxxvii. 27.—Prov. iii. 3, 4.
1. Who shall lay ANY THING to the charge of God's ELECT? [them that are in Christ, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit?] It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth them? Rom. viii. 1, 33, 34.

1. All things are YOURS [ye Corinthians] and YE ARE CHRIST'S and Christ is God's.—Of him YE ARE IN CHRIST Jesus. I Cor. iii. 21.—i. 30.

1. To them, that are sanctified by God the Father, and PRESERVED IN JESUS CHRIST, and call-

x. 21.—Hof. ix. 15.
2. Even to such as are of a CLEAN heart. *Ibid.*—Depart from evil, DO GOOD, and dwell FOR EVERMORE.—Bind mercy and truth about thy neck, &c. so shalt thou find favour, &c. IN THE SIGHT

2. [No righteous judge:] For to be SPIRITUALLY minded is LIFE and peace; but to be CARNALLY minded is DEATH. *Verse 6.*—Whosoever hath sinned against me, said the Lord, HIM will I blot out of my book. Ex. xxxii. 33.

2. Examine yourselves [ye Corinthians] whether ye be in the FAITH, &c. Know ye not, &c. that Christ is in you; except YE BE REPROBATES?—2 Cor. xiii. 5.

2. To them, who by patient CONTINUANCE IN WELL-DOING, SEEK for glory, honour, and im-

ed [to enjoy the blessings of his gospel. Jude 1.]

1. If we believe not, yet HE ABIDETH FAITHFUL; he cannot deny himself. 2 Tim. ii. 13. [Therefore]

1. Except THE LORD KEEP the city, the WATCHMAN waketh but IN VAIN. Pf. cxxvii. 1.

— 2 Tim. iv. 5.—1 John v. 18.

1. He [the Lord] led him [*Jacob*] about &c. he KEPT him as the apple of his eye. AS an eagle fluttereth over her young, taketh them, beareth them on her wings: SO the Lord alone did lead him. Deut. xxxii. 10, 11, 12.

1. Holy Father, KEEP THRO' THY OWN name those, whom thou hast given me [*that I may impart unto them the peculiar blessings of my dispensation.*] John xvii. 11.

him. [*He is fallen from God in spirit.*] Jude 21. — 1 John v. 21.—ii. 15.

1. You, who are KEPT by the POWER OF GOD unto SALVATION, ready to be revealed in the last time. 1 Peter i. 5.

mortality, [God will render] eternal life. Rom. ii. 7.

2. If we deny him, he will also DENY US: [*For he abideth faithful to his THREATENINGS, as well as to his promises*] ver. 12.

2. I say unto all, WATCH. — Watch THOU in ALL things. — He that is begotten of God KEEPETH HIMSELF. Mark xiii. 37.

v. 18.

2. There was NO strange God with him [*Jacob*]— But &c. they forsook God, &c. sacrificed to devils, &c. and when the Lord saw it, he abhorred them; [*and said*] I will spend mine arrows upon them. Ver. 12, 15, 17, 19, 23.

2. KEEP YOURSELVES in the love of God.—Little children KEEP YOURSELVES from idols.—Fathers &c. love not the world, &c. If any [*of you*] love the world, the love of the Father is not in

2. Through FAITH [*on your part.*] *Ibid.* — Holding FAITH, and a GOOD CONSCIENCE, which some having put away, concerning FAITH have made SHIPWRECK. 1 Tim. i. 19.

1. I

2. You

S

1. I AM PERSUADED, that neither death, nor life, &c. nor angels, &c. nor any other creature [NOTE: *he does not say, Nor any iniquity*] shall be ABLE TO SEPARATE US from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Rom. viii. 38.

[or] a REPROBATE. 1 Cor. ix. 26, 27.

1. I know whom I have believed, and I am PERSUADED, that He is ABLE TO KEEP that, which I have committed unto him AGAINST THAT DAY. 2 Tim. i. 12.

were BROKEN OFF, and FEAR &c. LEST he also spare NOT thee. Rom ii. 11.—xi. 17, &c. Give all diligence to add to your faith virtue &c. for IF YE do these things ye shall NEVER fall. 2 Peter i. 5, 10.

1. In ALL these things we are MORE than conquerors, THRO' HIM that loved us. Rom. viii. 37.

1. Moreover, whom he did predestinate [i. e. appoint to be conformed to the image of his Son, according to the CHRISTIAN dispensation] them he also called [to believe in Christ:] and whom he [thus] called [to believe in Christ, when they made

2. YOUR INIQUITIES have SEPARATED between you and your God. N. xv. 12.—I so run [for an incorruptible crown] not as uncertainly: so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: But I KEEP my body under, &c. LEST that by any means &c. I myself should be a CAST-AWAY,

2. There is no respect of persons with God.—Thou partakeſt of the root of the olive tree, &c. some of the branches are BROKEN OFF, &c. Boast not thyself against them, &c. BY UNBELIEF they thou standest by faith &c.

2. I HAVE KEPT the faith:—For I have KEPT the ways of the Lord, and HAVE NOT wickedly departed from my God. 2 Tim. iv. 7. Ps. xviii. 21.

2. Many are CALLED [so believe:] but few are chosen [to the rewards of faith.] Mat. xxii. 14.—O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt [i. e. I JUSTIFIED thee:] because thou desiredst me, &c. shouldst thou not also have

made their calling sure by actually believing, whom he also justified: and whom he justified [as sinners by faith, and as believers by the works of faith] them he also glorified. Rom. viii. 30.—By one OFFERING he hath perfected FOR EVER [in atoning merits] them that ARE SANCTIFIED. Heb. x. 14.— [Here we have a brief account of the method, in which God brings obedient, persevering believers to glory. But what has this to do with Zetotes's personal and unconditional predestination to eternal life or to eternal death? To show therefore, that the sense, which he gives to these passages is erroneous, I need only prove, that all those who are called are NOT JUSTIFIED; and that all those who are justified, and sanctified, are NOT GLORIFIED; but only those who make their calling, election, justification, sanctification and glorification SURE by the obedience of faith unto the end. And I prove it by the opposite scriptures.]

have had compassion on thy fellow servant, even as I HAD PITY on thee? And his Lord was wroth, and delivered him to the TORMENTORS. Mat. xviii. 32, &c.— He that despised Moses's law, DIED WITHOUT MERCY, &c. of how MUCH SORER punishment shall he be thought worthy, who hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith HE WAS SANCTIFIED, an unholy thing! Heb. x. 29.—Ye [believers] shall be hated of all men, &c. but he [of you] that endureth TO THE END, shall be [eternally] SAVED. Mat. x. 22. [For God] will render ETERNAL LIFE to them, who by PATIENT CONTINUANCE in well-doing seek for glory. Rom, ii. 7.

Can any unprejudiced person read the preceding passages without seeing: (1) That, according to the scriptures, and the gospel-axioms, our perseverance, is suspended on two grand causes, the first of which is merciful Free-grace, and the second, faithful Free-will.— (2) That those two causes must finally act in conjunction: And, —(3) That when Free-grace hath en-

abled *Free-will* to concur, and to work out its own salvation, if *free-will* obstinately refuses to do it till the night comes when no man can work, *free-grace* gives up *free-will* to its own perverseness; and then perseverance fails, and final apostasy takes place.



S E C T I O N XV.

The important doctrine of perseverance is farther weighed in the scripture-scales.

THE scriptures produced in the preceding section might convince an impartial Reader, that Zelotes and Honestus are both in the wrong with respect to the doctrine of perseverance, and that a bible-christian holds together the doctrines which they keep asunder. But considering that prejudice is not easily convinced; and fearing, lest Zelotes and Honestus will both think they have won the day, the one against *free-will*, and the other against *free-grace*, merely because they can quote behind each other's back some passages which I have not yet balanced, and which each will think matchless; I shall give them leave to fight it out before Candidus, reminding him, that Zelotes produces No. I, against *Free-will*, that Honestus produces No. II, against *Free-grace*, and that I produce *both numbers* to shew, that our free-will must concur with God's free-grace in order to our persevering in the faith, and in the obedience of faith.

1. A VINEYARD of red wine. I the Lord DO KEEP IT: I will water it EVERY MOMENT: lest any hurt it, I will keep it NIGHT AND DAY. Is. xxvii. 2, 3.

2. I had planted thee a NOBLE VINE, wholly a right seed: how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me? &c. Thou saidst, &c. I have loved
strangers,

strangers, and after them I WILL GO. Jer. ii. 21, 25
— What could have been done MORE TO MY VINE-
YARD, that I have not done in it? Wherefore, when
I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought i,
forth WILD grapes? And now, I will tell you what I will
do to my vineyard, &c. I will lay it WASTE, and &c.
command the clouds, that they rain NO RAIN upon
it. Is. v. 4, 5, 6.

1. The Lord God of
Israel saith, that he hateth
PUTTING AWAY. Mal. ii.
16. [*And yet he allows it*
for the cause of fornication.
Mat. v. 32.]

2. BACKSLIDING Israel,
&c. hath played the har-
lot. And I said, &c. Turn
thou unto me: But SHE
RETURNED NOT: and her
treacherous sister Judah
saw it. And I saw, when,

for — adultery, I had PUT HER AWAY, and given her
a bill of DIVORCEMENT: yet her treacherous sister
Judah FEARED NOT. Jer. iii. 6, 7, 8.

1. The righteous shall
NEVER BE REMOVED. Prov.
x. 30.

2. I marvel that ye are
SO SOON REMOVED from
him that called you. Gal.
i. 6.

1. The mountains shall
depart, &c. but my kind-
ness shall NOT DEPART
from thee, neither shall
the COVENANT OF MY
PEACE be REMOVED, saith
the Lord. Is. liv. 10.

2. Unto the WICKED
God saith: What hast
thou to do to declare
my statutes, or that thou
shouldst take MY COVE-
NANT in thy mouth? Ps.
l. 16. — O Israel, if thou
wilt put away thy abomi-

nations out of my sight, thou shalt NOT REMOVE. Jer.
iv. 1. — Jerusalem hath grievously sinned: THEREFORE
she is REMOVED, Lam. i. 8. — My God will cast them
away, BECAUSE they did not hearken unto him. Hof.
ix. 17.

1. They that trust in
the Lord shall be as mount
Zion, which CANNOT be
removed, but ABIDETH
FOR EVER. As the moun-
tains

2. Lord, who shall AB-
BIDE in thy tabernacle?
— He that WALKETH up-
rightly and WORKETH
righteousness, &c. He that
DOES

tains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about HIS PEOPLE, from henceforth, even FOR EVER. Pf. cxxv. 1, 2. | DOES these things shall NEVER be moved. Psalm xv. 1, 2, 5. — ABIDE in me, and I [*will abide*] in you. John xv. 4. — He that dwelleth in the secret

place of the most High [*Thou Lord art my hiding place, Ps. xxxii. 7.*] shall ABIDE under the shadow of the Almighty. Pf. xci. 1. — He that DOES the will of God, ABIDETH for ever. 1 John ii. 17. — DRAW OUT thy soul to the hungry, &c. and the Lord shall guide thee CONTINUALLY, and, &c. thou shalt be like a spring of water, whose waters FAIL NOT. Is. lviii. 10, 11.

1. The LORD will speak PEACE unto his people, and to his saints. Psalm lxxxv. 8. — Peace shall be upon Israel. Pf. cxxv. 5. [*For*] Christ is our peace. Eph. ii. 14. | 2. BE DILIGENT that you may be found of him in PEACE. — If the house be WORTHY, let YOUR PEACE come upon it. — As many as WALK according to this rule (*i. e. as becomes a new creature*) PEACE be on

them, and mercy. 1 Peter iii. 14. — Mat. x. 13. — Gal. vi. 15, 16.

1. O'CONTINUE thy loving-kindness unto them that KNOW THEE. | 2. And thy righteousness to the UPRIGHT IN HEART. Pf. xxxvi. 10. — He [*the apostate*] FLAT-

TERETH HIMSELF in his own eyes, &c. he hath LEFT OFF TO BE wise, and TO DO good, &c. He setteth himself in a way that is not good, he abhorreth not evil, &c. There are the workers of iniquity FALLEN, &c. and shall NOT be able to rise. Ver. 2, 3, 4, 12. — Whoso CONTINUETH in the perfect law of liberty, he being a DOER of the WORK, this man shall be BLESSED. Jam. i: 25. — They went out from us, but [*in general*] they were not of us [*that CONTINUE in the perfect law of liberty*]. For had they been of us [*that are still DOERS of the WORK*] they would no doubt have continued with us: [*The gnosticks, or antinomians, would not have been able*]

able to draw so many over to their pernicious ways, or tenets. 2 Pet. ii. 2, &c.] But they went out [they joined the antinomians] that they might be made manifest, that they were not ALL of us, i. e. that IN GENERAL their heart had departed from the Lord; and from us; they of late being of us more by profession, than by possession of the faith which works by obedient love.] 1 John, ii. 19.

St. John says, *They were not ALL of us*, to leave room for some exceptions. For, as we are persuaded, that many, who have gone over to the solifidians in our days, are still OF US that are DOERS of the WORK: So St. John did not doubt, but some, who had been *seduced* by the primitive antinomians [See verse 26.] continued to obey that perfect law of liberty, which the Nicholaitans taught them to decry. May we, after his example, be always ready to make a proper distinction between the solifidians that are *of us*, and those that are *not of us*! That is, between those, who still keep Christ's commandments; and those, who break them with as little ceremony as they break a ceremonious "rule of life," or a burdensome rule of civility!

1. Let them that suffer according to the will of God, commit the KEEPING OF THEIR soul TO GOD, &c. as unto a FAITHFUL Creator. 1 Pet. iv. 19.

1. I will betroth thee unto me FOR EVER, &c. I will even betroth thee unto me in FAITHFULNESS. — The Lord is FAITHFUL, who SHALL STABLISH you and KEEP YOU from evil. — To him that IS ABLE TO KEEP YOU from falling, and to present

2. IN WELL DOING. *Ibid.* — Say ye to the righteous, that it shall be WELL WITH THEM, for they shall eat the fruit of THEIR DOINGS. Is. iii. 10.

2. If ye have not been FAITHFUL in the unrighteous mammon [that which is least] who will commit unto you the true riches? Luke xvi. 11. — He made HIS OWN people to go forth like SHEEP, and guided them like a flock. And he led them on SAFELY,

sent you FAULTLESS before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. Hof. ii. 19, 20. 2 Theff. iii, 3. Jude 24.

SAFELY, so that they feared not, &c. Yet they KEPT NOT his testimonies; but TURNED BACK and DEALT UNFAITHFULLY: &c. When God heard

this, he &c. greatly ABHORR'D Israel: So that he FORSOOK the tabernacle, &c. which he had placed among men, &c. Ps. lxxviii. 52, &c.

1. The earth, which beareth thorns, is rejected; and &c. its end is to be burned. But, beloved, we are persuaded BETTER things of YOU, and things which accompany SALVATION, THO' we thus speak. Heb. 6. 8, 9.

2. FOR, &c. ye have ministered to the saints, and DO MINISTER: [*so that, in the judgement of charity, which hopeth all things, especially where there are favourable appearances, it is right in me to hope the best of you, nor will I suspect you, till you give me*

cause so to do. However remember that] If we sin wilfully, &c. there remaineth [*for us*] &c. a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries [*i. e. apostates*]: Heb. vi. 10. — x. 26, 27.

1. I am CONFIDENT of this very thing, that he, who has BEGUN a good work in you, WILL PERFORM it UNTIL the day of Jesus Christ. Phil. i. 6.

2. It is meet for me to think this of you all, because I have you in my heart [*and charity hopeth all things*] in as much as in my bonds, &c. ye are partakers of my grace: —

ye have ALWAYS OBEYED. Phil. i. 7.—ii. 12. [*Thus spake the apostle to those who continued to OBEY. But to his disobedient converts he wrote in a different strain.*] O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that you should NOT OBEY the truth? — Have ye suffered so many things IN VAIN? — I desire now to CHANGE my voice, for I stand in DOUBT of you. Gal. iii. 1, 4. —iv. 20.

1. The Lord is MY rock, and my fortress, and my

2. My defence is God, who SAVETH the UPRIGHT in heart.

my deliverer: my God, my strength, in whom I will trust, my buckler, and the horn of MY salvation, and MY high tower. Ps. xviii. 2.

forth WITH the WORKERS

1. I will put MY SPIRIT within you, and cause you [*so far as is consistent with your moral agency*] to walk in my statutes, and ye shall [*or will*] keep my judgments, and do them. Ez. xxxvi. 27.

1. ISRAEL shall BE SAVED in the Lord with an EVERLASTING SALVATION. Is. xlv. 17.

1. O Lord save me, and I shall be saved, for thou art my praise. Jer. xvii. 14.—Salvation is of the Lord. Jonah ii. 9.

1. The foundation of God STANDETH SURE, having this seal: the Lord knoweth them that are HIS. 2 Tim. ii. 19.

HIS. Rom. viii. 9. HIS PECULIAR people [*being*] an HOLY nation ZEALOUS of good works, 1 Pet. ii. 9. Tit. ii. 14.—Be ZEALOUS therefore, and repent: [*or*] I will SPEE THEE OUT of my mouth. Rev. iii. 19, 16.

heart. Ps. vii. 10.—Do good, O Lord, to those that are GOOD and UPRIGHT in their hearts: As for such as TURN ASIDE unto their crooked ways, the Lord shall lead them

OF INIQUITY. Ps. cxxv. 4, 5.

2. Thus saith the Lord God, I will yet for this BE ENQUIRED OF by the house of Israel, to do it, for them. Ez. xxxvi. 37.—Ye stiff-necked, &c. ye do always RESIST THE HOLY GHOST, as your fathers did. Acts vii. 51.

2. How shall we escape, if we NEGLECT SO GREAT SALVATION. Heb. ii. 3.—Remember Lot's wife. Luke xvii. 32.

2. Thy faith hath saved thee. Luke vii. 50.—Ye are saved, if ye keep [*in memory and practice*] what I have preached unto you, 1 Cor. xv. 2:

2. And let every one that nameth the name of Christ DEPART from iniquity. *Ibid.*—Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of

1. THOU

1. THOU wilt PERFORM the truth to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham, which THOU HAST SWORN to our fathers from the days of old.— To PERFORM the mercy promised to our Fathers, and to remember his holy COVENANT, and the OATH, which he swore to our father Abraham. Micah vi. 20.—Luke i. 72.

them forth from the iron furnace] saying, OBEY my voice and DO them, so shall ye be MY PEOPLE, and I will be your God; that I may PERFORM the OATH, which I HAVE SWORN to your fathers. Jer. xi. 3, 4) 5.

1. Surety *goodness* and mercy shall follow me ALL THE DAYS of my life. Ps. xlii. 6.

faith have MADE SURETY. Rom. xi. 22.—1 Tim. i. 18. 19.

1. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand: but it SHALL NOT come nigh THEE. Ps. xci. 7.

1. My SHEEP [*obedient believers*] hear my voice, and I know [*approve*] them, and they follow me: and I GIVE unto them eternal life, and they shall NEVER PERISH, neither

2. I will PERFORM the OATH, which I swore unto Abraham thy father, &c. BECAUSE that Abraham OBEYED my voice, and KEPT my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws. Gen. xxvi. 3, 5.—Thus says the Lord God of Israel, COUSED be the man, that OBEYETH NOT the words of this COVENANT, which I commanded your fathers [in the day that I brought

them forth from the iron furnace] saying, OBEY my voice and DO them, so shall ye be MY PEOPLE, and I will be your God; that I may PERFORM the OATH, which I HAVE SWORN to your fathers. Jer. xi. 3, 4) 5.

2. IF thou CONTINUE in his *goodness*.—Holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having PUT AWAY, concerning

faith have MADE SURETY. Rom. xi. 22.—1 Tim. i. 18. 19.

2. BECAUSE thou HAST MADE the most High thy habitation.—BECAUSE he HATH SET his love upon me, THEREFORE will I deliver him. *Verses* 9. 14.

2. The Lord preserveth the FAITHFUL, &c. Be of good courage, and he shall strengthen your heart, ALL YE, that HOPE IN THE LORD. Ps. xxxi. 23, 24.—IT YE WILL FEAR the

neither shall any pluck them out of my Father's hand. John x. 27. &c.

the Lord, and obey his voice, and NOT REBELL against his commandment then shall ye CONTINUE following the Lord your God. But if ye will NOT OBEY, &c. then shall the hand of the Lord be against you.—Only SERVE HIM in truth, with all your heart: for consider how great things he has done for you. But if ye shall still DO WICKEDLY, ye shall be CONSUMED. 1 Sam. xii. 14, 15, 24, 25. [*Left Samuel's testimony should be rejected as unevangelical, I produce that of Christ himself; hoping that Zelotes will allow our Lord to understand his own gospel.*] Bear much fruit, so shall ye be my disciples. As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: CONTINUE YE in my love. If YE KEEP my commandments, ye shall ABIDE in my love: even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and MY FATHER is his love. John xv. 8. &c.—Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh away—and they are burned. John xv. 2, 6.

1. There shall arise false Christs, and shall show great signs, inso-much that [IF IT WERE POSSIBLE] they shall DECEIVE πλανησας [*lead into error*] the VERY ELECT. Mat. xxiv. 24.

2. They shall deceive many.—Take HEED that no man DECEIVE YOU. Verses 4, 5. — They [*that cause divisions*] by good words DECEIVE the hearts of the simple. Rom. xvi. 18.

[*Query: Are all the simple believers, whom party-men* DECEIVE, *very* REPROBATES?] — I have espoused you to Christ, &c. But I fear, lest, by any means, as the serpent BEGUILLED Eve, so your minds should be CORRUPTED. 2 Cor. xi. 2, 3. — They HAVE BEEN DECEIVED [*or, have erred*] FROM THE FAITH [*ἀπὸ πίστεως*, *the very word used by our Lord, and strengthened by a preposition*] 1 Tim. vi. 10. — When Zelotes supposes, that the clause (*if it were possible*) necessarily implies an *impossibility*, does he not make himself ridiculous before those who know the scriptures?

That

That expression IF IT WERE POSSIBLE, is used only on four other occasions; and in each of them it notes *great difficulty*, but by no means *an impossibility*. Take only two instances: IF IT WERE POSSIBLE *ye would have plucked out your own eyes; and have given them to me.* Gal. iv. 15. — *Paul hastened to be at Jerusalem the day of pentecost,* IF IT WERE POSSIBLE *for him.* Acts xx. 16. Now is it not evident, either that Paul wanted common sense if he *hastened to do what could not absolutely be done*; or that the expression IF IT WERE POSSIBLE implies no impossibility? And is not this a proof, that calvinism can now DECEIVE Zelotes, as easily as the tempter formerly DECEIVED Aaron, David, Solomon, Demas, and Judas in the matter of the golden calf, Uriah, Milcom, and Mammon?

1. I have prayed for thee, that thy faith FAIL NOT. Luke xxii. 32.

That Peter's faith failed for a time is evident from the following observations: (1) *Faith without works is dead*: much more faith with lying, cursing, and the repeated denial of Christ:—(2) Our Saviour himself said to his disciples, after a far less grievous fall, *How is it that you have NO FAITH.* Mark iv. 40.—(3) His adding immediately, *When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren,* shows, that Peter would stand in need of *conversion*, and consequently of *living, converting faith*; for, as by killing unbelief we depart from God, so by living faith we are *converted to him.*

2. I know thy works, &c. thou holdest fast my name, and hast NOT DENIED my FAITH [*as Peter did*] — Having damnation because they have CAST OFF their first FAITH. Rev. ii. 13. 1 Tim. v. 12. —Which [a good conscience, *the believer's most precious jewel, next to Christ*] some having put away, concerning FAITH have made SHIPWRECK. 1 Tim. i. 19.—WITHOUT FAITH it is impossible to PLEASE God. — The just shall live by FAITH, but if he draw back [i. e. *if he make shipwreck of faith*] my soul shall have NO PLEASURE in him. Heb. xi. 6.—x. 38. — If any [*believer*] provide not for his own, &c. he hath denied the FAITH, and IS WORSE

him. Hence it is evident that, if Christ prayed, that Peter's faith might

worse than an INFIDEL. 1 Tim. v. 8.

not fail AT ALL, he prayed CONDITIONALLY; and, that upon Peter's refusing to *watch and pray*, which was the condition particularly mentioned by our Lord, Christ's prayer was no more answered than that which he soon after put up, about his not drinking the bitter cup, and about the forgiveness of his revilers and murderers. But, if our Lord prayed (as seems most likely) that Peter's faith might not fail or die like that of Judas, i. e. in such a manner as never to come to life again, then his prayer was perfectly answered: for the candle of Peter's faith, which a sudden blast of temptation [and not the extinguisher of malicious, final obstinacy] had put out, Peter's faith, I say, like the smoking flax, caught again the flame of truth and love, and shone to the enlightening of thousands on the day of pentecost, as well as to the *conversion* of his own soul that very night. However, from our Lord's prayer, Zelotes concludes, that true faith can never fail, in flat opposition to the scriptures, which fill the opposite scale; yea, and to reason, which pronounces, that our Lord was too wise to spend his last moments in asking, that a thing *might not* happen, which, if we believe Zelotes, *could not* possibly happen.

1. GOD even our Father, who hath loved us, and given us EVERLASTING consolation, &c. STABILISH you in every good word and work. 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17.--He who ESTABLISHETH US with you in Christ, &c. is GOD. 2 Cor. i. 21.

2. IF YE WILL NOT believe, ye shall NOT be ESTABLISHED. Is. vii. 9. God PRESERVETH NOT the life of the WICKED, &c. He withdraweth not his eyes from the RIGHTEOUS, &c. He sheweth them their work, and their transgressions, &c. He openeth also their ear to discipline, and commandeth, that they RETURN from iniquity. IF THEY OBEY and serve him, they will

T

will spend their days in prosperity, &c. But if THEY OBEY NOT, they shall PERISH, &c. and die without knowledge. Job xxxvi. 6—12.

1. Christ shall also CONFIRM you UNTO THE END, that ye may be blameless, &c. God is FAITHFUL, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son. 1 Cor. i. 8, 9.

2. Know ye not that YE ARE the temple of God, &c. If any [of you] defile the temple of God, HIM will God DESTROY. Chap. iii. 16, 17.—If thy right eye offend thee, PLUCK it out, for it is profitable for thee that

one of thy members should PERISH, and not that thy whole body should be CAST INTO HELL. Mat. v. 29.—DESTROY not him with thy meat, FOR WHOM CHRIST DIED.—For meat DESTROY not the WORK OF GOD [in] thy brother, who stumbleth, or is offended. Rom. xiv. 15, 20, 21. The Lord having SAVED the people, &c. afterward DESTROYED THEM that believed not, Jude 5.—They did ALL drink, &c. of that spiritual rock, which followed them: and that rock was Christ. But with MANY OF THEM, God was not well pleased; for they, &c. were DESTROYED of the destroyer. 1 Cor. x. 4, 5, 10. They were BROKEN OFF because of unbelief, and thou standest by faith, &c. CONTINUE in his goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be CUT OFF. Rom. xi. 20, 22.—Thro' thy knowledge shall the weak brother PERISH, FOR WHOM CHRIST DIED, &c. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend [and so to PERISH] I will eat no flesh while the world standeth. 1 Cor. viii. 11, 13.—There shall be false teachers among you, who &c. denying the Lord that BOUGHT THEM, shall bring upon themselves swift DESTRUCTION.—These shall UTTERLY PERISH in their own corruption, and shall receive the reward of unrighteousness, &c. cursed children, who have FORSAKEN THE RIGHT WAY. 2 Pet. ii. 1, 12, 15. See also the scriptures quoted, in page 102.

2. He

1. He hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee: so that [*in the way of duty*] we may boldly say, The Lord is my helper. Heb. xiii. 5, 6.—[I add *in the way of duty*, because God made that promise originally to Joshua, who *knew God's breach of promise*, when Achan stepped out of the way of duty. Compare Josh. i. 5, with Josh. vii. 12, and Numb. xiv. 34.]

1. Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, If thou be the SON [*er child*] OF GOD, cast thyself down; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, &c. [*not only lest thou fall finally, but also*] lest thou dash thy foot against a stone. Mat. iv. 5, 6. Ps. xci. 11, 12.

How wisely does the tempter quote scripture, when he wants to inculcate the *absolute* preservation of the saints! Can Zelotes find a fitter passage to support their *un-*

conditional perseverance! It is true however, that he never quotes it in favour of his doctrine: for who cares to plow with such an heifer? (*secum habet in cornu.*)

2. My people have committed two evils, they have FORSAKEN ME, &c.—I will even FORSAKE YOU, saith the Lord. Jer. ii. 13. Chap. xxiii. 33.—The destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and THEY that FORSAKE the Lord shall be CONSUMED, &c. and they shall both burn together, and none shall quench them. Is. i. 28, 31.

2. Jesus said it is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. Mat. iv. 7.—Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were DESTROYED of serpents. 1 Cor. x. 9.

[Who can tell how many have been destroyed by dangerous errors, which, after insinuating themselves into the bosom of the simple, by means of their smoothness and fine colours, drop there a mortal poison, that too often breaks out in virulent expressions, or in practices worthy of — “*Mr. Fulsome?*”]

cornu.) Therefore, tho' she is as fit for the work, as most of those which he does it with; he never puts her to his plow, no not when he makes the most crooked furrows. Should it be asked, why the devil did not encourage Christ to throw himself down, by giving him some hints, that a grievous fall would humble him, would make him sympathize with the fallen, would drive him nearer to God, would give him an opportunity to shout louder the praises of preserving grace, &c. I reply, that the tempter was too wise to show so openly the cloven foot of his doctrine: too decent, not to save appearances: too judicious to imitate *Zelotes*.

S E C T I O N XVI.

What thoughts our Lord, St. John, St. Paul, and St. James, entertained of fallen believers. A parallel betwixt the backsliders delineated by St. Peter, and those who are described by St. Jude. An horrible destruction awaits them, for denying the Lord that bought them, and for turning the grace of God into lasciviousness.

IT is impossible to do the doctrine of *perseverance* justice, without considering what Christ and the Apostles say of apostates. Even in their days the number of falling and fallen believers was so great, that a considerable part of the last Epistles seems to be nothing but a charge against apostates, an attempt to reclaim pharisaic and antinomian backsliders, and a warning to those who yet stood, not to fall away after the same example of unbelief and conformity to this present world.

Begin we by an extract from Christ's epistles to the churches of Asia. Tho' the EPHESIANS hated the DEEDS of the Nicolaitans, yet after St. Paul's death, they so far inclined to *lukewarmness*, that they brought upon themselves the following reproof. I
know

have somewhat against thee, because THOU HAST LEFT thy first love. Remember therefore, whence THOU ART FALLEN, and repent, and do thy first works, OR ELSE I will remove thy candlestick.—The church at PERGAMOS was not in a better condition, witness the severe charge that follows: *Thou hast them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, &c. to commit fornication. So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate. Repent, OR ELSE I will fight against thee with the sword of my mouth.*—The contagion reached the faithful church of THYATIRA, as appears from these words: *Thou sufferest that woman Jezebel to SEDUCE MY SERVANTS to commit fornication.—But unto, &c. as many as have not THIS DOCTRINE, and have not known the DEPTHS OF SATAN, I will put upon you none other burden.*—In SARDIS a few names [only] had not defiled their garments, the generality of christians there had, it seems, a name to live and were dead.—But the fall of the Laodiceans was universal: before they suspected it, they had all, it seems, slid back into the smooth, downward road that leads to hell. *I know thy works, says Christ, I would thou wert cold or hot. So then, because thou art lukewarm, I will spue thee out of my mouth.*—[Like those who stand complete merely in NOTIONS of imputed righteousness] *thou sayst, I am rich, &c. and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, poor, blind, and naked.* Rev. ii. iii.

Can we read this sad account of the declension, and falling away of the saints, without asking the following questions? (1) If backsliding and apostacy were the bane of the primitive church, according to our Lord's doctrine; and if he did not promise to ANY of those backsliders, that victorious, almighty grace would CERTAINLY bring them back; what can we think of Zelotes's doctrine, which promises *infallible perseverance*, and ensures *finished salvation* to EVERY backsliding, apostatizing believer? (2)

If the primitive church, newly collected by the spirit and sprinkled by the blood of Christ, guided by apostolic preachers, preserved by the salt of persecution, and guarded by miraculous powers, thro' which apostates could be *given to Satan for the destruction of the flesh*, [witness the case of Ananias, Sapphira, and the incestuous Corinthian ;] — If the primitive church, I say, with all these advantages, was in such danger by the falling away of the saints, as to require all those reproofs and threatenings from Christ himself: is it not astonishing, that whole bodies of protestant believers should rise in our *degenerate* days to such a pitch of unscriptural assurance, as to promise themselves, and one another, absolute, infallible perseverance in the divine favour? — And (3) if the apostate *Nicholas*, once a man of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, but afterwards (it seems) the ring-leader of the Nicolaitans: if *Nicholas*, I say, went about to lay a stumbling-block before christians, by teaching them that *fornication* would never hinder their final perseverance, never endanger their finished salvation; does *Zelotes* mend the matter when he insinuates withal, that *fornication*, yea, *adultery*, and, if need be, *murder*, will do christians good, and even answer the most excellent ends for them?

Consider we next what were St. John's thoughts of antinomian apostates. He had such a sight of the mischief, which their doctrine did, and would do in the church, that he declares, *This is love, that we walk after his commandments. This is the commandment, that ye have heard from the beginning, ye should walk in it. For MANY DECEIVERS are entered into the world, who confess not [practically] that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh* [to destroy the works of the Devil: who deny Christ in his holy doctrine: and, among other dangerous absurdities, will even give you broad hints, that you may commit adultery and murder without ceasing to be God's dear children. But believe them not.] *Look to yourselves that ye lose not this*

those things which we have wrought. Whosoever TRANSGRESSETH and ABIDETH NOT in the [practical] doctrine of Christ, hath not God &c. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed. 2 John 6, to 10. — Again, He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. — These things have I written unto you, concerning them that SEDUCE you. 1 John i, 4, 26. — Little children, let no man DECEIVE you: He that DOES righteousness is righteous, &c. He that COMMITTETH sin is of the devil, &c. In THIS the children of God are manifest, and the children of the Devil. 1 John iii, 7, &c. — They [who hold the contrary doctrine] went out from us, but [in general] they were not of us * — they were not ALL of us [the heart of most of them had already departed both from God and from us.] 1 John ii, 19.

What a fine opportunity had St. John of saying here, "If they are elect they will INFALLIBLY come back to us." But, as he believed not the modern "*doctrines of grace*," he says nothing, either for Calvin's reprobation, or Dr. Crisp's election. Nor does he drop the least hint about a *day of God's power*, in which changeless love was INFALLIBLY to bring back *one* of all those backsliders, to make him sing louder the praises of free, sovereign, victorious grace. See page 92. This passage of St. John therefore, which Zelotes quotes as a demonstration of Calvinian election, makes against it, rather than for it.

Altho' I have frequently mentioned St. Paul's thoughts concerning fallen believers, I am persuaded, that

* That this is St. John's meaning appears from the absurdity of supposing, that *one and all* backsliders are *calvinistically* reprobated: For, if *being of us*, means *being calvinistically elected*; when the loving apostle says, *If they had been of us they would no doubt have continued WITH us*: it necessarily follows, that all who do not continue with us — all who start aside for any time, are not of us, i. e. upon the Calvinian plan, are absolute reprobates, mere hypocrites: a doctrine this, too shocking to be admitted even in mystical Geneva,

that the reader will not be sorry to see them balanced with St. James's sentiments on the same subject.

St. PAUL's account of
Backsliders.

1. Alexander the copper-smith, [*who was once a zealous christian, see Acts xix. 33.*] did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works. — No MAN (*i. e. no believer*) stood with me, but ALL forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge. 2 Tim. iv. 14. — I fear lest when I come I shall not find you such as I would—lest there be debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults; and lest my God humble me among you, and that I shall bewail *many*, which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness, and fornication and lasciviousness, which they have committed. 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21

—Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is, &c. for if we sin wilfully [*as they do*] there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries, &c. [*especially him*] who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and

St. JAMES's account of
faithful believers.

2. My brethren, &c. if there come unto your assembly a man in goodly apparel, and also a poor man in vile raiment, and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, &c. are ye not partial? &c. But YE HAVE DESPISED the poor, &c. If ye have respect to persons ye commit sin, &c. for whosoever [*of you*] shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. — From whence come wars among YOU? Come they not even of your lusts? &c. YE ADULTERERS and adulteresses, know ye not that, &c. whosoever will be a friend of the world, is the enemy of God? Jam. ii. 1, &c. iv. 1, 4.

and hath done despite to the spirit of grace. Heb. x. 25, &c. — Many [*fallen believers*] walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is DESTRUCTION, whose God is their belly — and who mind earthly things. — For all [*comparatively speaking*] seek their own, and not the things which are Jesus Christ's. Phil. iii. 18.—ii. 21.

The epistle to the Hebrews is a treatise against *apostasy*, and of consequences against *Calvinian perseverance*. As a proof of it, I refer the reader to a convincing Discourse on Heb. ii. 3. which Mr. Olivers designs for the press. The whole Epistle of St. Jude, and the second of St. Peter, were particularly written to prevent the falling away of the saints, and to stop the rapid progress of apostasy. The Ep. of St. Jude, and 2 Pet. ii. agree so perfectly, that one would think the two apostles had compared notes, witness the following parallel.

St. PETER's description of
antinomian apostates.

1. They have FORSAKEN the right way;—following the way of BALAM, who loved the WAGES of unrighteousness. 2. Pet. ii. 15.

1. SPOTS are they and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings, while they FEAST with you, ver. 13.

1. They WALK after the FLESH in the LUST of UNCLEANNES. ver. 10.

1. They speak GREAT SWELLING WORDS of vanity—they promise them [whom they allure] liberty,

St. JUDE's description of
antinomian backsliders.

2. These be they, who SEPARATE themselves.—They ran greedily after the error of BALAM for REWARD. Jude. ver. 19, 14.

2. These are SPOTS in your feasts of charity, when they FEAST with you; feeding themselves without fear. ver. 12.

2. FALTHY dreamers—WALKING after their own LUSTS. ver 8, 16.

2. Their mouth speaketh GREAT SWELLING WORDS: — creeping in unawares [i. e. *insinuating*]

ty, while they themselves are the servants of corruption. ver. 18. 19.

1. As natural, brute beasts, &c. they SPEAK EVIL of the things that they understand not (*especially of the perfect law of liberty*) and shall utterly perish in their OWN CORRUPTION, ver. 12.

1. Wells *without water*, clouds that are CARRIED with a tempest—beguiling, UNSTABLE SOULS—to whom the mist of DARKNESS IS RESERVED FOR EVER. ver. 14. 17 [*How far was St. PETER from soothing ANY of those backsliders by the smooth doctrine of their NECESSARY, INFALLIBLE return!*]

1. [*St. Peter indirectly compares them to*] The ANGELS that SINNED, [*whom*] God spared not, but cast down to hell, and delivered into CHAINS OF DARKNESS to be reserved unto JUDGMENT. ver. 4.

ting themselves into rich widows houses] having men's persons in admiration. ver. 4, 16.

2. These SPEAK EVIL of those things which they know not (*especially of Christ's law*) But what they know naturally, as brute beasts in those things they CORRUPT THEMSELVES. ver. 10.

2. Clouds they are *without water*, CARRIED about of winds, trees whose fruit withereth, &c. WANDERING STARS, to whom IS RESERVED the blackness of DARKNESS FOR EVER. ver. 12, 13. [*How far was St. JUDE from rocking ANY of those apostates in the cradle of INFALLIBLE perseverance!*]

2. [*St. Jude compares them to*] The ANGELS who KEPT NOT their first estate, but left their own habitation, &c. reserved in everlasting CHAINS UNDER DARKNESS, unto the JUDGMENT of the great day. ver. 6.

From this remarkable parallel it is evident, that the *Apostates* described by *St. Peter*, and the *backsliders* painted by *St. Jude*, were one and the same kind of people: and by the following words it appears, that all those backsliders really fell from the GRACE OF God, and denied the Lord that BOUGHT THEM.

1. Even

<p>1. Even denying the LORD THAT BOUGHT THEM, and bring upon themselves SWIFT DE- STRUCTION, &c. whose &c. DAMNATION flum- bereth not. 2. Pet. ii. 1.</p>	<p>2. Ungodly men, turn- ing THE GRACE OF OUR God into lasciviousness, and DENYING [<i>in work</i> <i>at least</i>] THE ONLY LORD God, and our LORD JESUS CHRIST. [<i>as Lord, Law-</i> <i>giver, or Judge.</i>] Jud. 4.</p>
---	--

St. Peter more or less directly describes these backsliders in the same epistle, as people who have *forgotten that they were purged from their old sins*—who do not give all diligence to add to their faith, virtue—who do not make their calling and election sure—who after they have escaped the pollutions of the world thro' the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, [i. e. thro' a true and living faith] are again intangled therein, and overcome; whose latter end is worse than the beginning—who, after they have known the way of righteousness, turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them, and verify the Proverb, “The Sow that was washed, is turned to her wallowing in the mire.”

Here is not the least hint about the certain return of any of those backsliders, or about the good that their grievous falls will do either to others or to themselves. On the contrary, he represents them all as people, that were in the high road to destruction. And far from giving us an antinomian innuendo about the final perseverance of all blood-bought souls, i. e. of the whole number of the redeemed, he begins his epistle by declaring, that those self-destroyed backsliders denied the Lord that bought them, and concludes it by this seasonable caution: *There are in our beloved Brother Paul's epistles things* [it seems, about the election of grace, and about justification without the works of the law] *which they that are unlearned* [or rather, ἀμαθῆς, un-teachable] and unstable, wrest &c. unto their own destruction: ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, [being thus fairly warned] beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your
own

own steadfastness: but grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ: which is the best method not to fall from grace—the only way to inherit the blessing, with which God will crown the faithfulness and genuine perseverance of the saints.

I read the heart of Zelotes: and seeing the objection he is going to start, I oppose to it this quotation from Baxter. 'To say that then their faith [*which works by faithful love*] DOES MORE than CHRIST did, or God's GRACE, is a putid cavil. Their faith, &c. is no efficient cause at all of their pardon, or justification: it is but a necessary, *receptive qualification*; he that shuts the window *causeth* darkness: but it is sottish to say, that he who opens it, DOES MORE than the SUN to cause light, which he causeth not at all; but removeth the impediment of reception; and faith itself is God's gift:—as all other talents are, whether we improve them or not.

I should lose time, and offer an insult to the reader's understanding, were I to comment upon the preceding scriptures; so great is their perspicuity and number. But I hope, I shall not insult his candor by proposing to him the following queries. (1) Can Zelotes and Honestus be *judicious* protestants, I mean *consistent* defenders of bible-religion, if the one throws away the weights of the *second* scale, whilst the other overlooks those of the *first*? — (2) Is it not evident, that, according to the scriptures, the *perseverance* of the saints has two causes: the *first*, free-grace and *divine* faithfulness; and the *second*, free-will and *human* faithfulness produced, excited, assisted, and nourished, but NOT NECESSITATED by free-grace? — (3) With respect to the capital doctrine of *perseverance* also, does not the truth lie exactly between the extremes, into which Zelotes and Honestus perpetually run?—And lastly: is it not clear, that if Candidus will hold *the truth as it is in Jesus*, he must stand upon the line of moderation, call back Zelotes from the *east*, Honestus from the *west*, and make them cordially embrace each other under the scripture-me-
ridian.

ridian. There the kind father falls upon the neck of the returning prodigal, and the heavenly bridegroom meets the wise virgins: — There Free-grace mercifully embraces Free-will, while free-will humbly floops at the foot-stool of free-grace: There *the sun goes down no more by day, nor the moon by night*: that is, the two gospel-axioms, which are the great doctrinal lights of the church, without eclipsing each other shine in perpetual conjunction, and yet in continual opposition: There, their conjugal, mysterious, powerful influence gladdens the new Jerusalem, fertilizes the garden of the Lord, promotes the spiritual vegetation of all the trees of righteousness which line the river of God, and gives a divine relish to the fruits of the spirit which they constantly bear. There, as often as Free-grace smiles upon Free-will it says, *Be faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life*: And as often as Free-will sees that crown glitter at the end of the race, it shouts, *Grace!* Free-grace *! unto it*; a great part of our *faithfulness* consisting in ascribing to Grace all the honour, that becomes the FIRST CAUSE of all good — the ORIGINAL of all visible and invisible excellence.

Perseverance must close our race, if ever we receive the prize; let then the scriptural account of it close my scales. But before I lay them by, I must throw in two more grains of scriptural truth; lest the reader should think, that I have not made good weight. If I thought that Zelotes is a *gross* antinomian; and Honestus an *immoral* moralist; and that they *maliciously* tear the oracles of God in pieces; I would make them full weight by the two following scriptures:

1. The wrath of God, is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness, and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth [or a part of it] in unrighteousness. Rom. 1, 18.

2. I testify, &c. that if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy [much more if he takes away from the words of every book in the old and new testament] God shall

U

take

take his part out of the book of life; and out of the holy city, and from the things, which are written in this book. Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

But, considering Zelotes and Honestus as two good men, who sincerely fear and serve God in their way; and being persuaded that an *injudicious* fear of a gospel-axiom, and not a *wilful* aversion to the truth, makes them cast a veil over one half of the body of bible-divinity; I dare not admit the thought, that those severe scriptures are adapted to their case. I shall therefore only ask, whether they cannot find a suitable reproof in the following texts.

1. I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my word [contained No. 2] every one from his neighbour. Jer. xxiii. 30.

2. Ye have made the word of God [contained No. 1] of none effect by your tradition, Mat. xv. 6. [Equally dismembering christianity, ye still help the adversaries of the gospel,

to put in practice their pernicious maxim, DIVIDE AND CONQUER. And who requires this at your hands? Who will give you thanks for such services as these?

S E C T I O N XVII.

A scriptural plan of reconciliation between Zelotes and Honestus; being a DOUBLE DECLARATION to guard equally the two gospel-axioms, or the doctrines of FREE-GRACE and FREE-OBEDIENCE. Bishop Beveridge saw the need of guarding them both. Gospel-ministers ought equally to defend them. — An answer to Zelotes's objections against the declaration which guards the doctrine of free-obedience. — An important distinction between a PRIMARY trust in FIRST causes and means, and a SECONDARY trust in SECOND causes and means. — Some observations upon the importance of the second gospel-axiom. — Which extreme appeared greater to Mr. Baxter, that of Zelotes, or that of Honestus. — The author's thoughts upon that delicate subject.

I HAVE

I H A V E hitherto pointed out the opposite errors of *Zelotes* and *Honestus*, and shown that they consist in so maintaining *one* part of the truth as to reject *the other*; in so holding out the glory of *one* of the gospel-axioms as to eclipse *the other*. I now present the Reader with what appears to me a fair, scriptural, and guarded plan of reconciliation between themselves, and between all good men, who disagree about the doctrines of faith and works—of free-grace and obedience. The declaration which the Rev. Mr. S—y desired the Rev. Mr. W—y to sign at the Bristol-conference, gives me the idea of this plan: Nay, the *first* part of it is nothing but that declaration itself, guarded and strengthened by some additions in brackets.

I T I S P R O P O S E D :

1. THAT the preachers, who are supposed to countenance the *pharisaic* error of *Honestus*, shall sign the following ANTI-PHARISAIC Declaration, which guards the doctrine of faith and free-grace, without bearing hard upon the doctrine of obedience and free-will; and asserts the free, gratuitous justification of a *sinner* in the *day of conversion* and afterwards, without denying the *gracious, remunerative* justification of a *believer*, who, in the day of trial and afterwards, keeps the faith that works by love.

1. WHEREAS the doctrinal points in the minutes

2. THAT the preachers, who are supposed to countenance the *antinomian* error of *Zelotes*, shall sign the following ANTI-SOLIPIDIAN Declaration, which guards the doctrine of obedience and free-will, without bearing hard upon the doctrine of faith and free-grace; and asserts the *gracious, remunerative* justification of a *believer* in the day of trial and afterwards, without denying the *free, gratuitous* justification of a *sinner* in the day of conversion, and afterwards.

2. WHEREAS the books published against the said U 2 minutes,

minutes of a conference held in London, Aug. 7, 1770, have been understood to favour [*the pharisaic*] justification [*of a sinner*] by works: now the Rev. John Wesley, and others assembled in conference, do declare that we had no such meaning; and that we abhor the doctrine of [*a sinner's*] justification by works, as a most perilous and abominable doctrine; and as the said minutes are not [*or do not appear to some people*] sufficiently guarded in the way they are expressed, we hereby solemnly declare in the sight of God; that [*as SINNERS—before GOD'S throne—according to the doctrine of FIRST causes—and with respect to the FIRST covenant, or the law of INNOCENCE, which sentences ALL SINNERS to destruction*] we have no trust or confidence but in the [*mere mercy of God, thro' the sole righteousness and*] alone merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for justification or salvation, either in life, death, or the day of judgment: and though no one is a real

minutes, have been understood to favour the present, inamissible, and eternal justification of all fallen believers before God, that is, of all those, who having made shipwreck of the faith that works by obedient love, live in Lacedæan ease; and, if they please, in adultery, murder, or incest: now the Rev. Mr. **** and others do declare, that we renounce such meaning, and that we abhor the doctrine of the sordidians or antinomians, as a most perilous and abominable doctrine: and as the said books are not [*or do not appear to some people*] sufficiently guarded, we hereby solemnly declare in the sight of God, that [*AS PENITENT, OBEDIENT, and PERSEVERING BELIEVERS—before the MEDIATOR'S throne—according to the doctrine of SECOND causes—and with respect to the SECOND covenant, or the law of CHRIST, which sentences all his impenitent, disobedient, apostatizing subjects, to destruction*] we have no trust, or confidence,

real christian believer, (and consequently, tho' no one can be saved [*as a believer*]) who does not good works, where there is time and opportunity; yet our works have no part in [*properly*] meriting or purchasing our salvation from first to last, either in whole or in part; [*the best of men, when they are considered as SINNERS, being justified freely by God's grace, thro' the redemption that is in Jesus Christ.* Rom. iii. 24.

dence, † but in the truth of our repentance towards God, and in the sincerity of our faith in Christ for justification, or salvation, in the day of conversion and afterwards:—no trust, or confidence, but in our final perseverance in the obedience of faith, for justification or salvation in death, and in the day of judgment. BECAUSE no one is a REAL believer under any dispensation of gospel-grace, and of consequence no one can be saved, who does not good

works, i. e. who does not TRULY REPENT, BELIEVE, and OBEY, as there is time, light, and opportunity. Nevertheless our works, that is, our repentance, faith, and obedience, have no part in PROPERLY meriting or purchasing our salvation from first to last, either in whole or in part; the PROPERLY-meritorious cause of our ETERNAL, as well as *intermediate* and *initial* salvation, being ONLY the merits, or the blood and righteousness of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The preceding declaration, which defends the doctrine of *free-grace*, and

The preceding declaration, which defends the doctrine of *free obedience*,
U 3

† I beg that the reader would pay a peculiar attention to what precedes, and follows this clause. I, myself, would condemn it, as subversive of the doctrine of grace and pharisaical, if I considered it as detached from the context, and not guarded and explained by THE WORDS IN CAPITALS, upon which the greatest stress is to be laid. If *Zelotes* has patience to read on, he will soon see how the *secondary* trust in the obedience of faith, which I here contend for, is reconcilable with our *primary* trust in Christ.

and the *gratuitous* justification and salvation of a **SINNER**, is founded on such scriptures as these :

1. If Abraham were justified by works he hath WHEREOF TO BOAST. — To him that WORKETH NOT, but believeth on him that JUSTIFIETH THE UNGODLY, his faith is imputed, &c.—God imputeth righteousness WITHOUT WORKS. — NOT BY WORKS of righteousness which we have done, BUT OF HIS MERCY he SAVED us. — BY GRACE are ye SAVED, thro' faith: and that NOT OF YOURSELVES, it is the GIFT of God: NOT OF WORKS, lest any man should boast.—By the deeds of the law shall NO FLESH BE JUSTIFIED, &c.

JUSTIFIED, &c.

And let none say, that this doctrine has not the sanction of good men. Of an hundred whom Zelotes himself considers as orthodox, I shall only mention the learned and pious Bishop Beveridge, who, tho' a rigid calvinist in his youth, came in his riper years to the line of moderation which I recommend; and stood upon it when he wrote what follows, in his *Thoughts upon our call and election. Third Edit. page 297.*

‘ What then should be the reason, that so many
‘ should be called and invited to the chiefest good,
‘ the

ence, and the *remunerative* justification and salvation of a **BELIEVER**, is founded on such scriptures as these :

2. Was not Abraham our father JUSTIFIED BY WORKS?—Ye see how BY WORKS a man is JUSTIFIED, and not by faith only.—We are SAVED by HOPE. — In DOING this, thou shalt SAVE thyself.—He that ENDURETH unto the end, the same shall be SAVED.—He became the author of ETERNAL SALVATION to them that OBEY him. — THIS shall turn to my SALVATION THRO' your prayer. — With the mouth confession is MADE to SALVATION. — By thy WORDS thou shalt be JUSTIFIED. — The DOERS of the law [*of Christ*] shall be JUSTIFIED, &c.

' the highest happiness their natures are capable o ;
 ' yet so few of them should mind and prosecute it
 ' so as to be chosen, or admitted into the participa-
 ' tion of it? What shall we ascribe it to? The
 ' will and pleasure of almighty God, as if he de-
 ' lighted in the ruin of his creatures, and therefore
 ' altho' he calls them, he would not have them come
 ' unto him? No: that cannot be: for in his re-
 ' vealed will, which is the only rule that we are to
 ' walk by, he has told us the contrary in plain terms,
 ' and has confirmed it too with an oath; saying:
 ' *As I live, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked,*
 ' *but that he should turn from his way and live, Ez.*
 ' *xxxiii. 11.* and elsewhere he assures us, that he
 ' *would have all men to be saved, and come to the know-*
 ' *ledge of the truth, 1 Tim. ii. 4.* And therefore if
 ' we believe what God *says*, nay if we believe what
 ' he has *sworn*, we must needs acknowledge, that
 ' it is his will and pleasure, that as many as are
 ' called, should be all chosen and saved: and in-
 ' deed if he had no mind we should come when
 ' we are called to him, why should he call us all
 ' to come? Why has he given us his word, his mi-
 ' nisters, his ordinances; and all to invite and ob-
 ' lige us to repent and turn to him; if after all he
 ' has resolved not to accept of us, nor would have
 ' us come at all? Far be it from us that we should
 ' have such hard and unworthy thoughts of the great
 ' Creator and Governor of the world; especially
 ' considering that he has told us the contrary, as plain-
 ' ly as it was possible to express his mind unto us,'

Then the Bishop mentions five reasons why *many*
are called but few chosen: and he closes them by these
 words (page 310) * The last reason which our Savi-
 ' our gives in this parable, is because of those who
 ' are called, and come too at the call, many come
 ' not aright, which he signifies by the man that came
 ' without the wedding garment; where, altho' he
 ' mentions but one man, yet under that one is com-
 ' prehended all of the same kind, even all such per-
 ' sons—

‘ sons—as profess to believe in Christ, and to expect
 ‘ salvation from him, yet will not come up to the
 ‘ terms which he propounds in the gospel to them,
 ‘ even to *walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they*
 ‘ *are called.* Eph. iv, 1. And indeed this is the
 ‘ GREAT REASON OF ALL, why of so many, who are
 ‘ called, there are so few chosen, because there are
 ‘ so few, who do all things which the gospel requires
 ‘ of them. Many, like *Herod*, will do many things;
 ‘ and are almost persuaded to be christians as *Agrippa*
 ‘ was, &c. Some are all for the duties of the first
 ‘ table without the second, others for the second
 ‘ without the first. Some’ [*like heated Honestus*] ‘ are
 ‘ altogether for obedience and good works without
 ‘ faith in Christ: Others’ [*like heated Zelotes*] ‘ are as
 ‘ much for faith in Christ, without obedience and
 ‘ good works. Some’ [*like mere moralists*] ‘ would do
 ‘ all themselves, as if Christ had done nothing for
 ‘ them: others,’ [*like mere solifidians*] ‘ fancy that
 ‘ Christ has so done all for them, that there is no-
 ‘ thing left for themselves to do: and so betwixt
 ‘ both sorts of people’ [*between the followers of Ho-*
 ‘ *nestus, and those of Zelotes*] ‘ which are the far greater
 ‘ part of those who are called, either the MERITS or
 ‘ else the LAWS of Christ are slighted and con-
 ‘ demned. But is this the way to be saved? NO
 ‘ surely.’

Hence it is evident, that if Bishop *Beweridge* is
 right here, the saving truth lies exactly between the
 mistake of *Zelotes* and the error of *Honestus*. Now
 if this is the true state of the question, is it possible
 to propose a plan of reconciliation more scriptural
 than that, which so secures the MERITS of Christ as
 not indirectly to overthrow his LAWS, and so enforces
 his LAWS as not indirectly to set aside his MERITS?
 And is not this effectually done in the reconciling
 declarations? Do they not equally guard the two
 gospel-axioms? Do they not with impartiality de-
 fend *free-grace* and *free-obedience*? And might not
 peace

peace be restored to the church upon such a scriptural, rational, and moderate plan of doctrine?

I fear, that a *lasting* reconciliation upon any other plan is impossible: for the gospel must stand upon it's legs [the two gospel-axioms] or it must fall. And if Satan, by transforming himself into an angel of light prevails upon good, mistaken men to cut off one of these legs, as if it were useless or mortified; some good men, who are not yet deceived, will rise up in its defence. So sure therefore as *the gates of hell shall never prevail against the church of the living God—the pillar and ground of the truth*, there shall always be a succession of judicious, zealous men, disposed to hazard their life and reputation in the noble cause of gospel-truth, and ready to prevent the mystical ark from being overset on the right hand or on the left. If a pious *Crisp*, for example, pushes it into the *antinomian* ditch, for fear of the *pharisaic* delusion; a pious *Baxter* will enter his protest against him: and if a *Taylor* throws it into the *pharisaic* ditch, for fear of the *antinomian* error; God will raise up a *Wesley* to counterwork his design. Nay, a *Wesley* is a match for a benevolent *Taylor*, and a seraphic *Hervey*; and I hope, that should Mr. *Sh—y* ever desire him to sign an *anti-pharisaic* declaration, he will not forget to desire Mr. *Sh—y* to sign also an *anti-solifidian* protest; every gospel-minister being an equal debtor to both axioms: nor can I conceive why Mr. *Sh—y* should have more right * solemnly to secure the *first* axiom, than Mr. *W—y* has solemnly to guard the *second*.

* Mr. Wesley is too judicious a divine to sign a paper, that leaves the 2d axiom quite unguarded; accordingly we find that axiom guarded in these words of Mr. *Sh—y*'s declaration, "*No one is a believer, (and consequently cannot be saved) who doth not good works, where there is time and opportunity.*" Nevertheless this clause does not by far form so solemn a guard, as might have been demanded upon so remarkable an occasion. Mr. *Sh—y*, and the clergy that accompanied him, might with propriety have been desired to remove the fears of those who signed the declaration which he had drawn up, by signing

But, leaving those two divines, I return to *Zelotes*, who seems very much offended at my saying, *We have no trust, nor confidence*, that any thing will stand us instead of repentance, faith, and obedience: an assertion this, which implies, that [with respect to SECOND causes, and SECONDARY means] we place A SECONDARY *trust and confidence* in the graces which compose the christian character. But I ask, wherein does the heresy of this doctrine consist? Do I renounce orthodoxy when I say, that with respect to *some SECOND means*, and *some SECOND causes*, I have *no trust nor confidence* but in my eyes to see, in my ears to hear, and in my throat to swallow? Should not I be fit for Bedlam, if I *trusted* to see without eyes, to hear without ears, and to swallow without a throat? If I have not a *trust*, that my shoes will answer the end of *shoes*, and my hat the end of a *hat*; may I not wisely put my shoes upon my head, and my hat on my feet? And if I have not a *confidence*, that my horse will carry me better than a broom-stick, may I not as well get upon a broom-stick, as on horseback? What would *Zelotes* think of me, if I did
not

ing at least the following memorandum. — For as much as Aaron, David, Solomon, Peter, and the incestuous Corinthian did not do good works, when they, or any of them, worshipped a golden-calf, Milcom, and the abomination of the Zidonians, — denied Christ, or committed adultery, murder, or incest, *we hereby solemnly declare in the sight of God, that we abhor the doctrine* of the solidians who say, that the above-mentioned backsliders had justifying, saving faith, while they committed the above-mentioned crimes; such a doctrine being *most perilous and abominable*; because it absolutely overturns the xiith Art. of our church, and encourages all christians to make Christ the minister of sin, and to believe that they may commit the most atrocious crimes, without losing their faith, their justification, and their title to a throne of glory.

If Mr. *Sb—y* and his friends had refused to sign such a memorandum as this, the world would have had a public demonstration, that Calvinism is the doctrine of *protestant-indulgences*; and that it establishes *speculative*, and consequently makes way for *practical* anti-nomianism in its most flagrant immoralities, as well as in its most waning refinements.

not *trust* that bread will nourish me sooner than poison, and that fire will warm me better than ice? Is it not a branch of wisdom to *trust* every thing, just so far as it deserves to be trusted; and a piece of madness to do otherwise?

O ye admirers of Zelotes's gospel, come, and I will explain to you all my supposed error. I trust ONLY and SOLELY in GOD as the *first* and *capital* CAUSE, and in CHRIST as the *first* and *capital* MEANS, of my present and eternal SALVATION: But besides this PRIMARY trust, I have a thousand INFERIOR trusts. Take a few instances. I have a *sure trust and confidence*, that the bible will farther me in the way to eternal salvation, more than the Alcoran:—baptism, more than circumcision: the Lord's supper, more than the jewish passover:—the house of God; more than the play-house:—praying, more than cursing:—repentance, faith, hope, charity, and perseverance; more, far more than impenitency, unbelief, despair, uncharitableness, and apostacy.

If I am an heretic for saying that something besides Christ is conducive to *salvation*, and of consequence may, *in its place and degree*, be trusted in for salvation; is St. Paul orthodox, when he exhorts the Philippians to WORK OUT *their own* SALVATION, assures them that his affliction shall *turn to his* SALVATION THRO' *their prayers*, and writes to Titus, that *in* DOING the work of an evangelist, he shall SAVE *himself, and them that hear him?*

Again: will *Christ* stand me instead of *repentance*? Has he not said himself, *Except ye repent, ye shall perish?* Will *He* stand me instead of *faith*? Did he not assert the contrary when he declared, that *he who BELIEVETH NOT, shall be damned?* Will *He* stand me instead of evangelical *obedience*? Does he not maintain the opposite doctrine, where he declares, that he will bid them *depart from him, who call him Lord, Lord, and DO NOT the things which he saith?* Will *He* stand me instead of *perseverance*? Has he not said
himself

himself, that he will *deny them that deny him*; that he will finally own us as his *disciples*, IF WE CONTINUE *in his words*; and that *he, who ENDURETH TO THE END, the same shall be saved?*—Zelotes finds it easier to raise difficulties, than to remove those which are thrown in his way. He comes therefore, with his mouth full of objections against my second declaration. Let us lend him an ear, and give him an answer.

OBJ. I. “ If with respect to the doctrine of SECOND *causes*, and SECOND *means*, of eternal salvation, you have no trust or confidence to be saved AS A PENITENT, OBEDIENT, and PERSEVERING BELIEVER, but by *true repentance, faith, obedience, and perseverance*; you cannot repose your *whole* trust upon God alone; nor can you give Christ *all* the glory of your salvation.”

ANSWER. To make God a 2d CAUSE, and Christ a 2d MEANS of *salvation*, is not to give them the glory: it is to pull them out of their throne, and make them stoop to an office unworthy of their matchless dignity. If the king gave you a purse of gold, could you not give him *all the glory* of his generosity, without supposing that he was the laborious digger of the golden ore, the ingenious coiner of the gold, and the diligent knitter of the purse? If you complimented him in *all* these respects, lest he should not have ALL the glory; would you not pour contempt upon his greatness? And do you not see, that, by a parity of reason, what you call “ robbing God and Christ of their glory,” is only *refusing to dishonour them*, by ascribing them a shameful office; I mean the office of a *second cause*, or of a *secondary means* of salvation? Can you not conceive, that to give a *general* the honour of a *sergeant*, under pretence of giving him ALL the honour, is to set him below an *ensign*, and rank him with an *halberd-bearer*? Again: When you say, that, in general, upon a journey, with respect to SECOND *causes and means*, you have *no trust, or confidence*, but in your money, in the goodness of you,

your horses and carriage, in the passible state of the roads, in the skill of your driver, &c. do you betray any *mistrust* of divine providence? On the contrary, does not your distinction of SECOND causes and SECOND means show, that you reserve your PRIMARY *trust and confidence* for God, who is the FIRST CAUSE of your blessings; and for his *providential care* over you, which is the FIRST MEANS of your preservation? And if a pretender to orthodoxy charged you with atheism or heresy for your assertion; would you not give him your vote to be an officer of the protestant-inquisition; if the black tribunal, which totters in Spain, should ever be set up in England?

Obj. H. "Your first declaration indeed exalts Christ; but the second *uncrowns* him to *crown* our graces — yea, to *crown* OURSELVES as possessed of such and such graces; which is the rankest popery, and the very quintessence of pharisaism."

ANSWER. How can my *crowning* repentance, faith, and obedience with a *scriptural coronet*, rob Christ of his *peculiar crown*? Are we not indebted to him, both for our graces, and for the coronet, with which he rewards our acceptance and improvement of his favours? Would it be right in you to represent me as an enemy to the crown and king of England, for asserting that Barons, Earls, and Dukes have received from him, or his predecessors, the right of wearing coronets, or secondary crowns? Is it not the glory of our Sovereign, to be at the head of a *crowned* peerage? And would you really honour him, if on a coronation-day you secured the glory of his *imperial* crown, by kicking the coronets off the heads of all the peers, who come to pay him homage? Would he thank you for that ill-judged proof of your loyalty? Would he not reprove you for your unparallel'd rashness? And think you that Christ will commend the antinomian zeal, with which you set up the great image of *finished salvation* in the plain of mystical Geneva, upon an heap of the coronets wherewith he and his apostles have

W crowned

crowned the graces of believers? Can you search the sacred records without finding there the doctrine, which you represent as treasonable or heretical? Did you never read, *O woman great is THY faith! THY FAITH hath SAVED thee?* And what is this, but allowing *believers* to wear a *salvation coronet* — a coronet this, which they will justly cast before the throne of the grace that gave it them, and offered it all the day long to those, who obstinately put it from them? — Did you never read, *We are SAVED by HOPE:— Be FAITHFUL unto death, and I will give thee the CROWN of life:— He is the author of ETERNAL SALVATION to them that OBEY him:— He will give the CROWN of life to them that LOVE him, &c?* Is not this granting a *salvation coronet* to the *hopeful, faithful, obedient, loving* believer? And if you throw my scales away, and cry out “*Armenian* methodism turned out rank popery at last,*” think you there are no bibles left in the kingdom? No people able to read such scriptures as these? *Let no man BEGUILE you of your reward thro’ voluntary humility—fair speeches—and deceivableness of unrighteousness.— Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take THY CROWN, on any pretext whatever: no not on the most plausible of all pretexts, “Pray, give me THY CROWN, for it is not consistent with that of the Redeemer.”— Who could suggest to good men, so artful and dangerous a doctrine?— Who, but the deceitful adversary, that can as easily transform himself into an angel of light, to rob us of our crown of righteousness, as he formerly could transform himself into a serpent, to rob our first parents of their crown of innocence?*

OBJ. III. “You may turn and wind as long as you please; but you will never be able to reconcile your doctrine with *the doctrines of grace*; for if you have the LEAST trust and confidence in *your graces*, you do not trust WHOLLY in the Lord; you trust PARTLY in an arm of flesh, in direct opposition to this scripture,

Cursed

* The title of a calvinistic pamphlet published against the *fourth abstr.*

Curſed is the man, who truſteth in man, and maketh ſiſiſi his arm. Jer. xvii. 5."

ANSWER. I grant that our doctrine can never be reconciled to what you call "the doctrines of grace," because *your* partial doctrines of grace are irreconcilable with the holy, free, and equitable gospel of Christ: but, we can as easily reconcile the PRIMARY *truſt* mentioned in our *fiſt* declaration, with the SECONDARY *truſt* mentioned in the *ſecond*, as you can reconcile my *ſecond* ſcale with the *fiſt*. Our *ſecondary* confidence, which ariſes from the testimony of a good conſcience, no more militates in our breaſt with our *primary* confidence, which ariſes from the love of Christ; than our regard for the *queen* excludes our reſpect for the *king*. In myſtick Geneva indeed they teach, to the honour of the king, that the royal ſpouſe is all filthy: but in our Jeruſalem we aſſert, that *ſhe is all glorious*, and that *the king greatly deſires her beauty*. To uncrown her therefore, and load her with infamy, can never be the way of honouring and pleaſing our Melchizedec.

With reſpect to the paſſage, which you produce from Jeremiah, the ſenſe of it is fixed by what immediately follows, *And whoſe heart departeth from the Lord*. Theſe words ſhow, that the *truſt* forbidden in that ſcripture, is only ſuch a *truſt in man* and things, as makes our *hearts depart from the Lord*. Now this can never be the *truſt* and *confidence* mentioned in our *ſecond* declaration: For, in both declarations, we ſecure to God, as the *fiſt* cauſe; and to Christ, as the *fiſt* means, ALL the glory which is worthy of the *fiſt* cauſe, and of the *fiſt* means: and, I repeat it, if you aſcribe to the Lord any other glory, you inſult him as much as you would do a prince, if you gave him the glory which belongs to his conſort or his cook:—I mean the glory of bearing fine children, and of making good ſauces.

Again: There is no medium between *ſome* degree of *truſt*, and the *utmoſt* degree of *diſtruſt*. Now if the ſcripture which you produce, *abſolutely* forbids

every degree of inferior trust in man or things, it follows that the more full we are of distrust and diabolical suspicions, the more godly we are. And thus, for fear of putting any degree of secondary trust in man or in things, we must *mistrust* all our wives as adulteresses, all our friends as traitors, all our neighbours as incendiaries, all our servants as murderers, and all our food as poison. But if this fair consequence of your doctrine stands, what becomes of *charity*, which *thinketh no evil, and hopeth all things*? And if the words of Jeremiah are to be understood in your narrow sense, what becomes of Christ himself, who reposed a degree of trust in man—yea, in Judas, whilst he counted him faithful? That expression of Job therefore, *He [the Lord] putteth no trust, [that is, no absolute trust] in his saints*, is to be understood so as not to contradict the words of St. Paul, *He [the Lord] counted me faithful, [i. e. trusted in me] putting me into the ministry*; or the prophetic words of David concerning Christ and Judas, *yea, mine own familiar friend in whom I trusted, who did eat of my [multiplied] bread, hath lifted up his heel against me.*

To conclude: If England smiles yet at the imbecility of the king, who durst not venture over London-bridge, and wondered at those who trusted that *fabrick as a solid bridge*; shall we admire Zelotes's wisdom, who wonders at our having a scripture, inferior trust in the graces which form the christian's character? and shall we not count it an honour to be suspected of heresy, for *having a sure trust and confidence, that true repentance, and nothing else, will answer for us the end of repentance?*—that true faith, and nothing else, will answer for us the end of faith?—that evangelical obedience, and not an imputed righteousness, will answer for us the end of evangelical obedience?—and that final perseverance, and not whims about "finished salvation," will answer for us the end of final perseverance?

Having thus answered Zelotes's objections against the declaration which guards the second gospel-axiom, I shall now present him with some observations upon the importance of that axiom. (1)

(1) The **FIRST** axiom, or the doctrine of *grace*, holds forth chiefly what *Christ* has done; and the **SECOND** axiom, or the doctrine of *obedience*, holds forth chiefly what *we* are to do; now, any unprejudiced person must own, that it is as important for us to know *our own* work, as to know the work of *another*.—(2) In the day of judgment we shall not be judged according to Christ's works and experiences, but according to our own.—(3) Thousands of righteous heathens, it is to be hoped, have been saved without knowing any thing of Christ's external work: but none of them were ever saved without knowing and doing their own work, that is, without working out their salvation with fear and trembling according to their light.—(4) Most of the Jews, that have been saved, have gone to heaven without any *explicit, particular* acquaintance with Christ's merits: (See *Equal Check*, p. 43. Note.) but none of them was ever saved without *fearing God and working righteousness*.—(5) To this day, those that are saved, three parts of the world over, are in general saved by the gracious light that *directly* flows from the second gospel-axiom, thro' Christ's merits, altho' they never heard of his name. (6) England and Scotland, where the redeeming work of Christ is gloriously preached, swarm nevertheless with practical antinomians; that is, with men who practically separate works from faith, and the decalogue from the creed. Now all these *gnostics* follow the foolish virgins, and the unprofitable servant into hell, crying *Lord! Lord!* and forgetting to *do* what Christ commands.—(7) We can never be too thankful for the light of both axioms; but, were I obliged to separate them, I had much rather obey with Obadiah, Plato, and Cornelius; than to believe with Simon Magus, Nicholas, and "*Mr. Falsome.*"

These, and the like observations, appeared so weighty to judicious Mr. Baxter, that in the preface to his *Confession of faith*, page 29, he says: 'The great objection is, that I ascribe too much to works.

‘ — I shall now only say, &c. that I see many
 ‘ well-meaning, zealous men dividing our religion,
 [which is made up of the two gospel-axioms] ‘ and run-
 ‘ ning into two DESPERATE EXTREMES. One sort
 [at the head of whom is ZELOTÉS] ‘ by the heat of op-
 ‘ position to popery do seem to have forgotten, that
 ‘ faith and Christ himself are but *means*, and a way
 ‘ for the revolting soul to come home to God by ;
 ‘ and thereupon place all the essence of their religion
 ‘ in *bare believing* ; so making that the *whole*, which
 ‘ is but the door or *means* to better, even to a con-
 ‘ formity of the soul to the image and will of God.
 ‘ Others’ [at the head of whom is HONESTUS] ‘ observ-
 ‘ ing this error, fly so far from it as to make faith
 ‘ itself, and Christ, to be scarce necessary : so a man
 ‘ have God’s image, say they, upon his soul, what
 ‘ matter is it, which way he comes by it ? whether
 ‘ by Christ, or by other means ! And so they take
 ‘ all the history of Christ to be a mere accident to
 ‘ our necessary belief ; and the precepts only of ho-
 ‘ linefs to be of absolute necessity. The former con-
 ‘ temn *God*, under pretence of extolling Christ. The
 ‘ latter contemn *Christ*, under pretence of extolling
 ‘ God alone. — He that pretending to extol *Christ* or
 ‘ *Faith* degrades *godliness*, thereby so far rejects *God* :
 ‘ and he, that on pretence of extolling *Godliness*,
 ‘ degrades *Faith*, so far rejects *Christ*, &c. I there-
 ‘ fore DETEST BOTH these extremes :’ [that of Ze-
 ‘ lotes, and that of Honestus:] ‘ But yet it being
 ‘ the FORMER which I take to be the GREATER, and
 ‘ which too many men of *better* repute give too much
 ‘ countenance to, in their inconsiderate disputes
 ‘ against works in justification, I thought I had a
 ‘ call to speak in so great a cause.’

It appears from this excellent quotation, that judi-
 cious Mr. Baxter gave the preference to the *second*
 gospel-axiom, and thought the doctrine of *Honestus*
 less dangerous than that of *Zelotes*. For my part,
 tho’ *Zelotes* thinks me partial, I keep my scales even ;
 and according to the weights of the sanctuary which
 I have

I have produced, I find that *Zelotes* and *Honestus* are EQUALLY wanting. I thank them both for embracing *one* axiom : I check them both for neglecting *the other* : and if *Zelotes* deserves superior praise for maintaining the *first* axiom, I will cheerfully give him the *first* place in my esteem : I confess however, that I am still in doubt about it, for two reasons : (1) *Zelotes* preaches indeed the *first* gospel-axiom, for he preaches *Christ* and *free-grace* : but, after all, for whom does he preach them ? For *every creature* according to the gospel charter ? — No : but only for the little flock of the elect. If you believe his gospel, there never was a single dram of free, saving grace in the heart of God ; or one single drop of precious, atoning blood in the veins of Christ, for the immense herd of the reprobates. Before the beginning of the world, they were all personally appointed *necessarily* to sin and be damned. Thus, according to *Zelotes's* doctrine, free grace, and the first gospel axiom, are not only *more chimeras* with respect to a majority of mankind ; but *free wrath* lords it with sovereign caprice over countless myriads of men, to whom Christ may with the greatest propriety be preached as a *reprobating danger*, rather than as a *gracious redeemer*. — (2) I could better bear with *Zelotes's* inconsistencies, if he were satisfied with *diminishing* the genuine cordial of *free grace*, and *adulterating* it with his bitter tincture of *free wrath*, and with his luscious syrup of *wanton free-grace* : but alas ! he openly or secretly attacks the doctrine of *strict obedience* : he calls them “ poor creatures,” who zealously plead for it : he unguardedly intimates, that they are out of the way of salvation : and (Oh ! tell it not among the heathens :) he sometimes gives you “ deadly hints about the excellence of disobedience : “ sin works for our good : — it keeps us humble : — “ it makes Christ more precious : — it endears the “ doctrines of sovereign, rich, distinguishing grace : “ — it will make us sing louder in heaven.”

“ You wrong me [*says Zelotes*] you are a slanderer of God's people, and a calumniator of gospel-
“ ministers.

ministers. I, for one, frequently enforce the ten "commandments upon believers." True, Sir; but how do you do this? Is it not by insinuating more or less, sooner or later, as your *moral* audience and your *pious* heart can bear it, that the decalogue is not now a rule to be judged by, but "a rule of life," the breach of which will answer all the above-mentioned excellent ends in believers? And what is this, but preaching protestant-indulgences, as I said before? When you do this, do you not exceed the popish distinction between venial and mortal sins? yea, do you not make *all the crimes* of every fallen believer, *venial*? Nay more, do you not indirectly represent their grievous falls as *profitable*? And to seal up the delusion, do you not persuade the simple wherever you go, that our works have nothing to do with our eternal justification *before God*? That our everlasting salvation is *finished* by Christ alone, and that whoever believes fallen believers will be condemn'd by their bad works, is an enemy to the gospel, an Armenian, a Pelagian, a Papist, an Heretick?

If this character of *Zelotes* is just; and if *Honestus* is a conscientious good man, who preaches Christ every sacrament-day, and who enforces spiritual, sincere obedience, (i. e. true repentance, true faith, true hope, and true love to God and man, in all their branches;) and who does it with sincerity, assiduity, and warmth, I cannot but think as favourably of him as I do of his antagonist.

I must however do *Zelotes* the justice to say, that an appearance of truth betrays him into his favourite error. If he does not lay a scriptural stress upon the indispensableness of obedience, it is chiefly for fear of "legalizing the gospel," and robbing God's children of their comforts. See that fond mother, who prides herself in the tenderness she has for her children. She will not suffer the wind to blow upon them: the sun must never shine on their delicate faces: no downy bed is soft enough, no sweet-meats are sweet enough for them: lest they should know weariness.

weariness they must always ride in the easiest of carriages: their tutor must be turned out of door, if he ventures to give them proper correction. All the day long, they must be told what an immense estate they are born to, and how their father has put it out of his own power to cut off the entail. Above all, no body must mention to them the *duty* they owe to him. *Duty* — that bad word *duty* must not abridge their privileges, and stamp their obedience with legal and servile *meanness*. In a word by her injudicious, tho' well-meant kindness, she unerves their constitutions, spoils their tender minds, and brings deadly disorders upon them. Her fondness for her children is the very picture of Zelotes's tender regard for believers. No *duty* must be PRESSED upon the mass *duty*; no *command* INSISTED upon, no *self-denial* ORDERED; lest the dear people should lose the sweetness of their gospel liberty. And, if at any time "Mr. *Palsam's*" humours call aloud for physick, it is given with so much honey, that the remedy sometimes feeds the mortal disease.

Honestus sees, and justly dreads, the error of *Zelotes*; and, to avoid it, he is so sparing of gospel-encouragements, that he deals chiefly (if not wholly) in severe precepts, and hard duties. You may compare him to a stern father, who, under pretence of making his children hardy, and keeping them in proper subjection, makes them carry so heavy burdens, as if they were drudging slaves, and threatens to disown them for every impropriety of behaviour.

Not so a gospel-minister, who reconciles both extremes. He knows how to use sweets and bitters, promises and threatenings, indulgence and severity. He is like a wife and kind father, who does not spare the rod when his children want it; but nevertheless wins them by love as much as possible; — who does not disinherit them for every fault, and yet does not put it out of his power to do it, if they take to a vicious course of life, and obstinately trample his paternal love under foot. Reader, who of the three is in the right, *Zelotes*, *Honestus*, or the Reconciler?

S E C-

SECTION XVIII.

The doctrines of free-grace and free-will are farther maintained against Honestus and Zelotes by a variety of scripture-arguments.

I Flatter myself, that the harmonious opposition of the scriptures produced in the preceding sections, demonstrates the truth of the gospel-axioms. But lest prejudice should hinder Honestus and Zelotes from yielding to conviction, I present them with some scriptural arguments, which, like so many buttresses, will, I hope, support the doctrines of *free-grace* and *free-will*, and render them as firm as their solid basis, *reason* and *revelation*. I begin with the doctrine of *free-grace*.

(1) How gladly would Honestus stoop to, and triumph in *free-grace*, if he considered the force of such scriptures! *Without me you can do nothing:—What hast thou, which thou hast not received in a remote or immediate manner?—We are not sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God.—Who hath first given HIM, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For OF HIM, &c. are ALL things.*

(2) We cannot do the least good without faith and love: and the least degree of true faith and genuine love springs first from *free-grace*: for *Faith is the gift of God, love is the fruit of his spirit*, and when the apostle wishes *charity* to his converts, he wishes it them FROM GOD the Father, who is the author of EVERY good and perfect gift. Now if our every good thought, word, and work, springs from faith and love; and if faith and love spring from God; is it not evident, that he is the first cause of our genuine righteousness, as well as of our existence?

(3) When God says, *Ask and you shall have*, does he not show himself the original of all that we want for body and soul, for time and eternity? And if God owes us nothing.—if the help that is done upon earth,

earth, the Lord originally does it himself, is it not the height of ingratitude and pride to refrain from God, and arrogate to ourselves, the glory due to him and his infinite perfections?

(4) We are commanded *in every thing to give thanks*; but if grace is not the source of *all the good we do, or receive*; does it not follow, that, in some things the *original glory belongs to us, and therefore we deserve thanks before God himself?* And is not this the horrid sin of Anti-christ, who *sitteth as God in the temple of God, and there receives divine honours as if he were God?*

(5) Does not reason dictate, that God will not give his glory to another, and that even *the MAN, who is his fellow* must pay him homage? Is it not the Almighty's incommunicable glory to be the *first cause of all good, agreeably to those words of our Lord, There is none good [i. e. SELF-good, and truly SELF-righteous] but God, from whom goodness and righteousness flow, as light and heat do from the sun?* How dangerous then, how dreadful is the error of the self-righteous, who are above stopping to divine goodness, and giving it it's due! If robbing a church of its ornaments is sacrilege, how sacrilegious is the pride of a pharisee, who, by claiming original goodness, robs God's grace of its indisputable honours, and God himself of his incommunicable glory!

(6) To show christians how ridiculous and satanic is the pride of the self-righteous, I need only remind them that Christ himself.—*Christ the righteous* (as the Son of David) declined all *self-righteousness*. Did he not call his works, *The works that I do in my Father's name, or by my Father's grace?* And did he not, as it were, annihilate himself, when he said, *Why callest thou me good without any reference to the Godhead, of which I am the living temple?—I can do nothing of myself.—I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, HE DOES the works.—Learn of me to be LOWLY IN HEART?* What real christian can read such scriptures without learning to disclaim all self-right-

righteousness and to abhor pharisaic dotages? If Honestus is a *reasonable* christian, I need say no more to reconcile him to *Free-grace*.

I know not which of the two extremes is the most abominable, that of the pharisee, who, by slighting *free-grace*, will not allow God to be the *first cause* of all our *good* works; or that of the antinomian, who, by exploding *free-will*, indirectly represents the parent of good as the *first cause* of all our *wickedness*. This last error is that of Zelotes, to whom I recommend the following arguments.

1. All rationals [as such] are *necessarily* endued with *free will*, otherwise reason and conscience would be powers as absurdly bestowed upon them, as persuasiveness upon a carp, and a taste for music upon an oyster. What are reason and conscience but powers, by which we distinguish right from wrong, that we may chuse the one and refuse the other? And how do they reflect upon God's wisdom, who suppose, that he gave and restored to man these powers, without giving him a capacity to use them! And what can this capacity be, if it is not *free will*? As surely then as *wings* and *legs* prove, that eagles have a power to fly, and hares to run; whether they fly, or run, *towards* the sportsman's destructive weapon, or *from* it: so surely do *reason* and *conscience* demonstrate, that men are endued with liberty, i. e. have a power to chuse, whether they make a *right* or a *wrong* choice. Again,

2. What is a human soul? You justly answer, It is a thinking, willing, accountable thing: And I reply, from the very *nature* of our soul then, it is evident, that we are, and ever shall be *free-willing* creatures. For the moment souls have lost their power of thinking and willing *freely*, they are no longer *accountable*: moral laws are as improper for them as for raging billows. None but fools would attempt to rule delirious persons and mad men by penal laws. The reason is plain: people stark mad, thinking *freely* no longer, are no longer *free-willers*;

willers; and being no more free-willers, they are no more considered as *moral* agents. So certain then as man is a reasonable accountable creature, he is endued with *free-will* for: all rationals under God are accountable, and all accountable beings have more or less power over themselves and their actions. *He* [the Lord] *himself made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his counsel: if thou wilt to keep the commandments, and to perform acceptable faithfulness. He hath set fire and water before thee: stretch forth thy hand unto whether thou wilt. Before man is life and death, and whether him liketh shall be given him.* Eccl. xv. 14, &c. The tempter therefore may allure, but cannot force us to do evil; and God himself so wisely invites, and so gently draws us to obedience, as not to turn the scale for us in an *irresistible* manner.

(3.) O the absurdity of supposing, that *God has appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness*, if the world is not capable of making a right and a wrong choice; and if Christ, Adam, or the Devil absolutely turn the scale of our morals for us! O the blot fixed upon God's *wisdom*, when he is represented as *rewarding* men with heavenly thrones, for having done the good, which they could no more avoid doing, than rivers can prevent their flowing! O the dishonour done to his *justice*, when he is represented as sentencing men to everlasting burnings, for committing sin as *necessarily* as a leaden ball tends to the center!

(4.) If *free-grace* does all in believers without *free-will*, why does David say, *the Lord is my HELPER*? Why does our church pray after the Psalmist, *Make haste to HELP me*? Why does St. Paul declare, that *The Spirit itself * HELPETH our infirmities*?

X

Why

* The word in the original has a peculiar force: [συναντιλαμ. *ΣΥΝΤΙΛΑΜ*] It expresses at once how God's Spirit does his part (συν) *with* us, and [αντι] *OVER AGAINST* us; like two persons that take up a burden together and carry it, the one at one end, and the other at the other end; or like a minister and a congregation, who join in prayer by alternately taking up the responses of the Church.

Why did he not say, *I can do absolutely nothing*, instead of saying, *I can do all things, thro' the Lord who strengtheneth me*? And when Christ had said, *Without me you can do nothing*, why did he not correct himself, and declare, that we can do nothing WITH him, and that HE ALONE must do all? Nay, why does St. Paul apply to himself and others, when THEY WORK WITH God, the very same word that St. Mark applies to God, when HE WORKS WITH men? *We are, συνεργοι, WORKERS TOGETHER WITH God.* 1 COR. iii. 9. — *The Lord, συνεργυυτος, WORKING TOGETHER WITH them.* Mark xvi. 20.

(5.) Do not all the PROMISES, the performance of which is suspended upon some term to be perform'd by us thro' divine assistance, prove the concurrence of free-grace with free-will? When God says, *Seek, and you shall find.* — *Forgive, and you shall be forgiven.* — *Come unto me, and I will give you rest.* — *Return to me, and I will return to you,* &c. When God, I say, speaks this language, who does not see free-grace courting and alluring free-will? Free-grace says, *Seek ye my face,* and free-will answers, *Thy face, Lord, will I seek.* On the other hand, unbelievers know, that so long as their free-will refuses to submit to the terms fixed by free-grace, the promise miscarries, and God himself declares, *Ye shall know my breach of promise.* Numb. xiv. 34.

(6.) As the promises, which free-grace makes to submissive free-will, prove the doctrine of the gospel-axioms; so do the THREATENINGS, which anxious free-grace denounces, lest it should be rejected by free-will: Take also two or three examples.—*I will cast them that commit adultery with her, into great tribulation, EXCEPT they repent of their deeds.*—*EXCEPT ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish*—*He that believeth not shall be damned*—*If we sin wilfully [i. e. obstinately, and to the last moment of our day of grace] after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth [for us] &c. a fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries,* &c. Who does not see here, that

that free-grace provoked by inflexible free-will, can, and will act the part of inflexible justice?

(7.) There is not one *reproof*, *encomium*, or *exhortation* in the old and new testament, that does not support the capital doctrines of free-grace, or free-will. When Christ says with a frown: *How is it that you have no faith? O perverse generation, how long shall I suffer you?—O generation of vipers, BRING FORTH FRUIT meet for repentance.—Have ye your heart YET hardened?—*When he smiles and says, *Well done, good and faithful servant:—*When he *marvels*, and cries out, *Great is thy faith:—*Or when he gives such gracious exhortations, *Be not faithless, but believing:—Come to the marriage:—Be faithful unto death:—Only believe:—*When Christ, I say, speaks in this manner, is it not as if he expressed himself in such words as these? My free grace tries every rational means to win your free-will. I reprove you for your sins, I commend you for your faith, I exhort you to repentance, I shame you into obedience; I leave no stone unturned, to show myself the *rational* Saviour of my *rational*, *free-creatures*.

(8.) I may proceed one step farther, and say: There is not one *commandment* in the law, nor one *direction* in the gospel, that does not demonstrate the truth of this doctrine. For all God's precepts and directions are for our good, therefore *free-grace* gave them. Now if God is *wise*, as well as gracious, it follows that he gave his precepts and directions to *free-agents*, that is, to *free-willing* creatures. Let a king who has lost his reason, make a code of moral laws for trees, or horses: Let him send preachers into every mill in the kingdom to give proper directions to cog-wheels, and to assure them, that if they turn fast and right they shall grind for the royal family, and if they stop or turn wrong, they shall be cut to pieces and ground to saw-dust: But let not the absurdity of a similar conduct be charged upon God.

(9.) Every humble confession of sin shows the various workings of free-grace and free-will. *I have sinned*

finned—I have done wickedly, &c. is the language of *free-will* softened by *free-grace*. To suppose that these acknowledgments are the language of *free-grace* alone, is to suppose that *free-grace* *sins* and *does wickedly*. And when we heartily join in such petitions as these: *Turn us, and we shall be turned:—Draw me, and I will run after thee:—Bring my soul out of prison, that I may praise thy name:—Save, or I perish, &c.* do we not feel our *free-will* endeavouring to apprehend *free-grace*? Is this heresy? Did not St. Paul maintain this doctrine in the face of the church, and seal it with the account of his own experience, when he said, *I follow after, if that I MAY APPREHEND that, for which also I AM APPREHENDED of God?*

(10.) To conclude: there is not a damned spirit in hell, that may not be produced, as a living witness of the double doctrine which I defend. Why is Lucifer loaded with chains of darkness? Is it because there was never any *free-grace* for him? and because *free-wrath* marked him out for destruction, before he had personally deserved it? No; but because his *free-will* kept not the first estate of holiness, into which God's free grace had placed him. Why is Judas gone to his own place? Is it because the Holy Ghost spake an untruth when he said, that [till the day of retribution comes] *God's mercy is over all his works*? No; but because Judas's *free-will* was so obstinately bent upon *gaining the world*, that, according to our Lord's declaration, *HE LOST HIS OWN soul*, became a *son of perdition*, and, by *denying in work the Lord that bought him*, brought upon himself *swift destruction*. Now if Judas himself cannot say, '*God's free-wrath sent me to hell, and not my free-will; I am here in Adam's place, and not in my own. I never rejected against myself the counsel of a gracious God; for, with respect to ME, the Father of mercies was always unmerciful—the God of all grace had never any saving grace.*'—If Judas, I say, cannot justly utter these blasphemies, surely none can: and if none can, then every sinner in hell demonstrates the truth of the gospel.

gospel-axioms, and is a tremendous monument of the vengeance *justly* taken from *free-will*, for doing obstinately despite to the Spirit of *free-grace*.

(11.) But, leaving Judas to experience the truth of this awful scripture, *The backslider in heart shall be filled with HIS OWN ways*, let your soul soar upon the wings of faith and reason to the happy regions, where the spirits of just men made perfect shine like stars or suns in their father's kingdom. Ask them, to whom, and to what do you ascribe your salvation? and you hear them all reply, *Salvation is of the Lord.—Not unto us, but to his name we ascribe glory.—Of his own mercy he saved us, to the praise of the glory of HIS GRACE.* What a noble testimony is this to the doctrine of **FREE-GRACE!**

(12.) Nor does the Lord stand less for their **FREE-WILL**, than they do for his **FREE-GRACE**. Prostrate yourself before his everlasting throne, and with all becoming reverence ask the following question, that you may be able to vindicate God's righteous ways before an unrighteous man: *Let not the Lord be angry, and I will take upon me to speak unto the Lord: didst thou admit those happy spirits into thy kingdom, entirely out of partiality to their persons? If they are rais'd to glorious thrones, while damned spirits are cast into yonder burning lake, is it merely because absolute grace and absolute wrath made originally all the difference? In a word, is their salvation so of thy free-grace, that their free-will had absolutely no hand in the matter?*

Methinks that I hear the *Judge of all the earth* giving you the following answer, which appears to me perfectly agreeable to his sacred oracles.

O injudicious man, how canst thou be so slow of heart to believe all that I, and my prophets have said? Am not I a Judge as well as a Saviour? Can I shew myself a righteous Judge, and yet be partial in judgment? Nay, should I not be the most unjust of all judges, if from my righteous tribunal I distributed heavenly thrones and infernal racks out of distinguishing grace, and distinguishing wrath? Know that all souls are mine; and that in point of

judgment there is no respect of persons with me. In the great day I judge, that is, I condemn or justify, I punish or reward, every man according to HIS WORK, and consequently according to HIS FREE-WILL; for if a work is not the work of a man's free-will, it is not HIS work, but the work of him that uses him as a tool, and works by his instrumentality. So certain then as the office of a gracious Saviour is compatible with that of a righteous judge, my capital doctrines of free-grace and free-will are consistent with each other. If these, therefore, walk with me in white, know that it is because they are WORTHY: for the righteous is MORE EXCELLENT than his neighbour.—Like good and faithful servants, they occupied till I came; and lo, I came and my REWARD was with me. They have kept the faith; and I have kept my promise. They have not finally forsaken me; and I have not finally forsaken them. They have kept the word of my patience; and I have kept them from the great tribulation. They have made themselves ready [tho' some have done it only at the eleventh hour], and I have admitted them to the heavenly feast. They have done my commandments, and they are entered by the gates into the new Jerusalem. My free-grace gave them their free-will: their free-will yielded to my free-grace: and now my free-grace crowns their faithfulness. They were faithful unto death, and I have given them the crown of life. Thus my free-grace and mercy, which began the work of their salvation, concludes it in conjunction with my truth and justice: and my free-willing people shout Grace! Grace! when they consider the top-stone, as well as when they behold the foundation of their salvation. My free-grace is ALL to them, and their FREE WILL is so much to me, that I am not ashamed to call them brethren, and to acknowledge, that as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so do I rejoice over them, because when they heard my voice, they know the day of their visitation, and did not harden their hearts to the last.

If *Honestus* and *Zelotes* candidly weigh the preceding arguments in the balance of the sanctuary, they will, I hope, drop their prejudices against *free-grace* and *free-will*, and consent to a speedy, lasting reconciliation. But *Zelotes* is ready to say, that there can be no reconciliation between *Honestus* and himself, because he cannot in conscience be reconciled even to *me*, who here act the part of a mediator; tho' I come nearer to "the doctrines of grace" than *Honestus* does. Consider we then the capital objections of *Zelotes*: and if we can answer them to his satisfaction, we shall probably remove out of his way the strongest bars which the author of discord has fixed between him and *Honestus*.

S E C T I O N X I X.

Zelotes produces his first objection to a reconciliation with *Honestus*. That objection is taken from God's FORE-KNOWLEDGE, and turns upon a frivolous supposition, that the CERTAINTY of an event implies it's NECESSITY. — Our Lord is introduced as answering for himself, and showing, how his PRESCIENCE is consistent with our LIBERTY; and his goodness, with the just destruction of those, who obstinately sin away their day of initial salvation. — A fine observation of Archbishop King upon the consistency of God's FORE-KNOWLEDGE with our FREE-WILL. — The absurdity of supposing, that GOD cannot CERTAINLY know future events, which depend upon the WILL of FREE agents, because we cannot do it.

WHILST *Honestus* says, that he has no great objection to the doctrine of *free-grace*, when it is stated in a rational and scriptural manner, *Zelotes* intimates that he is still averse to the doctrine of *free-will*; and declares that capital objections are in his way, and that, till they are answered, he thinks it his duty equally to oppose *Honestus* and the reconciler.

Hear

Hear we then his objections, and let us see if they are as unanswerable as he supposes them to be.

Obj. 1. " You want to frighten me from *the doctrines of grace*, and to drive me into the heresy of *the free-willers*, by perpetually urging, that the personal, unconditional, and eternal rejection of the non-elect is inconsistent with divine mercy, goodness, and justice: but you either deny, or grant God's *foreknowledge*. If you deny it, you are an atheist: it being evident, that an ignorant God is no God at all. — If you allow it, you must allow that, when God made such men as Cain and Judas, he foreknew that they would **CERTAINLY** *deserve to be damned*: and that when he made them upon that foreknowledge, he made them that they might **NECESSARILY** *deserve to be damned*. And is not this granting all that we contend for, namely, that God does make, and of consequence has an indisputable right of making *vessels of wrath*, without any respect to works and free-will? Is it not far better to say, that we have no *free-will*, than to rob God of his *prescience*?"

Ans. We need neither rob God of his *prescience*, nor man of his *free-will*. I grant, God made angels and men, that **IF THEY WOULD NOT** be eternally saved, they might be damned. But what has this doctrine to do with yours, which supposes that he made some angels and men that they might *absolutely* and *necessarily* be damned. Is not our doctrine highly consistent with God's *goodness* and *justice*; while yours is the reverse of these divine perfections? Again,

Your argument, tho' ingenious, is inconclusive, because it is founded upon the common mistake of shifting the words upon which it chiefly turns. The flaw of it consists in substituting the clause **NECESSARILY** *deserve to be damned*, instead of the clause **CERTAINLY** *deserve to be damned*; just as if there was no difference between *certainty* and *necessity*. But a little attention will convince you of your error. It is *certain* that I write this moment, but am I *necessitated* to it

it? May I not drop my pen, and meditate, read, or walk? The chasm which, in many cases, separates *absolute certainty* from *absolute necessity*, is as immense as that, which stands between a *point* and *infinity*. Take notice of the insect that buzzes about your ears: does it not exist as *certainly* as God himself? but would it not be a kind of blasphemy to say that it exists as *necessarily*? Would it not be at least paying to a fly, an honour which is due to none but God, the only supreme and *absolutely-necessary* Being? And when you support your doctrines of grace by confounding *certainty* with *necessity*, do you not support them by confounding two things, which, in a thousand cases, and especially in the present one, have no more connection than the two poles? Have not judicious calvinists granted, that altho' the prescience of God concerning Judas's destruction could not stand [*cum eventu contrario*] *with his salvation*; yet it stood perfectly well [*cum possibilitate ad eventum contrarium*] *with the POSSIBILITY of his salvation*? And is not this granting, that altho' God clearly saw, that Judas **WOULD NOT** repent, he clearly saw also that Judas **MIGHT** have repented *in the accepted time*, which is all that I contend for. See Davenant's Animad. Cambridge Edition, 1641. page 38.

To be a little more explicit: let me again intreat you to fall with me before the throne of grace, where the Redeemer teaches mortals to be *meek, lowly, and wise in heart*. Spread your doubts before him in such humble language as this. 'Thou *Light of the world*, let
 ' not thy creature remain in darkness with respect to
 ' the most important question in the world. Am I ap-
 ' pointed *necessarily* to sin on and be damned? Is my
 ' *damnation finished*? Hast thou *absolutely* ordained me
 ' to be a vessel of wrath, and irrevocably appointed
 ' my eternal rejection without any respect to my *per-*
 ' *sonal free-will*? Does thy **FOREKNOWLEDGE NE-**
 ' **CESSITATE** my actions, or may I chuse life or death,
 ' and thro' thy mercy, or justice, have either the one or
 ' the other, according to my *free, unnecessitated* choice
 ' — my

* — my choice equally opposed to *unwillingness* and to
 * *necessity*? Speak, gracious Lord, that if I am a *ne-*
 * *cessary* agent, I may, without any farther perplexity,
 * yield myself to be carried by the irresistible stream
 * of thy free-grace, or of thy free-wrath, to the
 * throne in heaven, or to the dungeon in hell, which
 * thou hast appointed for me from all eternity, ac-
 * cording to the doctrine of the heathen poet :

* Solvite mortales animos, curis que levate :

* Fata regunt orbem, cartâ stant omnia lege. †

If Christ is *the Logos*; — if he is *Reason* and the
Word — the eternal *Wisdom*, and the uncreated *Word*
 of the Father; may we not get a satisfactory answer
 to the preceding question by considering with humble
 prayer his unerring *word*, and by diligently listening
 to the *reason* which he has given us? And shall I
 take an unbecoming liberty if I suppose, that He
 himself expostulates with *Zelotes* in such words as
 these ?

* Son of man, if thou chargest the *reprobation* of
 * the damned, or their *predestination to eternal death*,
 * upon my free-wrath, my sovereignty, or Adam's
 * sin, thou insultest my goodness and justice. *That*
 * *reprobation* has no *properly-original* cause, but their
 * own *personal free-will*. I would a thousand times
 * have crushed thy primitive parents into atoms,
 * when they forfeited my favour, rather than I would
 * have spared them to propagate a race of creatures,
 * most of whom, according to *thy* doctrines of grace,
 * are under an *absolute necessity* to *sin on* and be damned.
 * Thou hast a wrong idea of my word and attributes.
 * With the wisdom, and equity of a tender-hearted
 * judge I condemn the victims of my justice, and I
 * do it *merely* for their *personal* and *obstinate* contempt
 * of my free-grace. Be then no longer mistaken :
 * my *decree of reprobation* is nothing but a fixed reso-
 * lution

† O ye mortals, dismiss your cares, and unbend your minds.
 Predestination rules the world: all things happen according to a
 fixed decree. *Manilus.*

lution of giving sinners over to the perverseness of their *free-will*, if they resist the drawings of my *free-grace* to the end of their day of initial salvation. And what can be more equitable than such a resolution? Is it not right that *free-agents*, who TO THE LAST despise my *goodness*, should become monuments of my *despised goodness*, which is but another name for my *vindictive justice*?

‘ I *fore-saw* indeed, that by such a final contempt of my grace, many would bring destruction upon themselves: but, having wisely decreed to make a world of *probationers* and *free-agents*, I could not *necessari-ly* incline their will to obedience, without robbing them of *free-agency*: nor could I rob them of *free-agency* without foolishly defeating the counsel of my own mind, and absurdly spoiling the work of my own hands. Besides, from the beginning, my intention was not only to show my power and goodness in *creating*, but also to display my wisdom and justice in *governing* accountable creatures, to whom, *without respect of persons*, I should render according to their works — eternal life to them, who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory; but tribulation and anguish to them that are contentious and disobedient.’

‘ I abhor extorted, forced, necessary submission in *rational*s: it suits the dastardly children of the devil, and not the free born sons of God. I could not then in wisdom send upon this world such overpowering streams of light; or permit the tempter to spread such thick darkness upon it, as might *invincibly*, or *necessari-ly* turn the scale of man’s will for loyalty or rebellion. So unadvised a step would immediately have taken them out of the state of probation, in which I had placed them.’

‘ Again: Had I directly or indirectly thrown into the scale a weight sufficient to turn it irresistibly, I should have acted a most unreasonable and detestable part: (1) A most *unreasonable* part; for if I alone **COMPLETELY** work out the salvation of believers, according

‘ cording to what thou callest *finished salvation*, nothing can be more ABSURD, than to appoint a day of judgment and rewards, to bestow upon the elect an eternal life of glory according to THEIR WORKS: (2) ‘ n oft detestable part; for if I earnestly invited all wicked to chuse life, after having absolutely chosen death for most of them, should I not show myself the most hypocritical of all tyrants?’

‘ But, thou stumblest at my FOREKNOWLEDGE, and askest, why I bestow the blessings of *initial salvation* upon those whose free-agency will certainly abuse my goodness, and do despite to the spirit of my saving grace. Thou thinkest, “ It is wrong in me to give them that *will perish* the cup of *initial salvation*, when I know they *will not* accept the cup of *eternal salvation*. Thou supposest it would be better to *reprobate* them at once, than to *expose* them to a greater damnation, by putting it in their power to reject the terms of *eternal salvation*, and by that means to fall from *initial salvation*.” But I shall silence thy objections by proposing some plain questions to thee, as I once did to my servant Job.’

(1) ‘ Is it reasonable to suppose, that I should pervert *my nature*, and act in a manner contrary to *my perfections*, to prevent free-agents from perverting *their nature*, and acting in a manner contrary to *their happiness*? What wouldst thou have thought of my wisdom, if I had appointed Lucifer to hell, and Adam to the grave, from eternity; for fear they should deserve those punishments by *wilfully* falling from heaven and from paradise? Is it not absurd to fancy that the Creator must bring *himself* in guilty of misconduct, lest his rational creatures should render *themselves* so?’

(2) ‘ If thou thinkest it right in me, to command that the gospel of my free-grace be preached to *every creature*; altho’ thou knowest, that the neglecters of it will, like the people of Capernaum, fall into a deeper hell for their *final* contempt of that favour; why shouldest thou think it wrong in me to extend

‘ extend the virtue of my blood, and the strivings of
 ‘ my spirit, to those, who will *finally* reject my free-
 ‘ grace? When thou approvest the extensive tenour
 ‘ of my gospel-commission, dost thou well to be an-
 ‘ gry, or to fret, like Jonah, at the extensiveness
 ‘ of my mercy? Dost thou not see, that, if I were
 ‘ absolutely merciless towards *some men*, my com-
 ‘ mission to preach the gospel to *every man* would be
 ‘ utterly inconsistent with my veracity?

(3.) ‘ Have I not a right to create FREE-agents,
 ‘ and to place them in a state of PROBATION, that I
 ‘ may *wisely* REWARD their obedience, or *justly* PU-
 ‘ NISH their rebellion? *Who art thou, that repliest*
 ‘ *against God?* Shall the thing formed say to him that
 ‘ formed it, “*Why hast thou made me a free-agent?*
 ‘ a probationer for heavenly rewards, or infernal
 ‘ punishments?” May not I appoint, that *free-wil-*
 ‘ *ling* unbelievers, who do *final* despite to the spirit
 ‘ of my *free-grace*, shall be *vessels of wrath* self-fitted
 ‘ for destruction; and that *free-willing*, obedient be-
 ‘ lievers shall be *vessels of mercy*, *afore-prepared* unto
 ‘ *glory* by my *free-grace*, with which their *free-will*
 ‘ has happily concurred?’

(4.) ‘ In the nature of things, must not *Free-agents*,
 ‘ in a state of probation, be *free to fall*, as well as
 ‘ free to *stand*? When thou weighest gold, if thou
 ‘ hinderest one scale from turning, dost thou not
 ‘ effectually hinder the *free* motion of the other
 ‘ scale?’

(5.) ‘ Does it not become *me* to show myself good
 ‘ and gracious, tho’ *my creatures* prove wicked and
 ‘ ungrateful? Should I extinguish or restrain *my*
 ‘ light, because some people love darkness rather
 ‘ than light? If they will not do their duty by *me*,
 ‘ as obedient creatures; ought I not to behave to *them*
 ‘ as a *gracious* Creator, and to hold out the golden
 ‘ sceptre of my mercy, before I strike them with the
 ‘ iron rod of my vengeance? And should not the
 ‘ honour of my divine attributes, be considered more
 ‘ than the *additional* degrees of misery, which un-
 ‘ grateful

‘ grateful free-agents will *obstinately* bring upon themselves?’

(6.) ‘ When I had decreed to create a world of *free-agents*, and to try their loyalty, in order to *reward* the obedient and *punish* the rebellious, could I execute my wise, just, and gracious plan without *suffering* sin to enter into the world, if *free-agents* would commit it? Is permitting the *possibility* of sin any more than permitting, that *free-will* might, or *might not* concur with my *free-grace*? And could I ever have judged the world in righteousness, if I had not permitted such a *possibility*?’

(7.) ‘ If I had given the *casting* vote for Peter’s *obedience*, and for Judas’s *disobedience*, should I not have fixed an eternal blot upon my impartiality? Thinkest thou, that I could be so unwise and unjust, as to hold universal assizes, to *judge* angels and men according to what they have done thro’ *mere necessity*? Shall irresistible *free-grace*, and omnipotent *free-wrath*, commit spiritual rapes upon the human will? and shall I *reward* or *punish* overpowered mankind according to such rapes? Far be the thought from thee! Far be the iniquity from me! I judge the world in righteousness, and not in madness; according to *their own* works, and not according to *mine*.’

(8.) ‘ When I foresaw that sin would enter into the world, could I have been just, if I had not decreed to punish sinners? Could I with justice sentence *moral agents* either to *non-existence*, or to a *wretched* existence, BEFORE they had done wickedly?—AFTER they had sinned, and I had graciously promised them a Saviour, could I, without shewing myself full of *dissimulation*, *partiality*, and *falsehood*, condemn those that perish, BEFORE I had afforded them the means of recovery, by which many of their fellow-sinners, *under the same circumstances*, attain eternal salvation? Must not, in the nature of things, those, who work out their damnation, be doubly guilty, or I be notoriously partial? Must
‘ they

‘ *they not appear* without excuse before all; or I,
‘ without mercy, long-suffering, and truth towards-
‘ *them?*’

(9.) ‘ Dost thou not see, that altho’ the ministra-
‘ tion of righteousness and rewards *exceeds in glory,*
‘ yet the ministration of condemnation and punish-
‘ ments is GLORIOUS? Besides, are they not closely
‘ connected together? Has not the fear of hell, as
‘ well as the hope of heaven, kept thousands of mar-
‘ tyrs from drawing back to perdition, when the
‘ snares of death compassed them about? Nay, is
‘ not *the spirit of bondage unto fear* the beginning of
‘ wisdom, and of most conversions? and shall I act a
‘ deceitful part for thousands of years together;
‘ working upon my people by a lie; and making
‘ them believe that they *have damnation* if they disbe-
‘ lieve, or if they *cast off their first faith,* when yet
‘ [upon thy scheme] there is nothing but *finished salva-*
‘ *tion* for them?’

(10.) ‘ Will not the damnation of obstinate sinners
‘ answer as important ends in the worlds of rationals,
‘ as prisons and places of execution do in the king-
‘ doms of this world? If incorrigible, free-willing
‘ rebels sin to all eternity, will it not be just in me,
‘ to make the line of their punishment run parallel
‘ to the line of their wickedness? Does not thy rea-
‘ son dictate, that an unceasing contempt of my
‘ holy law, and a perpetual rebellion against creat-
‘ ing, redeeming, and sanctifying grace, will call
‘ aloud for a perpetual out-pouring of my righteous
‘ indignation? And does it not follow, that the
‘ eternal damnation of rebels eternally-obstinate—of
‘ rebels, who have WANTONLY trampled under foot
‘ the blessings of INITIAL SALVATION, is as con-
‘ sistent with my despised GOODNESS, as with my
‘ provoked JUSTICE?’

(11.) ‘ As I could not justly condemn *necessary*
‘ agents to infernal misery: so I could not delight in,
‘ and reward the obedience of *such* agents. And as
‘ thou hast more pleasure in the *free,* loving motions of

one of thy friends, than in the *necessary* motions of ten thousand pieces of clock-work, let them move ever so regularly: so do I put more value upon the free, voluntary obedience of one of my people, than upon all the *necessary* revolutions of all the planetary worlds. Why then wilt thou, by thy doctrine of *bound-will*, rob me of what I value most in the universe—the *free* obedience of my faithful servants—the *unforced, spontaneous* love of my mystical body, my spouse, my church?

(12.) ' With respect to my *foreknowledge* of sin, it had absolutely no influence on the commission of it. Thou thinkest the contrary, because thou canst not, in general, *certainly* foresee what thy neighbours will do, unless they are absolutely *directed* and *influenced* by thee: but the consequence does not hold. Short-sighted as thou art, dost thou not sometimes with a *degree* of certainty *foresee* things, which thou art so far from *appointing*, that thou wouldest gladly prevent them, if thou didst not consider, that such a step would be inconsistent with *thy wisdom*, and the *liberty of others*?

(13.) ' Again, may not my *foreknowledge* of a future event imply the **CERTAINTY** of that event with respect to *me*, without implying its **NECESSITY** with respect to the *free-agent*, who *spontaneously* brings it about? Suppose thou wert perfectly acquainted with the art of navigation, the force of every wind, the situation of every rock and sand-bank, the strength and burden of every ship, the disposition and design of every mariner, &c.—Suppose again, thou sawest a ship going full sail just against a dangerous rock, notwithstanding thy repeated signals and loud warnings to the pilot; mightest thou not foresee the *certain* loss of the ship, without laying the least *necessity* upon the pilot to steer her upon the fatal spot, where she goes to pieces? And shall not I, from whom no secrets are hid, and before whom things *pass* and *to come* meet in one *immoveable* everlasting now:—shall not I,

' *with*

' who inhabit eternity, where he *thar* was, and is, and
 ' as TO COME, shows himself the unchangeable I AM,
 ' — shall not I, I say, foresee the motions and actions
 ' of all my *free-agent-creatures*, as certainly, as a
 ' wise watchmaker foresees the motions of the watch which
 ' he has made? Imperfect as the illustration is, it is
 ' adapted to thy imperfect understanding. For, tho'
 ' thou canst not comprehend how I know *future con-*
 ' *tingencies*, thou canst easily conceive, that as no one
 ' but a watchmaker, can perfectly *foresee* what may ac-
 ' celerate, stop, or alter the motion of a watch; so
 ' none but the creator of a *free-agent*, can perfectly
 ' foresee the future motions of a free-agent. If *hell is*
 ' *naked*, and *destruction hath no covering before me*; is
 ' it not absurd to suppose, that the human heart can be
 ' hid from my all-piercing eye? And if thou, who
 ' livest but in a point of *time*, and in a point of *space*;
 ' — If thou, whose faculties are so shallow, and whose
 ' powers are so circumscribed;—if thou, I say, in that
 ' point of time and space which thou fillest, canst see
 ' what is before thee; why should not I, an all-wise
 ' and superlatively-perfect spirit, who fill all times,
 ' and all places, thro' an *infinite now* and a *boundless*
 ' *now*, see also what is before me? Perceivest thou
 ' not the absurdity of measuring me with thy span?
 ' Try to weigh the mountains in a balance, and to
 ' measure the seas in the hollow of thy hand: and,
 ' if thou findest thyself confounded at the bare
 ' thought of a task so easy to my omnipotence, fall
 ' in the dust, and confess that thou hast acted an
 ' unbecoming part, in attempting to put the very
 ' same bounds to *my omniscience*, which I have put to
 ' *thy foreknowledge*. To conclude:

(14.) ' Thou art ready to think hard of my wis-
 ' dom, goodness, or foresight, for giving a talent of
 ' saving grace to a man, who, by burying it to the
 ' last, enhances his own destruction: To solve this
 ' imaginary difficulty, thou ascribest to me a *dreadful*
 ' *sovereignty*—an horrible right of making vessels to
 ' dishonour, and filling them with wrath, *merely*

to show my *absolute power*. But let me expostulate a moment with thee.—I foresaw indeed, that the slothful, unfaithful man, to whom I gave one talent, would bury it to the last: but if I had kept it from him; if I had afforded him no opportunity of shewing his faithfulness, or his unfaithfulness; what could I have done with him? Had I sent him to hell upon *foreseen* disobedience, I should have acted the absurd and cruel part of a judge, who hangs an honest man to day, under pretence that he foresees, the honest man will turn thief to-morrow:—had I taken him to heaven, I should have rewarded *foreseen unfaithfulness* with heavenly glory.—And, had I refused to let him come into existence, my refusal would have been attended with a glaring absurdity, and with two great inconveniencies. (1) With a *glaring absurdity*: For if I foresee, that a man will *certainly* bury his talent; and if, upon this foresight, I refuse that man existence, it follows, I *foresaw*, that a thing which shall *never* come to pass, shall *certainly* come to pass. And what can be more unworthy of me, and more absurd, than such a foresight? (2) The notion that my fore-knowledge of the man's burying his talent, should have made me suppress his existence, is big with two great inconveniencies. For first, I should have defeated my own purpose, which was to shew my *distributive justice*, by rewarding him, *if he would be FAITHFUL*; or by punishing him, *if he would continue in his UNFAITHFULNESS*. And secondly, I should have broken, almost without interruption, the laws of the natural world, and nipped the man's *righteous* posterity in the bud. Had I for instance, prevented the wickedness of all the ancestors of the *Virgin Mary* by forbidding their existence, ten times over I might have suppressed her useful being, and my own important humanity. Nay, at this rate, I might have destroyed all mankind twenty times over.—Drop then thy prejudices: be not wise above what is written for thy instruction. Under pretence

of exalting *free-grace*, do not pour contempt upon
free-will, which is my master-piece in man, as man
 himself is my master-piece in this world. Remem-
 ber, that hell is the *just wages*, which abused free-
 grace gives to free-willing, incorrigible sinners;
 and that heaven is the *gracious reward*, with which
 my free-grace, when it is submitted to, crowns the
 obedience of corrigible, persevering believers. Nor
 forget, that, if thou opposest the doctrine of *free-
 grace*, thou underminest my cross, and insultest me
 as a *Saviour*; and if thou decryest the doctrine of
free-will, thou sappest the foundation of my tribu-
 nal, and affrontest me as a *judge*.

To the arguments contained in the preceding plea,
 I add an extract from a discourse written, I think, by
 Archbishop King, with a design to reconcile the *pre-
 destinarians* and the *free-willers*.

' *Foreknowledge* and *decrees*, says that judicious
 writer, are only assigned to God, to give us a no-
 tion of the *Reddiness* and *certainty* of the divine
 actions; and if so, for us to conclude that what is
 represented by them is inconsistent with the *contin-
 gency* of events or *free-will*, &c. is the same absur-
 dity as to conclude, that *China* is no bigger than a
 sheet of paper, because the map that represents it
 is contained in that compass.'

The same ingenious author proposes the ' argument,
 that has so puzzled mankind, and done so much
 mischief in the world. It runs thus: " If God
 foresee, &c. that I shall be saved, I shall *infallibly*
 be so; and if he foresee, &c. that I shall be damned,
 it is *unavoidable*. And therefore it is no matter
 what I do, or how I behave myself in this life." —
 If God's foreknowledge were exactly conformable
 to ours, the consequence would seem just: but, &c.
 it does not follow (because our foresight of events,
 if we suppose it *infallible*, must presuppose a *neces-
 sity* in them) that therefore the *divine* prescience
 must require the *same necessity* in order to it's being
 certain. It is true, we call God's *foreknowledge* and
 our

• our own, by the same name; but this is not from
 • any real likeness in the nature of the faculties, but
 • from some proportion observable in the effects of
 • them: both having this advantage, that they pre-
 • vent any surprize on the person endowed with them.
 • Now as it is true, that no *contingency* or *freedom* in
 • the creatures, can any way deceive or surprize God,
 • put him to a loss, or oblige him to alter his mea-
 • sures: so, on the other hand, it is likewise true, that
 • the divine *prescience* does not hinder *freedom*: and a
 • thing may *either be, or not be*, notwithstanding that
 • *fore-sight* of it, which we ascribe to God. When
 • therefore it is alledg'd, that if God foresees I shall
 • be saved, my salvation is *infallible*; this does not
 • follow: because the foreknowledge of God is not
 • like *man's*, which requires *necessity* in the event, in
 • order to it's being *certain*; but of another nature
 • consistent with *contingency*; and our inability to
 • comprehend this, arises from our ignorance of the
 • true nature of what we call *foreknowledge* in God,
 • &c. Only of this we are sure, that in this it differs
 • from ours, that it may consist either with the *being*,
 • or *not being* of what is said to be *foreseen*, &c. Thus
 • St. Paul was a *chosen vessel*, and he reckons himself
 • in the number of the *predestinated*, Eph. i. 5. And
 • yet, he supposes it possible for him to miss of salva-
 • tion: and therefore he looked upon himself as ob-
 • liged to use mortification, and exercise all other
 • graces, in order to make his calling and election
 • sure; *lest*, as he tells us, *that by any means, when I*
 • *have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away,*
 • or a *reprobate*, as the word is translated in other
 • places.

This author's important observation, concerning the
 difference between God's foreknowledge and *ours*, may
 be illustrated by the following remark. *Hearing* and
sight are attributed to God, as well as *foreknowledge*
 and *fore-sight*.—*He that planted the EAR, says David,*
shall he not HEAR? And he that formed the EYE, shall he
not SEE? Now is it not as absurd to measure God's PER-

PECT

PERFECT manner of *foreseeing* and *foreknowing*, by our IMPERFECT *foresight* and *foreknowledge*, as to measure his PERFECT manner of *seeing* and *hearing* by OUR IMPERFECT manner of doing it? If Zelotes said, I cannot *see* the inhabitants of the planets:—I cannot *see* the antipodes:—I cannot *see thro'* that wall:—I can see nothing of solids but their surface, &c. therefore God cannot see the inhabitants of planets, the antipodes, &c. would not his argument appear to you inconclusive? Nevertheless it is full as strong as the following, on which Zelotes's objection is founded: I cannot CERTAINLY FORESEE the FREE thoughts, and CONTINGENT intentions of the human heart, therefore *God cannot* do it: I am not *omniscient*, therefore *God* is not so. If I argued in this manner, would you not say?—O injudicious man, how long wilt thou measure God's powers by thine? See, if thou canst, what *now* passes in *my* breast. Nay, *see thy own back*:—See the fibres which compose the flesh of thy hands, or the vapour that exhales out of all thy pores. And if these *near*—these *present*—these *material* objects are out of the reach of *thy* SIGHT, what wonder is it, if *future contingencies* are out of the reach of *thy* FORESIGHT? Cease then to confine *God's* foreknowledge within the narrow limits of *thine*, and own that an omnipresent, omniscient, and everlasting spirit, who *is over all, thro' all, and in all*, and whose permanent existence and boundless immensity comprehend all times and places, as the atmosphere contains all clouds and vapours—Own, I say, that such a Spirit can, at one glance, see from his *eternity* all the revolutions of *time*, far more clearly than thou canst see the characters, which *thine* eyes are now fixed upon. And confess, that it is the highest absurdity to suppose, that an *omnipresent, omnipotent, spiritual, and eternal* EYE, which *is before, behind, and in all things, times, and places*, can ever be at a loss to know or foreknow any thing? And what is God but *such an eye*? And what are *divine knowledge and foreknowledge*, but the *sight* of *such a spiritual, eternal, and omnipresent Eye*?

I do.

I do not know whether this vindication of our *free-agency*, of God's *foreknowledge*, and of the *consistency* of both, will please my readers: but I flatter myself that it will *satisfy* Candidus. Should it soften the prejudices of *Zelotes*, without hardening those of *Honestus*, it will promote the reconciliation which I endeavour to bring about, and answer the end which I proposed, when I took up the pen, to throw some light upon this deep and awful part of my subject.

S E C T I O N. XX.

Zelotes's second objection to a reconciliation. That objection is taken from President Edwards and Mr. Fontaine's doctrine about necessity.—The danger of that doctrine. The truth lies between the extremes of rigid bound-willers and rigid free-willers. We have liberty, but it is incomplete, and much confined.—The doctrines of power, liberty, and necessity are cleared up by plain descriptions, and important distinctions.—The ground of Mr. Edwards's mistake about necessity is discovered; and his capital objection against FREE-WILL is answered.

ZELOTES has another specious objection to a reconciliation with Honestus: It runs thus:

OBJ. II. "Honestus is FOR *free-will*, and I am
 " AGAINST it. How can you expect to reconcile us?
 " Can you find a medium between *free-will* and *ne-*
 " *cessity*? Now, that we are not *free-willing* creatures
 " may be demonstrated from reason and experience.
 " (1) From *reason*: Does not every attentive mind
 " see, that a man *cannot help* following the last
 " dictate of his understanding; that such a dictate
 " is the *necessary* result of the *light* in which he
 " sees things; that this light likewise, is the *ne-*
 " *cessary* result of the *circumstances* in which he is
 " placed, and of the *objects*, which he is surrounded
 " with;—and of consequence, that all is *necessary*;
 " one event being as *necessarily* linked to, and
 " brought

" brought on by another, as the second link of a
 " chain in motion, is necessarily connected with, and
 " drawn on by the first link. Thus, for example, the
 " accidental, not to say the providential fight of Bath-
 " sheba, necessarily raised unchaste desires in David's
 " mind: These desires necessarily produced adultery:
 " And adultery, by a chain of necessary consequences,
 " necessarily brought on murder. All these events were
 " deorsed, and depended as much upon each other,
 " as the loss of a ship depends upon a storm, and a
 " storm upon a strong rarefaction or condensation of
 " the air.—(2) Experience shows, that we are not at
 " liberty to act otherwise than we do. Did you
 " never hear passionate people complain, that they
 " could not moderate their anger? How often have
 " persons in love declared, that their affections were
 " irresistibly drawn to, and fixed upon such and such
 " objects? You may as soon bid an impetuous river
 " to stop, as bid a drunkard to be sober, and a thief
 " to be honest, till sovereign, almighty, victorious
 " grace makes them so. * *The way of man is not in
 " himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his
 " steps.* Jer. x. 23."

ANS.

* This very passage was urged to a friend of mine by the obdu-
 rate highwayman, who was hang'd last year at Shrewsbury: He
 cited it on the morning of his execution, to execute his crimes, and
 to comfort himself. He had drunk so deep into the doctrine of ne-
 cessity, bound-will, and fatalism, that he was entirely inaccessible to
 repentance. What pity is it, that Zelotes should countenance so horrid
 a misapplication of the scriptures! Heated Austin is my Zelotes in
 this respect. Bishop Davenant saith of him, that " he did not abhor
 " fate;" and to prove his assertion, he quotes the following words
 of that Father. " *If any one attributes human affairs*" [which
 take in all the bad thoughts, words, and actions of men] " *TO FATE,*
 " *because he calls the WILL and the POWER of God by the name of*
 " *FATE, LET HIM HOLD his sentiment, and alter his language.*
 " *Sententiam teneat, linguam corrigat.* Aug. De grat. Lib. 5. c. 1."
 —Is not this granting Mr. Voltaire as much FATALISM as he con-
 tends for? and gilding the FATAL pill so piously, as to make it
 go down gibb with all the rigid bound-willers in christendom?

Ans. I grant, that *the way of man is not in himself* to make his escape, when the hour of vengeance is come, and when God surrounds him with his judgments: and that this was Jeremiah's meaning, in the verse which you quote to rob man of moral agency, is evident from the words that immediately precede. *The pastors are BECOME BRUTISH: THEREFORE they shall not prosper, and all their flocks shall be scattered: behold the noise of the bruit [the hour of vengeance] is come, and a great commotion out of the north country, to make the cities of Judah desolate, and a den of dragons.* Then come the misapplied words, *O Lord, I know that the way of a man [to make his escape] is not in himself, &c. Correct me, but with judgment, &c. lest thou bring me to nothing.* See verses 21, 22, 24.—With respect to David, he had probably resisted as strong temptations to impurity, as that by which he fell: and he might, no doubt have stood, if he had not been wanting to himself; both before, and at the time of his temptation.—With regard to what you say about a storm; two ships of equal strength may be tossed by the same tempest, and without *necessity* one of them may be lost by the negligence, and the other saved by the skill of the pilot. And if we may believe St. Paul, the lives which God had given him, would have been lost, if the sailors had not stayed in the ship to manage her to the last. Acts xxvii. 31, 34.—You appeal to *experience*: but it is as much against you, as against Honestus. Experience shows that we have *liberty*, and thus experience is against you. Again, experience convinces us, that our liberty has many *bounds*, and thus experience is against *Honestus*.—As to your scheme of the concatenation of *forcible* circumstances and events, it bears hard upon all the divine perfections. God is too *wise*, too *good*, and *holy*, to give us a conscience and a law, which forbid us to sin; and to place us in the midst of such *forcible* circumstances, as lay a majority of mankind under an *absolute necessity* of sinning to the last, and being damned for ever.—We are therefore endued with

a

a degree of free-will. Thro' him who *tasted death for every man*, and thro' the *free-gift* which came upon all men, we may *chuse life* in the day of initial *salvation*: We may, by grace [by the *saving grace* which has appeared to all men] pursue the things that make for our peace; or we may by nature [by our own natural powers] follow after the things that make for our misery, just as we have a mind. We cannot do all, says one, therefore we can do *nothing*: We can do *something*, says another, therefore we can do *all*. Both consequences are equally false. The truth stands between these two extremes. Besides:

The doctrine of *bound-will*, draws after it a variety of bad consequences. It is subversive of the *moral* difference, which subsists between virtue and vice. It takes away all the *demerit* of unbelief. It leaves no room for the *rewardableness* of works. It strikes at the propriety of a *day of judgment*. It represents truth and error like two *almighty charms*, which *irresistibly* work upon the elect and the reprobates, to bring about God's absolute decrees about our good or bad works, our finished salvation or finished damnation. In a word, it fastens upon us the grossest errors of *pharisaic fatalists*, and the wildest delusions of *antinomian gospellers*.

Having thus given a general answer to the objection proposed, I remind the reader, that Mr. Edwards, President of New-Jersey college, is exactly of 'Zelotes's sentiment with respect to *necessity* or *bound-will*. They agree to maintain, that *necessary* circumstances *necessarily* turn the scale of our judgment, that our judgment *necessarily* turns the scale of our will, and that the freedom of our will consists merely in chusing *with willingness* what we chuse *by necessity*. Mr. Voltaire also at the head of the fatalists abroad, and one of my opponents at the head of the Calvinists in England, give us, after Mr. Edwards, this false idea of liberty.

To shew their mistake, I need only to produce the words of Mr. Locke. 'Liberty cannot be where

Z

' there

• there is no *thought*, no *volition*. no *will*, &c. So a
 • man striking himself or his friend, by a convul-
 • sive motion of his arm, which is not in his power
 • by volition or the direction of his mind, to stop or
 • forbear; nobody thinks he has liberty in this; every
 • one pities him, as acting by *necessity* and *constraint*.
 • Again, there may be thought, there may be *will*,
 • there may be *volition*, where there is *no liberty*.
 • Suppose a man be carried, whilst fast asleep, into
 • a room, where is a person he longs to see, and be
 • there locked fast in beyond his power to get out;
 • he awakes and is glad to see himself in so desirable
 • company, which he stays *willingly* in; that is, he
 • prefers his staying to going away. Is not this stay
 • *voluntary*? I think nobody will doubt it, and yet
 • being locked fast in, he is NOT *at liberty* to stay,
 • he has NOT *freedom* to be gone. So that *liberty* is
 • not an idea belonging to *volition* or *preferring*; but
 • to the person having the POWER of doing or for-
 • bearing to do, according as the mind shall chuse
 • or direct.' *Essay on Hum. Und.* Ch. 21.

This excellent quotation encourages me to make a
 fuller enquiry into the mistakes of the *rigid predesti-*
narians, and *rigid free-willers*, who equally start from
 the truth that lies between them both. It is greatly
 to be wished, that the bounds of *necessity* and *liberty*
 were drawn consistently with reason, scripture, and
 experience. I shall attempt to do it; and if I am so
 happy as to succeed, I shall reach the center of the
 difficulty, and point out the very spring of *the waters*
of strife: *Honestus* will be convinced, that he has too
 high thoughts of our *liberty*: *Zelotes* will see, that his
 views of it are too much contracted: and *Candidus*
 will learn to avoid their contrary mistakes. I begin
 by a definition of *necessity*, and of *liberty*.

Moral philosophers observe that *necessity* is that *con-*
straint upon, or *confinement* of the soul, whereby we
 cannot do a thing otherwise than we do it. Hence it
 appears, that, *strictly speaking*, there is no such thing
 as *moral necessity*. For, could we be CONSTRAINED

to do *unavoidable* good or evil, that good were not good, that evil were not evil. Could we be **NECESSARILY CONFINED** in the channel of virtue or of vice, as a river is confined in its bed, without any power to retard or accelerate our virtuous or vicious motions as we see fit; our tempers and actions would lose their morality and their immorality. To speak with propriety, *necessity* has no place but in the *natural* world: strictly speaking, it is excluded from the *moral* world: for what we *may* and *must regulate* or *alter*, cannot possibly be *necessary* or *unalterable*. Nevertheless I shall by and by venture upon the *improper* expression of *moral necessity*, to convey the idea of a *strong*, moral propensity or habit, and to point out with greater ease Mr. Edwards's mistake.

This ingenious author asserts, that, by the law of our nature, we chuse what we **SUPPOSE** to be, upon the whole, most eligible. I grant it is so in *most* cases; nevertheless I deny *necessity*, because there is no necessity imposed upon us to **SUPPOSE**, that, upon the whole, a thing is most eligible, which at first sight appears to be so to the eye of prejudice or passion; our liberty being chiefly a limited **POWER** to mind either the dictates of reason and conscience, or those of prejudice and passion:—to follow either the motions of the tempter, or those of divine grace. I say a *limited power*, because our power is *incomplete*, as will appear by considering the particulars of which our liberty does, and does not consist. And,

(1.) It does not consist in * *general* in a power to chuse evil and misery as such. *Seldom* * do men, who

Z 2

are

* I use those *limited* expressions because, upon second thoughts, I do not absolutely assent to Mr. Edwards's doctrine, that the will *always necessarily* follows the last dictate of the understanding. I now think, that in this respect Calvin's judgment deserves our close attention, "Sic interdum flagitii turpitudine conscientiam urget, ut non sibi imponens sub falsa boni imagine, sed sciens et volens, in malum ruat. Ex quo affectu prodeunt istos voces, *Video meliora proboque, Deteriora sequor.*" Inst. Lib. 2. Cap. 2. sect. 23.

—Sometimes

are yet in a state of probation—men, who are not degenerated into *mere* fiends, chuse evil only as evil. When we pursue some evil, it is then *generally* under the appearance of some good; or, as being of two evils the less considerable; or, as leading to some good, which will sooner or later make us ample amends for the present evil. For God having made us for the supreme good, which is the knowledge and enjoyment of himself, he has placed in our souls an unquenchable thirst after happiness; that we may ardently seek him the fountain of true happiness. It can hardly be said therefore, that probationers are at liberty with respect to the capital enquiry, *Who will shew us any good?* We naturally desire *good*, just as an hungry man desires *food*: altho' he may say, I do not chuse to be hungry, yet he is so, whether he will or not

(2.) But altho' an hungry man is *necessarily* hungry, yet he does not *eat necessarily*, for he may *fast* if he pleases; and when he chuses to eat, he may prefer bad to wholesome food; he may take more or less of either; he may take it now or by and by—with deliberation or with greediness, as he pleases. Apply this observation to our *necessary* hunger or thirst after happiness. All probationers *necessarily* ask: *Who will shew us any good?* But altho' they *necessarily* aim at happiness, yet they are not *neccessitated* to aim at it in *this* or *that* way :—altho' they cannot but choose *that* end

—*Sometimes the horrid nature of vice so urges the conscience, that the sinner, no longer imposing upon himself by the false appearance of good, knowingly and willingly rushes upon evil. Hence flow these words, I see and approve what is good, but follow what is bad.*

Since these *tracts* went to the press, I have seen Mr. Wesley's *Thoughts upon Necessity*. He strongly sides here with *Calvin* against Mr. *Edwards*. For after asserting, that sometimes our *first*, sometimes our *last* judgment is according to the impressions we have received; that in some cases we may, or may not receive those impressions; and that in most, we may vary them greatly; he denies that the will *necessarily* obeys the *last* judgment, and affirms, that “The mind has an intrinsic power of cutting off the connexion “ between the judgment and the will.”

end, yet they are not *irresistibly* obliged to choose any one particularly means to attain it.

Here then room is left for *free-will* or *liberty*. We may choose to go to happiness, our mark, by saying, *What shall we eat? What shall we drink? Wherewith shall we be clothed?* Who will give us corn and wine, silver and gold, worldly honours and sensual gratifications?—Or we may say, Who will give us pardon and peace, grace and glory? *Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us.*—In a word, tho' we are *not* properly *at liberty* to choose happiness in general; that choice being morally *necessary* to us; yet, *in the day of initial salvation*, we may chuse to seek happiness in ourselves, in our fellow-creatures, or in our Creator: We may choose a way that will lead us to imaginary, and fading bliss, or to real and eternal happiness: Or, to speak as the oracles of God, we may *choose death or life*.

This being premised, I observe, that our liberty consists, (1) in our being under **NO NATURAL necessity** with regard to our choice of the means, by which we pursue happiness; and, of consequence, with regard to our schemes and actions. I repeat it, by *natural necessity* I mean, an absolute want of power to do the reverse of what is done. Thus, by *natural necessity* an ounce is outweigh'd by a pound; it can no ways help it; and a man, whose eyes are quite put out, *cannot absolutely* see the light, should he desire and endeavour it ever so much. Hence it appears, that, when Peter denied his Master, he was under *no natural necessity* so to do; for he might have confessed him, if he had pleased: When the martyrs confessed Christ, they might have denied him with oaths, if they had been so minded: and when David went to Uriah's bed, he might have gone to his own. There was no shadow of *natural necessity* in the case. We may then, or we may not admit the *truth* or the *lie*, that is laid before us as a principle of action. Thus the Eunuch *without necessity* admitted the truth deli-

vered

vered to him by Philip; and Eve *without necessity* entertained the lie, which was told her by the serpent.

(2.) Our liberty consists in a power carefully to consider, whether what is presented to us as a principle of action, is a *truth* or a *lie*; lest we should judge according to *deceitful appearances*. Our blessed Lord, by steadily using this power, steadily baffled the tempter: And Adam, by not making a proper use of it, was shamefully overcome.

(3.) It consists in a power natural to all moral agents, to do acts of sin if they please, and in a supernatural or gracious power [bestowed for Christ's sake upon fallen man] to forbear, with some degree of ease, doing sinful acts, † at least when we have not yet fully thrown ourselves down the declivity of temptation and passion; and when we have not yet, by that means, contracted such strong habits, as make virtue or vice *morally necessary* to us.

(4.) It consists in a gracious power to make diligent enquiry, and to apply in doubtful cases to *the Father of lights* for wisdom, before we *practically* decide, that such a doctrine is true, or that such an action is right. Had Eve and David used that power, the one would not have been deceived by a flattering serpent; nor the other by an impure desire.

But (5.) the highest degree of our liberty consists in a power to suspend a course of life entered upon;
to

† I make these exceptions for two reasons: (1) Because I am sensible of the justness of Ovid's advice to persons in love,

Principiis obsta, sero medicina paratur.

For if love, and indeed any other violent passion, is not resisted at it's first appearance, it soon gets to such a height, that it can *hardly* be mastered, till it has had it's course: (2) Because an habit strongly rooted is a second nature. It is far easier to refrain from the first acts, than to break off inveterate habits of virtue or of vice. In such cases, powerful, uncommon impulses of grace or of temptation are peculiarly necessary to throw us out of our beaten track. Hence the strong comparison of the prophet, *Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also, that are ACCUSTOMED to do evil, do good*—without a more than common assistance of divine grace.

to re-examine our principle, and to admit a new one, if it appear better; especially when we are particularly assisted by divine grace, or strongly wrought upon by temptations adapted to our weakness. Thus by their *gracious* free agency, Manasses and the prodigal son suspended their *bad* course of life, weighed the case a second time *for the better*, admitted the truth which they once rejected, and from that new principle wrought righteousness: while, on the other hand, Solomon, Judas, and Demas, by their *natural* free-agency suspended their *good* course of life, weighed the case a second time *for the worse*, admitted the lie which they once detested, and from that new principle wrought damnable iniquity. Is not this account of our *real*, tho' *limited* liberty, more agreeable to scripture, reason, conscience, and experience, than the *necessity* maintained by *Calvinistic* bound-willers and *deistical* fatalists?

I have already observed, [Equal Check, Part I. p. 24] that the seemingly contrary systems of those gentlemen, like the two opposite half-diameters of a circle, meet in *natural necessity*, a central point which is common to both; Mr. Voltaire, who is the apostle of the deistical world, and Mr. Edwards, who is the oracle of Calvinistic metaphysicians, exactly agreeing to represent man as a *mere*, tho' *willing* slave to the circumstances in which he finds himself, and to load him from head to foot, and from the cradle to the grave, with the chains of absolute *necessity*, one link of which he can no more break, than he can make a world. Their error, if I mistake not, springs chiefly from their overlooking the important difference there is, between *NATURAL necessity*, and what the barrenness of language obliges me to call *MORAL necessity*. Hence it is, that they perpetually confound *REAL liberty* which is always of an *ACTIVE* nature, with that kind of *necessity* in disguise, which I beg leave to call *PASSIVE liberty*. Clear definitions, illustrated by plain examples, will make this plain; will unravel the
mystery

mystery of fatalism, and rescue the capital doctrine of *liberty* from its confinement in mystical Babel.

(1.) A thing is done by **NATURAL necessity**, when it *unavoidably* takes place, according to the fixed laws of *nature*. Thus, by *natural necessity*, a serpent begets a serpent, and not a dove; a fallen man begets a fallen child, and not an angel; a deaf man cannot hear, and a cripple cannot be a swift racer.

(2.) A thing is done by **MORAL necessity** [if I may use that improper expression] when it is done by a free-agent with a peculiar degree of readiness, resolution, and determination; — from strong motives, powerful arguments, confirmed habits: and when it might nevertheless be done just the reverse, if the free-agent pleased. Thus, by a low degree of **MORAL necessity**, chaste, conscientious Joseph struggled out of the arms of his master's wife, and cried out, *How CAN I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?* And, by an high degree of it, Satan hates holiness, God abhors sin, and Christ refused to fall down, and worship the devil.

(3.) I have observed in the second check, that Mr. Edwards's celebrated treatise, upon free-will, turns in a great degree upon a comparison between *balances* and the *will*. To show more clearly the flaw of his performance, I beg leave to venture upon the *improper*, and in one sense *contradictory*, expression of **PASSIVE liberty**. By **PASSIVE liberty** [which might also be called **MECHANICAL liberty**] I mean the readiness with which just scales turn upon the least weight thrown into either of them. Now it is certain that **THIS liberty** [so called] is **MERE necessity**: for two even scales *necessarily* balance each other, and the heavier scale *necessarily* outweighs the lighter. According to the fixed laws of nature, it cannot be otherwise. It is evident therefore, that when Mr. Edwards avails himself of such popular, improper expressions as these, "Good scales are *free* to turn either way—just balances are *at liberty* to rise or fall by the least weight," he absurdly imposes upon the

moral

moral world a MECHANICAL *freedom of liberty*, which is MERE NECESSITY. His mistake is set in a still clearer light by the following definition.

(4.) ACTIVE *liberty* is that of LIVING creatures, endued with a *degree of power to use their powers in VARIOUS manners*: Their prerogative is to have in general the weight that turns them in a great degree AT THEIR OWN DISPOSAL. Experience confirms this observation: How many stubborn beasts, for example, have died under the repeated strokes of their drivers, rather than to move at their command! And how many thousand jews chose to be destroyed rather than to be saved by him, who said: *How often would I have gathered you, &c. and YE WOULD NOT?* Hence it appears, that ACTIVE *liberty* subdivides itself into *brutal liberty*, and *rational*, or *moral liberty*.

(5.) BRUTAL *liberty* belongs to beasts, and RATIONAL OR MORAL *liberty* belongs to men, angels, and God. By BRUTAL *liberty* understand the power, that beasts have to use their *animal* powers various ways, according to their instinct, and at their pleasure. By RATIONAL *liberty* understand the power that God, angels, and men have to use their *divine, angelic, or human* powers in various manners, according to their wisdom, and at their pleasure. Thus while an oak is tied fast by the root, to the spot where it feeds and grows, a horse carries his own root along with him; ranging without necessity, and feeding as he pleases, all over his pasture. While an horse is thus employed, a man may either make a saddle for his back, a spur for his side, a collar for his shoulder, a stable for his conveniency, or a carriage for him to draw: — or, leaving these mechanical businessses to others, he may think of the scourge that tore his Saviour's back, call to mind the spear that pierced his side, reflect upon the cross that galled his shoulder, the stable where he was born, and the bright carriage in which he went to heaven: or he may, by degrees, so innure himself to infidelity, as to call the gospel a fable, and Christ an impostor.

According

According to these definitions it appears, that our sphere of *liberty* encreases with our *powers*. The more *powers* animals have, and the more ways they can use those powers, the more BRUTAL *liberty* they have also: Thus, those creatures that can, when they please, walk upon the earth, fly thro' the air, or swim in the water, as some sorts of fowls, have a more extensive liberty than a worm, which has the freedom of one of those elements only, and that too in a very imperfect degree.

As by the help of a good horse a rider increases his power to move swiftly, and to go far; so by the help of science and application, a philosopher can penetrate into the secrets of nature, and an Archytas or a Newton can

Aerias † tentare domos, animo que rotundum
Transmigrae polum.

Such geniuses have undoubtedly more *liberty of THOUGHT* than those fots, whose minds are fettered by ignorance and excess, and whose imagination can just make shift to flutter from the tavern to the play-house, and back again.—By a parity of reason, they, who enjoy *the glorious liberty of the children of God*, who can in a moment recollect their thoughts, fix them upon the noblest objects, and raise them, not only to the stars, like Archytas; but to the throne of God, like St. Paul;—they, who can *become all things to all men, be content* in every station, and even *sing at midnight* in a dungeon, regardless of their empty stomachs, their scourged backs, and their *feet made fast in the stocks*; they, who can command their passions and appetites, *are free from sin*, and find “God’s service perfect freedom;”—these happy people, I say, enjoy far more *liberty of HEART* than the brutish men, who are so enslaved to their appetites and passions, that they have just *liberty* enough left them, not to ravish the women they set their eyes upon, and
not

† Soar to the stars, and with his mind travel round the universe.

not to murder the men they are angry with. But altho' the liberty of God's children is *glorious* now, it will be far more so, when their regenerate souls shall be matched in the great day with bodies blooming as youth, beautiful as angels, radiant as the sun, powerful as lightning, immortal as God, and capable of keeping pace with the Lamb, when he shall lead them to new fountains of bliss, and run with them the endless round of celestial delights.

To return: Innumerable are the degrees of *liberty* peculiar to various orders of creatures: but no animals are accountable to their owners for the use of their powers, but they which have a peculiar degree of knowledge. Nor are they accountable, but in proportion to the degree of their *knowledge* and *liberty*. Your horse, for instance, has power to walk, trot, and gallop; you want him to do it alternately, and if he does not obey you, when you have intimated your will to him in a manner suitable to his capacity, you may, without folly and cruelty, spur or whip him into a reasonable use of his *liberty* and *powers*: for inferior creatures are in subjection to their possessors in the Lord. But if his feet were tied, or his legs broken; and you spurred him to make him gallop; or if you whipped a hen to make her swim, and an ox to make him fly; you would exercise a foolish and tyrannical dominion over them. This cruel absurdity however, or tantamount, is charged upon Christ by those, who pretend to "*exalt him*" most. They thus dishonour him, as often as they insinuate that the children of men have no more power to believe than hens to swim, or oxen to fly; and that the Father of mercies will damn a majority of them, for not using a power, which he determined they should never have.

Some people assert, that man has a little liberty in *natural*, but none in *spiritual* things. I dissent from them for the following reasons. (1) All men (monsters not excepted) having a degree of the *human form*, they probably have also a degree of *human capacity*

capacity—a measure of those *mental* powers, by which we receive the knowledge of God: a knowledge this, which no horse can have, and which is certainly of a *spiritual* nature.—(2) The same apostle, who informs us, that *the natural man* [so called] the man, who quenches the spirit of grace under his dispensation, *cannot know the things of the spirit of God, because they are discerned only by the light of the spirit, which he quenches or resists*—the same apostle, I say, declares, that *What may be known of God is manifest in them* (the most abandon'd heathens) *for God hath shewed it unto them—so that they are without excuse; because, when they knew God [in some degree] they glorified him not as God, according to the degree of that knowledge: but became brutish, besotted persons; or, to speak St. Paul's language, they became vain in their imaginations—they became fools—their foolish heart was darkened—wherefore God gave them up to a reprobate mind, and they were left in the deplorable condition of the christian apostates described by St. Jude, sensual, having not the spirit: In a word, they became PSYCHICOR* * *MERE animal men, the FULL reverse of spiritual men: 1 Cor. ii. 14. Far from being the wiser for the light, that [graciously] enlightens every man who cometh into the world, they became inexcusable by changing the truth of God into a lie, and turning their light to darkness, thro' the wrong use which they made of their liberty.*

When the advocates for *necessity* deny man the talent of *spiritual liberty*, which divine wisdom and
grace

* PSYCHE is sometimes taken only for the principle of *animal life*: Thus, Rev. 8, 9. *The third part of the sea became blood, and the third part of the creatures which were in the sea, and bad PSYCHAS, not a nature, but ANIMAL LIFE, died.* Hence Calvin himself renders the word *psychicos*, ANIMAL-MAN, tho' our translators render it *NATURAL man*, as if the greek word were *physicos*. And upon their mistake, a vast majority of mankind are rashly represented as being *absolutely* destitute of all capacity to receive the *saving* truths of religion.

grace have bestowed upon him, they fondly exculpate themselves, and rashly charge God with Calvinistic reprobation. For, who can think that an oyster is culpable for not flying as an eagle? And who can help shuddering at the cruelty of a tyrant, who, to shew his sovereignty, bids all the idiots in his kingdom solve Euclid's problems, if they will not be cast into a fiery furnace? Nor will it avail to say, as *Elisha Coles* and his admirers do, that, tho' man has lost his power to obey, God has not lost his power to command upon pain of eternal death: For, this is pouring poison into the wound, which the doctrine of *natural necessity* gives to the divine attributes. Your slave runs a sportive race, falls, dislocates both his arms, and by that accident loses his power or liberty to serve you: In such circumstances you may indeed find fault with him, for bringing this misfortune upon himself; but you show a great degree of folly and injustice, if you *blame* him for not digging with his arms out of joint: And when you refuse him a surgeon, and insist upon his thrashing, if he will not doubly feel the weight of your vindictive hand, you betray an uncommon want of good nature. But, in how much more unfavourable a light would your conduct appear, if his misfortune had been entailed upon him by one of his ancestors, who lost a race near six thousand years ago; and if you had given him a bond stamp'd with your own blood, to assure him that *your ways are equal*, that you are not an austere man, that *your mercy is over all your household*, and that *punishing is your strange work*?

God is not such a master as the Calvinian doctrines of grace make him. For Christ's sake he is always well pleased with the *right* use we make of our *present* degree of liberty, be that degree ever so little. For unconverted sinners themselves have *some* liberty. Fast tied and bound as they are with the chain of their sins, like chained dogs, they may move a little. If they have a mind, they may, to a certain degree, come out of the sataa's kennel. When they

A a

are

are pinch'd with hunger or trouble, like the prodigal son, they may go a little way towards the bread and the cordial that came down from heaven; and when their chains gall their minds, they may give the Father of mercies to understand, that they want "the pitifulness of his great mercy to loose them." Happy the souls, who thus meet God with their little degree of power! Thrice happy they, who go to him so far as their chain allows, and then groan with David: *My belly cleaveth to the dust.—Bring my soul out of prison, that I may praise thy name!* When this is the case, *the captive exile hasteneth that he may be loosed:* They that are thus *faithful over a few things*, will soon be *set over many things*; they will soon experience an enlargement, and say with the Psalmist: *Thou hast enlarged my steps under me.* My liberty is increased. *I will run the way of thy commandments.*

The defenders of *necessity* are chiefly led into their error by considering the *imperfection* of our *liberty*, and the *narrow limits* of our *powers*: but they reason inconclusively who say, "Our liberty is imperfect; therefore we have none. *Without Christ we can do nothing*; therefore we have absolutely no power to do any thing." As some observations upon this part of my subject, may reconcile the judicious and candid on both sides of the question; I venture upon making the following remarks.

All power, and therefore all liberty, has its bounds. The KING of England can make war or peace when he pleases, and with whom he pleases; and yet he cannot lay the most trifling tax without his parliament.—The power of SATAN is circumscribed by God's power.—God's own power is circumscribed by his other perfections: he *cannot* sin, because he is holy; he *cannot* cause two and two to make six, because he is *true*; nor can he create and annihilate a thing in the same instant, because he is *wise*.—Our LORD's power is circumscribed also. *Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do.*

If

If a degree of CONFINEMENT is consistent with the LIBERTY of omnipotence itself, how much more can a degree of RESTRAINT be consistent with our *natural, civil, moral, and spiritual* LIBERTY? Take an instance of it: (1) With regard to NATURAL liberty. Altho' you cannot fly, you may walk—but not upon the sea as Peter did:—nor thirty miles at once as some people do:—not one mile when you are quite spent:—nor five yards when you have a broken leg.—(2) With respect to CIVIL liberty. You are a *free-born* Englishman: nevertheless you are not *free* from taxes: and probably you have not the *freedom* of two cities in all the kingdom. On the other hand, St. Paul is Nero's *prisoner bound with a chain*, and yet he swims to shore, he gathers sticks, makes a fire, and preaches *two years in his own hired house, no body forbidding him*.—(3) With respect to MORAL liberty. When *Nabal* is in company with his fellow-fots, has good wine before him, and is already heated by drinking, he cannot refrain himself, he must get drunk: but might he not have done violence to his inclination before his blood was inflamed? Conscious of his weakness, might he not at least have avoided the dangerous company he is in, and the sight of the sparkling liquor, in which all his good resolutions are drown'd?

Take one instance more of the *imperfect liberty* I plead for. Is not what I have said of *civil*, applicable to *devotional* liberty? You have not the power to *love* God with *all* your heart; but may you not *fear* him a little? You cannot wrap yourself for *one hour* in the sublime contemplation of his glory; but may you not meditate for *two minutes* on death and judgment? St. Paul's *burning zeal* is far above your sphere; but is not the *timorous inquisitiveness* of *Nicodemus* within your reach? You cannot attain the elevations of him who has *ten talents* of piety; but might you not so use your *one talent* of consideration, as to gain two—four—eight—and so on, till the unsearchable riches of Christ are all yours? And, if

I may allude to the emblematic pictures of the four evangelists, may you not ruminate upon earth with the ox of St. Luke, till you can look up to heaven with St. Matthew's *human face*, fight against sin with the courage of St. Mark's *lion*, and soar up towards the sun of righteousness with the strong wings of St. John's *eagle*? Did not our Lord expect as much from the pharisees, when he said to them? *Ye hypocrites, how is it that you do not discern this [accepted] time? Yea, and why even OF YOURSELVES judge ye not what is RIGHT?* Alas! how frequently do we complain of the want of power, when we have ten times more than we make use of? How many *slathfully* bury their talent, and *peevishly* charge God with giving them none? And how common is it to hear people, who are sincerely invited to the gospel feast, say, "I CANNOT come," who might roundly say, if they had Thomas's honesty, "I WILL NOT believe?" The former of these pleas is indeed more decent than the latter: but is it not shamefully evasive? And does it not amount to the following excuse: "I CANNOT come without taking up my cross; and as I WILL NOT do it, my coming is *morally* impossible?"—a lame excuse this, which will pull down aggravated vengeance upon those, who, by making it, trifle with truth, with their own souls, and with God himself.

From the whole I conclude, that our *liberty*, or *free-agency* consists in a LIMITED ABILITY to use our bodily and spiritual powers right or wrong at our option; and that to deny mankind such an ability is as absurd as to say, that a man cannot work, or beg, or steal, as he pleases;—bend the knee to God, or to Ashtaroth;—go to the house of prayer, or to the play-house;—turn a careless or an attentive ear to a divine message;—refuse or give credit to an awful report;—slight or consider a matter of fact;—and act in a reasonable or unreasonable manner, at his option.

Is not this doctrine agreeable to the dictates of conscience, as well as to plain scripture? And when we maintain, that, as often as our free-will inclines

to vital godliness since the fall, it is *touch'd*, tho' not necessarily *impell'd* by free-grace:—When we assert in the words of our Xth article, that “we have no power to do GOOD works acceptable to God, WITHOUT the grace of God, by Christ, PREVENTING” [NOT FORCING] “us that we may have a GOOD will;” do we not sufficiently secure the honour of *free-grace*? Say we not as much as David does in this passage, *Thy people* [obedient believers] shall, or will be *willing* [to execute thy judgments upon * thine enemies] *in the day of thy power*—i. e. in the day of thy powerful wrath? Or as we have it in the common prayers, *In the day of thy power shall the people offer free-will* [not bound-will] *offerings*?—Do we not grant all that St. Paul affirms, when he says to the Philippians, *Work out your own salvation with fear, &c. for it is God, that worketh in you both to WILL and to DO*? i. e. God at his own good pleasure gives you a *gracious* talent of *will* and *power*: Bury it not: Use it *with fear*: Lay it out *with trembling*; lest God take it from you, and *give you up to a reprobate mind*?—And is it not evident, that these two passages, on which the rigid *bound-willers* chiefly rest their mistake, are perfectly agreeable to the doctrine of the moderate *free-willers*, which runs thro' all the scriptures, as the preceding pages demonstrate?

Rational and scriptural as the doctrine of *liberty* is, President Edwards will root it up: and to succeed in his attempt, he fetches ingenious arguments from heaven and hell.

Superas, Acheranta movendo,—He musters up all the subtleties of logick and metaphysick, with all the refinements of Calvinism, to defend his favourite doctrine

A a 3

trine

* That this is the true meaning of Ps. cx. iii. is evident from the context. Read the *whole* Psalm; compare it with Ps. cxlix, 6.—Mal. iv. 1, 2, 3. and Rev. xix, 19, and you will see, that *the day of God's POWER, or the day of God's ARMY, is the day of his wrath against his enemies*:—a day this, which is expressly mentioned two verses after, and described in the rest of the psalm.

trine of *necessity*. To the best of my remembrance, a considerable part of his book may be summed up in the following paragraph, which contains the most ingenious objection of the Calvinists.

The Arminians say, that if we act *necessarily* we are neither punishable nor rewardable; because we are neither worthy of blame, nor of praise. But the DEVIL, who is *punished*, and who therefore is blame-worthy, is NECESSARILY WICKED; he has *no liberty* to be good. And GOD, who deserves ten thousand times more praises than we can give, is NECESSARILY GOOD; he has *no liberty* to be wicked. Hence it appears, that the reprobates may be NECESSARILY wicked like the devil, and yet may be JUSTLY punishable like him; and that, the elect may be NECESSARILY good like God and his angels, and yet, that they may be in their degree PRAISE-WORTHY like God, and REWARDABLE like his angels. Therefore, the doctrine of the Calvinists is rational, as only supposing what is undeniable, namely, that NECESSARY sins may JUSTLY be punished in the reprobates; and that NECESSARY obedience may WISELY be rewarded in the elect. And, on the other hand, the doctrine of the Arminians, who make so much ado about reason and piety, is both *absurd* and *impious*:—*absurd*, as it supposes, that the DEVIL is not *worthy of blame*, because he sins NECESSARILY; and *impious*, as it insinuates that GOD does not *deserve praise*, because his goodness is NECESSARY.

This argument is plausible, and an answer to it shall conclude this dissertation. (1) God is enthroned in goodness far above the region of evil; neither *can he be tempted of evil*; the excellence, unchangeableness, and self-sufficiency of his nature being every way infinite. He does not then exercise his liberty, in chusing moral good or evil; but (1) In choosing the various manners of enjoying himself according to all the combinations, that may result from his unity in trinity, and from his trinity in unity:—(2) In regulating the infinite variety of his external productions;—(3) In appoint-
in

ing the boundless *diversity* of rewards and punishments, with which he crowns the obedience or disobedience of his rational creatures:—(4) In finding out different methods of overruling the free-agency of men and angels; and of suspending the laws, by which he governs the material world:—And (5) in stamping different classes of beings, with different signatures of his eternal power and godhead; and in indulging with multifarious discoveries of himself, the innumerable inhabitants of the worlds which he has created, or may yet condescend to create.

On the other hand, the *devil* is sunk far below the region of virtue and bliss; neither can he be tempted of GOOD, on account of his consummate wickedness, and fixed aversion to all holiness. His liberty of choice is not then exercised about *moral* good and evil; but about various ways of doing mischief, procuring himself some ease, and trying to avoid the *natural* evils, which he feels or fears.

This is not the case of man, who inhabits, if I may use the expression, a *middle region* between heaven and hell:—a region, where light and darkness, virtue and vice, good and evil, blessing and cursing, are yet before him, and where he is in a state of probation, that he may be rewarded with *heaven*, or punished with *hell*, according to his good or bad works. It is then as absurd in President Edwards to confound our liberty with that of God, and of the devil; as it would be in a geographer, to confound the equinoxial line with the two poles.

A comparison may illustrate this conclusion. As the *mechanical* liberty of a pair of just scales consists in a power gradually to ascend as high, or to descend as low, as the play of the beam permits: So the *moral* liberty of rationals in a state of probation, consists in a *gracious* power gradually to ascend in goodness quite to their *zenith* in heaven, and in a *natural* power to descend in wickedness quite to their *nadir* in hell: so immensely great is the play of the *moral* scales!

God's

God's will, by the perfection of his nature, being immoveably fixt in the *height* of all goodness, cannot stoop to an inferior good, much less to evil: and the devil, being sunk in the *depth* of all wickedness, and daily confirming himself in his iniquity, can no more rise in pursuit of goodness. Thus the presence of all wickedness keeps the scale of the prince of darkness *fixedly sunk* to the nethermost hell; while the absence of all unrighteousness keeps the scale of the Father of lights, *fixedly raised* to the highest pitch of heavenly excellence. God is then quite *above*, and satan quite *below* a state of probation. The one is good, and the other evil, in the highest degree of *moral necessity*. Not so man, who hovers yet between the world of light and the world of darkness—man, who has life and death, salvation and damnation placed within his reach, and who is called to *stretch forth his hand* to that which he will have, that the *reward of his hands* may be given him.

Nor does it follow from this doctrine, that God's goodness is not praise-worthy, and that Satan's wickedness is not worthy of blame; for, altho' God is *fixedly* good, and Satan *fixedly* wicked, yet the goodness of God, and the wickedness of the devil, are still of a *moral* nature; and therefore commendable and discommendable. I mean (1) That God's goodness consists in the perfect *rectitude* of his eternal *will*, and not in a want of power to do an act of injustice; and (2) That the devils wickedness consists in the complete *perverjeness* of his obstinate *will*, and not in a complete want of power to do what is right. Examples will explain this.

A rock cannot do an act of justice or an act of injustice, because *reason* and *free-agency* do not belong to a stone: therefore, the praise of justice, or the dispraise of injustice can never be wisely bestowed upon a rock. If a rock falls upon the man who is going to murder you, and crushes him to death, you cannot seriously return it thanks, because it fell without any good intention towards you; nor could it possibly help

help falling just then. Not so the *rock of ages*, the parent of rationals and free-agents: He does justice with the highest *certainty*, and yet with the highest *liberty*; I say with the highest *liberty*, because, if he *would*, he *could*, with the greatest ease, do what to me appears inconsistent with the scriptural description of his attributes? Could he not, for example, to please *Zelotes*, make "efficacious decrees" of *absolute* reprobation, that he might secure the sin and damnation of his unborn creatures? Could he not protest again and again, that he *willeth not* primarily the death of *sinners*, but rather that they *would turn and live*; when nevertheless, he has *primarily*, yea *absolutely* appointed that *most* of them shall never turn and live?—Could he not openly *command* ALL *men* EVERY WHERE to *REPENT* upon pain of eternal death; and yet keep *MOST men every where* from repenting, by giving them up to a reprobate mind from their mother's womb, as he is supposed to have done by the myriads of "poor creatures" for whom, if we believe the advocates of Calvinistic *grace*, Christ never procured one single grain of penitential *grace*?—Could he not invite *all the ends of the earth* to look unto him, and be *saved*, and call himself *the Saviour of the world*, and *the Saviour of all men*, tho' especially of them that *believe* [of all men, by *initial* salvation; and of them that believe and obey, by *eternal* salvation] when yet he determined from all eternity, that there shall be neither *saviour* nor *initial* salvation, but only a *damner* and *finished damnation*, for the majority of mankind? Could he not have caused his only begotten Son to assume an human form, and to weep, yea bleed over obstinate *sinners*; protesting, that he *came to save the world*, and to *gather them as a hen gathers her brood under her wings*; when yet from all eternity he had *absolutely ordained* * *their wickedness and damnation*,

* When Calvin speaks of the absolute destruction of *so many nations*, which ["*uni cum liberis eorum infantibus*"] *regarded with*

damnation, to illustrate his glory: In a word, could he not prevaricate from morning till night, like the God extolled by Zelotes;—a God this, who is represented as sending his ministers to *preach the gospel* [i. e. to offer “finished and eternal salvation”] to every creature, when his unconditional, efficacious decree of reprobation, and the partiality of Christ’s atonement, leave to multiplied millions no other prospect, but that of *finished and eternal damnation*?—Could not God, I say, do all this, *if he would*? Do not even some good men indirectly represent him as having acted, and continuing to act in that manner? Now if he does it not, when he has full power to do it; if he is determined not to sully his veracity by such shuffling, his goodness by such barbarity, his justice by such unrighteousness; or to use Abraham’s bold expression, *if the Judge of all the earth does right*, when, if he would, he **COULD** do wrong, to set off his “sovereignty” before a Calvinistic world; is not his goodness *praise-worthy*? Is it not of the *moral kind*?

The same might be said of the devil’s wickedness. Tho’ he is confirmed in it, is it not still of a *moral* nature? Is there any other restraint laid upon his repenting,

their little children are involved WITHOUT REMEDY in eternal death by the fall; he says that “*God foreknew their end before he made man*”: And he accounts for this *foreknowledge* thus: “*He foreknew it, because he had ordained it by his decree*”—a decree this, which three lines above he calls “*horribly awful*”: “*Et ideo prescivit, quia decreto suo sic ordinavit*.”—“*Decretum quidem horribile, fa-teor*.” And in the next chapter he observes, that, “*For as much as the reprobates do not obey the word of God, we may well charge their disobedience upon the WICKEDNESS of their hearts; provided we add at the same time, that they were devoted to THIS WICKEDNESS; because, by the just and unsearchable judgment of God, they were raised up to illustrate his glory by their DAMNATION*.”—“*Modo simul adjiciatur, ideo in hanc pravitatem addictos, quia justo, et inscrutabili Dei judicio suscitati sunt, ad gloriam ejus sua damnatione illustrandam*.” This Calvinism unmasked may be seen in *Calvin’s Institutions*, Third Book, Chap. 23, Sect. 7.—and Chap. 24. Sect. 14.

pening, but that which he first lays himself? Could he not confess his rebellion, and suspend some acts of it, *if he would*? Could he not of two sins, which he has an opportunity to commit, chuse the least, *if he were so minded*? But, granting that he has lost all moral free-agency, granting that he sins *necessarily*, or that he could do nothing better *if he would*, I ask: who brought this *absolute necessity* of sinning upon him? Was it another devil who rebell'd 5000 years before him? You say, No: HE brought it upon HIMSELF by his *wilful, PERSONAL, unnecessary* sin: and I reply, Then he is blame-worthy for wilfully, *personally*, and unnecessarily bringing that horrible misfortune upon himself: and therefore, his case has nothing to do with the case of the children of men, who have the depravity of another entailed upon them, without any *personal* choice of their own. Thus, if I mistake not, the doctrine of *liberty*, like the bespattered swan of the fable, by diving a moment in the lympid streams of truth, emerges fairer, and appears purer, for the aspersions cast upon it by rigid bound-willers and fatalists, headed by Mr. Edwards and Mr. Voltaire.

S E C T I O N XXI.

The fourth objection of ZELOTES to a reconciliation with HONESTUS. In answer to it the Reconciler proves by a variety of quotations from the writings of the Fathers, and of some EMINENT DIVINES, and by the TENTH ARTICLE of our church, that the doctrines of FREE GRACE and FREE-WILL, as they are laid down in the SCRIPTURE-SCALES, are the very doctrines of the-PRIMITIVE CHURCH, and of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND. These doctrines widely differ from the tenets of the Pelagians and ancient Semi-pelagians.

OBJECTION IV. “ You have done your
 “ best to vindicate the doctrine of moderate
 “ free-

“ *free-willers*, and to point out a middle way between
 “ the sentiments of *Honestus* and *mine*, or to speak
 “ your own language, between *rigid free-willers* and
 “ *rigid bound-willers*: but you have not yet gained
 “ your end. For if you have *Pelagius* and *Mr. Wesley*
 “ on *your* side, the primitive church and the church
 “ of England are for *us*: nor are we afraid to err in
 “ so good company.”

ANSWER. I have already observed, that, like true protestants, we rest our cause upon *right reason* and *plain scripture*: and that both are for us, the preceding sections, I hope, abundantly prove. Nevertheless, to show you, that the two gospel-axioms can be defended upon any ground, I shall, *first*, call in the greek and latin Fathers, that you may hear from their own mouth, how greatly they dissent from you. *Secondly*: To corroborate their testimony, I shall show that ST. AUGUSTIN himself, and *judicious Calvinists*, in their bright moments, have granted all that we contend for concerning *free-will*, and the *conditionality* of ETERNAL salvation.—And *thirdly*, I shall confirm the sentiment of the Fathers by our articles of religion, one of which particularly guards the doctrine of *Free-will* evangelically connected with, and subordinated to *Free-grace*.

* * * * *

I. I grant, that, when St. Augustin was heated by his controversy with Pelagius, he leaned too much towards the doctrine of *Fate*; meaning by it the overruling, efficacious will and power of the Deity, whereby he *sometimes* rashly hinted that all things happen: [See the note page 259] But in his best moments he happily dissented from himself, and agreed with the other Fathers. Take some proofs of their aversion to fatalism and bound-will, and of their attachment to our supposed “ *heresy*.” (1) JUSTIN MARTYR, who flourished in the second century, says: “ Si fato fieret ut esset aut improbus aut bonus, nec alii quidem probi essent, nec alii mali:” Apol. 2. That

That is: *If it happened by FATE [OF NECESSITY] that men are either good or wicked; the good were not good, nor should the wicked be wicked.*

(2) TERTULLIAN, his co-temporary, is of the same sentiment: "Cæterum nec boni nec mali merces jure pensaretur ei, qui aut bonus aut malus necessitate fuit inventus, non voluntate." Tert. lib. 2. contra Marc.— *No reward can be JUSTLY bestowed, no punishment justly inflicted upon him, who is good or bad by NECESSITY, and not by his own CHOICE.*— In the fifth chapter of the same book he asserts, that God has granted man liberty of choice, "ut suæ DOMINUS constanter occurreret, et bono sponte servando, et malo sponte vitando; quoniam et aliàs positum hominem sub judicio Dei, oportebat justum illud efficere de arbitrii sui MERITIS:"— *That he might constantly BE MASTER of his own conduct by VOLUNTARILY doing good, and by VOLUNTARILY avoiding evil: because, man being appointed for God's JUDGMENT, it was necessary to the justice of God's sentence, that man should be judged according to [meritis] the deserts of his free-will.*

(3) IRENÆUS Bishop of Lyons, who flourished also in the 2d century, bears thus his testimony against bound-will. "Homo vero rationabilis, et secundum hoc similis Deo, LIBER ARBITRIO factus, et SUÆ POTESTATIS, IPSE SIBI CAUSA EST ut aliquando quidem frumentum, aliquando autem palea fiat; quapropter et juste condemnabitur." Lib. IV. adv. Hæret. cap. 9.— *That is: Man, a reasonable being, and in that respect like God; is made FREE IN HIS WILL; and being endued with POWER TO CONDUCT HIMSELF, he is a CAUSE of his becoming sometimes wheat, and sometimes chaff; therefore will he be JUSTLY condemned.*— Again, "Dedit ergo Deus bonum, &c. et qui operantur quidem illud, gloriam et honorem percipi-

B b

ent,

* According to the doctrine maintained in these pages, God is the FIRST cause of our conversion, or of our "becoming wheat." But man is the FIRST cause of his own perversion, or of his "becoming chaff."

“ent, quoniam operati sunt bonum, cum possent non
 “operari illud. Hi autem qui illud non operantur,
 “judicium Dei nostri recipient, quoniam non sunt
 “operati bonum cum possent operari illud.”—God
 gives goodness, and they who do good shall obtain honour
 and glory, because they have done good WHEN THEY
 COULD forbear doing it. And they who do it not, shall
 receive the just judgment of our God, because they have
 not done good WHEN THEY COULD do it.—Once more:
 “Non tantum in operibus, sed etiam in fide, LIBE-
 “RUM, et SUAE POTESTATIS ARBITRIUM servavit
 “homini Deus.” Ibid. Lib. 4. cap. 62—God has
 left man’s will FREE, and at HIS OWN DISPOSAL, not only
 with regard to works, but also with regard to faith.—
 Nor did Ireneus say here more than St. Augustin does
 in this well-known sentence, “Possere credere est om-
 “nium, credere vero fidelium:” To have a power to
 believe is the prerogative of all men, but actually to
 believe is the prerogative of the faithful.

(4) ORIGEN nobly contends for liberty: he grants
 rather too much than too little of it: He continually
 recommends, καλήν προαίρεσιν, a good choice, which
 he frequently calls τὴν ῥοπὴν τῆς αὐτεξουσίας, “the
 inclination of the powerful principle whereby we are
 masters of our own conduct.” He observes that we are
 not at liberty to see, but [τὸ κρίναι—τὸ χρῆσασθαι
 τὴν ῥοπὴν, τὴν εὐδοκίαν;] “to judge—to use our power
 of choice, and our approbation.” And in the solution
 of some scriptures, which seem to contradict one ano-
 ther, HE REFUTES the sentiment of those who reject the
 doctrine of our co-operating with divine grace, and
 who think, ἔκ ἡμετέρου ἐργον εἶναι τὸ κατ’ ἀρετὴν ζῆν,
 ἀλλὰ πάντα θεῶν χάριτι—That it is NOT OUR OWN
 WORK to lead a virtuous life, but that it is ENTIRELY
 the work of divine grace.

(5) St. CYPRIAN and LACTANTIUS speak the
 same language, as the learned reader may see by
 turning to the seventh book of Vossius’s history of
 Pelagianism. Nor did St. BASIL dissent from them,
 if we may judge of his sentiments by the following
 passage, which is extracted from his 37th Homily,
 where

where he proves that God is not the author of evil. "What is forced is not pleasing to God, but what is done from a truly virtuous motive: and virtue comes from the WILL, not from NECESSITY." [Hence it appears, that in this Father's account, necessity is a kind of compulsion contrary to the freedom of the will.] For (adds he) the will depends on what is WITHIN US, and within us is FREE-will."

GREGORIUS NYSSENUS is of one mind with his brother St. Basil. For speaking of faith he says, that it is placed "within the reach of our FREE ELECTION"—And again, "We say of faith what the Gospel contains, namely that He, who is begotten by spiritual regeneration, knows of whom he is begotten, and what kind of a living creature he becomes." For "spiritual regeneration is the only kind of generation, which puts it in OUR POWER to become what we CHUSE TO BE. Greg. Catech. Disc. Chap. 36, and Chap. 6."

(7) St. CHRYSOSTOM is so noted an advocate for free will, that Calvin complains first of him. Part of Calvin's complaint runs thus: Habet Chrysostomus alicubi, &c. Inft. lib. 2. Cap. 2. Sec. 4.—That is, "St. Chrysostom says somewhere, For as much as God has put good and evil in our own power, [electionis liberum donavit arbitrium] he has given us A FREE POWER TO CHUSE [the one or the other;] and, as he does not retain us AGAINST OUR WILL, so he embraces us WHEN WE ARE WILLING." Again, "Often a wicked man, IF HE WILL, is changed into a good man, and a good man, thro' sloth, falls away † and becomes wicked; because God has endued us with FREE-AGENCY: nor does he make us do things NECES-

B b 2

SARILY

† I have advanced several arguments to prove that Judas was sincere, when Christ chose him to the apostleship: I beg leave to confirm them by the judgment of two of the Fathers. St. Chrysostom in his 52d Discourse says, Ο Ιουδας Βασιλευς των πρωτων ην, &c. That is, "Judas was AT FIRST a child of the kingdom, and
"beard

RARELY, but he places proper remedies before us, and suffers all to be done ACCORDING TO THE WILL of the patient, &c. From these words of St. Chrysoſtom, Calvin draws this conclusion: "Porro Græci præ aliis, atque inter eos ſingulariter Chryſoſtomus, in extollenda humanæ voluntatis facultate modum exceſſerunt."—That is, *The greek Fathers above others, and among them eſpecially Chryſoſtom, have exceeded the bounds in extolling the power of the human will.*—Hence it appears, that, Calvin himſelf being judge, the Fathers, but more particularly the greek Fathers, and among them St. Chryſoſtom, ſtrongly oppoſed *bound-will, and neceſſity.*

(8) St. AMBROSE, a latin Father, was alſo a ſtrenuous defender of the ſecond goſpel-axiom, which ſtands or falls with the doctrine of FREE-WILL. Take two proofs of it. "Ideo omnibus opera ſanitatæ detulit, ut quicumque periret mortis ſuæ cauſas ſIBI adſcribat; qui curari NOLUIT cum remedium haberet quo POSSET evadere." Amb. Lib. 2. de Cain et Abel. cap. 13.—That is: *God affords to all the means of recovery, that whoever perishes may impute his own deſtruction to HIMSELF: for as much as he would not be cured when HE HAD A REMEDY whereby he MIGHT HAVE ESCAPED.*—Again, commenting upon theſe words of Chriſt, *It is not mine to give, &c.* he ſays: "Non eſt meum qui juſtitiam ſervo, non gratiam."

"heard it ſaid to him with the diſciples, You ſhall ſit upon twelve thrones: but AT LAST he became a child of hell." And St. Ambroſe, upon Rom. ix. 13, has theſe remarkable words: "Non eſt perſonarum acceptio in præſcientia Dei, &c." That is, "There is no reſpect of perſons in God's ſoraknowledge: For præſcience is that whereby he knows aſſuredly how the will of every man will be, in which he will continue, and by which he ſhall be damn'd or crowned, &c. They who, as God knows, will perſevere in goodneſs, are frequently bad before: and they who, as he knows, alſo will be found evil at laſt, are ſometimes good before, &c. For both Saul and Judas were once good."—Hence it is, that he ſays, in another place, "Sometimes they are at firſt good, who afterwards become and continue evil; and in this reſpect they are ſaid to be written in the book of life, and blotted out of it."

gratiam. Denique ad Patrem referens addidit,
 Quibus paratum est, ut ostendat Patrem quoque
 non petitionibus deferre solere, sed MERITIS; qui
 Deus personarum acceptor non est. Unde et apof-
 tolus ait. Quos præscivit prædestinavit. Non enim
 ante prædestinavit quam præscivit, quorum præ-
 mia prædestinavit." Amb. De fide. Cap. 4.—
 That is, "It is not mine" [to give the next seat to my
 person] "in point of JUSTICE, for I do not speak in
 point of FAVOUR: and referring the matter to his
 Father, he adds, TO THEM FOR WHOM IT IS PRE-
 PARED, to show that the Father also" [in point of
 reward] "is not wont to yield to prayer, but [MERITIS]
 to worthiness; because God" [when he acts as judge
 and rewarder] "is no respecter of persons. Hence it is
 that the apostle says, THOSE WHOM GOD FOREKNEW
 HE PREDESTINATED. For he did not predestinate
 to reward them, before he foreknew them" [as persons
 fit to be rewarded.] From this excellent quotation
 it appears, that St. Ambrose maintained the two gos-
 pel-axioms, or the doctrines of Grace and Justice—of
 favour and worthiness, on which hang the ELECTION
 OF DISTINGUISHING GRACE, and the ELECTION OF
 REMUNERATIVE JUSTICE, which the Calvinists per-
 petually confound, and which I have explained
 Section xii.

(9) St. JEROM, warm as he was against *Pelagius*,
 is evidently of the same mind with the other Fathers,
 where he says: "Liberi arbitrii nos condidit Deus;
 nec ad virtutes nec ad vitia necessitate trahimur:
 Alioquin ubi necessitas est, nec damnatio nec corona
 est."—That is, God has endued us with FREE-WILL.
 We are not NECESSARILY drawn either to virtue or to
 vice. For where NECESSITY rules, there is no room left
 either for damnation, or for the crown.—Again, in his
 3d book against the Pelagians he says; "Etiam his
 qui mali futuri sunt, dari potestatem conversionis
 et penitentiae"—That is, Even to those who shall be
 wicked, God GIVES POWER to repent and turn to him.—
 Again, upon Isaiah i, "Liberum servat arbitrium,

“ ut in utramque partem, non ex præjudicio Dei,
 “ sed ex MERITIS singulorum, vel pœna vel præmi-
 “ um fit.” *Our will is kept FREE TO TURN EITHER*
WAY, that God may dispense his rewards and punishments,
not according to HIS OWN PRÆJUDICE, but according
to the merits [that is, according to the works] of every
one.—Once more, he says to Ctesiphon, “ Frustra
“ blasphemias, et ignorantium auribus ingeris, nos
“ liberum arbitrium condemnare. Damnetur ille qui
“ damnat.”—That is, You speak evil of us without
ground; you tell the ignorant that we condemn FREE-
WILL: But let the man who condemns it be condemned.

When I read these explicit testimonies of St. *Jerom* in favour of *free-will*, I no more wonder that *Calvin* should find fault with him, as well as with St. *Chryso- stom*. Take *Calvin*'s own words [Inst. Lib. 2. Cap. 2. sec. 4.] “ Ait Hieronimus [*Dial. 3. contra Pelag. &c.*] *Nostrium [est] offerre quod possumus: illius [Dei] implere quod non possumus.*”—*Jerom* says [in his third dialogue against pelagianism] *It is our part to offer what we can. It is God's part to fill up what we cannot.—You see clearly by these quotations [adds Calvin] that they [these Fathers, upon the Calvinian plan,] attributed to man too much power to be virtuous.*” Such a conclusion naturally becomes *Calvin*. But what I cannot help wondering at, is that *Ztlozes* should indifferently call all the advocates for *free-will*, *Pelagians*, when St. *Jerom*, who next to St. *Augustin* distinguished himself by his opposition to *Pelagianism*, is so strenuous a defender of the doctrine of *free-will*, in the books which he wrote against *Pelagius*.

(10) *EPIPHANIUS* confirms this doctrine where he says, “ Sane quidem justius a stellis, quæ necessita-
 “ tem pariunt, pœnæ repetantur, quam ab eo qui
 “ quod agit necessitate adactus aggreditur.” *Epiph.*
advers. Hæret. l. 1. —It would be more just to punish the
stars, which make a wicked action NECESSARY; than
to punish the man, who does that wicked action BY NE-
CESSITY.—He expresses himself still more strongly

in

in the same book : Speaking of the pharisees, who were rigid predestinarians, he says : “ Est illud vero
 “ extremæ cujusdam imperitiæ, ne dicam amentiz, ac
 “ cum resurrectionem mortuorum esse fateare, ac
 “ justissimum cujusque facti *judicium* constitutum,
 “ *fatum* nihilominus esse ullam asserere. Qui enim
 “ duo ista convenire possunt, **JUDICIUM** atque **FA-**
 “ **TUM.**”—That is, *It is extreme ignorance, not to say*
madness, to allow the resurrection of the dead, and a
day of most righteous JUDGMENT for every action ; and
at the same time to assert that there is a DESTINY :
For how can these two agree together, a JUDGMENT
and a DESTINY [OR NECESSITY?]

(11) St. BERNARD grants rather more liberty than I contend for, where he says, “ Sola voluntas,
 “ quoniam pro *ingenita libertate* aut dissentire sibi,
 “ aut præter se in aliquo consentire nullâ vi, nullâ
 “ cogitur necessitate, non immeritò justam vel in-
 “ justum, beatitudine seu miserâ dignam ac capacem
 “ creaturam constituit, prout scilicet justitiæ injusti-
 “ tiæ ve consenserit.” Bern. De Grat. et lib. arb.
 —That is, *The will alone can make a man DESERV-*
EDLY just or unjust, and can DESERVEDLY render him
fit for bliss or misery, as it consents either to righteousness
or to iniquity : for as much as the WILL, according to
it's INNATE LIBERTY, cannot be forced to will or will
any thing against it's own dictates.

(12) CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS upon John, Book
 vi. chap. 21, vindicating God's goodness against the
 horrid hints of those who make him the author of
 sin, as all *rigid* predestinarians do, says with great
 truth : “ The visible sun rises above our horizon,
 “ that it may communicate the gift of it's brightness
 “ to ALL, and make it's light shine upon ALL ; but
 “ if any one shuts his eyes, or WILLINGLY turns
 “ himself from the sun, REFUSING the benefit of
 “ it's light, he wants it's illumination, and remains
 “ in darkness ; not thro' the fault of the sun, but
 “ THRO' HIS OWN FAULT. Thus the true sun,
 “ who came to enlighten those that sit in darkness,
 “ visited

“ visited the earth, that [*in different manners and*
 “ *degrees*] he might impart to ALL the gift of know-
 “ ledge and grace, and illuminate the inward eyes
 “ of ALL &c. But many REJECT THE GIFT of this
 “ heavenly light FREELY GIVEN TO THEM, and
 “ have closed the eyes of their minds, lest so excel-
 “ lent an irradiation of the eternal light should shine
 “ unto them. It is not then thro’ the defect of the
 “ true sun, but only thro’ THEIR OWN iniquity”
 [i. e. thro’ their own perverse free-will.]—And Book
 i. Chap. 11, the same Father speaking on the same
 subject says, “ Let not the world accuse the word of
 “ God, and his eternal light; but it’s own weakness;
 “ for the sun enlightens, but man REJECTS THE
 “ GRACE THAT IS GIVEN him, blunts the edge of
 “ the understanding granted him, &c. and, as a
 “ prodigal, turns his sight to the creatures, neglect-
 “ ing to go forward, and thro’ laziness and negli-
 “ gence [*not thro’ necessity and predestination*] buries
 “ the illumination, and despises this grace.”

(13) CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS is exactly of the
 same sentiment: for, calling *divine word* what St.
 Cyrill calls *divine light*, he says; “ The divine word
 “ has cried; calling ALL, knowing well those that
 “ WILL NOT obey; and yet, because it is IN OUR
 “ POWER EITHER TO OBEY, OR NOT TO OBEY, that
 “ none may plead ignorance, it has made a righteous
 “ call, and requireth but that which is according to
 “ the ABILITY AND STRENGTH OF EVERY ONE.”
 Clem. Alex. Strom. Book ii.

(14) THE FATHER who wrote the book *De voca-*
tione gentium, says, “ Sicut qui crediderunt juvantur
 “ ut in fide maneant; ita qui nondum crediderunt,
 “ juvantur ut credant: Et quemadmodum illi in
 “ SUA POTESTATE habent, ut exeant; ita et isti in
 “ SUA habent POTESTATE ut veniant.”—That is:
As they that have believed, are HELPED to abide in the
faith; so they that have not yet believed are HELPED to
believe: and as the former have it IN THEIR POWER

to go out, so the latter have it IN THEIR POWER to come in.

(15) ARNOBIUS produces this objection of an heathen, "If the Saviour of mankind is come, as you say, why does he not save all?" and he answers it thus: "Patet omnibus fons vitæ, &c.—That is, *The fountain of life is open to all, nor is any one deprived of the right of drinking. But if thy pride be so great, that thou rejectest the offered gift and benefit, &c. why dost thou blame him (Christ) who invites thee, [cujus solæ sunt hæ partes, ut SUB TUI JURIS ARBITRIO fructum suæ benignitatis exponat?]*" Arn. Contra gentes. Lib. 2.] "whose full part it is to submit the fruit of his bounty to a CHOICE THAT DEPENDS UPON THYSELF."

(16) PROSPER, although he was St. Augustin's disciple, does justice to the truth which I maintain. For, speaking of some that fall away from holiness to uncleanness, he says, "Non ex eo necessitatem pereundi habuerunt quia prædestinati non sunt; sed ideo prædestinatio non sunt, quia tales futuri ex voluntariâ prævaricatione præsciti sunt." Prosp. ad. obj. iii. Gall.—That is, *They did not lie under a necessity of perishing, because they were not elected* [to a crown of life:] "but they were not elected" [to that reward] "because they were foreknown to be such as they are by THEIR VOLUNTARY iniquity."—The same Father allows that it is absurd to believe a day of judgment, and to deny free-will.—"Judicium futurum (says he) omnino non esset si homines Dei voluntate peccarent." Prosp. ad. obj. 10. Vinc. That is, "By no means would there be a day of JUDGMENT, if men sinned by the WILL [or decree] of God."—The reason is plain; If we sinned thro' any necessity laid on us by the will of God, or by predestinating fate, we might say like the heathen poet, "Fati ista culpa est: nemo fit fato nocens." *It is the fault of FATE: NECESSITY excuses any one.*

(17) FULGENTIUS, altho' he was also St. Augustin's disciple, cuts the doctrine of bound-will by the root,

root, where he says: "Nec justitia justa dicetur, si puniendum reum non invenisse, sed fecisse dicatur. Major vero injustitia, si lapsa Deus retribuat poenam, quem statem dicitur prædestinasse ad ruinam." *Fulg. l. 1. ad Mon. cap. 22.*—That is, JUSTICE could not be said to be JUST, if it did not find, but made a man an offender. And the injustice would be still greater, if God, after having PRÆDESTINATED a man to ruin when he stood, inflicted punishment upon him after his fall.

(18.) If any of the Fathers is a rigid bound-willer, it is heated AUGUSTIN: nevertheless, in his cool moments, he grants as much free-will as I contend for. Hear him. "Nos quidem sub fato Hellarum nullius hominis genitum ponimus, ut LIBERUM ARBITRIUM VOLUNTATIS, quo bene vel male vivitur, PROPTER JUSTUM DEI JUDICIUM AB OMNI NECESSITATIS VINCULO vindicemus." *Aug. l. 2. contr. Faust. c. 5.*—That is, "We place no man's nativity under the fatal power of the stars, that we may assert the LIBERTY OF THE WILL, whereby our actions are rendered either moral or immoral, and keep it FREE FROM EVERY BOND OF NECESSITY, ON ACCOUNT OF THE RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT of God."—Again: "Nemo habet in potestate quid veniat in mentem; sed consentire vel dissentire PROPRIÆ VOLUNTATIS est." *Aug. De litera et spiritu. Cap. 34.* That is, "No body can help what comes into his mind; but to CONSENT to, or DISSENT from involuntary suggestions, is the prerogative of our own will." *—Once more: "Initium salutis nostræ a Deo miserante habemus; ut acquiescamus salutiferæ

* Dr. Tucker judiciously unfolds St. Augustine's thought, where he says, 'There is a sense, in which it may be allowed on the Semi-pelagian' [*Semi-augustinian*] 'or arminian plan, that grace is irresistible: But it is a sense that can do no manner of service to the cause of Calvinism. Grace, for instance, especially *prevenient*, or *preventing* grace, may be considered as a precious gift, or universal endowment.'

feræ inspirationi, *NOSTRÆ EST POTESTATIS.*" De dogmatibus ecclesiasticis. Cap. 21.—That is, *The beginning of our salvation flows from the merciful God; but it is in our power to consent to his saving inspiration.*—And what he means by having a thing *in our power*, he explains in these words, "*Hoc quisque in sua potestate habere dicitur, quod si vult facit, si non vult non facit.*" Aug. De Spir. et lit. c. 31.—That is, *Every one has that IN HIS OWN POWER, which he does IF HE WILL, and which he can forbear doing, if he WILL NOT do it.*

Agreeable to this is that rational observation, which, I think, is St. Augustin's also. "*Si non est liberum arbitrium, non est quod salvetur. Si non est gratia non est unde salvetur*"—*If there is no FREE-WILL, there is nothing to be saved: If there is no FREE GRACE, there is nothing whereby we may be saved.* A golden saying this, which is as weighty as my motto, "*If you take away FREE-GRACE, how does God SAVE the world? And if you take away FREE-WILL, how does he JUDGE the world?*"

So great is the force of truth, that the same prejudiced Father [commenting upon this text, *Every man that hath this hope in him PURIFIETH HIMSELF*, 1 John iii, 3.] does not scruple to say: "*Behold after what manner he has NOT taken away free-will, that the apostle should say, keepeth HIMSELF pure. Who keepeth us pure except God? But God keepeth thee not: so against thy will.* Therefore in as much as *thou join'st thy will to God, thou keep'st thyself pure. Thou keep'st thyself pure, not of thyself,*

' endowment, like the common gifts of health, strength, &c. In which case the recipient must necessarily receive them; for he has not a power to refuse. But after he has received them, he may choose whether he will apply them to any good and salutary purposes, or not: And on this freedom of choice rests the proper distinction between good and evil, virtue and vice, morality and immorality. Grace therefore must be received; but after it is received, it may be abused: The talent may be hid in a napkin, and the spirit may be quenched, or have a despite done to it.'

" thyself, but by him, who comes to dwell in thee.
 " Yet because in this thou *dost something* of thine own
 " will, therefore is *something* also attributed to thee.
 " Yet so it is ascribed to thee, that still thou mayst say
 " with the Psalmist, *Lord, be thou my HELPER*. If thou
 " sayst, *Be thou my HELPER* thou *dost something*; for
 " if thou *dost nothing*, how does he HELP?" Happy
 would it have been for the church, if St. Augustin
 had *always* done justice in this manner to the *second*,
 as well as to the *first* gospel-axiom! He would not
 have paved the way for Free-wrath, and antinomian
 Free-grace. Nor could Mr. Wesley do more jus-
 tice to both gospel-axioms than Augustin does in
 the following words. " Non illi debent sibi tribuere,
 " qui venerunt, quia vocati venerunt: nec illi qui
 " noluerunt venire, debuerunt alteri tribuere, sed
 " tantum sibi; quia ut venirent vocati, in liberâ erat
 " voluntate. Aug. lib. 83. Quæstionum. Quæst.
 68 — *They that came (to Christ) ought not to impute it*
to themselves, because, they came being called: And they
that would not come ought not to impute it to another, but
only to themselves, because, when they were called it was
in the power of their FREE-WILL to come.—" Deus non
 " deserit nisi desertus:" *God forsakes no man, unless*
he be first forsaken. Here is a right dividing of the
 word of truth! a giving God the glory of our salva-
 tion, without charging him with our destruction!

Nay, St. JEROM and St. AUGUSTIN, notwith-
 standing their *warmth* against Pelagius, have not only
at times, strongly maintained our *remunerative election*;
 but, by not immediately securing the *election of distin-*
guishing grace, they have really granted him far more
 than I, in conscience, can do. Take the following
 instances of it.

St. JEROM upon Gal. 1. says, " Ex Dei præscientiâ
 " evenit, ut quem scit justum futurem, prius diligit
 " quàm oriatur ex utero."—*It is owing to God's præ-*
science that he loves those whom he foresees will become
just, before they come out of their mother's womb.—Again
 upon Mal. 1. he says " Dilectio et odium Dei vel
 " ex

“ ex præscientiâ nascitur futurorum, vel ex operibus.”—*God’s love and hatred springs from his foreknowledge of future events, or from our works.* Nay, in his very dispute with the Pelagians, Book iii, he declares, that God “*eligit quem bonum cernit,*” *chooses him whom he sees good.* Which is entirely agreeable to this *unguarded* assertion of St. AUGUSTIN: “*Nemo eligitur nisi jam distans ab illo qui rejicitur.*” “*Unde quod dictum est, quia elegit nos Deus ante mundi constitutionem, non video quomodo sit dictum, nisi de præscientiâ fidei et operum pietatis.*” Aug. *Quæst. 2. ad Simplicianum.*—That is, *No body is chosen but as he already differs from him that is rejected. Nor do I see how it can be said, That God has chosen us before the beginning of the world, unless this be said, with respect to God’s foreknowledge of our faith and works of piety.*

I call these assertions of St. Jerom and St. Augustin *unguarded*, because they so maintain the election of *remunerative justice* as to leave no room for the election of *distinguishing grace*, which I have maintained in my exposition of Rom. ix, and Eph. i.—An election this, which the Pelagians overlook, and which St. Paul secures when he says, that God chose Jacob to the privileges of the covenant of peculiarity, *before he had done any good, that the purpose of God according to the election of superior grace might stand NOT OF WORKS, but of the superior kindness of him that calleth:—An important election this, inconsistently given up by St. Augustin, when speaking of Jacob he says in the above-quoted treatise, “Non electus est ut fieret bonus, sed bonus factus eligi potuit!”—He was not chosen that he might become good, but being made good he could be chosen.*

I shall close these quotations from the Fathers, with *one more* from St. *Irenæus*, who was *Polycarp’s* disciple, and flourished immediately after the apostolic age. “*Quoniam omnes ejusdem sunt naturæ, et potentes retinere et operari bonum, et potentes rursus amittere id, et non facere; juste apud homines* C c “*sensatos,*

“ *senfatos, quanto magis apud deum, alii quidem*
 “ *laudantur, et dignum percipiunt testimonium elec-*
 “ *tionis bonæ, et perseverantiæ; alii vero accusantur,*
 “ *et dignum percipiunt damnum. ed quod justum et*
 “ *bonum reprobaverunt.”* Iren. adv. Hæc. Lib.
 iv. Cap. 74.—That is, *For as much as all men are of*
the same nature, HAVING POWER to hold and to do that
which is good, and HAVING POWER again to lose it,
and not to do what is right; before men of sense, and
how much more before God! some are JUSTLY praised,
and receive a worthy testimony, for making a GOOD
CHOICE and persevering therein: while others are justly
accused, and receive a condign punishment, because they
 REFUSED *what is just and right.*

If I am not mistaken, the preceding quotations prove: (1) That the Fathers in general pleaded for as much free-will as we contend for:—(2) That the two champions of the doctrines of grace, Prosper and Fulgentius, and their predestinarian leader St. Augustin, when they considered [“*justum Dei judicium*”] *the righteous judgment of God*, have [at times at least] maintained the doctrine of *liberty* as strongly as the rest of the Fathers: And (3) That St. Augustin himself was so carried away ONCE by the force of the arguments and scriptures, which support the remunerative election of *impartial JUSTICE*, as rashly to give up the *gratuitous* election of *distinguishing GRACE*.

Should any of the above-mentioned Fathers have contradicted himself [as St. Augustin has done for one] I hope I shall not be charged with “*gross misrepresentations*” for quoting them when they speak as the oracles of God. If at any time they deviate from that blessed rule, let them defend their deviations if they can; or let *Zelotes* and *Honestus* [who follow them when they go out of the way] do it for them. I repeat it, like a true protestant I rest the cause upon right reason and plain scripture; and if I produce the sentiments of the Fathers, it is merely to undeceive *Zelotes*, who thinks that all *moderate free-*

free-willers are Pelagian hereticks, and that the Fathers were as rigid *bound-willers* as himself.



II. Proceed we to confirm the preceding quotations by the testimony of some modern divines.

(1) CALVIN says :—“ Quasi adhuc integer stare homo, SEMPER apud Latinos LIBERI ARBITRII nomen extitit. Græcos vero non puduit multo arrogantius usurpare vocabulum : Siquidem *αυτεξουσιον*, dixerunt, ac si potestas sui ipsius penes hominem fuisset.” *Inst. Lib. 2. Cap. 2. Sec. 4.*—“ The Latin Fathers have always retained the word FREE-WILL, as if man stood yet upright. As for the Greek Fathers, they have not been ashamed to make use of a much arrogant expression; calling man *αυτεξουσιον*” [FREE AGENT, or SELF-MANAGER :] “ just as if man had a power to govern himself.” This concession of Calvin decides the question. I need only observe that Calvin wrongs the Fathers when he insinuates, that they ascribed liberty to man, “ as if man stood yet upright.” No: They attributed to man a *natural* liberty to EVIL, and a *gracious*, blood-bought liberty to GOOD: Thus, like our reformers, they maintained man’s free-agency without derogating from God’s grace.

(2) BISHOP ANDREWS, a moderate Calvinist, says : “ I dare not condemn the Fathers, who almost all assert, that we are elected and predestinated according to faith foreseen: That the necessity of damnation is hypothetical, not absolute, &c. That God is ready and at hand to bestow and communicate his grace, &c. It is the fault of men themselves, that what is offered is not actually conferred: For grace is not wanting to us, but we are wanting to that.” And this he confirms by this passage from St. Augustin. “ *All men may turn themselves from the love of visible and temporal things to keep God’s commands, IF THEY WILL; because that light (Christ) is the light of all mankind.*”

(3) The

(3) The doctrine of *free-will* stands or falls with the *conditionality* of the covenant of grace. Hence it is, that all rigid bound-willers abhor the word *condition*: nevertheless Mr. ROBERT, a judicious Calvinist, sees the tide of the contrary doctrine so strong, that he says in his *Mystery of the Bible*, “ Sound
 “ writers, godly and learned, ancient and modern,
 “ foreign and domestic, do unanimously subscribe to
 “ the *conditionality* of the covenant of grace, in the
 “ sense before stated :”—a sense this, which Bishop Davenant clearly expresses in these words: “ Peter,
 “ notwithstanding his predestination, might have
 “ been damn’d, *if* he had *voluntary* continued in
 “ his impenitency; and Judas, notwithstanding his
 “ reprobation might have been saved if he had not
 “ *voluntarily* continued in his impenitency.” *Animadversions*, page 241.

(4) Dr. TUCKER observes, that altho’ *Vossius* and *Norris* [who have each written an history of pelagianism] differ in some points; yet they “ agree that St.
 “ Augustin’s [*calvinian*] positions were allowed by
 “ his warmest defenders at that very time, to be lit-
 “ tle better than *novelties*, if compared with the
 “ writings of the most antient Fathers, especially
 “ of the greek church.” Let. to Dr. Kippis. p. 79.

(5) EPISCOPIUS in his answer to Capellus, Part. 1, says, “ Augustin, Prosper, and all the other divines
 “ of that age [*quinet priorum annium seculorum patres*]
 “ and the fathers of all the preceding ages, have not
 “ represented the grace of regeneration so *special*, as
 “ to take away FREE-WILL. On the contrary, they
 “ unanimously agree, that the FULL effect of rege-
 “ nerating grace depends in some degree on man’s
 “ free-will; in so much that, this grace being im-
 “ parted, the *consent* or *dissent* of the human will may
 “ follow. I say the *consent* or *dissent*, lest some peo-
 “ ple should think, that I understand by *free-will*
 “ nothing but a certain *willingness*.”—The same
 learned author says in his Answer to Camero, Chap.

vi. "What is plainer than that the ancient divines;
 " for three hundred years after Christ, those at least
 " who flourished before St. Augustin, maintained the
 " liberty of our will, or an indifference to two con-
 " trary things, free from all internal or external ne-
 " cessity, &c. Almost all the reformed divines con-
 " fess it, when they are pressed by the authority of
 " the Fathers. Thus Melancthon, on Rom. ix;
 " says, *Scriptores veteres omnes, præter Augustinum,*
 " *ponunt aliquam causam electionis in nobis esse.*" (That
 is) *All the ancient Authors, except St. Augustin, allow*
that the cause of our election [to an eternal life of
glory] is in some degree in ourselves.

(6) VOSSIUS, a divine perfectly acquainted with
 all the ancient christian writers, says in the sixth book
 of his *Pelagian history*. "The Greek Fathers AL-
 " WAYS, and ALL the Latin Fathers, who lived be-
 " fore Augustin, are wont to say, that those men are
 " predestinated to life" [*eternal in glory*] "whom God
 " foresaw would live piously and well; or, as some
 " others speak, whom God foresaw would *believe* and
 " *persevere*, &c. Which they so interpret, that pre-
 " destination UNTO GLORY is made according to
 " God's foreknowledge of FAITH and PERSERVE-
 " RANCE. But they did not mean the *foreknowledge*
 " of such things, which a man was to do by the
 " power of nature, BUT BY THE STRENGTH OF
 " PREVENIENT AND SUBSEQUENT GRACE. There-
 " fore this consent of antiquity is of no service to
 " the Pelagians, or Semi-pelagians, who both hold,
 " that a reason of predestination in all it's effects,
 " may be assigned from some thing in us. Whereas
 " the * orthodox Fathers acknowledge, that the
 " FIRST GRACE" [i. e. INITIAL SALVATION] "is not

C c 3

" conferred

* I desire the reader to take notice, that this doctrine of the abso-
 lute freedom of *prevenient grace*, or *initial salvation*, is all along
 maintained in my *first* scale; and that if Vossius's account of the
Semi-pelagians is exact, Zelotes cannot justly charge us with *semipela-*
gianism; and we have as much right to be call'd *orthodox*, as the
 Fathers themselves.

“ conferred of merit [*or works*] but freely. So that
 “ they thought no reason FROM ANY THING IN US,
 “ could be given of predestination TO PREVENIENT
 “ GRACE.”

(7) Dr. DAVENANT, Bishop of Salisbury, and one of the english divines, who were sent to the Synod of Dort, [in his *ANIMADVERSIONS upon a treatise intitled “God’s love to mankind,”* Cambridge edition, 1641. page 48] sets his seal to the preceding quotations in these words: “ THE FATHERS, when they
 “ consider that the wills of men non-elected do com-
 “ mit all their evil acts FREELY, usually say, that
 “ THEY HAD A POWER TO HAVE DONE THE CON-
 “ TRARY:” And he himself espouses their senti-
 ment: For speaking of Cain’s murder, Absalom’s
 incest, and Judas’s treason, he says, page 253,
 “ All these sinful actions, and the like are commit-
 “ ted by reprobates, out of their OWN FREE ELEC-
 “ TION, HAVING A POWER whereby they MIGHT
 “ have abstained from committing them.”—Again,
 page 198 he says, “ They [*God’s decrees*] leave the
 “ WILLS OF MEN to as much LIBERTY, as the *di-*
 “ *vine prescience* † does. And this is the GENERAL
 “ OPINION of divines, tho’ they differ about the
 “ manner of according man’s liberty with God’s
 “ predestination.”—Once more, page 326, &c.
 “ The decree of preterition neither taketh away any
 “ POWER OF DOING WELL, wherewith persons non-
 “ elected are endued, &c. Neither is it a decree
 “ binding God’s hands from giving them SUFFICI-
 “ ENT GRACE to do many good acts, which they
 “ WILFULLY refuse to do, &c. The non-elect HAVE
 “ A POWER, or possibility, TO BELIEVE OR REPENT
 “ at the preaching of the gospel; WHICH POWER
 “ MIGHT BE REDUCED INTO ACT, IF the voluntary
 “ forwardness and resistiveness of their own hearts
 “ were

† This would be true if it were spoken of the predestination which I contend for: but it is a great mistake, when it is said of the doctrine of *efficacious, absolute* predestination maintained by Zelotes.

“ were not the *only* hinderiꝯg cause.” Page 72, the learned Bishop grants again all that we contend for, in these words: “ In bad and wicked actions of the reprobate, their FREEDOM OF WILL is not *vain*; because thereby their consciences are convicted of their guiltiness and misdeserts, and GOD’S JUSTICE IS CLEARED IN THEIR DAMNATION. Neither is there any indeclinable or insuperable necessity domineering OVER FREE-WILL, MORE THAN IN THE OPINION OF THE REMONSTRANTS.” Once more, p. 177. “ Predestination [*says he*] did not compel or necessitate Judas to betray and sell his master, &c. The like may be said of all other sinners, who commit such sins upon deliberation, and so proceed to election;” [*i. e. to chuse evil;*] “ having in themselves a natural power of understanding, whereby they were able otherwise to have deliberated, and thereupon OTHERWISE to have chosen. And we see by experience, that traytors and adulterers fully bent to commit such wicked acts, *can*, and often times *do refrain* putting them in practice upon better deliberation. This is a demonstration, that they can chuse the doing or the forbearing to do such wicked acts.”

From these quotations it appears, that when judicious and candid Calvinists have to do with judicious and learned Remonstrants, they are obliged to turn *moderate free-willers*, or to fly in the face of the sacred writers, the Fathers, and the best divines of their own persuasion.



III. *Zelotes* endeavours to hide his error under the wings of the *church of England*, as well as behind the authority of the Fathers, but with as little success. I design to show his mistake in this respect, in an Essay on the 17th Article: In the mean time I shall observe, that a few years before Archbishop Cranmer drew up our articles of religion, he helped the other reformers to compose a book called *The necessary doctrine*

trine of a christian man, and added to it a section upon *free-will*, in which *free-will* is defined "A power of the will joined with reason, whereby a reasonable creature, without constraint, in things of reason, discerneth and willeth good and evil; but CHU- SETH GOOD BY THE ASSISTANCE OF GOD'S GRACE, and EVIL OF ITSELF."—"Wherefore," adds *Cranmer*, "men be to be warned, that they do not im- pute to God their vice or their damnation, but to themselves, which by FREE-WILL have abused the grace and benefits of God.—All men be also to be monished, and chiefly preachers, that in this high matter, they, looking on both sides" [*i. e. regard- ing both gospel-axioms*] "so attemper and moderate themselves, that neither they so preach the grace of God" [*with Zelotes*] "that they take away thereby *free-will*; nor, on the other side, so extoll freewill [*with Honestus*] "that injury be done to the grace of God."

I grant that in the book, from which this quotation † is taken, there are some errors, which *Cranmer* afterwards renounced, as he had done *absolute pre- destination*

† Burnet's Hist. of the Reformation, 2 Ed. Part. 1. p. 291, and a pamphlet intitled *A dissertation on the 17th Article, &c.* furnish me with these important quotations the last seems greatly to embarrass Mr. Hill. He attempts to set it aside by urging: (1) That in *The necessary erudition of a christian man*, "the doctrines of the mass, transubstantiation, &c. are particularly taught as necessary to salvation."—(2) That "*Bonner and Gardiner, as well as Cranmer, gave their imprimatur to it:*" And (3) That "*even in this book the doctrine of predestination is not denied, but the thing itself clearly admitted; only it is laid down in such a manner as not to, &c. supersede the necessity of personal holiness.*" To this I answer (1) That *Cranmer* expressly recanted the errors which Mr. Hill mentions, but instead of recanting the doctrines of *free-grace* and *free-will*, he proceeded upon that very plan in drawing up our articles, and liturgy, as I shall prove just now.—(2) That *Bonner and Gardiner* gave their imprimatur to this quotation, no more proves that it contains false doctrine, than their subscribing to the 39 Articles some years after shows, that our articles are heretical.—(3) We thank Mr. Hill for informing the public that the Book called *THE ERUDITION OF*

destination before. But, that he never varied from the doctrine of *free-will* laid down in the above-mentioned passage, is evident from the tenour of our articles of religion, which he penn'd, and which contain exactly the doctrine of the above-quoted lines.

Hear him, and the church of England, publicly maintaining *free-grace* and *free-will*. In the tenth article, OF FREE-WILL, they assert, that "We have
" no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to
" God, WITHOUT THE GRACE OF GOD: by Christ
" PREVENTING [i. e. first visiting] us, that we
" may have a GOOD will, and WORKING WITH US
" when we have that GOOD will." Hence it evidently follows that WE HAVE A POWER TO DO GOOD, &c. WITH the grace of God by Christ PREVENTING [i. e. first visiting] us that we may have a good will. Let the article be thrown into the scales, and the judicious reader will easily see that it directly or indirectly guards the very doctrine which the Fathers maintained, and which we defend, No. 1, against *Honestus*, and No. 2, against *Zelotes*.

1. " The condition of " man after the fall of " Adam is such, that he " CANNOT turn and " prepare himself BY " HIS	2. The condition of man after the fall of Adam [and the promise made to him] is such, that he CAN turn and prepare himself to
---	--

A CHRISTIAN MAN clearly admits the doctrine of *predestination*, only in such a manner as not to supersede the necessity of holiness. This is just the manner in which we admit it after *Cranmer* in our 17th Article. And we argue thus: If the doctrine of *free-grace* and *free-will* admirably-well balanced by *Cranmer* in *The Erudition of a christian man*, is a false doctrine, because that book contains some papistical errors: does it not follow, that the doctrine of a *predestination* consistent with personal holiness is a false doctrine, since [Mr. Hill himself being judge] such a doctrine is clearly admitted in that very book?—If Mr. Hill gives himself time to weigh this short answer to his pamphlet intitled "*Cranmer vindicated from the charge of [what he is pleased to call] Pelagianism, by the author of Goliath slain* ; I make no doubt but he will see, that *Goliath*, [if that word means our doctrine] far from being slain, is not so much as wounded.

“ HIS OWN NATURAL
“ STRENGTH, &c. TO
“ FAITH AND CALLING UPON
“ GOD.”

1. “ Wherefore we
“ have no power to do
“ good works, &c, WITH-
“ OUT the grace of
“ God by Christ prevent-
“ ing us [i. e. *visiting us first*]
“ us first] that we may
“ have a good will, and
“ working WITH” [not
“ WITHOUT] “ us, when
“ we have that good will.”

to faith and calling upon
God, altho' NOT BY
HIS OWN NATURAL
STRENGTH.

2. Wherefore we have
a power to do good works,
&c. THRO' the grace of
God by Christ preventing
us [i. e. *visiting us first*]
that we may have a good
will, and working WITH
[not WITHOUT] US,
when we have that good
will.

Who does not see, that there is not the least disagreement between these balanced propositions? And that, when Zelotes produces the Xth article of the church † of England to prove us hereticks, he acts as unreasonable a part as if he produced John xv. 5, to show that St. Paul was not orthodox when he wrote Phil. iv. 13.

1. WITHOUT ME |
[Christ] ye can do no-
thing. John xv. 5.

2. I (Paul) can do all
things THRO' CHRIST.
Phil. iv. 13. This

† The Rev. Mr. Toplady makes much ado in his *Historical proof of the Calvinism of our church*, about some dissenters, whom he calls *free-willers*, and represents as the *first separatists* from the church of England. But they were rigid *Pelagian-free-willers*, and not moderate, *bible-free-willers* such as *Cranmer* was, and all unprejudiced church-men are. This is evident from the account which Mr. Toplady himself gives us of their tenets, page 54. Some of which are as follows, “*That children were not born in original sin:—That lust after evil was not sin, if the act were not committed,*” &c. *Hongbus* does not run into such an extreme: much less we, who stand with *Cranmer* on the line of moderation, at an equal distance from *Calvinian*, rigid bound-willers, and from *Pelagian*, rigid free-willers. I hope this hint is sufficient to show, that, tho' the simple may be frightened by the words *free-willers* and *separatists*, no judicious church-of-England-man will think, that he separates from our church, when he stands to the harmonizing doctrine of free-grace and free-will, which is maintained in our Xth article, and in these pages.

This supposed "heresy" runs thro' our common prayer-book. Take one or two instances of it. In her catechism she teaches every child whom she nurses, to thank God for calling him to this state of salvation—i. e. to a state of initial salvation according to the christian covenant. She informs him that his duty is to love God with all his heart, and his neighbour as himself, &c. and then she adds: *My good child, know this, that thou art not able to do these things OF THY SELF, nor to walk in the commandments of God, WITHOUT HIS SPECIAL GRACE, which thou must learn at all times to call for by diligent prayer, &c.* Now every child, whose mind is not yet tainted with Calvinism, understands the language of our holy mother according to the doctrine of the scales, thus.

1. OF MYSELF I am NOT able to love God with all my heart, &c.

1. I am not able to walk in the commandments of God WITHOUT HIS SPECIAL GRACE.

1. I am in a state of INITIAL GRACE, and I heartily thank our heavenly Father, that he has called me to this state of salvation.

2. By God's special grace I AM ABLE to love him with all my heart, &c.

2. I am able to walk in the commandments of God WITH HIS SPECIAL GRACE, "and, by God's GRACE, so I WILL."

2. To have God's SPECIAL GRACE I must learn at all times to call for it by diligent prayer; according to the help afforded me in my state of initial salvation.

This doctrine of *free-grace* and *free-will* runs also thro' the collects of our church. Read one of those which Zelotes admires most. *Grant to us, Lord, we beseech thee, the spirit [i. e. the special grace] to think and do always such things as be rightful; that we, who CANNOT DO any thing that is good WITHOUT THEE, may BY THEE BE ENABLED to live according to thy will, thro' Jesus Christ our Lord.* 9th Sund. aft. Trinity. Divide the doctrine of this collect according

ing to the two gospel-axioms, and you will have the following balanced propositions.

1. *We cannot do any thing that is good WITHOUT THEE, OR THY SPIRIT.*

1. *We cannot but by thee live according to thy will, &c.*

2. BY THEE OR thy SPIRIT we can think and do always such things as be rightful.

2. *By thee we can live according to thy will, &c.*

To bring more proofs that this is the doctrine of the church of England, would be to offer an insult to the attention of her children. Nor can her sentiments on *free-will* be more clearly expressed than they are in these words of the martyr'd prelate who drew up her articles: "It pleaseth the high wisdom of God, that man prevented [i. e. *first visited*] by his grace, which being offered man may, IF HE WILL refuse or receive, be also a worker BY HIS FREE CONSENT and obedience to the same, &c. and by God's grace and help shall walk in such works as be requisite to his" [*continued * and final*] "justification." *Necess. Doct.*

However, lest *Zelotes* should object to my quoting the *Necessary Doctrine of a christian man*, I substitute for the preceding quotation one, to which he has indirectly subscribed in subscribing to the 35th article of our church. "CAST WE off all malice, and ALL EVIL WILL; for this Spirit will never enter into AN EVIL-WILLING soul" [*to bring there his SPECIAL GRACE.*] "LET US cast away all the whole lump of sin that standeth about us, for he will never dwell in a body that is subdued to sin, &c. IF WE DO OUR ENDEAVOUR, we shall not need to fear. WE SHALL BE ABLE to overcome all our enemies, &c. ONLY

* I add the words *continued and final*, to guard the unconditional freeness of *initial* justification and salvation; because *this* justification is previous to all works on our part, and because all good works are but the *voluntary* [*Zelotes* would say, the *necessary*] fruits of *the free gift*, which is come upon all men to justification. Rom. v, 18.

“ ONLY LET US APPLY OURSELVES TO ACCEPT THE
 “ GRACE THAT IS OFFERED US. Of almighty God
 “ WE HAVE COMFORT BY HIS GOODNESS: Of our Sa-
 “ viour Christ’s mediation WE MAY BE SURE: And
 “ this Holy Spirit WILL SUGGEST unto us that which
 “ shall be wholesome, and comfort us in all things.”

Homily for Rog. week, Part iii.—How strongly are the doctrines of free-grace and free-will guarded in these lines! And who does not see, that our Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies, agree to maintain the gospel-marriage of *free-grace* and *free-will*, as well as Mr. Wesley, Mr. Sellon, and myself?

The preceding quotations and remarks will, I hope, convince the impartial reader, that [some few unguarded expressions being excepted] Zelotes might as well screen his doctrines of narrow grace, bound-will, and free-wrath, behind the *Scripture scales*; as defend them by the authority of the *primitive church*, and the *church of England*.



IV. Should Zelotes think to answer the contents of this section by saying that my doctrine is “*rank Pelagianism*?” I reply: (1) That *Vossius*, who wrote the history of Pelagianism, entirely clears our doctrine of the charge of both *Pelagianism* and *Semi-pelagianism*, as appears by the passage which I have quoted from him, page 302: and in this cause, the name of *Vossius* is *Legion*.

(2) PROSPER in his Letter to St. Augustin, gives us this account of the principles of the Pelagians.
 “ Prior est hominis obedientia quam Dei gratia.—
 “ Initium salutis ex eo est qui salvatur, non ex eo
 “ qui salvat.”—“ *Man’s obedience is before hand with God’s grace.—The beginning of salvation is from him that is saved, and not from him that saves.*” These two propositions are grossly pharisaic, and detestable: they set aside the *first* gospel-axiom; and far from recommending them, I every where oppose to them the weights of my *first* scale. It would not then be:

D d

more

more ridiculous to charge me with *Crispianity*, than it is, to accuse me of *Pelagianism*.

(3) Bishop Davenant in his *Animadversions*, page 14 and 15, calls *Faufus Rhegiensis* one of the *ancient Semi-pelagians*, and lays down his doctrine in the five following anti-calvinistic propositions, in which reigns a confusion equal to that of Calvinism. 1. "Salus hominis non in prædeterminatione factoris, sed in operatione famulantis collocata est." "*Man's salvation is not placed in the ELECTION of the Creator, but in the actions of the worker.*"—This is absolutely false with respect to the election of distinguishing grace. What had the Ephesians wrought to deserve to be elected and called to share the blessings of the gospel of Christ, which St. Paul calls *so great salvation*? Who can make appear, that they merited so great a favour better than the *Hottentots*?—2 "Non est specialis circa credentes Dei munificentia." "*God shows no special grace and favour to believers.*"—This is absolutely false also, with respect to all *jewish* and *christian* believers, to whom he gives that grace, and those talents, which he does not bestow upon the heathens who *fear God and work righteousness*.—3. "Prædeterminatio ad justitiam pertinet." "*Election belongs to justice.*" This also is *absolutely* false, if it is understood of the *election of distinguishing grace*, whereby a man receives one, two, or five talents to trade with, before he has done any thing. And it is *partly* false, if it is understood of our election to receive rewards of grace and glory: For that election belongs to *rich mercy*, as well as to *distributive justice*; it being God's mercy in Christ, which engaged him to *promise* penitent, obedient believers *rewards* of grace and glory.—4. "Nisi præscientia exploraverit, prædeterminatio nihil decernit." "*Predestination appoints nothing, unless prescience has seen a cause for the appointment.*"—This is false also, if this *cause* is supposed to be *always in us*. What foreseen excellence made God predestinate the posterity of *Jacob* to the old covenant of peculiarity, rather than the offspring of *Ejan*?
And

And what reason can *Honestus* assign, for his being called to read the bible in a church, and not the Alcoran in a mosque?—“*Justitia periclitabitur sine merito indignus eligitur.*” “*Justice will be in danger, if an undeserving person is chosen without any worthiness.*” This is true with regard to the remunerative election of obedient believers to crowns of glory in the church triumphant. Therefore, when Christ speaks of that election, he says, *They shall walk with me in white, FOR THEY ARE WORTHY*: But it is absolutely false, with respect to the election of distinguishing grace, whereby the English and Scotch are chosen to the blessings of christianity, rather than the Turks and Cannibals. I may therefore conclude, that, according to the accounts, which Vossius, Prosper, and Bishop Davenant give us of *Pelagianism* and ancient *Semi-pelagianism*, our doctrine is just as far from those erroneous systems, as it is from *Fatalism* and *Calvinism*.

S E C T I O N XXII.

The fifth objection of ZELOTES against a reconciliation with HONESTUS. In answer to it, the Reconciler shows, that the earliest Fathers held the doctrine of the scripture-scales, and that the Rev. Mr. TOP-LADY'S HISTORIC PROOF of their Calvinism is quite ANTI-HISTORICAL.

THE preceding section seems to embarrass *Zelotes* almost as much as my *second scale*; but soon recovering his usual positiveness, he endeavours to set all the preceding quotations aside by the following objection.

OBJECTION V. “I make no great account of the
 “ Fathers, except those who may be called *apostolic*,
 “ as having lived in, or immediately after, the *apostolic*
 “ age. Therefore, if BARNABAS, who was
 “ St. Paul's fellow-apostle;—if CLEMENT, who was
 “ bishop of the uncorrupted church at Rome;—

D d 2

“ CLEMENT,

“ CALVINIST, whom the apostle mentions not only
 “ as his *fellow-labourer*, but also as one, *whose name*
 “ was written in the book of life, Phil. iv. 3.—If
 “ POLYCARP and IONATHAN, who were both disciples
 “ of the apostle St. John, who filled the episcopal
 “ sees at *Smyrna* and *Antioch*, and, who nobly laid
 “ down their lives for Christ, the one in the flames,
 “ and the other in the jaws of hungry lions:—If
 “ these early fathers, I say, these undaunted mar-
 “ tyrs are for us, as well as *St. Augustin*; we may,
 “ without endangering the truth, allow you, that
 “ the generality of the other fathers countenanced
 “ too much the doctrine of your scales. And that
 “ these Fathers were for us, is abundantly demon-
 “ strated in the Rev. Mr. Toplady’s *Historic Proof*
 “ of Calvinism.”

ANSWER. It is true that, when Mr. Toplady pro-
 mises us “ *The judgment of the earliest fathers*” con-
 cerning calvinism, he says [*Hist. proof*, p. 121.]:
 “ I must repeat my question, which seems to have
 “ given Mr. Sellon and his fraternity so much dis-
 “ quiet: Where was NOT the doctrine of PREDES-
 “ TINATION before *Pelagius*?” But nothing can be
 more frivolous than this question: since I, myself,
 who oppose *Calvinian* predestination as much as Mr.
 Toplady does the *second* scripture-scale, would put the
 question to a *Pelagian*, i. e. to a *rigid* free-willer.
 To do the subject justice, and not to mislead his un-
 wary readers into unscriptural tenets by the lure of a
 scripture-word, Mr. Toplady should have said,
 “ Where was NOT, before *Pelagius*, the CALVINIAN-
 “ doctrine of the *absolute* predestination of *some* men to
 “ *unavoidable, eternal life*, and of *all the rest* of man-
 “ kind to *unavoidable, eternal death*, WITHOUT ANY
 “ RESPECT to their VOLUNTARY faith and works?”
 For neither Mr. Sellon, nor any of “ *his fraternity*,”
 ever denied the *predestination* which St. Paul mentions.
 Nay, we strongly contend for it: See SECTION XIV—
 All we insist upon is, that the *predestination*, election, and
 reprobation taught by St. Paul, by the earliest Fathers,
 and by us, are as different from the *predestination*, &c.
 taught

taught by Calvin, Zanchy, and Mr. Toplady, as the *Scripture-scales* are different from the *Historic Proof*. See our *Genuine Creed*. Art. vii.

We grant also that the ingenious Vicar of *Broad-Hembury* has filled a section with *proofs*, that the early Fathers were sound Calvinists: But, what weight have these proofs? Are they not founded (1) Upon the words OUR, WE, US and ELECT, which he fondly supposes to mean US, who are CALVINISTICALLY ELECTED, in opposition to our neighbours, who, from all eternity were UNCONDITIONALLY and ABSOLUTELY reprobated from eternal life?—(2) Upon some phrases, where those Fathers mention the *particular, applicatory redemption* or the *particular election and calling* of those, to whom the Gospel of Christ is preached; a *redemption* of believers, an *election* and a *calling* these, for which I, myself, who am no Calvinist, have strongly contended in my answer to Mr. Hill's *Creed for the Arminians*?—(3) Upon some sentences, which being torn from the context seem to speak in the *Calvinian strain*.—(4) Upon the harmless words WILL—PURPOSE—REQUISITE—DECREE, &c. which are fondly supposed to demonstrate the truth of *calvinian necessity*, and *calvinian decrees*.—(5) Upon the words *Brethren*,—*the church of Saints*—*the new people*—*my people*, which, (such is the force of prejudice!) Mr. Toplady imagines must mean his *calvinistically-elected brethren*, &c. just as if people could not be *brethren*, form a *christian church*, be *God's peculiar, new, christian people*, in opposition to his *old people the jews*, or to those who in every nation fear God and work righteousness, or even in opposition to *unconverted people*; without the *chimerical election*, which drags after it the *necessary damnation* of all the world besides!

The truth is, that the Fathers mentioned in *Zeloter's* objection, followed the very same plan of doctrine which is laid down in these pages, altho' they did not always balance the two gospel-axioms with the scrupulous caution and nicety, which the vain jangling of captious, contentious and overdoing divines obli-

ges me to use. Mr. *Fopland* himself will hardly deny, that the early Fathers held the doctrine of our first scale. And, that they held the doctrine of the second, I prove by the following * extracts from their excellent epistles.

BARNABAS says in his *Catholic Epistle*, ' Let us
 ' give heed unto the last days, for all the time of OUR
 ' LIFE AND FAITH SHALL PROFIT US NOTHING, IF
 ' WE DO NOT endure unjust things, and future temp-
 ' tations.—Let us, being spiritual, be made a PER-
 ' FECT temple to God, AS MUCH AS IN US LIES.
 ' Let us meditate upon the FEAR of God, and en-
 ' deavour to KEEP his commandments, THAT WE
 ' MAY REJOICE in his judgments: The Lord accept-
 ' ing NO MAN'S PERSON JUDGETH the world: Every
 ' man shall receive according to HIS DEEDS. If he
 ' be good, HIS GOODNESS GOES BEFORE HIM: if
 ' wicked, the ways of his wickedness follow after
 ' him. TAKE HEED LEST, at any time, BEING
 ' CALLED, and at ease, we do not FALL ASLEEP in
 ' our sins, and the wicked one getting power over us,
 ' &c. EXCLUDE US FROM THE KINGDOM of the
 ' Lord. Understand a little more; having seen the
 ' great signs and wonders among the people of THE
 ' Jews, and that THE LORD DOES SO LEAVE THEM;
 ' therefore let US TAKE HEED, lest haply WE BE
 ' FOUND, as it is written, *Many CALLED, FEW CHO-*
 ' *SEN.* That man shall JUSTLY PERISH, who HATH
 ' KNOWLEDGE of the way OF TRUTH, and yet WILL
 ' NOT refrain himself from the dark way.' Page 6,
 7, 8.

I grant to Mr. *Fopland* that *Barnabas* says, page
 28, ' Thou shalt not command thy maid or man-ser-
 ' vant WITH BITTERNESS, especially those who hope
 ' in

* Not having the original, I extract what follows of *St. Clement* from Mr. Wesley's Christian Library, Vol. 1. The quotations from the Epistles of *Barnabas*, *Polycarp*, and *Ignatius*, are taken from the translation of *The. Elborow*, *Vicar of Cbiswick*. It is to be met with in his book, called *A prospect of primitive christianity as it was left by Christ and his apostles*; Printed in the Savoy, 1663.

‘ in him, LEST THOU BE FOUND DESTITUTE OF
 ‘ THE FEAR OF GOD, who is over both: For he came
 ‘ not to call men’ [*to the blessings of christianity*] ‘ by
 ‘ their persons,’ [*that is, according to the context, he
 came not to call MASTERS only*] but those whom his
 ‘ spirit prepared:’ [whether they be *servants* or
masters: For God called to christian liberty the de-
 vout soldiers and servants who waited on *Cornelius*,
 as well as *Cornelius* himself; giving them equally
the spirit of adoption, because they were equally pre-
 pared for it by *the spirit of conviction and bondage*,
 which they had not received in vain.]—From the last
 words of this quotation Mr. *Toplady* fondly infers
 the Calvinism of *Barnabas*; whereas from the words,
 which I have produced in capitals, it is evident, that
 this apostle was as far from calvinism as St. James
 himself: For they show that *Barnabas* thought, a
 believer could BE FOUND DESTITUTE OF THE FEAR
 OF GOD, i. e. could so fall away into a graceless
 state, as to make shipwreck even of THE FEAR OF
 GOD, only by COMMANDING A SERVANT WITH
 BITTERNESS.

This *historic proof* of *Barnabas*’s calvinism is so
 much the more surprizing, as he says a few lines be-
 low, ‘ Meditate to SAVE A SOUL by the word. And
 ‘ thou shalt LABOUR FOR THE REDEMPTION OF THY
 ‘ SINS.—Give to every one that asketh of thee; but
 ‘ KNOW WITHALL who is the GOOD RECOMPENSER OF
 ‘ THE REWARD, &c. it is therefore an excellent
 ‘ thing for him who learns the righteous commands
 ‘ of the Lord, &c. to WALK IN THEM: for he who
 ‘ DOES THEM, shall BE OLORIFIED in the kingdom
 ‘ of God: but he who CHUSETH the other things,
 ‘ SHALL PERISH with his works. Therefore there is
 ‘ a resurrection and a RETRIBUTION.—The Lord is
 ‘ at hand, and his REWARD. I intreat you again
 ‘ and again, that ye be good LAWGIVERS TO YOUR-
 ‘ SELVES, and that ye remain FAITHFUL COUNSEL-
 ‘ LORS TO YOURSELVES,—Be ye taught of God,
 ‘ seeking out what the Lord REQUIRETH FROM YOU,
 ‘ AND

“AND DO, THAT YE MAY BE SAVED IN THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.” I see no calvinism in all this; but only the doctrine of the *second* scripture-scale, which all calvinists would abhor, as they do Mr. *Wesley's* Minutes, if consistency belonged to their system.

NOT was St. CLEMENT more averse to *that* scale than *Barnabas*: For, altho', in the excellent Epistle which he wrote to reconvert the wrangling Corinthians, he maintains the protestant doctrine of *faith*, as clearly as our church does in her *eleventh* article; yet, he as strongly inculcates the doctrine of *works*, as she does in the *twelfth*. Nay, he so closely connects *faith* and *it's* works, that what St. Paul calls *faith*, he does not scruple to call *obedience*. “By OBEDIENCE [*says he*] he [*Abraham*] went out of his own land.”—And again: “By faith and HOSPITALITY was Rahab saved”—Hence it is, that he guards the doctrine of obedient *free-will*, as strongly as that of prevenient *free grace*. “Let us remember [*says he*] the words of our Lord, Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven.—Let them [*children*] learn, how great power HUMILITY HAS WITH GOD; how much holy LOVE AVAILS with him: how the FEAR of him is good and great, and SAVETH ALL THOSE who, with a pure mind, turn to him in holiness.—Let us AGONIZE TO BE FOUND IN THE NUMBER of them that wait for him [*God*] THAT WE MAY PARTAKE thereof: [i. e. of the things which are prepared for them that wait for him.]”

His description of *love* is so highly anti-calvinistic, that it amounts even to christian *perfection*. “BY LOVE were all the elect of God MADE PERFECT;—No words can declare it's PERFECTION—All the generations, from Adam to this day, are passed away; but those, who WERE MADE PERFECT IN LOVE, are in the region of the just, and shall appear in glory.—LOVE † COVERETH A MULTITUDE
“ OF

† By comparing these two sentences, it is evident, St. *Clement* believed and taught, that our charity not only covers us to cover the
sins

“ OF SINS — Happy then are we, beloved, if we
 “ FULFIL THE COMMANDMENTS of God in the unity
 “ of LOVE, that so, THRO’ † LOVE, OUR SINS MAY
 “ BE FORGIVEN US. — Following the commandments
 “ of God, THEY SIN NOT.”

So far was he from Calvinian narrowness and reprobation, that, when he exhorts the Corinthians to repentance, he does it in these words. “ Let us fix
 “ our eyes on the blood of Christ, and see how precious it is before God, which, being shed for OUR
 “ SALVATION, BROUGHT THE GRACE OF REPEN-
 “ TANCE TO ALL THE WORLD. Let us look dili-
 “ gently to ALL AGES, and learn, that our Lord has
 “ ALWAYS GIVEN PLACE FOR REPENTANCE TO ALL
 “ WHO DESIRED to turn to him. *Noah* preached
 “ RE-

sins of others; but, in a SECONDARY sense, CAUSES also God’s covering of our own sins; the FIRST CAUSE of pardon being always his free-grace in Jesus Christ. Mr. *Baxter* exactly expresses St. *Clement’s* sentiment in his comment upon these words of St. *Peter*, *Above all things have fervent charity among yourselves; for charity shall cover the multitude of sins.* ‘ It is but partiality [says he] and jealousy of the cause of justification against the papists, which makes some excellent expositors DISTORT this text, so AS TO EXCLUDE from it’s sense God’s COVERING OF OUR SINS; because they consider not aright—(1) That pardon as continued, and as renewed, has more for the condition of it required in us, than the first pardon and begun justification has. The first act of sound faith serveth for the beginning, but the continuance of it [of sound faith] ‘with it’s necessary fruits,’ [love, &c.] ‘is necessary to the continuance of pardon.—(2) That the faith, which is required to justification and pardon, is giving up ourselves to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the baptismal covenant: That is, our christianity, which is not put in opposition to that love, or repentance, which is still implied as part of the same covenant-consent, or as its necessary fruit; but to the works of the law of *Moses*, or of works, or to any works, that are set in competition with *Christ* and free-grace. If prejudice hindered not men; the reading of the angel’s words to *Cornelius*, and of *Christ’s* [forgive and ye shall be forgiven,] ‘and the parable of the pardoned debtor, cast into prison for not pardoning his fellow-servant, with *Jam. ii.*, and *Mat. xv.*, would end all this controversy,’—O *Clement*! O *Baxter*! what have ye said? Are ye not as *Heterodox*, as the Author of the *Minutes* and their vindicator?

“REPENTANCE, and they who harkened to him,
 “were SAVED. *Jonah* denounced destruction upon
 “the Ninevites; yet they, REPENTING OF THEIR
 “SINS, APPEASED GOD BY THEIR PRAYERS, and
 “RECEIVED SALVATION, ALTHO’ THEY WERE
 “STRANGERS TO THE COVENANT OF GOD.—
 “Wherefore let us, &c. turn ourselves to his mercy.”

In all this I see no more *Calvinism*, than I do in
 Mr. Wesley’s Minutes. However Mr. Toplady’s
Historic Proof is gone forth: and it is now demon-
 strated, that St. CLEMENT was an orthodox, and a
 sound Calvinist; while the author of the Minutes is
 a heretic, and almost every thing that is bad! O
soksidianism! is thy influence over those who drink of
 thy enchanting cup so great, that they can *prove*, *be-*
lieve, and make people *believe* almost any thing?

By the same frivolous arguments Mr. Toplady at-
 tempts to evince the Calvinism of *Polycarp*, whose
 epistle, in some places, is rather too much anti-cal-
 vinistical. Reader judge for thy self, and say which
 of *Calvin’s* peculiarities breathe thro’ the following
 passages of his epistle to the *Philippians*, page 2.
 “Who [*Christ*] shall come to JUDGE the quick and
 “the dead, and WHOSE BLOOD God will strictly
 “REQUIRE AT THE HANDS of those, who DO NOT
 “BELIEVE ON HIM. But he, who raised him from
 “the dead, will raise us up also, IF WE DO HIS
 “WILL, and WALK IN HIS COMMANDMENTS, &c.
 “remembering what the Lord said, teaching in this
 “wise, Judge not THAT YE BE NOT JUDGED:
 “Forgive, and IT SHALL BE FORGIVEN you: Be
 “merciful, THAT YE MAY OBTAIN MERCY: In
 “what measure ye mete, IT SHALL BE MEASURED
 “TO YOU again, &c. These things, Brethren, I
 “write unto you CONCERNING RIGHTEOUSNESS.”

Polycarp, far from recommending the *Calvinian*
 imputation of *Christ’s* righteousness, openly sides
 with those who are reproached as *Perfectionists* in our
 days: For in the next page he says: “If any man
 “is possessed of these [*faith* followed by *hope*, and led
 “on

“ on by *love*] HE HATH FULFILLED THE COMMAND
 “ OF RIGHTEOUSNESS. He who is POSSESSED OF
 “ LOVE IS FREE FROM ALL SIN.—Let us arm our-
 “ selves with the armor of RIGHTEOUSNESS, and
 “ teach ourselves in the first place to WALK IN THE
 “ COMMANDMENTS of the Lord:—from whom [*says*
he in the next page] “ IF WE PLEASE HIM IN THIS
 “ WORLD, we shall receive a” [or the] “ future RE-
 “ WARD: for he has engaged for us, to raise us from
 “ the dead: And IF WE HAVE OUR CONVERSATION
 “ WORTHY OF HIM, we shall also reign with him,
 “ as we believe.”—Nor is he ashamed to urge the
 practice of good works from a motive, which *Zelotes*
 would call downright popery. For after observing,
 that “ Paul, and the rest of the apostles, have not
 “ run in vain, but in faith and righteousness; and
 “ having obtained the place DUE unto them, are
 “ now with the Lord, &c.” he adds, “ When ye can
 “ do good, do not defer it, for ALMS DELIVERETH
 “ FROM DEATH.”—If Mr. Wesley said this, he would
 be an heresiarch: *Polycarp* says it; but no matter:
Polycarp is a famous martyr; and therefore he must
 be a sound Calvinist.

And so must *IGNATIUS*, who, from the same motive
 is pressed into the service of the *calvinian* doctrines of
 grace. To show that Mr. *Toplady* is mistaken, when
 he asserts that *Ignatius* was *calvinistically-orthodox*, I
 need only prove that *Ignatius* enforced the SECOND
 gospel-axiom, as well as the FIRST. And that he
 did so, is evident from the following quotations. He
 writes to the *Smyrneans*. “ Let all things abound
 “ among you IN GRACE, for YE ARE WORTHY. Ye
 “ have every way refreshed me, and Jesus Christ will
 “ refresh you. Ye have loved me, &c. God will
 “ requite you; and IF YE PATIENTLY ENDURE all
 “ things for his sake, YE SHALL ENJOY HIM.—Be-
 “ ing PERFECT yourselves, mind the things which
 “ are perfect. For IF YE HAVE BUT A WILL TO DO
 “ GOOD, God is ready to ASSIST you.”—H. writes
 to *Polycarp*. “ The more the labour is, the more
 “ the:

" the gain.—It is NECESSARY FOR US PATIENTLY TO
 " endure all things for God, THAT HE MAY PATI-
 " ENTLY BEAR WITH US.—Ministers of God, do
 " things pleasing to him, &c. whose soldiers ye are,
 " from whom YE EXPECT YOUR SALARY. Let none
 " among you be found a deserter of his colours. Let
 " your baptism arm you: Let faith be your helmet,
 " love your spear, patience your whole armour, and
 " YOUR WORKS your gage [*your depositum*] THAT
 " YE MAY RECEIVE A REWARD WORTHY OF YOU.
 " —When ye shall have dispatched this business,
 " THE WORK SHALL BE ASCRIBED TO GOD, and TO
 " YOU"—[according to the doctrine of *free-grace* and
free-will.]—And, at the end of his letter, he ex-
 horts the presbyters; and Polycarp, to write edi-
 fying letters to the neighbouring churches, " that
 " ye may all be GLORIIFIED BY an eternal work, AS
 " THOU ART WORTHY."

To the Ephesians, whom he calls "*elect* BY REAL
 " SUFFERINGS," as well as "*thro' the will of God*,"
 he writes: " Keeping the melody of God, which is
 " unity, ye shall with one voice glorify the Father
 " by Jesus Christ, THAT HE MAY ALSO HEAR YOU,
 " and acknowledge you, BY WHAT YOU DO, to be the
 " members of his Son. So that it is profitable for
 " you to continue in immaculate unity, THAT YE
 " MAY ALWAYS BE PARTAKERS OF GOD.—KEEP
 " YOURSELVES in all purity and temperance, both
 " in flesh and spirit thro' Jesus Christ."

To the *Magnesians* he says: " All works have
 " some END: Two [*ends*] are propounded, DEATH
 " and LIFE; and every man shall go to HIS PROPER
 place" [thro' his works of faith or unbelief.]

To the *Trallians* indeed he writes: " FLY there-
 " fore evil plants [*atheists and infidels*] which bring
 " forth deadly fruit, which IF A MAN TASTES OF,
 " HE DIES PRESENTLY. For *these are not the plan-*
 "*tation of the Father; if they were, they would ap-*
 "*pear branches of the cross, and their fruit would be*
 " INCORRUPTIBLE" [OF RATHER, NOT ROTTEN, NOT
 S.UND.]

SOUND.] Mr. *Toplady* depends much on the latter part of this quotation: But all we see in it, is, that *Ignatius* believed, none are actually plants of righteousness, but they who actually APPEAR such, by actually bearing GOOD fruit, which he calls *αἰσθητός*, in opposition to rotten fruit: for if the word *φθίσειν*, means to spoil, to corrupt, to rot, *αἰσθητός* means as well not rotten, as incorruptible: and that it means so here, is evident, from the motive urged by *Ignatius* in the context, to make the *Trallian* believers fly from these evil plants—these atheistical apostates: “If a man,” that is, if any one of you, believers [for unbelievers, being dead already, have no spiritual life to lose] “If a man TASTES their deadly fruit, HE DIES PRESENTLY;” so far is he from being sure to recover, and sing louder in heaven if he apostatizes, and FEASTS for months upon their deadly fruit! This important clause renders the quotation altogether ANTI-calvinistical, especially if we compare it to a similar caution which this very Father gives to the Ephesians, “Let no one among you be found an herb of the devil: Keep yourselves in all purity, &c.” That is, Let none of you apostatize by tasting the deadly fruit of these evil plants, which have apostatized. Both quotations evidently allude to these words of *Jeremiah*, Chap. ii. 21. *I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly of right seed: How then ART THOU TURNED into the DEGENERATE PLANT of a strange vine!* Both are strongly anti-calvinistical: and yet the former is produced by Mr. *Toplady* as a proof of Calvinism! Need I say any more to make *Zelotes* himself cry out? *Logica Genevensis!*

From the whole I hope, that unprejudiced readers will subscribe to the following remarks.—(1) *Barnabas*, *Clement*, *Polycarp*, and *Ignatius* undoubtedly held the first gospel-axiom, or the godly, scriptural doctrine of free-grace: So far we agree with Mr. *Toplady*. But to prove them Fathers after his own heart, this gentleman should have proved, that at least by necessary consequence they rejected the second gospel-axiom,

axiom, which *necessarily* includes our doctrines of moderate *free-will*, of the *works* of penitential faith, and of the *reward of eternal salvation* annexed to the *unnecessitated, voluntary* obedience of faith.—(2) If Mr. *Toplady* dismembered the *Equal Check*, and broke the *Scripture-Scales*; taking what I advance against the *proper merit* of works, and in defence of *free-grace*; producing my arguments for the covenants of *peculiarity*, and for the *election of distinguishing grace*; and carefully concealing all that I have written in favour of *assisted free will*, and *evangelical morality*;—If Mr. *Toplady*, I say, followed this method, in those two pieces only he would find a great many more proofs of *Calvinism*, i. e. of mangled, immoral, antinomian christianity, than he has found in *all* the writings of the earliest Fathers, to whom he so confidently appeals.—(3) We must then still go down so low as the fourth or fifth century, before we can find *Calvin the first*, I mean HEATED *St. Augustin*. And how inconsistent a Calvinist COOL *St. Augustin* was, has already been proved. I therefore, flatter myself, that Mr. *Toplady's* ANTI-historic proof of the Calvinism of the primitive church, will no longer keep *Zelotes* from a scriptural reconciliation with *Honestus*. But I see, that the time is not yet come; for he turns over two octavo volumes, and prepares another weighty objection, which the reader will find in the following section.

S E C T I O N XXIII.

ZELOTES's sixth objection to a reconciliation with HONESTUS. The reconciler answers it by showing:—
 (1) *That the evangelical marriage of Free-grace and Free-will, reflects no dishonour upon God's Sovereignty:—*(2) *That Mr. Toplady's grand argument against that marriage, is inconclusive:—*(3) *That Mr. Whitefield's "inextricable dilemma," in favour of Calvinian election and reprobation, is a mere sophism:—*
—And

—And (4) That Zelotes's jumble of FREE-WRATH, and UNEVANGELICAL FREE-GRACE, pours REAL contempt upon ALL the divine perfections; SOVEREIGNTY itself not excepted.

OBJECTION V. 'If you are not a Pelagian, are you not a secret atheist? Do you not indirectly un-god Jehovah? You want me to meet *Honestus* half way: but if I meet him where you are, shall not I meet him on the brink of an horrible precipice? Are you not an opposer of God's Sovereignty, which shines as gloriously among his other perfections, as the moon does among the stars? Is not a God without *Sovereignty* as contemptible as a king without a kingdom? And can you reconcile your arrogant doctrine of *Free will*, with the supreme, absolute, irresistible power, by which God works all things after the counsel of HIS OWN will? Hear the Calvin of the day—the champion of the doctrines of grace:

“ For this (*atheism*) also arminianism has paved the way, by despoiling the divine Being among other attributes, of his unlimited supremacy, of his infinite knowledge, of his infallible wisdom, of his invincible power, of his absolute independency, of his eternal immutability. Not to observe, that the exempting of some things and events from the providence of God, by reterring them to free-will, &c. is another of those black lanes, which lead, in a direct line, from Arminianism to Atheism. Neither is it at all surprizing, that any, who represent men as Gods (by supposing man to possess the divine attribute of independent self-determination) should, when their hand is in it, represent God himself with the imperfections of a man, by putting limitations to his sovereignty, by supposing his knowledge to be shackled with circumscription, and darkened with uncertainty; by connecting their ideas of his wisdom and power with the possibility of disconcertment and disap-

E e 2

“ pointment,

" pointment, embarrassment and defeat; by transfer-
 " ring his independency to themselves, in order to
 " support their favourite doctrine which affirms, that
 " the divine will and conduct are dependent on the
 " will and conduct of men; by blotting out his im-
 " mutability, that they may clear the way for con-
 " ditionat, variable, vanquishable, and amissible
 " grace; and by narrowing his providence, to keep
 " the idol of *Free-will* upon its legs, and to save hu-
 " man reason from the humiliation of acknowledging
 " her inability to account for many of the divine dis-
 " posals, &c. Who sees not the atheistical tendency
 " of all this? Let Arminianism try to exculpate her-
 " self from the heavy, but unexaggerated indictment:
 " which if she cannot effect, 'twill be doing her no
 " injustice to term her Atheism in masquerade." *The*
Rev. Mr. Toplady's HISTORIC PROOF. page 728,
 &c.

ANSWER. If this terrible objection had the least
 degree of solidity, I would instantly burn the *checks*
 and the *scripture-scales*; for I trust, that the glory of
 God is ten thousand times dearer to me than the suc-
 cess of my little publications. But I cannot take bare
 assertions, groundless insinuations, and bombastic
 charges for solid proofs. In a mock-sea-fight, can-
 nons may dreadfully roar; but no masts are shot away,
 no ship is sent to the bottom. And that, in *this* po-
 lemic broad-side, the weight of the ball (if there
 is any) does not answer to the noise of the explosion,
 will appear, I hope, by the following answers.

I. (1) This objection is entirely levelled at the
second scripture-scale, which is made of so great a
 variety of plain scriptures, that, to attempt to set it
 aside as leading to *atheism*, is to endeavour setting
 aside one half of the doctrinal part of the bible as
 being *atheistical*: And if so considerable a part of
 the bible is *atheistical*, the whole is undoubtedly a
 forgery. Thus Zelotes, rather than not to cut down
 what he is pleased to call *arminianism*, fells one half
 of the trees, that grow in the fruitful garden of re-
 vealed

vealed truth, under pretence that they are productive of *atheism*; and, by that means, he gives infidels a fair opportunity of cutting down all the rest.

(2) *Zelotes* is greatly mistaken if he thinks, that the free-agency we plead for, *absolutely* crosses the designs of him, who *works all after the counsel of his own will*: For, if part of THIS COUNSEL is, that man shall be a *FREE-agent*, that *life and death*, heaven and hell, shall be *set before him*; and that he shall *eternally* have either the one or the other, according to HIS OWN choice:—if this is the case, I say, God's wisdom cannot be disappointed, nor his sovereign power baffled, be man's choice whatever it will: Because God designed to manifest his *SOVEREIGN WISDOM* and *POWER* in the wonderful creation, wise government, and righteous judging of *free-agents*; and not in overpowering their will, or in destroying their *free-agency*; much less in subverting his awful tribunal, and in obscuring *all* his perfections to place *one* of them [*Sovereignty*] in a more glaring light.

(3) I grant, that the doctrine of *free-will*, evangelically assisted by Free grace, [not calvinistically overpowered by forcible grace or wrath;]—I grant, I say, that this doctrine can never be reconciled with the doctrine of an *unscriptural, tyrannical Sovereignty*, which *Zelotes* rashly attributes to God, under pretence of doing him honour: But, that it is perfectly consistent with the awful, and yet amiable views, which the scriptures give us of God's *real Sovereignty*, is, I hope, abundantly proved in the preceding pages. To the arguments which they contain, I add the following illustration.

If a king, wisely to try, and justly to reward, the honesty of his subjects, made a statute, to ensure particular rewards to thief-catchers, and particular punishments to thieves; would it be any disparagement to his *wisdom, power, supremacy, and sovereignty*, if he did not necessitate, or *absolutely oblige*, some of his subjects to rob, and others to catch them in the

robbery; lest he should not order the former for *infallible* execution, and appoint to the latter a *gratuitous* reward? Would not our gracious Sovereign be injured by the bare supposition, that he is capable of displaying his *supreme* authority by such a pitiful method? And shall we suppose, that the King of kings—the Judge of all the earth, maintains his righteous *Sovereignty* by a similar conduct?

(4) We perpetually assert, that God is the only *first cause* of all good; both natural and moral; and thus we ascribe to him a *Sovereignty* worthy of the Parent of good. If we do not *directly* with the MANICHEES, or *indirectly* with the CALVINISTS, represent God as the FIRST CAUSE of EVIL, it is merely because we dare not attribute to him a *diabolical Supremacy*. And we fear, that *Zelotes* will have no more thanks, for giving God the glory of predestinating the reprobates *necessarily* to sin on, and be damn'd; than I should have, were I to give our Lord the shameful glory of seducing *Eve* in the shape of a lying serpent, lest he should not have the glory of *being*, and *doing* ALL IN ALL.

(5) We apprehend, that the doctrine of the Scales [i. e. the doctrine of *free-will*, evangelically subordinate to *free-grace* or to *just-wrath*] perfectly secures the honour of God's *greatness*, *supremacy*, and *power*; without dishonouring his *goodness*, *justice*, and *veracity*. It seems to us unscriptural and unreasonable to suppose, that God should eclipse *these*, his MORAL perfections [by which he *chiefly* proposes himself to us for our imitation] in order to set off *those*, his NATURAL perfections. A grim tyrant, a *Nebuchadnezzar* is praised for his *greatness*, *sovereignty* and *power*: But a *Titus*, a prince who deserves to be called *the darling of mankind*, is extoll'd for his *goodness*, *justice*, and *veracity*. And who but Satan, or his subjects, would so over-value the praise given to a *Nebuchadnezzar*, as to slight the praise bestowed upon a *Titus*? Was not *Titus* as great a Potentate as *Nebuchadnezzar* and *Darius*, tho' he did not like them make tyrannical

cal decrees to assert his power, and then execute them with wanton cruelty, or with absurd mourning; lest he should lose the praise of his *Sovereignty* and *immutability*, before a multitude of mistaken *decretists*?

II. Having, I hope, broken the heart of *Zelotes's* objection by the preceding arguments; it will not be difficult to take in pieces his boated quotation from *Mr. Toplady's Historic Proof*; and to point out the flaw of every part.

(1) "*Arminianism paves the way for atheism by despoiling the divine Being of his unlimited SUPREMACY.*" No: it only teaches us, that it is absurd to make God's *supremacy* bear an undue proportion to his other perfections. Do we *despoil* the king of his manly shape, because we deny his having the *head* of a *giant*, and the *body* of a *dwarf*?—(2) "*Of his infallible wisdom.*" No; God *wisely* made free-agents, that he might *wisely* judge them *according to their works*: and it is one of our objections to the modern doctrines of grace, that they "*despoil God of his wisdom*" in both these respects.—(3) "*Of his invincible power.*" No: God does whatever pleases him, in heaven, earth, and hell. But reason and scripture testify, that he does not chuse to set his *invincible power* against his *unerring wisdom*, by *overpowering* with saving grace, or *damning wrath*, the men whom he is going *judicially* to *reward* or *punish*.—(4) "*Of his absolute independency.*" Absurd! when we say that the promised reward, which a general bestows upon a soldier for his gallant behaviour in the field, *depends* in some measure upon the soldier's gallant behaviour; do we *despoil* the general of *his independency* with respect to the soldier? Must the general to show himself *independent*, *NECESSITATE* some of his soldiers to fight, that he may foolishly promote them; and others to desert, that he may blow their brains out with *Calvinian independency*?—(5) "*Of his eternal immutability.*" No: when we assert, that God *justifies* men according to their faith, and *rewards* them according to their good works; or when we say, that
he

he condemns them according to their unbelief, and punishes them according to their bad works; do we intimate that he betrays the least degree of *mutability*? On the contrary, do we not hereby represent him as faithfully executing his *eternal, immutable* decree of judging and treating men according to their works of faith, or of unbelief?—See the *Genuine Creed*. Art. viii.

Mr. Toplady goes on: (6) “*The exempting of some things and events from the providence of God, by referring them to free will, &c. is another of those black lanes, which lead in a direct line from arminianism to atheism.*”—This is a mistake all over. By the doctrine of moderate free-will we exempt no event, or thing, from the providence of God: For we maintain, that, as God’s power made free-will, so his providence rules, or over-rules it in ALL things. Only we do not believe, that ruling, or over-ruling, implies necessitating, overpowering, or tricking, when judgment, punishments, and rewards are to follow. Our doctrine therefore, is a lightsome walk, which leads to the right knowledge of God, and not one of those black lanes which lead in a direct line from Calvinian election, to “Mr. Fulsome’s” presumption; and from Calvinian reprobation, to Francis Spira’s despair.

(7) Arminianism “*represents men as Gods, by supposing man to possess the DIVINE attribute of INDEPENDENT self-determination.*”—OUR doctrines of grace suppose no such thing: On the contrary; we assert that obedient free-will is ALWAYS DEPENDENT upon God’s Free-grace; and disobedient Free-will, upon God’s Just wrath:—This charge of Mr. Toplady is therefore absolutely groundless.—(8) Arminianism “*represents God himself with the imperfections of a man, by putting LIMITATIONS to his SOVEREIGNTY.*”—This is only a repetition of what is absurdly said No. 1, about God’s “*unlimited supremacy.*”—(9) It “*supposes his knowledge to be shackled with circumscription, and darkened with uncertainty.*” It supposes no such thing:

thing: See page 257. On the contrary: One of our great objections to Calvinism is, that it so shackles God's infinite KNOWLEDGE, as to despoil him of the knowledge of future contingencies, or of those events which depend upon man's unnecessitated choice; absurdly supposing that God knows what he absolutely decrees and no more. *If events were UNDECREED, [says Mr. Toplady in his Hist. Proof, p. 192,] they would be UNFOREKNOWN: if unforeknown, they COULD NOT be infallibly predicted.—How came God to foreknow man's fall, says Calvin [nisi quia sic ordinavit] but because he had appointed it?* Thus Calvin and Mr. Toplady, in one sense, allow less foreknowledge to God, than to a stable-boy: For, *without decreeing any thing about the matter, a postilion knows that, if the horse he carries, gets into his master's garden, some of the beds will be trampled; and that, if a thief has an opportunity of taking a guinea without being seen, he will take it.* See pages 253, 257.

(10) The Arminians. “*connect their ideas of God's wisdom and power, with the possibility of disconcertment and disappointment, embarrassment and defeat.*” No such thing: See page 256. We maintain that God, in his infinite wisdom and power, has made *free-agents*, in order to display his *goodness* by rewarding them, if they believe and obey; or his *justice* by punishing them, if they prove faithless and disobedient. Which of the two therefore comes to pass, God is no more *disconcerted, disappointed, embarrassed, &c.* than a lawgiver and judge, who acquits or condemns criminals according to *his own law*, and to *their own works*.—(11) What Mr. Toplady says in the next lines, about the Arminians “*transferring independency to themselves, in order to support their favourite doctrine, which affirms, that the divine will and command are DEPENDENT on the will and conduct of men:*” —and what he adds about their *blotting out God's immutability, and narrowing his providence, to keep the idol of free-will upon its legs*, is a mere repetition of what

what is answered in No. 4, 5, 6, 7. This elegant *tautology* of Mr. *Toplady* may make some of his admirers wonder at the *surprizing variety* of his arguments; but attentive readers can see thro' the rhetorical veil.

What that gentleman says of "*conditional, variable, vanquishable, and amissible grace,*" is verbal dust, raised to obscure the glory of the *second* gospel-axiom, to hide one of the scripture-scales, and to substitute *over-bearing, necessitating* grace, and *free, unprowoked* wrath, for the *genuine* grace and *just* wrath mentioned in the gospel. Let us however dwell a moment upon each of these epithets. (1) "*CONDITIONAL* grace:" We assert [according to the *first* axiom] that the grace of *initial* salvation is UNCONDITIONAL: And [according to the *second* axiom] we maintain that the grace of *eternal* salvation is CONDITIONAL; excepting the case of complete idiots, and of all who die in their infancy. If Mr. *Toplady* can disprove either part of this doctrine; or, which is all one, if he can overthrow the *second* gospel-axiom, and break our *left* scale, let him do it.—(2) "*VARIABLE* grace:" We assert that *grace*, as it is inherent in God, is INVARIABLE. But we maintain, that the *displays* of it towards mankind are *various*; asserting that those displays of it which God grants in a way of REWARD, to them that faithfully use what they have, and properly ask for more, may and do VARY, according to the variations of faithful or unfaithful Free-will; our Lord himself having declared, that *to him that hath* to purpose, *more shall be given*; and that *from him that hath not* to purpose, *even what he hath shall be taken away*.—(3) "*VANQUISHABLE* grace:" To call God's grace *vanquishable* is absurd; because Christ does not *fight* men with grace, any more than a physician fights the sick with remedies. If a patient will not take his medicines, or will not take them properly, or will take poison also, the medicines are not *vanquished*, but despised, or improperly taken. This does not show the weakness of the medicines, but the

the perverseness of the patient. Nor does it prove, that the dying man is stronger than his healthy physician; but only, that the physician will not drench him, as a farrier does a brute. If Mr. Toplady asserts the contrary, I refer him to page 76. &c. And, pointing at Christ's tribunal, I ask: Could the judge of all the earth *wisely* and *equitably* sentence men to eternal life, or to eternal death, if he first drenched them with the cup of *finished salvation*, or *finished damnation*?—(4) “AMISSIBLE grace:” Why cannot *evangelical* grace be *lost*, as well as the *celestial* and *paradisaical* grace which was bestowed upon angels and man before the fall? Is a diamond less precious for being *amissible*? Is it any disgrace to the sun, that thousands of his beams are *lost* upon the drones who sleep away his morning light? Or that they are abused by all the wicked, who dare to sin in open day? If divine grace is both *forcible* and *inamissible*, what signify the apostolic cautions of *not receiving it in vain*, and of *not doing despite to the spirit of grace*?—In a word, what signifies our second gospel-scale, with all the scriptures that fill it up?

To conclude: If those scriptures clearly demonstrate the doctrine of a *free-will*, always subordinate either to *free-grace*, or to *just wrath*; when Mr. Toplady calls that *Free-will* an “*idol*,” does he not inadvertently charge God with being an *idol maker*, and represent the sacred writers, as supporters of the *idol* which God has made? And when that gentleman says, that we “*keep the idol of free will upon its legs, to save human reason from the humiliation of acknowledging her inability to account for many of the divine disposals*;” does he not impose *bound will* and *Calvinian reprobation* upon us, just as the Bishop of Rome imposes *transubstantiation* upon his tame underlings; that is, under pretence that we must humbly submit our reason to the *divine* declarations, decrees, or *disposals*? Just as if there were no difference between *popish* declarations, or *Calvinian* decrees, and “*DIVINE disposals!*”—Just as if the bare fear of re-
garding

garding reason, were sufficient to drive us from all the rational scriptures, which fill our second scale, into all the absurdities, and horrors of *Free-wrath*, and *finished damnation!*

And now say, candid reader, if I may not justly apply to the calvinian doctrines of grace, a part of what Mr. *Toplady* rashly says of "*Arminianism?*" "*Let*" Calvinism "*exculpate herself from the heavy, but unexaggerated indictment: which, if she cannot effect, 'twill be doing her no injustice to term her*" [I shall not say "*Atheism in masquerade.*" but] an irrational, and unscriptural system of doctrine.

III. 'Not so:' [replies *Zelotes*] 'If you have answered Mr. *Toplady's* argument, You cannot set aside Mr. *Whitefield's* dilemma in his letter to Mr. *Wesley*. To me at least, that dilemma appears absolutely unanswerable. It runs thus:—"Surely Mr. *Wesley* will own God's justice in imputing Adam's sin to his posterity; and also, that after Adam fell, and his posterity in him, God might JUSTLY HAVE PASSED THEM ALL BY, without sending his own Son to be a Saviour for ANY ONE. Unless you do heartily agree in both these points, you do not believe original sin aright. If you do own them, you must acknowledge the doctrine of ELECTION and REPROBATION to be HIGHLY JUST and REASONABLE. For if God might justly impute Adam's sin to *all*, and afterwards have passed by *all*, then he might justly pass by some. Turn to the right hand, or to the left, you are reduced to an INEXTRICABLE DILEMMA."— See Mr. *Whitefield's* works: VOL. iv. p. 67.'

ANSWER. We own God's justice in imputing Adam's sin *seminally* to his posterity, because his posterity sinned *seminally* in him, and was in him *seminally* corrupted. And we grant, that, in the loins of Adam, we SEMINALLY deserved all that Adam himself PERSONALLY deserved. So far we agree with Mr. *Whitefield*; maintaining, as he does, that, by our fallen nature in Adam, we are *all children of wrath*; and

and that, as soon as our first parents had sinned, God might justly have sent them, and US IN THEIR LOINS, into the pit of destruction: much more "*might he justly have passed us ALL by, without sending his own Son to be a Saviour for ANY ONE.*" Therefore Mr. Whitefield has no reason to suspect, that we deny the scripture-doctrine of original sin.

This being premised, we may easily see, that the great flaw of the "*inextricable dilemma*" consists, in confounding our SEMINAL state with our PERSONAL state; and in concluding, that what would have been just, when we were in our SEMINAL state in the loins of Adam, must also be just in our PERSONAL state, now we are out of his loins. As this is the main spring of Mr. Whitefield's mistake, it is proper to point it out a little more clearly. Let the following propositions form the pointer.

1. *The wages of sin is death, yea, eternal death, or damnation.*—2. The wages of sin personally, and consciously COMMITTED, is damnation personally and consciously SUFFERED.—3. The wages of sin *seminally* and *unknowingly* committed is damnation, *seminally* and *unknowingly* suffered.—4. When Adam had personally and consciously sinned; God would have been JUST, if he had inflicted upon him the personal and conscious punishment, which we call damnation.—(5) When we had *seminally* and *unknowingly* sinned in Adam, God would have been JUST if he had inflicted a *seminal*, and *unfelt* damnation upon us for it: for then our punishment would have borne a JUST PROPORTION to our offence. We should have been punished as we had sinned, that is, *seminally*, and without the least consciousness of pain or of loss.

But, is it not contrary to all equity, to punish a sin *seminally* and *unknowingly* committed, with an eternal punishment, personally and knowingly endured? For what is Calvinian REPROBATION, but a dreadful decree, that a majority of the children of men shall be PERSONALLY bound over to conscious, necessary, and eternal SIN; which sin shall draw after it conscious, necessary, and eternal DAMNATION?

F f

Hence

Hence it appears that Calvinian predestination to death is horrible in its *end*, which is PERSONAL, NECESSARY, and ETERNAL torments consciously endured: but much more horrible in the *means* which it appears to secure that end, namely PERSONAL, REMEDILESS SIN;—sin NECESSARILY, UNAVOIDABLY, and REPEATEDLY committed: And all this, merely for a sin SEMINALLY, UNKNOWINGLY, and UNCONSCIOUSLY committed: and [what is still more horrible] for a sin, which God himself had *absolutely predestinated*, if the doctrine of Calvinian predestination, or of the ABSOLUTE * NECESSITY of events is scriptural.—It is true, *Zelotes* says, that altho' reprobates are absolutely *reprobated* merely for the sin of *Adam*, yet they are *damned* merely for *their own*. But this evasion only makes a bad matter worse; for it intimates that *Free-wrath* so flamed against their unformed *persons*, as to determine that they should absolutely be formed, not only to be NECESSARILY and ETERNALLY MISERABLE, but also to be NECESSARILY and ETERNALLY GUILTY: which is pouring as much contempt upon divine goodness, as I should pour upon *Phineas's* character, if I asserted, that he contrived, and absolutely secured the filthy crime of *Zimri* and *Cesby*, that, by this means, he might have a *fair opportunity of infallibly* running them both thro' the body.

An illustration may help the reader to understand how hard the ground of Mr. Whitefield's dilemma bears upon God's equity. I have committed an horrid murder: I am condemned to be burned alive for it: My sentence is just: Having *personally* and *consciously* sinned without necessity, I deserve to be *personally* and *consciously* tormented. The judge may then, without cruelty, condemn every part of me to
the

* *Wickliff* used to say, "ALL things that happen, do come ABSOLUTELY of NECESSITY." Hist. Proof p. 191. And Mr. *Topeady*, after taking care to distinguish, and set off the words *all*, *absolutely*, and *necessity*, says in the next page, "I agree with him as to the NECESSITY OF EVENTS."

the flames; and the unbegotten posterity in my loins may justly burn with me, and in me; for with me and in me it has sinned as a part of myself. Nor is it a great misfortune for my posterity to be *thus* punished; because it has as little *knowledge* and *feeling* of my punishment, as of my crime.—But suppose the judge, after relieving me, divided and multiplied me into ten thousand parts; Suppose again, that each of these parts necessarily grew up into a man or a woman; would it be reasonable in him to say to seven or eight hundred of these men and women, ‘ You were all SEMINALLY guilty of the murder committed by the man whom I relieved, and from whose loins I have extracted you: And therefore my mercy *passes you by*, and my justice absolutely reprobates your PERSONS. I force you into REMEDILESS circumstances, in which you will all NECESSARILY commit murder; and then I shall have as fair an opportunity of UNAVOIDABLY *burning you* for *your own UNAVOIDABLE murders*, as I have had of absolutely *reprobating you* for the murder committed by the man, from whom your wretched existence is derived.’—Who does not see the *injustice* and *cruelty* of such a speech?—Who, but Zelotes, would not blush to call it a *gracious speech*, or a “*doctrine of grace?*”—But if the persons, whom I suppose extracted from me, are relieved as well as myself: if we are put all together in *remediable* circumstances, where *sin* indeed *abounds*, but where *grace* *abounds much more*, supposing we are not unnecessarily, voluntarily, and obstinately wanting to ourselves; who does not see, that, upon the PERSONAL commission of avoidable, voluntary murder [and much more upon the personal refusal of a pardon *sincerely* offered upon *reasonable* conditions] my posterity may be condemned to the flames as justly as myself?

If this illustration exactly represents the deplorable case of Calvinian reprobates, who, barely for a sin which they *seminally* committed, are supposed to be

personally bound over first to unavoidable perseverance in sin, and next to unavoidable and eternal damnation; will not all my unprejudiced readers wonder to hear Mr. *Whitfield* assert, that the calvinian doctrine of REPROBATION is “*highly just and reasonable?*”

What! replies that good, mistaken man, will not “*Mr. Wesley own, that God might justly have passed all Adam’s posterity by, without sending his own Son to be a Saviour for any one?*” ANSWER: God forbid we should ever imagine, that God was bound to send his Son to die for *any man!* No: God was no more bound to *redeem* any man, than he was bound to *create* the first man; *redemption* as well as *creation* entirely flowing from rich, and every way undeserved grace.

“Then you give up the point, says *Zelotes*; for “THERE IS NO MEDIUM between God’s *refusing* to send his Son to redeem a part of Adam’s posterity, and his passing a sentence of *Calvinian* reprobation upon them.—Now, if he could *justly refuse* to send his Son to save ANY, he could justly refuse to send him to save SOME, and therefore he could *justly reprobate* some, i. e. predestinate them to a *remediless* state of sin, and of consequence to unavoidable damnation.”

This sophistical argument probably misled Mr. *Whitfield*. But the “MEDIUM” which he could not see, the MEDIUM which spoils his “*inextricable dilemma,*” the door at which we readily go out of the prison, where *Logica Genevensis* fancies she has confined us, may easily be pointed out, thus: If God had not entertained gracious thoughts of peace, mercy, and redemption towards *all mankind*; if he had designed absolutely and unconditionally to glorify nothing but his vindictive justice upon a number of them, for having SEMINALLY SINNED in Adam, he might undoubtedly have passed them by; yea, he might have severely punished them. But, as I have observed, in this case he would have punished them *equitably*, that is, SEMINALLY. He would have crushed guilty Adam, and
with

his OMNISCIENCE, if he cannot foreknow future contingencies? If to foretel without a mistake, that such a thing will happen, he must necessitate it, or do it himself? Was not *Nero* as wise in this respect? Could not he foretel that *Phebe* should not continue a virgin, when he was bent upon ravishing her? That *Seneca* should not die a natural death, when he had determined to have him murdered? And that *Crispus* should fall into a pit, if he obliged him to run a race at midnight in a place full of pits? And what old woman in the kingdom could not precisely foretel that a silly tale should be told at such an hour, if she were resolved to tell it herself, or, at any rate, make a child do it for her?

“ Again, What becomes of God’s LOVING-KINDNESSES, which have been ever of old towards the children of men? And what of his IMPARTIALITY, if most men, absolutely reprobated for the sin of Adam, are never placed in a state of personal trial and probation? Does not God use them far less kindly than he does devils, who were tried every one for himself, and remain in their diabolical state, because they brought it upon themselves by a *personal* choice? Astonishing! That the Son of God should have been flesh of the flesh, and bone of the bone of millions of men, whom, upon the Calvinian scheme, he never indulged so far as he did devils! What an hard-hearted relation to myriads of his fellow-men, does *Calvin* represent our Lord? Suppose Satan had become our *kinsman* by incarnation, and had by that means got *the right of redemption*: would he not have acted like himself, if he had not only left the majority of them in the depth of the fall, but enhanced their misery by the sight of his partiality to the elect?”

“ Once more, What becomes of FAIR DEALING, if God every where represents sin as the dreadful evil which causes damnation, and yet the most horrid sins *work for good* to some, and as P. O. intimates “accomplish their salvation thro’ Christ?”—And what of HONESTY, if the God of truth himself promises, that

all

all the families of the earth shall be blessed in Christ, when he has cursed a vast majority of them, with a decree of absolute reprobation, which excludes them from obtaining an interest in him, even from the foundation of the world?"

“Nay what becomes of his SOVEREIGNTY itself, if it is torn from the mild and gracious attributes by which it is tempered? If it is held forth in such a light, as renders it more terrible to millions, than the sovereignty of Nebuchadnezzar in the plain of Dura appeared to Daniel’s companions, when *the form of his visage was changed against them,* and he decreed that they should be cast into the burning fiery furnace? for, they might have saved their bodily life by bowing to the golden image, which was a thing in their power; but poor Calvinian reprobates can escape at no rate: the horrible decree is gone forth; they must, in spite of their best endeavours, dwell body and soul with everlasting burnings.”

To these queries taken from the *Third Check*, I now add those which follow. What becomes of God’s infinite POWER, if he cannot make *Free agents*, or creatures endued with *Free-will*? And what of his boundless WISDOM, if, when he has made such creatures, he knows not how to rule, overrule, reward, and punish them, without *necessitating* them, that is, without undoing his own work—without destroying their *Free-agency*, which is his master-piece in the universe?—Nay, what would become of the divine IMMUTABILITY, about which Zelotes makes so much ado, if God, after having suspended in all † the Scriptures the reward of eternal life, and the punishment of eternal death, upon our *unnecessitated* works of faith and unbelief; he so altered his mind in the day of judgment, as to suspend heavenly thrones, and infernal racks, only upon the good works of Christ, and the bad works of Adam; thro’ the *necessary* medium of faith and holiness, absolutely forced.

† See the *Scriptural Essay*. Equal Check, page 96. &c.

forced upon some men to the end; and thro' the necessary means of unbelief and sin, absolutely bound upon all the rest of mankind?—And, to conclude, how shall we be able to praise God for his INVARIABLE FAITHFULNESS, if his *secret* will and *public* declarations are at almost-perpetual variance; and if Zelotes's doctrines of grace tempt us to complain with the poet,

‡ Nescio quo teneam mutantem Protea nodo;
instead of encouraging us to say with David, *For ever O Lord, thy word is SETLED in heaven. Thy FAITHFULNESS is unto all generations?*

If Zelotes cannot answer these queries in as rational, and scriptural a manner, as his objections have, I trust, been answered; will not the *Culvinian* doctrines of UNSCRIPTURAL *free-grace* and EVERLASTING FREE-WRATH appear to unprejudiced persons, as great enemies to the divine perfections, and to the *sincere milk of God's word*; as *Virgil's Harpies* were to the Trojan Hero, and to his richly-spread tables? And is there not *some* resemblance between the *Diana* and *Hecate* whom I unmask, and the petty goddesses whom the poet describes thus?

Sive § Deæ, seu sint diræ obscenæ que volucres,—
Tristius haud illis monstrum, nec sævior ulla

Pestis

‡ "He is like Proteus: I know not how to hold him:"—whether by his SECRET WILL, which has absolutely predestinated millions of men to necessary sin and eternal damnation; or by his REVEALED WILL, which declares, that he willeth not primarily that any man should perish, but that all should be eternally saved, by working out their salvation, according to the talent of will and power, which he gives to every man to profit withal.

§ 'Tis hard to say whether they are goddesses or fowls obscene. However they are as ugly and dangerous Appearances, as ever ascended from the Stygian lake. They have faces like virgins, hands like birds claws, and an intolerably-filthy looseness! As for their body, it is invulnerable; at least you cannot wound it; they so nimbly fly away into the clouds; leaving the food which they greedily rose, polluted by their defiling touch.

Pestis et ira deum Stygiis sese extulit undis.
 Virginei volucrum vultus, sædissima ventris
 Proluvies, uncæ que manus :—nec vulnera tergo
 Accipiunt : celeri que fugâ sub sidera lapsæ,
 Semefam prædam, et vestigia sæda relinquunt.

S E C T I O N XXIV.

Zelotes's last objection against a reconciliation with Honestus. In answer to it, the Reconciler shows, by various illustrations, that the scriptures do not contradict themselves in holding forth first and second causes—primary and subordinate motives ; and that the connexion of Free-grace with Free-will is properly illustrated by the scriptural emblem of a marriage ; this relation exactly representing the conjunction and opposition of the two gospel axioms, together with the pre-eminence of Free-grace, and the subordination of Free-will.

IF you compare the prejudice of *Zelotes* against *Honestus* to a strong castle, the objections which fortify that castle, may be compared to the rivers which were supposed to surround *Pluto's* palace. Six of them we have already crossed ; one more obstructs our way to a reconciliation, and, like *Phlegeton*, it warmly runs in the following lines :

OBJECTION VII. “ When king *Joram* said to *Jehu*,
 “ *Is it peace?* *Jehu* answered, *What peace, so long as*
 “ *the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel are so many?*
 “ And what peace can I make with *Honestus* and you,
 “ so long as ye adulterate the gospel, by what you
 “ call the *evangelical marriage*, and what I call the
 “ *monstrous mixture* of FREE-GRACE and FREE-WILL?
 “ I cannot, in conscience, take one step towards a
 “ reconciliation, unless you can make appear, that,
 “ upon your conciliating plan, the dignity of *Free-*
 “ *grace* is properly secured. But, as this is impos-
 “ sible, I can only look upon your *Scripture-scales*,
 “ as a new attempt to set one part of the scripture
 against

against the other, and to give infidels more room to say, that the bible is full of contradictions."

ANSWER. Exceedingly sorry should I be, if the *Scripture-scales* had this unhappy tendency. To remove your groundless fears in this respect, and to prevent the hasty triumph of infidels, permit me (1) to show, that what, at first sight, seems a *contradiction* in the scriptures which compose my scales, appears, upon due consideration, to be only the *just subordination* of *second CAUSES* to the *first*, or the proper union of *inferior MOTIVES* with *leading* ones: and (2) to prove, that what *Zelotes* calls "a monstrous mixture of *Free-grace* and *Free will*," is their *important concurrence*, which the scriptures frequently represent to us under the significant emblem of a *marriage*. Plain illustrations will throw more light upon the subject than deep arguments; I shall therefore use the former, because they are within the reach of every body, and because *Zelotes* cannot set them aside under pretence that they are "*metaphysical*."

I. May we not, on different occasions, use with propriety words, which *seem* contradictory, and which nevertheless agree perfectly together. For instance: With respect to the doctrine of *first* and *second CAUSES*, and of *primary* and *secondary MEANS*, may I not say, "I plowed my field this year," because I *ordered* it to be plowed?—May I not say on another occasion, "Such a farmer plowed it *alone*," because no other farmer shared in his toil?—May I not, the next moment, point at his team, and say, "These horses plowed all my field *alone*," if I want to intimate, that no other horses were employed in that business?—And yet, may I not by and by show *Zelotes* a new-constructed plow, and say: "That light plow plowed all my field?"—Would it be right in *Zelotes*, or *Lorenzo*, to charge me with *shuffling*, or with *self-contradiction*, for these different assertions?

If this illustration does not sufficiently strike the reader, I ask: May not a clergyman, without shadow of prevarication, say on different occasions, I hold

my living thro' divine permission,—thro' the Lord Chancellor's presentation,—thro' a liberal education,—thro' my subscriptions,—thro' the Bishop's institution, &c? May not all these expressions be true, and proper on different occasions? And may not these *causes, means, and qualifications*, concur together, and be *all essential* in their places?

Once more: Speaking of a barge, that sails up the river, may I not, without contradicting myself, say one moment, The *wind ALONE* [in opposition to the *tide*] brings her up? And if the next moment I add, Her *sails ALONE* [in opposition to *oars* or *haling lines*] bring her up against the stream, would it be right to infer that I exclude the tackling of the vessel, the rudder, and the steersman from being all necessary in their places? Such however is the inference of *Zelotes*. For while *Honestus* thinks him an *enthusiast*, for supposing that absolutely nothing but wind and sail [grace and faith] is requisite to spiritual navigation; *Zelotes* thinks that *Honestus* is hardly fit to be a cabin boy in the ship of the church, because he lays a particular stress on the right management of the tackling and rudder; and both will perhaps look upon me as a trimmer, because, in order to reconcile them, I assert, that the wind and sails, the masts and yards, the rigging and the rudder, the compass and pilot have each their proper use and office.

II. With respect to *primary* and *secondary* MOTIVES, may I not say, that Christ humbled himself to the death of the cross, out of obedience to his Father:—out of compassionate love for a lost world:—that he might put away sin by the sacrifice of himself:—that whosoever believeth in him should not perish:—that the scriptures might be fulfilled:—that he might leave us an example of humble patience:—that thro' death he might destroy the prince of darkness:—and that he might see the travel of his soul, obtain the joy that was set before him, and be satisfied?—Would *Zelotes* show himself a judicious divine, if he intimated, that these motives are incompatible and contradictory?—

May

May not a variety of motives sweetly concur to the same end? May you not, for example, relieve your indigent neighbour, out of fear to meet the inexorable rich man in hell?—out of pity for a fellow-creature in distress?—out of regard for him, as a fellow-christian?—out of a desire to maintain a good conscience, and to keep the commandments?—out of gratitude, love, and obedience to Christ?—that the worthy name, by which we are called *christians*, may not be blasphemed?—that your neighbour may be edified?—that you may show your love to God?—that you may declare your faith in Christ?—that you may lay up treasure in heaven?—that, like a faithful steward, you may deliver up your accounts with joy?—that you may receive the REWARD of the inheritance?—that you may be justified by your works as a BELIEVER in the great day, &c?—May not all these motives, like the various steps of Jacob's mysterious ladder, perfectly agree together? And if a good work comes up for a memorial before God, winged with all these scriptural motives; is it not likely to be more acceptable, than one which ascends supported only by one or two such motives?

Zelotes frequently admits but of two causes of our salvation, and recommends but one motive of good works. The two causes of eternal salvation, which he generally confines himself to, are *Christ* and *Faith*: and, what is most astonishing, *solifidian* as he is, he sometimes gives up even *faith* itself: For if he reads that FAITH was imputed to Abraham for righteousness, he tells you that *faith* is to be taken *objectively* for *Christ* and his good works, which is just as reasonable as if I said, that when Sir Isaac Newton speaks of *the eye* and of *a telescope*, he intends that these words should be taken *objectively*, and should mean *the sun* and *the moon*.—Again: As *Zelotes* frequently admits but one cause of salvation, that is, *Christ's righteousness*: so he often admits but one motive of sincere obedience, and that is, the *love of Christ known by name*. Hence he gives you to understand

stand, that all the good works of those, who never heard of *Christ*, are nothing but *splendid sins*. To avoid his mistake we need only admit a variety of causes and motives: And to flee clear of the error of *Honestus*, we need only pay to the Redeemer the so justly deserved honour of being, in conjunction with his Father and Spirit, the *grand*, ORIGINAL CAUSE, and as he is the Lamb slain, the ONE PROPERLY MERITORIOUS CAUSE of our salvation; representing a grateful love to him as the *noblest*, and most powerful motive to obedience, where the christian gospel is preached. In following this reasonable and catholic method, we discover the harmony of the scriptures; we reconcile the opposite texts which fill the scripture-scales; and, far from giving room to infidels to say, that the bible is full of *contradictions*, we show the wonderful agreement of a variety of passages, which, upon the narrow plans of *Zelotes* and *Honestus*, are really *inconsistent*, if not altogether *contradictory*.

III. With respect to the two GOSPEL-AXIOMS and their basis, FREE-GRACE and FREE-WILL, contrary as they *seem* to each other, they agree as well as a thousand harmonious contrasts around us. If *Zelotes* considers the natural world in a *favourable* light, he will see nothing but OPPOSITION IN HARMONY. *Midnight* darkness, when it is reconciled with the blaze of *noon*, crowns our hills with the mild, delightful light of the *rising* or *setting sun*.—When sultry *summers* and frozen *winters* meet half way, they yield the flowers of the *spring* and the fruits of *autumn*.—If the *warming* beams of the sun act in conjunction with *cooling* showers, the earth opens her fruitful bosom, and crowns our fields with a plenteous harvest.—Reflect upon your animal frame: How does it subsist? Is it not by a proper union of opposite things, *fluids* and *solids*?—and by a just temperature of contrary things, *cold* and *heat*? Consider your *whole self*: Are you not made of a thinking soul, and of an organized body?—of *spirit* and *matter*? Thus, two things, which are exactly the reverse of each other, by harmonizing

nizing together, form *man*, who is the wonder of the natural world : just as the Son of God, united to the son of Mary, forms *Christ*, who is the wonder of the spiritual world.

I readily confess, that the connexion of the two gospel-axioms, like that of matter and spirit, is a deep mystery. But as it would be absurd to infer, that man is an *imaginary* being, because we cannot explain how thought and reason can be connected with flesh and blood : So would it be unreasonable to suppose, that the coalition of *Free-grace* with *Free-will* is a *chimera* in divinity, because we cannot exactly describe how they are coupled. We are however indebted to St. Paul for a most striking emblem of the essential *opposition* and wonderful *union* that subsist between the two axioms, or [which comes to the same] between the *Redeemer* and the *redeemed*—between *Free-grace* and *Free-will*.

If the true church is a mystical body composed of all the souls, whose submissive *Free-will* yields to *Free-grace*, and exerts itself in due subordination to our loving Redeemer ; does it not follow, that *Free-grace* exactly answers to *Christ*, and *holy Free-will* to God's *holy Church* ? Now, says the apostle, *the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church :—Husbands love your wives as Christ loved the church :—A man shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning CHRIST and the CHURCH ;* and upon the preceding observation, I take the liberty to add : *This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning FREE-GRACE and FREE-WILL.* If marriage is a divine institution, *honourable among all men*, and typical of spiritual mysteries :—if *Isaiah* says, *Thy Maker is thy Husband* :—if *Hossea* writes, *In that day, says Jehovah, thou shalt call me ISHI ;* that is, *MY HUSBAND* :—if St. Paul says to the Corinthians, *I have espoused you as a chaste virgin to one HUSBAND, even Christ* :—and if he tells the Romans, that they are become dead to the law, that they should be MARRIED to another, even

to HIM who is raised from the dead, that they should BRING FORTH FRUIT UNTO GOD:—if the sacred-writers, I say, frequently use that emblematic way of speech, may I not reverently tread in their steps, and, in the fear of God, warily run the parallel, between the conjugal tie and the mystical union of *Free-grace* and *Free-will*? And,

(1) If the husband is the HEAD of the wife, as says St. Paul; or her LORD, as St. Peter intimates; is not *Free-grace* the HEAD and LORD of *Free-will*? Has it not the preeminence in all things?—(2) If the bridegroom makes his address to the bride first, without forcing or binding her with cords of necessity; does not *Free-grace* also seek *Free-will* first, without forcing it, and chaining it down with necessitating, Turkish decrees?—(3) If the mutual, *unnecessitated*, voluntary consent of the bridegroom and of the bride, is the very essence of marriage; may I not say, that the mutual, *unnecessitated*, voluntary consent of *Free-grace* and *Free-will*, makes the marriage between Christ and the willing souls, whom St. John calls *The bride*, and *The Lamb's wife*?—(4) The husband owes no obedience to his wife, but the wife owes *all reasonable obedience* to her husband. And does not the parallel hold here also? Must not *Free-will* humbly and obediently submit to *Free-grace*, as Sarah did to Abraham, calling him LORD?—(5) The man is to give honour to his wife as to the weaker vessel; And does not *Free-grace* do so to *Free-will*, it's inferior? Is not it's condescending language, *Behold I stand at the door and knock:—Open to me, my sister, my love, &c.* Yea, does not FREE-GRACE, like St. Paul, become all things [but sin and wantonness], to all men, that by any means it may gain the FREE-WILL of some?—(6) If the unbelieving wife departs, let her depart, says St. Paul. And if unbelieving *Free-will* is bent upon eloping from *Free-grace*, may it not do it? Is it locked up as the Sultanas are in Turkey? Altho' incarnate *Free-grace* compassionately mourned over the obstinate

obstinate *Free will* of the Jews, did it draggon them into compliance? Was not it's language, *I would; and ye would not*?—*Thou hast been weary of me, O Israel.—My people would none of me: so I gave them up to their own hearts lust, and they walked in their own counsel*; doing, as a nation, what Judas was judicially permitted to do as an individual?—(7) *In case of adultery, is it not lawful for the husband to put away his wife*? And may not *Free-grace* repudiate *Free-will* for the same reason? When the *Free-will* of Judas had long carried on an adulterous commerce with *Mammon*; and when he refused to return; did not our Lord put him away; giving him a bill of divorce; together with the fatal sop? And far from detaining him by fulsome, calvinian carcasses, did he not publicly say, *We to that man!*—*What thou doest do quickly.*—*Remember Lot's wife*? (8) Can the husband, or the wife, have children alone? Can *FREE-GRACE* do *human good works* without *human FREE-WILL*? Did not our Lord speak a self-evident truth, when he declared, *Without ME, YE can do nothing*? And did not St. Paul set his seal to it, when he said: *We are not sufficient, OF OURSELVES, to think any thing [morally good] as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is OF GOD:—Not I [alone, or principally] but THE GRACE OF GOD, which was WITH ME*? And, morally

† Some Calvinists have done this great truth justice, and among them the judicious Mr. Riland of Northampton, A. M. who hath published an extract from Dr. Leng, Bishop of Norwich, descriptive of the resemblance that man bears to God. The first article of his extract runs thus. "The soul is an image of the *almighty power* of God. God " has a power of *beginning* motion: So has the soul.—God's will " acts with *astonishing sovereignty*, and absolute dominion and " pleasure, *where*, and *when*, and *how* he will.—The soul chuses " or refuses, accepts or rejects an object, with an amazing resemblance to a God. Even devils and the wicked refuse God with " *sovereign will* and a *most free* contempt."—Hence it appears, that to rob man of *free-agency* under pretence of making *free-grace* all in all, is to destroy the first feature of God's image in his living picture, man.

gally speaking, what can Christ do as the husband of the church, without her concurrence? What, besides stoning, inviting, pre-engaging and drawing? Do we not read, that *he could not do many works among the people of Nazareth, because of THEIR unbelief?* And, for want of co-operation or concurrence in sinners, does he not complain, *I have laboured in vain:— I have spent my strength for naught:—All the day long I stretched forth my hands, and no man regarded?*— Lastly: May I not observe, that, as the procreation of children is the most important consequence of marriage; so the production of *the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ*, is the most important consequence of the harmonious opposition of *Free-grace* and *Free-will*; when they are joined together in that evangelical marriage, which the scripture calls *Faith working by love?*

Should *Zelotes* object here, that, “Some good people produce all the fruits of righteousness, and do all the good works, which St. Paul expects from believers, tho’ they say all manner of evil against *Free-will*, will hear of nothing but *Free-grace*, and perpetually decry their own good works:” I reply; That there are such persons, is granted: Nor are they less conspicuous for their *unreasonableness*, than for their *piety*. They may rank for consistency with a woman, who is excessively fond of her husband, and peevish with every body else, especially with her own children.—Her constant language is, “My husband is all in all in the house: he does every thing: I am absolutely no body, I am worse than any body, I am a monster, I bring forth nothing but monsters: my best productions are dung, dross, and filthy rags, &c. &c.”—A friend of her husband tired to hear such speeches day by day, ventures to set her right by the following questions; “Pray, Madam, if your husband is all in the house, is he his own *wife*? If he does *all* that is done under your roof, did he get drunk the other day when your footman did so? Does he bear his own children, and give them suck? If
“you

“ you are absolutely no body, who is the *mother* of the fine boy that hangs at your breast? And if he is a *mere* † *monster*, why do you dishonour your husband by *fathering* a monster upon him?”—While she blushes, and says, “ I hate controversy, I cannot bear carnal reasonings, &c.” I close this parallel between *marriage*, and the evangelical union of *free-grace* and *free-will*, by some remarks, which, I hope, will reconcile *Zelotes* and *Honestus* to the harmonious opposition of the *seemingly* contrary doctrines of *grace* and *justice*, of *faith* and *works*, of *free-grace* and *free-will*, which answer to the *two gospel-axioms*, and are balanced in the *two scripture scales*.

Union without *opposition* is dull and insipid. You are acquainted with the pleasures of friendship: You would gladly go miles, to shake hands with an intimate friend; but why did you never feel any pleasure in shaking your left hand with your right, and in returning the friendly civility? Is it not because the joining of your own hands would be expressive of an union without proper opposition;—of an union without sufficient room to display the mutual endearments of *one free-will* in *harmony* with *another*? For what I have all along called *Free-grace*, is nothing but *God's gracious FREE-WILL*, to which the *obedient FREE-WILL* of believers humbly submits itself. Why can

† Walking about my parish some years ago, I heard a collier's wife venting her bad humour upon some body, whom she called *Son of b—cb*. I went into the house to make peace; and, finding that it was her own Son, whom she thus abused, I expostulated with her about the absurdity of her language, so far as it offended *God*, and reflected upon *herself*. I might have added, that, if her child was *the Son of a b—cb*, he must also be *the Son of a d—g*; a circumstance this, not less dishonourable to her *husband*, than to *herself*; but I really forgot this argument [*ad mulierem*] at that time. However I mention it here, in hope that *Zelotes*, who, thro' voluntary humility, calls his good works as many bad names as the woman did her son, will take the hint, and will no more reflect upon Christ by injudiciously loading the productions of his free-grace with antinomian abuse.

can you have no satisfaction in going to the fire, when a fever enflames your blood; or in drinking a cooling draught, when you are benumbed with cold? Is it not because in either case the pleasure ceases; or rather becomes pain, for want of proper opposition?

Is not *opposition* WITHOUT UNION the very ground of infernal woe? When *opposition* amounts to downright *contrariety*, does it not end in fierce destructive discord? And does not this discord produce the horrid concert which our Lord describes by *weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth*, the genuine expressions of sorrow, anguish and despair? On the other hand, is not *opposition in union* the very soul of celestial joys? And should I take too much liberty with the deep things of God, if I ventured upon the following query? Is it not from the eternal, mysterious, ineffable *opposition of Father and Son*, in eternal, mysterious, ineffable *union* with each other, that the eternal love and joy of the *Spirit* proceeds to accomplish the mystery of the divine *unity*, and form the very *heaven of heaven*?

But if that question appears too bold, or too deep, I drop it, and, keeping within *earthly* bounds, I ask, Does not experience convince us, that the most perfect concerts are those, in which a number of instruments, *soft* as the flute, and *strong* as the bassoon, *high-sounding* as the clarion, and *deep* toned as the kettle-drum, properly agree with *tenor*, *counter-tenor*, *bass*, and *treble* voices? Is it not *then*, that the combined effects of slow and quick vibrations, high and low notes, sharp and flat tones, solemn and cheerful accents; grave and shrill, melting and rousing, gentle and terrible sounds, by their harmonizing oppositions, alternately brace and dilate our auditory nerves; or delightfully sooth and alarm, lull and ravish, our musical powers?—Such, and far more glorious, is the GOSPEL CONCERT of *free-grace* and *free-will*:—A sweetly-awful concert this, in which prohibitions and commands, cautions and exhortations, alluring promises and fearful threatenings, gentle offers of

mercy

mercy and terrible denunciations of vengeance, have all their proper places.

Now man is brought down to the gates of hell, as a rebellious worm; and now [by a proper transition] he is exalted to the heaven of heavens, as the friend of God—Now Christ hangs on an ignominious cross; and now he fills the everlasting throne:—One day, as a SAVIOUR and a PROPHEET, he gives grace, he offers glory; he calls, he entreats, he weeps, he bleeds, he dies; another day, as a REWARDER and a KING, he revives and triumphs; he absolves or condemns; he opens and shuts both hell and heaven. The treble in this doctrinal concert, appears ENTHUSIASTIC just as prejudiced *Honestus*; and the bass passes for HERETICAL discord with heated *Zelotes*: but an unbiassed protestant knows the joyful sound of Free-grace—the solemn sound of Free-will—and the alarming sound of Just-wrath; and admitting each in his concert, he makes scriptural melody to his Priest and Law-giver—to his Redeemer and his Judge. As for the merry tune of antinomian Free-grace, mixed with the reprobating roar of Calvinian Free-wrath, it grates upon him, it grieves his soul, it diffuses chilliness through his veins, it carries horror to his very heart.

Whilst a divine combines evangelically, and uses properly the two gospel-axioms, you may compare him to a musician, who skilfully tunes, and wisely uses all the strings of his instrument. But when *Zelotes*, and *Honestus* discard one of the evangelical axioms, they resemble an Harper who peevishly cuts half the strings of his harp, and ridiculously confines himself to using only the other half. Or, to return to the scriptural simile of a marriage: When an unprejudiced evangelist solemnizes the doctrinal marriage which I contend for, he pays a proper regard to the *Bridegroom* and to the *Bride*: He considers both *Free-grace* and *Free-will*. Therefore, when he sees *Honestus* perform all the ceremony with *Free-will* only, he is as much surprized, as if he saw a clergyman take a gold ring from the right hand of a woman,

put

put it on the fourth finger of her left hand, and gravely try to marry her to herself. And when he sees *Zelotes* transact all the business with *Free-grace* alone, he is not less astonished than if he saw a minister take a single man's right hand, put it into his left hand, and render himself ridiculous by pronouncing over him a solemn nuptial blessing.

If *Zelotes* is still afraid, that upon the plan of an evangelical marriage between *Free-grace* and *Free-will*, the transcendent dignity of God's Grace is not properly secured; and that *human agency* will absolutely claim the incommunicable honours due to *divine Favour*; I shall guard the preceding pages by some remarks, which will, I hope, remove *Zelotes's* groundless fears, and give *Honestus* a seasonable caution.

God's gracious dispensations towards *man*, or [which comes to the same] the dealings of *Free-grace* with *Free-will*, are frequently represented in scripture under the emblem of *gracious covenants*. Now *covenants*, which are made between the *Creator* and his *Creatures*; between the Supreme Being, who is absolutely independent, because he wants nothing; and inferior Beings, who are entirely dependent upon him, because they want all things; — such *gracious covenants*, I say, always imply a matchless condescension on the part of the *Creator*, and an inconceivable obligation on the part of his *Creatures*. Therefore, according to the doctrine enforced in these sheets, *Free-grace*, which shines by its own eternal lustre, without receiving any thing from *Free-will*, can never, in point of dignity, be confounded with *Free-will*; because *Free-will* borrows all its power and excellence from *Free-grace*; just as the moon borrows all her light and glory from the Sun.

We infer therefore, that, as the *moon* acts in conjunction with, and due subordination to the *Sun* in the *natural world*, without supplanting or rivalling the sun; So *Free-will* may act in conjunction with, and due subordination to *Free-grace* in the *spiritual world*, without rivalling, much more without supplanting

Free-grac.

Free-grace. And hence it appears, that Zelotes's fears, lest our doctrine should pour contempt on the glory of *Free-grace*, are as groundless, as the panick of the ancient Persians, who, when they saw the moon passing between the earth and the sun, imagined that the great luminaries which rule the day and the night, were actually fighting for the mastery; and absurdly dreaded, that the strife would end in the total extinction of the solar light.

Ezekiel [Chap. XVI.] gives us an account of the glory, to which God advanced the Jewish church. From a state of the greatest meanness and pollution, he raised her to the dignity and splendor described in these words: *I washed away thy blood from thee.—I covered thy nakedness.—Yea, I swore unto thee, and entered into a [marriage-] covenant with thee, saith the Lord God; and thou becamest mine.—I clothed thee also with embroidered work; I decked thee with ornaments:—Thou wast exceeding beautiful: Thou didst prosper into a kingdom, and thy renown went forth among the heathen for thy beauty: For it was perfect thro' the comeliness, which I had put upon thee, saith the Lord.* However, the Jewish church [such is the power of Free will!] abused these glorious favours, as appears from the next words: *Thou didst trust in thine own beauty, and playedst the harlot, saith the Lord God.* But, does this adulterous ingratitude of the Jews disprove the truth of *Ezekiel's* doctrine, any more than the adultery of *Bathsheba* disproved her being once *Uriah's* lawful wife? And can any consequence be charged upon the doctrine of the evangelical marriage maintained in these sheets, which is not equally chargeable upon the above-mentioned doctrine of the prophet?

We grant that *Free-will* too frequently forgets its place, as too many persons of the inferior and weaker sex forget theirs, notwithstanding their solemn promise of dutiful obedience till death: But does this show, either that the union of indulgent *Free-grace* and dutiful *Free-will* is an heretical fancy; or that *Free-will* is really equal to *Free-grace*? If imperious *Free-will* rises against *Free-grace*, and acts the part of a *Jezabel*,

is not *Free-grace* strong enough to reduce it by *proper* methods, or wise enough to give it a bill of divorce-ment, if *such* methods prove ineffectual? Does *Zelotes* act a becoming part when he so interferes between *Free-grace* and *Free-will*, as to turn the latter out of the Church, under pretence of siding with the former? Has he any more right to do it, than I have to turn Queen Charlotte out of England, under pretence that bloody *Mary* abused her royal authority?

Why does *Zelotes* stumble at the doctrine of the evangelical marriage which I prove? And why is *Lorenzo* offended at the mystery of Christ's incarnation? Is it not because they overlook the noble original of *Free-will*? If you trace the *free-willing soul* back to it's eternal source, you will find that it proceeds from Him, who *breathed into the nostrils of Adam the breath of life*, that man might become a *living soul*. And where is the absurdity of asserting, that God does re-*forb* [if I may use the expression] his own living, eternal breath? And that, by means of the mysteries, which we call *redemption* and *sanctification*, he reunites himself to that very spirit, which came from him; to that very soul, which he breathed into the earthly Adam? If man's dignity before the fall was such, that, when St. *Luke* declares our Lord's human generation, and comes to the highest round of the genealogical ladder, he is not afraid to say, that Christ was *The Son of Adam*, &c. *who was the Son of God*, Luke, 1, 38, where is the absurdity of supposing, that God in Christ kindly receives *his Son* again, when that son returns to him like the free-willing penitent prodigal?

Nor need *Free-will* be proud of this unspeakable honour: For, not to mention it's *creation*, for which it is entirely indebted to *Free-grace*, does it not owe to *divine favour*, all the blessings of REDEMPTION? If *Free-grace* should say to *Free-will*, *when I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thy own blood, I said unto thee, Live*; would not believing *Free-will* instantly bow to the dust, and thankfully acknowledge the *undeserved mercy*? Why then should *Zelotes* think, that *Free-will* will infallibly forget it's place, if it is raised to the honour of an evangelical, conjugal union with *Free-grace*?

grace?—If a prince raised a filthy, condemned, dead shepherdess from the dunghill, the dungeon, and the grave; graciously advancing her to princely honours, and a seat at his feet, or by his side; does it follow, that *she* would necessarily forget her former baseness? Or that *his* condescension would unavoidably rob him of his native superiority? For my part, when I hear St. John say, *Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we, who submit our Free-will to Free-grace, should be called the sons of God—the wife of the lamb, &c.* far from being tempted to forget my wretchedness, I am excited to fear the Lord and his goodness, and encouraged to perfect holiness in that fear: For every man who hath this faith, and hope, purifieth himself even as God is pure: So far is he from necessarily walking in pride, as a vain-glorious pharisee; or from exalting himself, as a self-deified antichrist! Besides, to all eternity the glaring truth maintained by the apostle, will abase Free-will, and secure the transcendent dignity of Free-grace: *What hast thou, which thou hast not, more or less directly, received of FREE, creating, preserving, redeeming, sanctifying, or rewarding GRACE? Who hath FIRST given to it, and it shall be recompensed to him again? For of him, i. e. of God, the bottomless and shoreless ocean of Free-grace, and thro' him, and to him, are all [good] things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen!*

SECTION. XXV.

The Author sums up the opposite errors of Zelotes and Honestus, whom he invites to a speedy reconciliation: To bring them to it, he urges strong and soft motives; and, after giving them some directions, and encouragements, he concludes by apologizing for his plainness of speech, by acknowledging his great inferiority to the two reconciled rivals, and by expressing a sincere respect for their person, and an humble wish for his own.

IF *Honestus* is not averse to the rational and scriptural terms of peace proposed in the preceding pages, and if I have removed the objections which *Zelotes* makes against these terms, what remains for

me to do but to press them both to be instantly reconciled. To this end I shall once more urge upon them two powerful motives, the one taken from the unspeakable mischief done by their unreasonable division, and the other from the advantage and comfort which their scriptural agreement will produce.

Permit me, *Zelotes*, to begin by the mischief which you do, through your opposition to the moral truths maintained by *Honestus*. If reason and scripture breathe through the preceding pages, is it not evident, that, under pretence of exalting *Free-grace*, which is the *first* weight of the sanctuary, you throw away the *second* weight, which is the *free-will-offering* of sincere obedience; constantly refusing it the place of a *weight* before God, when the children of men are weighed for eternal life or eternal death, in the awful, decisive balance of *election* and *reprobation*? Does it not necessarily follow from thence, that the *personal election* of some men to eternal salvation, is merely of *unscriptural Free-grace*; while the *personal reprobation* of others from grace and glory, is entirely of *tyrannical Free-wrath*? Is not this the language of your doctrine? There is, for the *elect*, but *one* weight, bearing the stamp of heaven and everlasting love; namely, *The finished work of Christ*, which is absolutely and irresistibly thrown into the scale of all who are predestinated to eternal life; And this golden weight is so heavy, that, without any of their good works it will *unavoidably* turn the scale for their eternal salvation. And, on the other hand, there is, for the reprobates, but *one* weight, bearing the stamp of hell and everlasting wrath, namely the *finished work of Adam*, which is absolutely and irresistibly thrown into the scale of all that are predestinated to eternal death: And this leaden weight is so heavy, that let them endeavour ever so much to rise to heavenly joys, it will *necessarily* sink them to eternal woe.' Thus you turn the gospel into a Calvinian farrago; whereas, if you divided the truth aright, you would do both gospel-axioms justice; asserting, that, although the
initial

initial salvation of *sinners* is of free-grace alone; yet the *eternal* salvation of *adult believers*, which is *judicially*, as well as *graciously*, bestowed upon them by way of *reward*, is both of Free-grace and of rectified Free-will;—both of faith, and of it's voluntary works;—both of Christ living, dying, and rising again for us; and of believers graciously assisted [not despotically necessitated] to persevere in the obedience of faith.

The mischief does not stop here: To make way for your error, you frequently represent the second scripture-scale, with the passages which it contains, as pharisaical or Mosaical *legality*; distressing the minds of the simple by your unscriptural refinements, and hardening the *Nicolaitans*—the practical antinomians, in their contempt of morality and sincere obedience. I do you justice, *Zelotes*: I confess, that, like Christ, you *hate their deeds*; but alas! like antichrist, you love, you dearly love their spurious doctrines of grace; and this inconsistency involves you in perpetual difficulties, and glaring contradictions. One moment your solifidianism makes you extol their *immoral* principles: the next moment your exemplary piety makes you exclaim against their consistent—*immoral* practices. One hour you assure them, that our eternal justification *entirely* depends upon God's absolute predestination, and upon the salvation completely finished by Christ for us: You openly declare, that, from first to last, our works have absolutely no hand in the business of salvation; and you slyly insinuate, that a fallen believer is as much a child of God, when he puts his bottle to his neighbour to make him drunk, or when he commits adultery and premeditates murder; as when he deeply repents and bears fruit meet for repentance. The next hour, indeed, you are ashamed of such barefaced antinomianism. To mend the matter, you contradict yourself, you play the Arminian, and assert, that all drunkards, adulterers, and murderers are unbelievers, and that all such sinners are in the high road to hell. Thus you alternately encourage and chide, flatter and correct

your *Nicolaitan*-converts : But one care does them more harm, than twenty stripes do them good. Nor need they fear either stripes or wounds ; for instead of the precious balm of *Gilead*, you have substituted the cheap balm of *Geneva* :—a dangerous salve this, which slightly heals, and too often imperceptibly poisons a wounded conscience. With this application they soon cure themselves : One single dose of *unconditional* election to eternal life, of *inamissible*, *complete* justification merely by the good works of another, or of “ *salvation finished in the full extent of the word* ” without any of our own performances, makes them as hearty and cheerful as any *Laodiceans* ever were.

When they hear your *Arminian* pleas for undefiled religion, they wonder at your *legality*. If you will be *inconsistent*, THEY will not : They are determined to be all of a piece. You have inspired them with sovereign contempt for the *preceptive*, *remunerative*, and *windictive* part of the gospel : Nay, you have taught them to abhor it, as the dreadful heresy of the *Arminians*, *Pelagians*, *Pharisees*, and *Free-willers*. And thus you have inadvertently paved, and pointed out the way to the *antinomian* city of refuge. Thither they have fled, by your direction, and having laid hold on the false hope which you have set before them, they now stand completely deceived in *self-imputed*, and *non-imparted* righteousness. It is true that you attack them there, from time to time : ashamed of the genuine consequences of your partial gospel, you call *St. James* to your assistance, and erect a *Wesleyan* battery to demolish their solidian ramparts : but alas ! you have long since taught them to nail up all the pieces of evangelical ordnance : and when you point them against their towers, they do but smile at your inconsistency. Looking upon you as one who is not less intangled in *the law*, than risen *Lazarus* was in his *grave-clothes*, they heartily pray, that you may be delivered from the remains of *Moses's* vail, and see into the privileges of believers as clearly as they do : And when they have briskly fired back your own
shots,

shots, *Legality! Legality!* they sit down behind the walls which you take so much pains to repair, I mean the walls of mystical *Geneva*; singing there a solifidian *Requiem* to themselves, and sometimes a triumphal *Te Deum* to one another.

Happy would it be for you, *Zelotes*, and for the church of God, if the mischief done by your modern gospel were confined to the *immoral* fraternity of the *Nicolaitans*. But alas! it produces the worst effect upon the *Moralists* also. *Honestus* and his admirers see you extol *Free-grace* in so unguarded a manner, as to demolish *Free-will*, and unfurl the banner of *Free-wrath*. They hear you talk in such a strain, of a *day of God's power*, in which the elect are *irreflexibly* converted, as to make sinners forget, that now is the *day of salvation*, and the time to use *one or two talents*, till the Lord comes with more. Perhaps also *Honestus* meets with a soul frightened almost to distraction, by the doctrine of *absolute reprobation*, which always dogs your favourite doctrine of *Calvinian election*.—To complete the mischief, you drop some deadly hints about the *harmlessness* of sin; or, what is still worse, about its *profitableness* and sanctifying influence with respect to believers. Neither height nor depth of iniquity shall separate them from the love of God. Nay, the most grievous falls,—falls into adultery and murder, shall be so over-ruled, as infallibly to drive them nearer to Christ, and, of consequence, to make them rise higher, and sing louder in heaven. This solifidian gospel shocks *Honestus*. His moral breast swells against it with just indignation; and supposing that the doctrine of *Free-grace* [of which you call yourself the defender] is necessarily connected with such loose principles, he is tempted to give it up, and begins perhaps to suspect that religious experiences are only the workings of a melancholy blood, or the conceits of enthusiastic brains. This, *Zelotes*, and more, is the mischief you inadvertently do by your warm opposition to the doctrines of JUSTICE, which support
the

the *second* gospel-axiom, and are inseparable from the *Scripture-doctrines of GRACE.*

And you, *Honestus*, if you lay aside the *first* weight of the sanctuary, are you less guilty than *Zelotes*? When you say little or nothing of our fall in Adam; of our recovery by Christ, and of our need of a living, victorious faith; and when, under the plausible pretence of asserting our *moral agency*, and pleading for *sincere obedience*, you keep out of sight the unsearchable riches of Christ, the wonderful efficacy of his atoning blood, and the encouraging doctrine of Free-grace; do you not inadvertently confirm deistical moralists in their destructive notions, that scraps of moral honesty will answer the end of exalted piety, and of renovating faith? And do you not encrease the prejudices of *Zelotes*; making him believe by your sparing use of the *first* gospel-axiom, that all who represent *morality* and *good works* as an indispensable part of Christ's gospel, are secret enemies to Free-grace, and stiff maintainers of pharisaic errors?

O *Zelotes*, O *Honestus*, what have ye done? What are ye still doing? Alas! ye drive one another farther and farther from the complete *truth*, as it is in *Jesus*. In your unreasonable contention, ye break the harmony of the gospel;—ye destroy the Scripture-scales;—ye tear in two the book of life, and run away with a mangled part, which ye fondly take for the whole. Ye crucify *Christ* DOCTRINAL: *Honestus* pierces his right hand, while *Zelotes* transfixes the left; both pleading, as the scribes and pharisees did, that ye only crucify a *deceiver of the people*.

A skilful physician by prudently mixing two contrary drugs, may so temper their effect, as to compound an excellent medicine. Thus those ingredients, which, if they were given alone, would perhaps kill his patients, by being administered together, operate in corrective, qualifying conjunction, and prove highly conducive to health. Happy would it be for your spiritual patients, if ye imitated his skill, by evangelically combining the gracious promises,
and

and the holy precepts, which support the two gospel-axioms. But alas! ye do just the reverse, when ye indiscriminately administer only the truths of the *first*, or of the *second* axiom. Thus, instead of curing your patients, ye sour their minds; *Honestus*, with the poisonous leaven of the *pharisees*; and *Zelotes*, with the killing leaven of the *antinomians*.

The practice of thousands shows what dangerous touches ye have, by these means, given to their principles: For, your admirers, O *Zelotes*, are encouraged so to depend upon *Free-grace*, as not vigorously to exert the powers of *Free-will*. And it is well if some of them do not lie down in stupid dejection, *idly* waiting for an over-bearing impetus of divine grace, which, you insinuate, is to do all for us without us; while others cheerfully rise up to play, in consequence of the Laodicean ease, which naturally flows from the doctrine of *salvation calvinistically-finished*.—On the other hand, your heaters, O *Honestus*, are so taught to depend upon their *best endeavours*, and the faithful exertion of their *free-will*, that many of them see no occasion ardently to implore the help of *Free-grace*, as fickle, impotent, blind, guilty, hell-deserving sinners ought to do. Trusting to what THEY WILL DO to-morrow, they neglect and grieve the spirit, which is ready to help their infirmities *to-day*. And it is to be feared, that many of them play the dangerous game of *procrastination*, till the sun of righteousness sets with respect to them—till all their oil is burned, and their lamps going out with a bad smell, leave them in the dreadful night when no man can work.

Who can tell the mischief, which ye have already done by your mangled gospels? It will be known in the great day. But suppose ye had only caused the miscarriage of *one soul*; would not this be matter of unspeakable grief? If ye would esteem it a misfortune, to have occasioned the loss of your neighbour's *horse*; think, O think how sad a thing it must be, to have caused, tho' undesignedly, the destruction of his *soul*.

soul. The loss of the cattle upon a thousand hills can be repaired; but if a man should gain the whole world, and thro' your wrong directions lose his own soul; what will he; what will you give in exchange for his soul?

In the multitude of those, whose salvation is thus endangered, I see *Lorenzo*—sensible, thoughtful, learned *Lorenzo*: His case is truly deplorable, and a particular attention to it may convince you of the fatal tendency of a gospel which wants almost one half of it's proper weight. Altho' the dogmatical assertions of a preacher, if they are supported by the charms of a mellifluous eloquence, or the violence of a boisterous oratory, prevail with many; yet not with all. For while some, greedily drink in the very dregs of error, thro' the weakness of their mind, the moveableness of their passions, and the credulity which accompanies superstitious ignorance: others are tempted to doubt of the plainest truths, thro' the nicety of a keen wit; the refinements of a polite education, and the scrupulousness of a sceptical understanding. *Lorenzo* is one of this number. He is determined not to pin his faith upon any man's sleeve. And he sets out in search of religious truth, with this just principle, that religion may improve, but can never oppose good sense and good morals. In this disposition *Lorenzo* hears *Zelotes*; and when *Zelotes* begins to play upon his numerous audience with his rhetorical artillery, *Lorenzo* examines if the cannon of his eloquence is loaded with a proper ball;—if the solidity of his arguments answers to the positiveness, loudness, or pathos of his delivery. *Zelotes*, not satisfied to preach *only* the doctrine contained in the *first* Scripture-scale, takes upon himself warmly to decry the doctrine contained in the *second*; and at times he even explodes morality; *unguardedly* representing it as the cleaner way to hell. If this is the gospel, says *Lorenzo*, I must for ever remain an unbeliever; for I cannot swallow down a cluster of inconsistencies,

consistencies, whence the poison of immorality visibly distils.

He hears you next, *Honestus*; and he admires the rational manner in which you prove man's Free-agency, and point out the delightful paths of virtue; but alas! you mention neither our natural impotence, nor the help which *free, redeeming grace* has laid on Christ for helpless sinners. As this doctrine is not repugnant to the light of reason, *Lorenzo* prefers it to the solifidian scheme of *Zelotes*. Thus reason stands him instead of Christ, Free-will instead of Free-grace, and some external acts of benevolence, instead of the faith which renews the heart. And upon the lame leg of this outward morality he hops along in the ways of virtue, till a violent temptation pushes him into some gross immorality. His wounded conscience begins then to want ease and a cure; but he knows not where to seek it. *Honestus* seldom points him clearly to the Saviour's *blood*; and when *Zelotes* does it, he too often defiles the sacred fountain with unscriptural refinements, and immoral absurdities artfully wrapped up in scripture-phrases. Hence it is, that *Lorenzo* does not see the remedy, or that he turns from it with contempt. Nor would I wonder if [while each of you thus keeps from him one of the keys of christian knowledge] he remained a stranger to the gospel, and began to suspect, that the bible is a mere jumble of legends and inconsistencies—an apple of discord thrown among men by crafty priests, and artful politicians, to awe the vulgar, and divert the thoughts of the inquisitive. In these critical circumstances he meets with *Hume* and *Voltaire*, whom he prefers to you both; and, renouncing equally *Free-grace* and *Free-will*, he flies for shelter to open *infidelity*, and avowed *fatalism*. There numbers follow him daily: and there your refinements, O *Zelotes*, and your errors, O *Honestus*, will probably drive the next generation, if ye continue to sap the foundation of the gospel-axioms. For the gospel can no more stand long upon one of it's pillars, than ye can stand
long

long upon one of your legs. Christianity without *faith*, or without *works*, is like a sun without *light*, or without *heat*. Such christianity is as different from primitive christianity, as such a sun is different from the bright luminary, at whose approach darkness flies, and winters retire.

Nor are *Lorenzo*, and his deistical friends hurt alone by your doctrinal mistakes. Ye, yourselves, probably feel the bad effects of your parting the gospel-axioms. It is hardly possible, that ye should take off the fore-wheels, or the hind wheels of the gospel-chariot, without retarding your own progress towards the new Jerusalem. To say nothing of your spiritual experiences, may I not inquire, if *Honestus*, after all his discourses on morality and charity, might not, in some instances, be a little more moral, or more extensively charitable, if not to the bodies, at least to the souls of his neighbours? And may I not ask *Zelotes*, if after all his encomiums upon Free-grace, he might not be a little more averse to narrowness of spirit, unscriptural positiveness, and self-selecting partiality;—a little less inclined to rash judging, contempt of his opponents, and free-wrath?

Should ye find, after close examination, that these are the mischievous consequences of your variance; and should ye desire to prevent them, ye need only go half way to meet and embrace each other. You, *Zelotes*, receive the important truth which *Honestus* defends, and in subordination to Christ and Free-grace, preach *Free-will*, without which there can be no acceptable obedience. And you, *Honestus*, espouse the delightful truth recommended by *Zelotes*. Preach *Free-grace*, without which *Free-will* can never be productive of sincere morality. So shall you vindicate morality and free-will with less offence to *Zelotes*, and with more success among your own admirers. In a word, instead of parting the two gospel-axioms, and filling the church with gnostics or formalists,—with antinomian believers, or faithless workers;—instead of tearing our Priest asunder from our King, and making christianity a laughing stock for infidels by
your

your perpetual divisions, admit the use of the *scripture-scales*;—contend for the faith once delivered to the faints; and, dropping your unreasonable, unscriptural objections against each other, seek hand in hand “*Fulsome*” the gross antinomian, and *Lorenzo* the immoral moralist; earnestly seek these lost sheep, which ye have inadvertently driven from the good Shepherd, and which now wander upon the dark mountains of immorality and scepticism. They may be brought back: They are not yet devoured by the roaring lion. If you will reclaim them; You, *Honestus*, calm the agitated breast of *Lorenzo*, and strengthen his feeble knees, by all the reviving, exhilarating truths of the *first* gospel-axiom. And you, *Zelotes*, instead of frightening him from these truths, by adulterating the genuine doctrine of *Free-grace* with loose, solidian tenets; or by slyly dropping into the cup of salvation which you offer him, poisonous drops of *Free-wrath*, *Calvinian reprobation*, and *necessary damnation*; recommend yourself to his reason and conscience by all the moral truths, which spring from the fitness of things, and the second gospel-axiom.—With regard to *Fulsome*, remember, O *Zelotes*, that you are commanded to *feed the fat with judgment*, and that Christ himself fed the ancient *Laodiceans* with that convenient food. Give therefore to this modern *Laodicean* CHIEFLY the gospel-truths which fill the second gospel-scale. But give them him in *full* weight. Let him have a good measure, pressed down, and running over into his antinomian bosom, till he *hold the truth in unrighteousness* no more. And that he may receive the WHOLE truth as it is in *Jesus*, be you persuaded, *Honestus*, to second *Zelotes*. Inforce your moral persuasions upon *Fulsome*, by all the weighty, evangelical arguments, which the *first* axiom suggests. So shall you break the force of his prejudices. He will see that *sincere obedience* is inseparable from *true faith*; and being taught by happy experience, he will soon acknowledge, that the doctrine of *Free-will* is as consistent with the doctrine of *Free-grace*, as the *free-re-*
turning

turning of our breath is consistent with the *free-drawing* of it. Thus ye will both happily concur in converting those whom ye have inadvertently perverted.

While, like faithful dispensers of gospel-truths, ye weigh in this manner to every one his portion of physick or food in due season, and in proper scales; our Lord, by lifting upon you the light of his pleased countenance, will make you sensible, that, in spirituals, as well as in temporals, *A false balance is an abomination to him; but a just weight is his delight.* Your honesty may indeed offend many of your admirers, and make you lose your popularity: But prefer the testimony of a good conscience, to popular applause; and the witness of God's spirit, to the praise of party-men. Nor be afraid to share the fate of our great Prophet, and of his blunt forerunner, who, by firmly standing to the gospel-axioms, lost their immense congregations and their life. *Christ* sell a sacrifice, not on'y to divine justice, but also to *Caiaphas's* pharisaic rage against the truths contained in the first scale: And *John* the Baptist had the honour of being beheaded, for bearing his bold testimony against the antinomianism of a professing prince, who *observed him, heard him gladly, and did many things.* O *Honestus*, O *Zelotes*, think it an honour to tread in the steps of these two martyred champions of Truth. Let them revive, and preach again, in you. Shrink not at the thought of the pharisaic contempt, and of the antinomian abuse, which await you, if you are determined to preach both the *anti-pharisaic* and the *anti-solifidian* part of the gospel. On the contrary: be ambitious to suffer something for him, who calls himself *the Truth*—for him, who suffered so much for you, and who for the joy of your salvation which was set before him, despised the shame, endured the Cross, and now sits at God's right hand, ready to reward your faithfulness with a crown of righteousness, life, and glory.

Ye should wade to that triple crown, through floods of persecution, and rivers of blood, if it were necessary. But God may not call you to suffer for your faithfulness.

faithfulness. And if he does, he will reward you, even in this life, with a double portion of peace and love. While the demon of discord sows the tares of division, and blows up the coals which bigotry has kindled, ye shall inherit the beatitude of peace-makers. The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall rest upon you, as it does upon all the sons of peace. And the delightful tranquillity restored to the church, shall flow back into your own souls, and be extended as a river to your families, and neighbourhood, which your opposite extremes have perhaps distracted.

What a glorious prospect rises before my exulting imagination! A holy, catholic church! A church, where the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, and the foretastes of eternal life, are constantly enjoyed: where swords are beat into reaping hooks; and where shouts for controversial engagements, are turned into songs of brotherly love!—To whom, next to God, are we obliged for this wonderful change? It is to you, *Zelotes*, whose intemperate zeal is now rectified by the judicious solidity of *Honestus*; and to you, *Honestus*, whose phlegmatic religion is now corrected by the fervour of *Zelotes*. Henceforth instead of contending with each other, ye amicably bear together the ark of the Lord. While ye triumphantly sustain the sacred load, and while christian psalmists joyfully sing, ‘Behold how good and pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity: Union is the refreshing dew which falls upon the hill of Sion, where the Lord promised his blessing, and life for evermore.’—While they sing this, I say, the thousands of Israel pass the waters of strife, and take possession of the land of Canaan—the spiritual kingdom of God. Their happiness is almost paradisaical: *The multitude of them that believe are of one heart and of one Soul:—They continue stedfastly in the apostles doctrine and fellowship—in breaking of bread and in prayers. They eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart: neither says any of them, that ought of the things which*

he possesse are his own: for they have all things comen: They are perfected in one. Truth has cast them into the mould of love. Their hearts and their language are no more divided. *They think and speak the same.* In a word, Babel is no more, and the new Jerusalem comes down from heaven.

O *Zelotes*, O *Honestus*, shall this pleasing prospect vanish away as the colours of the rain-bow? Will ye still make *Lorenzo* think, that the *Acts of the Apostles* are a religious novel? and the christian harmony there described, a delusive dream? O God of peace, truth, and love, suffer it not. Bless the scriptures, bless the arguments, which fill these pages. Give, O give me favour in the sight of the two antagonists, whom I address. Make me, unworthy as I am, the means of their lasting reconciliation. Remove their prejudices: Soften their hearts: Humble their minds; and endue me with the strength of a spiritual *Sampson*, that, taking these two pillars of our divisions in the arms of praying love, I may bend them towards each other, and press them, breast to breast, upon the line of moderation, till they become one with the truth, and one with each other.—When thou hadst prospered the endeavours of Abraham's servant, to the bringing about the marriage of Isaac and Rebecca, thou wroughtest new miracles. Thou didst melt angry Esau in the arms of trembling Jacob, and injured Joseph over the neck of his relenting brethren. Repeat, Good Lord, these ancient wonders: Show thyself still the God of all consolation. Let me not only succeed in asserting the evangelical marriage of condescending *Free-grace* and humble *Free-will*; but, also in reconciling the contentious divines, who rashly put asunder what thou hast so strongly joined together.

O *Zelotes!* O *Honestus!* my heart is enlarged towards you. It ardently desires the peace of Jerusalem and your own. If to day ye do not despise the *consistent* testimonies of the Fathers, and of our Reformers;—if to-day ye regard the whispers of reason,
and

and the calls of conscience;—if to-day ye reverence the sacrifices of the prophets, the assertions of the apostles, and the declarations of Jesus Christ:—*if to-day ye hear the voice of God speaking to you by the Spirit of Truth, and by the Prince of Peace; harden not your hearts.*—You, *Zelotes*, harden it not against Free-will, sincere obedience, and your brother *Honestus*. And you, *Honestus*, humbly bow to Free-grace, and kindly embrace your brother *Zelotes*. All things are now ready. Come together to the marriage of *Free-grace* and *Free-will*. Come to the feast of reconciliation. Jesus himself will be there to turn your bitter *waters of jealousy* into the generous wine of brotherly kindness. Too long have you begged to be excused; saying, “*I have married a wife—I have espoused a party, and therefore I cannot come.*” *Party-spirit* has seduced you: Put away that strumpet. *Espouse Truth*; embrace love; and you will soon give each other the right hand of fellowship.

I have gently drawn you both with the bands of a man—with rational arguments. I have morally compelled you with the Spirit's sword—the word of God. By the numerous and heavy weights, which fill these *scripture-scales*, I have endeavoured to turn the scale of the prejudices, which each of you has entertained against one of the gospel-axioms. But alas! my labour will be lost, if you are determined still to rise against that part of the truth, which each of you has hitherto defended. Come then, when reason invites, when revelation bids, when conscience urges, yield to my plea:—Nay, yield to the solicitations of *thousands*: For altho' I seem to mediate alone between you both, thousands of well-wishers to *Sion's* peace, thousands of moderate men, who mourn for the desolations of Jerusalem, with success to my mediation. Their good wishes support my pen: Their ardent prayers warm my soul: My love for peace grows importunate, and constrains me to redouble my intreaties. O *Zelotes*, O *Honestus*, by the names of *christians*, and *protestants*, which ye bear:—by your regard for the honour and

peace of *Sion*;—by the blessings promised to them that love her prosperity;—by the curses denounced against those who widen the breaches of her walls;—by the scandalous joy, which your injudicious contentions give to all the classes of infidels;—by the tears of undissembled sorrow, which God's dearest children shed in secret over the disputes which your mistaken zeal has raised, and which your obstinate opposition to a part of the truth continues to foment;—by your professed regard for the sacred book, which your divisions lacerate, and render contemptible;—by the worth of the souls, which you fill with prejudices against christianity;—by the danger of those, whom you have already driven into the destructive errors of the *antinomians* and of the *pharisees*;—by the Redeemer's seamless garment, which you rend from top to bottom;—by the insults, the blows, the wounds which *Christ PERSONAL*, received in the house of his jewish friends; and by those which *Christ DOCTRINAL*, daily receives at your own hands;—by the fear of being found proud despisers of one half of God's revealed decrees, and rebellious opposers of some of the Redeemer's most solemn proclamations;—by all the woes pronounced against the enemies of his royal crown, or of his bloody cross;—by the dreadful destruction which awaits *Antichrist*; whether he transforms himself into an angel of light, artfully to set aside *Christ's* righteous law; or whether he appears as a man of God, slyly to supersede *Christ's* gracious promises;—by the horrible curse which shall light on them, who, when they are properly informed, and lovingly warned, will nevertheless obstinately continue to weigh out in *false balances* the food of the poor, to whom the gospel is preached;—and, above all, by the matchless love of him who *was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself*, I intreat you, *suffer the word of reconciliation: Be ye reconciled to reason and conscience—to each other and to me—to all the bible and to primitive christianity—to Christ our KING and to Christ our PRIEST*, So shall all unprejudiced christi-
 ans

ans meet and embrace you both; upon the meridian of moderation and protestantism, which stands at an equal distance from antinomian dreams, and pharisaic delusions.

O Zelotes—O Honestus—mistaken servants of God; if there is any consolation in Christ; if any delight in truth; if any comfort of love; if any fellowship of the spirit; if any bowels of mercies, fulfil ye my joy, and the joy of all moderate men in the church militant; nay, fulfil ye the joy of saints and angels in the church triumphant; *Be ye like minded; having the same love; being of one accord, of one mind. Let nothing be done through strife, or vain glory; but, in lowliness of mind, let each esteem the other better than himself. Look not each on his own things [on the scriptures of his favourite scale:] but look also on the things of the other, on the passages which fill the scale defended by your brother.* Remember that if we have all faith, and all external works, without charity we are nothing. Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity seeketh not her own; charity rejoiceth not in iniquity and discord, but rejoiceth in the truth, even when truth bruises the head of our favorite serpent—our darling prejudice. Let then *charity, never-failing charity* perfect you both in one. Hang on this golden beam, and it will make you a couple of impartial, complete divines, holding together as closely, and balancing one another as evenly, as the concordant passages which form my *scripture-scales*.

My message respecting the equipoise of the gospel-axioms, I have endeavoured to deliver with the plainness, and earnestness, which the importance of the subject calls for: If, in doing it, my aversion to unscriptural extremes, and my love for peaceful moderation, have betrayed me into any unbecoming severity of thought, or asperity of expression, forgive me this wrong, which I never designed, and for which I would make you all possible satisfaction, if I were conscious of guilt in this respect. Ye are sensible, that I could not act as a *reconciler*, without doing first the

the office of an *expostulator*, and *reprover* :—An office this which is so much the more thankless, as our very friends are sometimes prone to suspect that we enter upon it, not so much to do them good, as to carry the mace of superiority, and indulge a restless, meddling, censorious, lordly disposition. If unfavorable appearances have represented me to you in these odious colours, give me leave to wipe them off, by cordial assurances of my esteem and respect for you. Yes, my dear, tho' mistaken brothers, I sincerely honour you both for the good which is in you; being persuaded that your mistakes spring from your religious prejudices, and not from a *conscious* enmity against any part of the truth. When I have been obliged to *expose* your *partiality*, I have comforted myself with the pleasing thought, that it is a *partiality* to an important *part* of the gospel. The meek and lowly Saviour, in whose steps I desire to tread, teaches me to honour you for the *part* of the truth which you embrace, and forbids me to despise you, for that which you cannot yet see it your duty to espouse. Nay, so far as ye have defended *Free-grace* without annihilating *Free-will*, or contended for *Free-will* without undervaluing *Free-grace*, ye have done the duty of evangelists in the midst of this *pharisaic* and *antinomian* generation. For this ye both deserve the thanks of every bible-christian, and I publicly return you mine. Yes, so far as *Zelotes* has built the *right* wing of Christ's palace, without pulling down the *left*; and so far as *Honestus* has raised the *left* wing, without demolishing the *right*; I acknowledge that ye are both ingenious and laborious architects, and I shall think myself highly honoured, if, like an under-labourer, I am permitted to wait upon you, and to bring you some rational and scriptural materials, that you may build the temple of gospel-truth with more solidity, more evangelical symmetry, and more brotherly love, than you have yet done.

God only knows what contemptible thoughts I have of myself. It is better to spread them before him, than

to

to do it before you. This only I will venture to say: In a thousand respects I see myself vastly inferior to either of you. If I have presumed to uncover your theological sores, and to pour into them some tincture of myrrh and aloes, it is no proof that I prefer myself to you. A surgeon may open an impostume in a royal breast, and believe that he understands the use of his scissors and probe better than the king, without entertaining the least idea of his being the king's superior. If I have made a PAIR of scripture-scales, which weigh gospel-gold better than your SINGLE SCALES; it no more follows, that I esteem myself your superior, than it follows that an artist who makes scales to weigh common gold, esteems himself superior to the ministers of state, because he understands scale-making better than they.

Horace will help me to illustrate the consistency of my reproofs to you, with my professions of respect for you. I consider you, *Zelotes*, as an one-edged sword, which cuts down the *pharisaic* error; and you, *Honestus*, as an one-edged scymetar, which hews the *antinomian* mistakes in pieces: but I want to see you both as the Lord's *two-edged sword*; and I have indulged my *Alpine* roughness, in hopes, that, [thro' the concurrence of your candour with the divine blessing, which I implore on these pages] you will be ground to the other edge you want. This, ye know, cannot be done without some close rubbing: and therefore, while ye glitter in the field of action, let not your displeasure arise against a grinding stone cut from the neighbourhood of the *Alps*, and providentially brought into a corner of your church, where it wears itself away in the thankless office of grinding you both, that each of you may be as dreadful to *antinomianism* and to *pharisaism*, as the cherub's *flaming sword, which turned, and cut every way*, was terrible to the two first offenders. So shall ye keep the way to the tree of life in an evangelical manner; and instead of triumphing over you, as I go the dull
round.

round of my controversial labour, I shall adopt the poet's humble saying :

Fungor vice cotis, acutum
Reddere quæ ferrum valet, exors ipsa secandi.

*Not that I dare to flaming zeal pretend,
But only boast to be the gospel's friend;
To what you both to act, and, like the hone,
Give others edge, tho' I myself have none.*

Or rather, considering what the prophet says of the impartial hand which weighed feasting Belshazzar, and wrote his awful doom upon the wall that faced him, I will pray; ' O God be merciful to me, a sinner; and when I turn my face to the wall on my dying bed, let not my knees smite one against the other at the sight of the killing word, TŒKEL :. Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. Let me not be found wanting either the testimony of thy Free-grace thro' faith, or the testimony of a good conscience thro' the works of faith. So shall the Spirit of thy Free-grace bear witness with my free-willing spirit, that I am a child of thine, that I have kept the faith, and that in the great day, when I shall be weighed in the balances of the sanctuary, I shall be found a JUSTIFIED SINNER, according to the ANTI-PHARISAIC weights, which fill the first scripture-scale; and a JUSTIFIED BELIEVER, according to the ANTI-SOLIPSI-DIAN weights, which fill the second.'

THE END.

A S U P P L E M E N T

T O S E C T I O N VIII.

(E N D I N G A T P A G E 67.)

Z E L O T E S founds one of his mistakes chiefly upon three texts, which it may be proper more fully to balance here, on account of the undue stress which he lays upon them.

1. I have suffered the loss of all things for Christ, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, NOT HAVING ON MINE OWN [*pharisaic, external*] R I G H T E O U S N E S S, which is of the [*letter of the Mosaic*] law. — [*that antichristian righteousness touching which I was blameless, when I breathed out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord.*] Compare Phil. iii. 9, with Phil. iii. 6, and Acts ix. 1.

2. Thou meetest him that rejoiceth, and worketh R I G H T E O U S N E S S. Is. lxiiv. 5.—Blessed are they who are persecuted for R I G H T E O U S N E S S S A K E: [*that is, for the good they do; it being absurd to suppose, that the wicked will persecute the righteous for the good which Christ did 1750 years ago.*] Mat. v. 10.—Solomon said, Thou hast shewed to David my father great mercy, ACCORDING AS he walked before thee IN T R U T H A N D R I G H T E O U S N E S S, and in uprightness of heart with thee. I

Kings iii. 6.—He shall pray unto God, and he will be favourable unto him:—for he will render unto man HIS R I G H T E O U S N E S S. Job xxxiii. 26.—O man of God, flee these things [*hurtful lusts*] and follow after R I G H T E O U S N E S S, godliness, &c.—lay hold on eternal life. 1 Tim. vi. 11, 12.—Who, thro' faith WROUGHT R I G H T E O U S N E S S, Heb. xi. 33.—I have sought

fought the good fight, I have kept the faith [*that worketh by righteous love,*] &c. HENCEFORTH there is laid up for ME a crown of RIGHTEOUSNESS, 2 TİM. iv. 7, 8.—SOW TO YOURSELVES IN RIGHTEOUSNESS, reap in mercy. Hof. x. 12.—If the man be poor, thou shalt—deliver him his pledge again, that he may sleep in his own raiment and bless thee; and IT shall be RIGHTEOUSNESS UNTO THEE BEFORE THE LORD THY GOD. DEUT. xxiv. 12, 13.—MY RIGHTEOUSNESS I hold fast, and will not let it go. Job xxvii. 6.—Blessed is he—that DOES RIGHTEOUSNESS at all times. Ps. cvi. 3.—Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly, and WORKETH RIGHTEOUSNESS. Ps. xv. 1, 2.—RIGHTEOUSNESS delivereth from death.—The wicked shall fall by his own wickedness. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE UPRIGHT shall deliver them. PROV. xi. 4, 5, 6.—Ye are his servants whom YE obey, whether of sin unto death, or of OBEDIENCE UNTO RIGHTEOUSNESS. Rom. vi. 16.—He that ministereth seed to the sower, &c. increase the fruit of YOUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. 2 Cor. ix. 10. He hath given to the poor, HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS remaineth for ever, Ibid. verse 9.—If the wicked will turn from all his sins, &c. and keep all my statutes, &c. all his transgressions shall not be mentioned unto him: in HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS THAT HE HATH DONE, he shall LIVE. Ez. xviii. 21, 22.—That ye may be sincere, and without offence, being filled with THE FRUITS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS, which are by Jesus Christ to the glory of God, Phil. i. 10, 11.—Except YOUR RIGHTEOUSNESS shall exceed the righteousness of the pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven, Mat. v. 20.—Little children, let no man deceive you, he that DOES RIGHTEOUSNESS is righteous, even AS HE [Christ] IS RIGHTEOUS. 1 John iii. 7. [Now Christ is righteous in reality, and not by antinomian imputation.]

They who suppose therefore, that St. Paul prays, he might not be found before God in HIS OWN evangelic
gelical

pelical righteousness, or in HIS OWN personal obedience of faith, make him deceive his own soul, and contradict not only the prophets, but himself, St. John, and Jesus Christ.

1. Them that have obtained like precious faith with us, thro' the righteousness [*i. e. thro' the righteous mercy and truth*] of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. 2 Pet. i. 1.

2. I the Lord speak RIGHTEOUSNESS, I declare things that are RIGHT Isa. XLV. 19 — In thy FAITHFULNESS, answer me, AND IN THY RIGHTEOUSNESS. Ps. cxliii. The wrath of man worketh

not THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD. Jam. i. 20. — Seek ye first the kingdom of God and HIS [God's] RIGHTEOUSNESS [that is, according to the context, Seek ye poverty of spirit, and the holiness described in the sermon on the mount.] Mat. vi. 33. — It had been better for them not to have known THE WAY OF RIGHTEOUSNESS, than after they have known it to turn from the HOLY COMMANDMENT delivered unto them. 2 Pet. ii. 21. — By faith Noah moved with fear PREPARED AN ARK &c, [*i. e. obeyed*] by the which he, &c. became heir of THE RIGHTEOUSNESS WHICH IS BY FAITH. Heb. xi. 7. Thus says the Lord, thy Redeemer; — O that thou hadst HEARKENED TO MY COMMANDMENTS! then had thy peace been as a river, and THY RIGHTEOUSNESS as the waves of the sea. Isa. xlviii. 17, 18. — My RIGHTEOUSNESS shall answer for me [*Jacob*] in time to come, Gen. xxx. 33. — Noah was a just [*righteous*] man and perfect in his generations, and Noah WALKED with God. — And the Lord said to Noah, Come thou &c. into the ark, FOR THEE HAVE I SEEN RIGHTEOUS BEFORE ME in this generation. Gen. vi. 9. — vii. 1.

1. We pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God: for he hath made him to be SIN [*that is, a sin-offering*] for us, who knew no sin; that we might be

2. His own self BARE OUR SINS in his own body on the tree, THAT we being dead to sin, should LIVE TO RIGHTEOUSNESS, 1 Pet. ii. 24. — I will K'k" make

he made THE RIGHTEOUS-
NESS of God in him, 2Cor.
v. 20, 21.

make thy officers peace,
and thy exacters RIGH-
TEOUSNESS. Is. lx. 17.—
All thy commandments

are RIGHTEOUSNESS. Ps. cxix. 172.— Him that
saith unto the wicked, thou art RIGHTEOUS, him shall
the people curse, nations shall abhor him. Prov.
xxiv. 24.— Put on the new man, which after God
is created in RIGHTEOUSNESS and true holiness. Eph.
iv. 24.— Christ gave himself for us that he might re-
deem us from all iniquity, and [*make us the righ-
teousness of God in himself, or to speak without a
figure*] purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous
of good works. Tit. ii. 14.— He hath raised up an
horn of salvation for us—to perform the mercy pro-
mised, that we, &c. [*might be made the righteousness
of God, or, as Zacharias expresses it*] that we might
serve him without fear; in holiness and RIGHTEOUS-
NESS before him all the days of our life. Luke i.
69, 72, 74, 75.

I hope, the balance of the preceding scriptures
abundantly shows, that Zelotes mistakes the genuine
obvious meaning of Phil. iii. 9, 2 Pet. i. 1. and 2
Cor. v. 21, when he supposes that these passages e-
vince the truth of the *antinomian* imputation of righ-
teousness, which he so strenuously contends for. Should
there be any other passage of this nature, which has
escaped my notice; I beg that Zelotes's admirers
will not impute the omission to disingenuity; my sin-
cere desire being to do justice to every portion of the
scripture, and not artfully to conceal any part of the
anti-pharisaic and anti-solifidian truth.

End of the Supplement.

APPEN-

 APPENDIX to Page 300.

Containing Dr. Whitby's testimony concerning the antiquity of the doctrine of FREE-WILL, evangelically connected with the doctrines of Free-grace and Just-wrath; with some remarkable quotations from the Fathers.

SINCE the preceding pages have been printed, providence has thrown in my way Dr. *Whitby's Discourse* on the points of doctrine which are balanced in the Scripture-scales. He highly deserves a place among the modern divines who confirm the contents of Sect. xxi, concerning the antiquity of the doctrine of *Free-will*, evangelically-connected with the doctrines of *Free-grace* and *Just-wrath*. I therefore produce here the following extract from his useful book: Second Edition, printed in London, 1735.

In the preface, page 3, he says, with respect to the leading doctrines of election and reprobation, in which he entirely dissents from Calvin, ' I found I
 ' still sailed with the stream of antiquity, seeing only
 ' one, St. Augustin, with his two boatswains, *Prosper*
 ' and *Fulgentius*, tugging hard against it, and often
 ' driven back into it by the strong current of scrip-
 ' ture, reason, and common sense.' As a proof of this, the Doctor produces, among many more, the following quotations from the Fathers, which I transcribe only in English; referring those who will see the greek or latin, to the Doctor's discourses, where the books, the pages, and the very words of the Fathers, are quoted.

Page 95, &c. Dr. Whitby says, ' They [the Fathers]
 ' unanimously declare, that God hath left in the
 ' power of man, *To turn to vice or virtue*, says JUSTIN
 ' MARTYR:—*To chuse or to refuse faith and obedience,*
 ' *to believe or not*, say IRENEUS, CLEMENS Alexan-
 ' drinus

• drinus, TERTULLIAN, and St. CYPRIAN : — That
 • every one &c. renders himself either righteous or dis-
 • obedient, says CLEMENS of Alexandria.—That God
 • hath left it in our own power to turn to, or from
 • good — to be good or bad, to do what is righteous or
 • unrighteous. So ATHANASIUS, EPIPHANIUS, MA-
 • CARIUS, St. CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, and CY-
 • RIL of Alexandria. — That our happiness or punish-
 • ment depends on our own choice; That it is our own
 • choice to be an holy seed. or the contrary; to fall
 • into hell, or enjoy the kingdom, to be children of the
 • night or of the day; — By virtue to be God's, or by wick-
 • edness to be the devil's children; so CYRIL of Jerusa-
 • lem, BASIL, CHRYSOSTOM, and GREGORY Nyssen.
 • That we are vessels of wrath or of mercy from our
 • own choice, every one preparing himself to be a vessel
 • of wrath from his own wicked inclination; or to be
 • a vessel of divine love by faith, because they have
 • rendered themselves fit for [rewarding] 'mercy. So
 • ORIGEN, MACARIUS, CHRYSOSTOM, ŒCUMENI-
 • US, and THEOPHILACT.'

Page 336, &c. The Doctor has the following
 words, and striking quotations. — 'All these argu-
 • ments' [for the freedom of the will of man] 'are
 • strongly confirmed by the concurrent suffrage, and
 • the express and frequent declarations of the Fathers.
 • — Thus JUSTIN MARTYR having told us, that
 • man would not be worthy of praise or recompence,
 • did he not chuse good of himself, nor worthy of
 • punishment for doing evil, if he did not this † of
 • himself, says, This the Holy Spirit hath taught us by
 • Moses

† This good Father, to guard the doctrine of grace as well as
 that of justice, should have observed, that Free-grace is the *first cause*,
 and Free-will the *second*, in our choice of moral good; but that Free-
 will is the *first cause* in our choice of moral evil. Forgetting to make
 these little distinctions, he has given the Calvinists just room to com-
 plain, and has afforded the Pelagians a precedent to bear hard upon
 the doctrine of grace. Should some prejudiced reader think, that this
 doctrine ascribes too much to man, because it makes Free-will a
first

Moses in these words; See, I have set before thee good and evil; chuse the good. — CLEMENS Alexandrinus says, *The prophecy of Isaiah saith, IF YOU BE WILLING, &c. demonstrating that both the choice and the refusal, (viz. of faith and obedience, of which he there speaketh) are in our own power.* — TERTULLIAN pronounces them *unsound in the faith, corrupters of the christian discipline, and excusers of all sin, who so refer all things to the will of God, by saying nothing is done without his appointment, as that we cannot understand that any thing is left to ourselves to do.* — St. CYPRIAN proves [*Credendi vel non credendi libertatem in arbitrio positam*] *that to believe or not, was left to our own free choice, from Deut. xxx. 19, and Isa. i. 19.* — THEODORET having cited these words of Christ, *If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink,* adds, *Ten thousand things of this nature may be found both in the gospels, and other writings of the apostles, clearly manifesting the liberty and self-election of the nature of man.* — St. CHRYSOSTOM speaks thus, *God saith, IF YOU WILL, and IF YOU WILL NOT, giving us power, and putting it in our own option to be virtuous or vicious.* The Devil saith, *Thou canst not avoid thy fate:* God saith, *I have put before thee fire and*
K. k. 3.
water.

first cause in the choice of moral evil: I answer two things: (1) To make God the *first cause* of moral evil is to turn *Manichee*, and assert, that there is an *evil*, as well as a *good principle* in the Godhead. (2) When we say, that *Free-will* chuses moral evil of itself, without necessity, and is, of consequence, the *first cause* of its own evil choice; we do not mean that *Free-will* is its own *first cause*. No: God made the free-willing soul, and freely endued man with the power of chusing without necessity. Thus God's supremacy is fully secured: If therefore, in the day of probation, we have the east, when good and evil are set before us; our *Free-will* is not placed on a level with God by this tremendous power; but we place ourselves voluntarily UNDER the rewarding sceptre of *Free-grace*, or the iron-rod of *Just-wrath*. By this means, God maintains both his sovereignty as a king, and his justice as a judge: while man is still a subject fit to be graciously rewarded or justly punished, according to the doctrines of *Free-grace* and *Just-wrath*.

* water, life and death, stretch forth thy hand to whome-
 * ther of them thou wilt. The Devil says, *It is not in*
 * *thee to stretch forth thy hand to them.* — St. AUSTIN
 * proves from those words of Christ, *Make the tree*
 * *good, &c. or make the tree evil* [in nostra potestate
 * situm esse mutare voluntatem] *that it is put in our*
 * *own power to change the will.* It would be endless
 * to transcribe all that the Fathers say upon this
 * head. — ORIGEN is also copious in this assertion ;
 * for, having cited those words, *And now, Israel,*
 * *what does the Lord thy God require of thee?* he
 * adds, *Let them blush at these words, who deny that*
 * *man has free-will. How could God require that of*
 * *man, which he had not in his power to offer him?* And
 * again : *The soul, saith he, does not incline to either*
 * *part out of necessity, for then neither vice nor virtue*
 * *could be ascribed to it ; nor would its choice of virtue*
 * *deserve reward ; nor its declination to vice, punishment.*
 * *But the liberty of the will is preserved in all things,*
 * *that it may incline to what it will ; as it is written,*
 * *Behold, I have set before thee life and death.* St.
 * AUGUSTIN also, from many passages in which
 * the scripture saith, *Do not so or so ; or do this or*
 * *that,* lays down this general rule, *That all such*
 * *places sufficiently demonstrate the liberty of the will ;*
 * and this he saith against them [qui sic gratiam dei
 * defendunt, ut negent liberum arbitrium] *who so-*
 * *asserted the grace of God, as to deny the liberty of the*
 * *will.*

Page 340. ‘ They’ [the Fathers] ‘ add, that all
 * God’s commands and prohibitions, &c. would be
 * vain and unreasonable, and all his punishments
 * unjust and his rewards groundless, if man, after
 * the fall, had not still the liberty to do what is com-
 * manded, and forbear what is forbidden. For, saith
 * St. AUSTIN, *The divine precepts would profit none, if*
 * *they had not Free-will, by which they doing them,*
 * *might obtain the promised rewards, &c. These precepts*
 * *cut off men’s excuse from ignorance, &c. but then,*
 * *Because others, saith he, accuse God of being wanting*

in giving them power to do good, or inducing them to
 sin; against these men he cites that known passage
 of the Son of Sirach, *God left man in the hands of his
 counsel, if he would to keep the commandments, &c.*
 And then cries out, *Behold, here, a very plain proof
 of the liberty of the human will! &c.* for, how does
 he command, if man hath not Free will or power to
 obey? — What do all God's commands shew, but the
 Free will of man? For they would not be commanded,
 if man had not that freedom of will by which he could
 obey them. And therefore in his book *De fide*, against
 the Manichees, who denied that man had Free-will,
 and that it was in his power to do well or ill, he
 makes this an indication of their blindness: *Who,*
saith he, will not cry out, that it is silly to command
him who has not liberty to do what is commanded; and
that it is unjust to condemn him, who has it not in his
power to do what is required? And yet these miserable
men [the Manichees] *understand not that they as-*
cribe this wickedness and injustice to God. — CLEMENS
 of Alexandria declares, that neither praises nor
 reprehensions, rewards or punishments are just, if the
 soul has not the power of chusing or abstaining, but
 evil is involuntary. Yea, he makes this the very
 foundation of salvation, without which there could be
 neither any reasonable baptism, nor divine ordering of
 our natures, because faith would not be in our own
 power. — The soul, says ORIGEN, acts by her own
 choice, and it is free for her to incline to whatever
 part she will; and therefore God's judgment of her
 is just, because of her own accord she complies with
 good or bad monitors. — One of these two things is
 necessary, saith EPIPHANIUS, either that, a necessity
 arising from our being born, there should be no judge-
 ment, because men act not freely; and if laws be justly
 made by God, and punishments threatened to, and inflict-
 ed on the wicked, and God's judgments be according to
 truth, there is no fate, for therefore is one punished for
 his sins, and another praised for his good works, be-
 cause

' cause he has it in his power to sin or not. — For *hobbs*,
 ' says *THEODORET*, can he justly punish a nature' [with
 endless torments] ' which had no power to do good, but
 ' was bound in the bonds of wickedness. And again,
 ' God having made the rational nature with power over
 ' its own actions, averts men from evil things, and pro-
 ' vokes them to do what is good by laws and exhorta-
 ' tions, but he does not necessitate the unwilling to em-
 ' brace what is better, that he may not overturn the
 ' bounds of nature. Innumerable are the passages
 ' of this nature, which might be cited from the
 ' Fathers.'

Page 36r, &c. The Doctor produces again many
 quotations from the Fathers, in defence of liberty.
 Take some of them. ' *JUSTIN MARTYR* argues, — If
 ' man has not power by his free choice to avoid evil,
 ' and to chuse the good, he is unblameable whatsoever he
 ' does. — *ORIGEN*, in his dissertation against Fate,
 ' declares that, the assertors of it do free men from all
 ' fault, and cast the blame of all the evil that is done
 ' upon God. — *EUSEBIUS* declares, that This opinion
 ' absolves sinners, as doing nothing on their own accords
 ' which was evil; and would cast all the blame of all
 ' the wickedness committed in the world upon God and
 ' upon his providence. — That men lie under no necessity
 ' from God's foreknowledge [which was of old the
 ' chief argument of the fatalists, espoused of late by
 ' Mr. Hobbs, and is still made the refuge of the pre-
 ' destinarians] may be thus proved, saith *ORIGEN*;
 ' because the prophets are exhorted in the scripture to call
 ' men to repentance, and to do this in such words, as if
 ' it were unknown whether they would turn to God, or
 ' would continue in their sins; as in those words of
 ' *Jeremiah*, Perhaps they will hear, and turn every
 ' man from his evil way: and this is said, not that
 ' God understood not whether they would do this or not,
 ' but to demonstrate the almost equal balance of their
 ' power so to do, and that they might not despond; or re-
 ' mit of their endeavours by an imagination that God's
 ' foreknowledge laid a necessity upon them, as not leaving

' it in their power to turn, and so was the cause of their
 ' sin.— If men, says CHRYSOSTOM, do pardon their fel-
 ' low men, when they are necessitated to do a thing, much
 ' more should this be done to men compelled by fate' [or
 ' by decrees] ' to do what they do; for if it be absurd
 ' to punish them, who by the force of barbarians are com-
 ' pelled to any action, it must be more so to punish him
 ' who is compelled by a stronger power. — If fate be esta-
 ' blished, says EUSEBIUS, philosophy and piety are over-
 ' thrown.'

Page 364, the Doctor adds: ' Tho' there is in the
 ' rational soul a power to do evil, it is not evil on that
 ' account, saith DIDYMU Alexandrinus, but be-
 ' cause she will freely use that power: and this is not
 ' only ours, but the opinion of ALL who speak orthodoxly of
 ' rational beings. — St. AUGUSTIN lays down this, as
 ' the true definition of sin: Sin is the will to obtain or
 ' retain, that which justice forbids, and from which IT
 ' IS FREE for us to abstain. Whence he concludes,
 ' that No man is worthy of dispraise or punishment, for
 ' not doing that, which he HAS NOT POWER to do: and
 ' that if sin be worthy of dispraise and punishment, it is
 ' not to be doubted, tunc esse peccatum cum et liberum
 ' est nolle,' [that our choice is sin, when we are free
 ' not to make that choice.] ' These things, saith he, the
 ' shepherds sing upon the mountains, and the poets in the
 ' theatres, and the unlearned in their assemblies, and the
 ' learned in the libraries, and the doctors in the schools,
 ' and the bishops in the churches, and mankind through-
 ' out the whole earth.'

I conclude this extract by accounting for St. Au-
 gustin's inconsistency. He was a warm man. And such
 men, when they write much, and do not yet firmly
 stand upon the line of moderation, are apt to contra-
 dict themselves, as often as they use the armour of
 righteousness on the *right* hand and on the *left*, to
 oppose contrary errors. Hence it is, that when St. Au-
 gustin opposes the Manichees, who were rigid bound-
 willers, he strongly maintained Free-will with *Pelagius*;
 and when he opposed the Pelagians, who were rigid
 free.

free-willers, he strongly maintained bound-will and necessity with *Manes*. The scripture-doctrine of Free-will lies between the error of *Pelagius* and that of *Manes*. The middle way between these extremes is, I hope, clearly pointed out in Section xx. — Upon the whole, he must be perverse, who can cast his eyes upon the numerous quotations which Dr. *Whitby* has produced, and deny that the Fathers held the doctrine of the Scripture-scales with respect to *Free-will*; and that, if they leaned to one extreme, it was rather to that of the Pelagians, than to that of the rigid bound-willers, who clothe their favourite doctrine of necessity with the specious names of invincible *Fate*, irrevocable *Decrees*, or absolute *Predestination*.

End of the Appendix.

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

THE KEY to the controversy, which is designed to be ended by the *Scripture-scales*, proving too long for this place, the publication of it is postponed. It may one day open the way for *An Essay on the XVIIth Article*, under the following title:

The Doctrines of *Grace* reconciled to the Doctrines of *Justice*.

B E I N G

An Essay on Election and Reprobation,

In which the defects of *Pelagianism*, *Calvinism*, and *Arminianism*, are impartially pointed out, and primitive, scriptural harmony is more fully restored to the gospel of the day.

In the mean time, to supply the want of the *Key*, the reader is presented with the following *Copious Index*.

A C O-

A C O P I O U S
I N D E X
T O T H E
S C R I P T U R E - S C A L E S .

IN the ADVERTISEMENT prefixed to the first part, and in the EXPLANATION prefixed to the second part, the names *Zelotes*, *Honestus*, &c. and the words *Pharisaism*, *Antinomianism*, &c. are explained.

F I R S T P A R T .

P R E F A C E .

	Page
Description of a true protestant — —	ii
Some Account of the Scripture-scales — —	iv
The Author's three protests — —	xi
He expresses his respect for his opponents	xiii, xix
[See also on this head] — —	214, 387
Strictures upon the <i>Three Letters</i> of Rich. Hill, Esq; xv	

S E C T I O N I .

The cause of the misunderstandings of <i>pious</i> protestants — —	1
A view of the GOSPEL AXIOMS; or <i>Weights of the Sanctuary</i> , which the Reconciler uses to weigh the <i>Doctrines of GRACE</i> and the <i>Doctrines of JUSTICE</i> — —	2, 11
The contrary mistakes of <i>Zelotes</i> and <i>Honestus</i> —	3
They are invited to weigh their Doctrine in the Scripture-scales — —	5
Directions to use them properly — —	7

S E C T I O N II .

General Remarks on <i>Free-grace</i> and <i>Free-will</i> -	9
---	---

SALVATION

	Page
SALVATION is originally of <i>Free grace</i> , DAMNATION of <i>Free-will</i> — — —	12
SECTION III.	
Scripture-principles forming the beam of the scripture scales — — —	14
The three chains by which they hang —	16
A rational account of the origin of evil —	17
SECTION IV.	
An account of the covenant of works, and that of grace — — —	19
Eternal salvation and damnation have two causes	20
The glory of <i>Christ</i> , of <i>first Causes</i> , and of <i>original merit</i> , is balanced with the importance of <i>Obedience</i> , <i>second Causes</i> , and <i>derived worthiness</i>	21
SECTION V.	
The importance of <i>faith</i> is balanced with that of <i>works</i> — — —	27
SECTION VI.	
The law is made for <i>believers</i> as well as for <i>unbelievers</i> — — —	22
It is absurd to make believers afraid of obeying the ten commandments in order to eternal salvation — — —	33
The Decalogue was a rule of judgment for <i>jewish</i> believers. How far it binds <i>christian</i> believers — — —	34
The Decalogue is not the Adamic law of innocence, but the <i>jewish</i> edition of the Mediator's practicable law: This is proved by ten arguments — — —	35—43
This Doctrine is held by unprejudiced Calvinists	40
Flavel's important distinction to solve the difficulties, which arise from the vague meaning of the word <i>law</i> in St. Paul's Epistles — — —	41
The difference between the old [<i>jewish</i>] covenant, and the new [<i>christian</i>] covenant —	43
A parallel between mount <i>Sinai</i> and mount <i>Sion</i>	46
The <i>Blessings</i> of Moses, and the <i>Curjes</i> of Christ	49

S E C-

SECTION VII.		Page
Obedience to the law of Christ is [under Christ] the way to eternal salvation — —		52
<i>Faith</i> and <i>free-grace</i> are balanced with <i>works</i> and <i>free-will</i> — — — —		53
The sum of the scriptures concerning the moral law — — — —		58
SECTION VIII.		
Christ's work is balanced with our own.—Christ's Free-grace saves us. Our Free-will <i>subordinately</i> works out our own salvation — —		59
<i>Christ's</i> original righteousness is balanced with <i>our own</i> derived righteousness — — — —		389
SECTION IX.		
General redemption, which is the most wonderful work of <i>Free-grace</i> , is balanced with the obstinate neglect of that redemption, which neglect is the most astonishing work of <i>Free-will</i> — — — —		69
How all men are <i>temporally</i> redeemed by Christ's blood; and why some men are not <i>eternally</i> redeemed by his spirit — — — —		69
All men have an interest in Christ under various dispensations of grace, till they are judicially and finally given up to a reprobate mind. —		74
From general Redemption flow general, sincere, and rational gospel-calls, commands, entreaties, &c. The power of these calls of <i>free-grace</i> , is balanced with the power of <i>free-will</i> — —		76
There is not one text in all the bible against <i>general</i> redemption by <i>price</i> — — — —		81
<i>Augustin</i> and <i>Calvin</i> were at times carried away by the scriptures which assert <i>this</i> general redemption — — — —		82
In what sense Christ did <i>not pray for the world</i> —		84
In what sense some people are particularly <i>redeemed out of every nation</i> — — — —		87
How Christ could shed his blood for Judas who was in hell; and for David, who was in heaven — — — —		89
L I		The

The temporal *redemption* of all men is no more inconsistent with divine wisdom, than their *creation* — — — 89

SECTION X.

Some passages, which are generally pressed into the service of *bound will, free wrath, and necessitating grace*, are balanced with other scriptures, which explain them, and guard the doctrine of *free-will* — — — 91

The Calvinian *ordaining* of some souls to eternal life, is an unscriptural tenet; with a *note*, in which the frivolousness of the Rev. Mr. *Maddan's* plea for that dangerous doctrine is shown by ten arguments — — — 94, 139

The Father peculiarly gives to the Son the souls who submit to his paternal drawings, and are faithful to their dawning light — 99, 106, 108

How of those whom the Father gave to Christ, Judas was lost, that the scripture might be fulfilled — — — 101

Why the obstinate Jews could not believe, and why they were none of Christ's sheep — 104

Inattention to the doctrine of the various dispensations of God's grace, misleads the defenders of the adulterated doctrines of grace — 109

The doctrine of the dispensations is scriptural - 110

SECTION XI.

Five couple of balanced propositions to throw light upon Rom. ix. — — — 112

St. Paul does not establish *Calvinian* election and reprobation in Rom. ix. — — — 113

What election and calling, he contends for in that chapter — — — 114

Calvin mistook the sense of that chapter, because he overlooked the beginning and the end of it; two keys these, which, together with Rom. xi. 13, &c. open the apostle's meaning 113, 120, 121

The election of *grace* implies an harmless reprobation of inferior grace — — — 117

Why

	Page
Why St. Paul mentioned the cases of Ishmael and Esau	118
The reprobation of <i>justice</i> , which is caused by obstinate unbelief and disobedience, is most judiciously intanced in Pharaoh	119
In what sense God raised up Pharaoh to show forth his power in him	120
The election of <i>grace</i> is balanced with the election of <i>justice</i>	124
A specimen of Mr. Henry's inconsistent exposition of Rom. ix.	125
How the purpose of God, according to the election of grace, does not stand of works but of distinguishing grace [Note].	127
In what sense Esau was <i>hated</i>	128
A view of God's judicial hardening, which flows from the reprobation of justice	129
God has a right to keep some men absolutely out of the covenant of peculiarity, according to the election and reprobation of distinguishing favour; in which case, he acts with <i>sovereign</i> grace, as a supreme and wise Benefactor, who could not possibly bestow his <i>peculiar</i> benefits upon all. In this sense he makes a christian comparatively a <i>vessel to honour</i> ; ordering that a jew, who was before the honourable vessel, shall be a vessel of comparative dishonour	128-131
God has a right, as supreme lawgiver, not only judicially to give up obstinate unbelievers to their voluntary hardness, according to the election and reprobation of sovereign justice; but also to appoint that such obstinate unbelievers, such imitators of Pharaoh, shall be vessels of wrath self-fitted for destruction	131, 132, 135, 136
God is the righteous author of the <i>natural</i> evil of <i>punishment</i> , when man's self-perverted free-will has been the author of the <i>moral</i> evil of <i>disobedience</i>	137
The translators of our bible improperly insinuate, that the wicked are <i>appointed to be disobedient</i>	138, 94
L. 1 2	How

	Page
How the Lord said to Shimei, <i>Curse David.</i> —	140
How God punished David by no longer restraining Absalom — — —	141
How God caused the Egyptians to <i>hate</i> his people — — —	ib.
Whether the Lord <i>deceived</i> Jeremiah — — —	142
Calvinian election is as subversive of the scripture, as Calvinian reprobation — — —	143

S E C T I O N XII.

There is an unconditional election of sovereign grace, and a conditional election of impartial justice — — —	146
Ten directions to understand the doctrine of election — — —	147
The doctrine of the unconditional election and reprobation of <i>grace</i> , is illustrated by St. Paul's account of the various classes of vessels in God's house, which vessels are <i>comparatively</i> honourable or dishonourable — — —	153
The same doctrine is farther illustrated by God's absolute election of some of his servants, to receive a greater number of talents; and by his absolute reprobation of others of his servants from that greater number of talents, agreeably to the parable of the talents — — —	155
The remunerative election, and the retributive reprobation of <i>justice</i> , are both illustrated by the latter part of the parable of the talents —	156
That parable is considered as it is connected with the parable of the virgins, and the account of the day of judgment — — —	159
A balanced view of the scriptures, which assert our election of <i>GRACE</i> , and our election of <i>JUSTICE in Christ</i> — — —	160

S E C T I O N XIII.

Our election and calling in Christ, which is maintained in Eph. i, is not a being calvinistically ordained and called to eternal life, from among myriads of men unconditionally reprobated from eternal life, and absolutely ordained to eternal

eternal death: but a being chosen and called from the <i>darkness</i> of gentilism, and from the <i>obscurity</i> of Judaism, to the comparatively- <i>marvellous light</i> of the christian dispensation. The proofs of this assertion are taken from St. Paul's own words to the Ephesians	—	163
The genuine sense of Eph. i.	—	166
This sense is confirmed by the concessions of some Calvinist-commentators	—	168
How much Rom. ix, and Eph. i, are wrested from their apostolic meaning	—	170, 171
The accounts of the book of life are cast into the scales, and the balance proves the scriptural elections of free-grace and impartial justice, and disproves the Calvinian election of <i>lawless</i> grace, and the reprobation of <i>free-wrath</i>	—	172

S E C O N D P A R T.

P R E F A C E.

The Reconciler's Petition to his opponents	—	iii.
What are the capital questions which he has debated with them	—	v, vi.
He intreats them to end the controversy by fairly breaking one of his Scripture-Scales, or by candidly receiving them both	—	vii.

S E C T I O N XIV.

The final perseverance of the saints has two causes: The <i>first</i> is the final exertion of God's <i>free-grace</i> : and the <i>second</i> is the final concurrence of the believer's obedient <i>free-will</i> . This reconciling doctrine of perseverance is laid down in eight balanced propositions.	—	177
These propositions are summed-up.	—	180
The scripture-weights of <i>Free-grace</i> are balanced with those of <i>Free-will</i> , respecting the doctrine of <i>perseverance</i>	—	181

SECTION XV.

The doctrine of perseverance is farther weighed
in the Scripture-Scales, with the weights of
free-grace and free-will ——— 193.

SECTION XVI.

Christ's thoughts concerning fallen believers and
apostates ——— 205

The thoughts of St. John on the same subject. - 206

Those of St. Paul and St. James — — 208

St. Peter's description of antinomian apostates,
is balanced with St. Jude's description of law-
less backsliders ——— 209

No hint is given about the *certain, infallible*
return of one of the multitude of these back-
sliders ——— 211

SECTION XVII.

The plan of reconciliation between Zelotes and
Honestus ——— 215

The *anti-pharisaic* Bristol-DECLARATION is
adopted, guarded, and strengthened to defend
the doctrines of *grace* and *faith* — — 216

An *anti-solifdian*, scriptural DECLARATION is
added to it, and balanced with it, in order to
guard the doctrines of *justice* and *obedience* — ib.

The scripture-ground of these two Declarations. 218

Bishop Beveridge saw the beauty of such a plan. - 220

It is in vain to hope for a lasting reconciliation
upon any other ——— 221

It is unreasonable not to repose an inferior trust
in the *secondary* means and causes of our eter-
nal salvation ——— 222

To repose our inferior trust in Christ is to insult
him. ——— 224

How the crowns of the faithful agree with the
Redeemer's crown ——— 225

What kind of trust in man and things brings us
under the curse ——— 227

It is a very wicked thing to trust the Lord exclu-
sively of every body else ——— 228

The explicit knowledge of the doctrines of *grace*
and *faith*, is balanced with the explicit know-
ledge of the doctrines of *justice* and *works* -- 229

Which

	Page
Which of the two extremes appeared most dangerous to Mr. Baxter,—that of <i>Zelotes</i> —or that of <i>Honestus</i> ——— ———	230
The Author's thoughts on that delicate subject, and why he dares not give the preference to <i>Zelotes</i> ——— ——— ———	231
How an unprejudiced gospel-minister steers his course between the errors of <i>Zelotes</i> and <i>Honestus</i> ——— ——— ———	233
SECTION XVIII.	
The doctrine of <i>Free-grace</i> is farther maintained against <i>Honestus</i> by six arguments — — —	234
The doctrine of <i>Free-will</i> is farther maintained against <i>Zelotes</i> by twelve arguments — — —	236
SECTION XIX.	
<i>Zelotes</i> produces his <i>first</i> objection to a reconciliation. He cannot reconcile man's free-will with God's foreknowledge and decrees — — —	244
The flaw of his argument ——— ———	ib.
Our Lord is introduced as answering for himself, and showing, by 13 remarks, how his prescience is consistent with our liberty ———	246
Why God gives one or more talents of saving grace, <i>even</i> to those who bury them ———	253
A fine observation of Archbishop <i>King</i> upon the consistency of God's <i>foreknowledge</i> with man's <i>free-will</i> ——— ——— ———	255
The absurdity of supposing, that God cannot <i>certainly</i> know all the future events which depend upon the will of <i>Free-agents</i> , because we cannot <i>thus</i> foreknow these events — — —	257
SECTION XX.	
<i>Zelotes's second</i> objection to a reconciliation. It is taken from the plausible doctrine of <i>bound-will</i> and <i>necessity</i> ——— ——— ———	258
A general answer to the objection ———	260
What difference there is between being <i>willing</i> and being <i>free-willing</i> ——— ———	261
	What

● When I wrote the first Checks I had not sufficiently attended to

	Page
What our liberty does consist in	263
Some distinctions needful to understand the doctrines of necessity and liberty	268
All beasts have naturally a degree of brutal liberty	269
Our liberty increases with our powers	270
All men have some liberty in spiritual, as well as in natural things. There is absolutely no <i>natural man</i> [in the <i>Calvinian</i> sense of the word]	
The scriptures never mention such a being: Just the reverse.	272, 275
To suppose that any man is the <i>natural man</i> of the Calvinists, is to exculpate him and to charge God foolishly	273
Unconverted sinners have some liberty	ib.
What misleads the opposers of liberty	274
Our various degrees of liberty are instanced in <i>natural, civil, moral, and devotional</i> liberty	275
The absurdity of pleading, that we have absolutely no power	276
The THIRD † OBJECTION of <i>Zelotes</i> to a reconciliation, is President <i>Edwards's</i> grand argument for <i>bound will</i> ; and his capital objection against what he is pleased to call <i>Arminianism</i> .	278
An answer to it	ib.
SECTION XXI.	
The fourth Objection of <i>Zelotes</i> against a reconciliation	283
The Fathers held the doctrine of the Scales with respect to <i>free-will</i> as well as <i>free-grace</i>	284
This is proved by quotations from seventeen of them	285
Augustin himself was at times for <i>free-will</i>	295
See also the Appendix on this head	iii.
	Nay,

to this difference. Whatever clashes there with it, I now renounce as a remain of Calvinian confusion.

† In the body of the work, thro' mistake, the author did not properly distinguish this objection as the THIRD OBJECTION of *Zelotes*.

	Page
In what sense God's grace may be said to be <i>irresistible</i> [Note] ——— ———	295
Nay, he more than once runs into the extrem of rigid free-willers ——— ———	298
The preceding assertion concerning the Fathers is supported by quotations from eminent modern divines ——— ——— ———	300
Bishop Davenant himself, the champion of the Calvinists, is forced to grant as much <i>Free-will</i> as the Reconciler contends for ———	303
So did Cranmer, who prudently stood up for <i>Free-grace</i> and <i>Free-will</i> , and found the balance of the two gospel-axioms ———	305
So does the church of England in her Articles, and liturgy ——— ———	306
Pelagian, rigid free-willers depart from the doctrine of the church of England; not moderate bible-free-willers [Note] ———	307
Moderate free-willers are neither <i>Pelagians</i> , nor such as were formerly called <i>Semi-Pelagians</i> ——— ——— ———	302, 319

SECTION XXII.

<i>Zelotes's fifth</i> Objection to a reconciliation - -	321
The <i>early</i> Fathers held the reconciler's doctrine -	322
A Specimen of Mr. Toplady's <i>Historic proof</i> of their Calvinism ———	323
<i>Barnabas</i> was no Calvinist ——— ———	324
<i>St. Clement</i> was a strong perfectionist ———	326
His doctrine concerning charity covering our sins ——— ——— ———	327
<i>Polycarp</i> was no Calvinist, but a perfectionist -	328
<i>Ignatius</i> far from being a Calvinist, maintained the doctrine of rewards, evangelical worthiness, and christian perfection ———	329

SECTION XXIII.

<i>Zelotes's sixth</i> Objection to a reconciliation --	333
Moderate <i>Free-will</i> perfectly agrees with God's <i>sovereignty</i> ——— ——— ———	334
An answer to Mr. Toplady's grand argument against free-will, and the pure gospel, which, under	

	Page
under the name of <i>Arminianism</i> , he represents as <i>atheistical</i> ———	337
Various answers to what Mr. Whitefield calls the “ <i>inextricable dilemma</i> ” in favour of bound- will, and Calvinian reprobation ———	342
All the divine perfections [Sovereignty not ex- cepted] are eclipsed, or obscured by the <i>Cal- vinian</i> doctrines of grace ———	349
SECTION XXIV.	
<i>Zelotes's seventh</i> objection to a reconciliation. —	354
The agreement of <i>first</i> and <i>second</i> causes, mo- tives, and means, is proved by a variety of illustrations. ———	355
The union of <i>Free-grace</i> and <i>Free-will</i> , together with the SUPERIORITY of <i>Free-grace</i> , is il- lustrated by the scriptural emblem of a <i>mar- riage</i> ———	359
The unreasonableness of those who sincerely obey, and yet decry sincere obedience ———	362
Remarks upon <i>opposition in harmony</i> , to illustrate the harmonious opposition of the two gospel- axioms ———	363-
The absurdity of solemnizing the gospel-marri- age with <i>Free-grace</i> or with <i>Free-will</i> alone. —	365
The <i>superiority</i> of <i>Free-grace</i> is farther estab- lished ———	366
SECTION XXV.	
The errors of <i>Zelotes</i> are summed up ———	370
The mischief of these errors ———	372
The errors of <i>Honestus</i> and their mischief —	374
How <i>Lorenzo</i> is hurt by both ———	376
Directions to <i>Zelotes</i> and <i>Honestus</i> ———	378
Encouragements ———	380
They are pressed to a speedy reconciliation --	382
The Reconciler expresses his respect for the recon- ciled rivals, and accounts for the plainness of his reproofs. ———	386