

QUAKERISM

NOT CHRISTIANITY:

OR,

REASONS FOR RENOUNCING

THE

DOCTRINE OF FRIENDS.

IN THREE PARTS.

BY SAMUEL HANSON COX, D. D.

*Pastor of the Laight-street Presbyterian Church; and for twenty years a
Member of the Society of Friends.*

Judge not according to the appearance; but judge righteous judgment. John, 7 : 25.
Lo, they have rejected the word of the Lord; and what wisdom is in them? Jer. 8 : 9.
We have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty; not walking in craftiness, nor handling
the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to
every man's conscience in the sight of God. 2 Cor. 4 : 2.

PRINTED BY D. FANSHAW.

SOLD BY JONATHAN LEAVITT,

182 Broadway, New-York:

AND CROCKER & BREWSTER, 47 WASHINGTON-ST.

BOSTON.

.....

1833.

BX 7734
C6

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1833, by SAMUEL HAN-
SON Cox, D. D., in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern
District of New-York.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE reader is respectfully requested to *consult in his Bible* the passages to which reference is made in this work ; especially those which, after such reference, are discussed or expounded without being quoted at large.

The quotations of latin and other passages, which are improvidently too numerous for correct taste, it may be, have been on review mostly retained, as the chief objection to them is perhaps neutralized by the consideration that they are generally translated, or their meaning is sufficiently indicated by the scope or connection of the argument, which they are designed in some way to subserve.

The notes are embodied at the end of the volume, as more favorable to method and compactness, if not preferable also on the score of utility.

Many peculiar or singular expressions, and some repetitions of thought, occur incidentally and unavoidably in a treatise of this special nature—and often with a relative aspect which all readers will not equally discern. The table of contents following, has been arranged to serve also as a general index.

Let it be remembered that *principles not persons* are here assailed; the SYSTEM, not purposely the INDIVIDUALS who hold, more than those who deny it. The system is viewed mainly in its RELIGIOUS aspect only, and contrasted with the system of the scriptures; and thence pronounced to be FUNDAMENTALLY ERRONEOUS. Let the publication be so regarded and judged—especially by those who believe that it is no advantage to be edified for eternity on a false foundation.

What I ask of ALL CHRISTIANS, in reference to it, whoever they may be and wherever they may reside, is simply—to do justice, and not desert the Master in regard to it! If they will act in the fear of God, and DO THEIR DUTY; and defend this work so far as it defends christianity: this is all I ask of them—and this a GREATER than any of us demands. It would indeed grieve me to see *christians* siding with *Quakerism* against *christianity*: but, even then, I should have a resource—should have, if the *ninety-third psalm only* was “written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.”

ERRATA.

Last line but one, on page 22—*serene* for screen.

Line 18, on page 29—*curtained* for continued.

Page 112, line 8—*desiring* for devising.

Page 263, line fifth from the bottom—*eminently* for evidently.

Page 420, last line but one—*secrel* for secrets.

☞ Other typographical inaccuracies will be perceived, which it seems impossible wholly to prevent; especially as a new orthography, half introduced, mystifies the operatives at the printing-office, ever and anon, between the *Walk-erian* and *Websterian* style and authority.

CONTENTS.

PART FIRST.		Page.		
Address to certain ministers of the gospel,	9		Harshness,	151
Their probable estimate of Quakerism,	10		Sincerity,	160
Sentiments of Dr. Alexander,	11		Sentiments of Dr. Miller,	165
Friends a society, not a church,	13		Priest-craft,	167
The author's conversion,	15		Confidence,	175
Reluctance to leave Friends,	33		Irreligious sages,	178
Visit to Elias Hicks,	33		Changing one's religion,	183
"Dealings" at Philadelphia,	39		Union of the evangelical ministry,	184
Decision to profess Christianity,	44		Sectarianism,	190
Dedication to the ministry,	46		Orthodoxy not illiberal,	195
Disownment by Friends, note 14,	46		Success—a criterion,	197
Style of this work,	48		Forbearance and evidence,	198
Barclay, the greatest author of Friends,	50		Quotation from Dr. Woods,	199
Logic,	52		Quotation from Dr. Beecher,	202
Friends averse to classical learning,	56		Quakerism, a synopsis,	207
Uncharitableness,	61		Infidels prefer Quakerism,	216
Schism in the body,	68		Trinity,	217
Believing what we cannot understand,	80		War,	234
Distinction between the mode and the fact,	81		Washington's opinion,	245
George Fox, note 17,	90		The pacification of the world,	255
Mystery,	91		Conclusion,	256
1 Tim. 3 : 16,	93		PART SECOND.	
Which party are primitive Friends,	94		Mottos,	261
Journal of George Fox,	101		Principles,	263
His miracles,	104		Quotation from Dr. Fitch,	267
Apostates,	108		Positions of truth,	268
Rom. 9 : 1-3, note 23,	111		Title of this work, what it means,	277
Motives of the author,	112		Definition of Christianity,	279
Predicament of a censurer,	115		Radicalism and innovation,	281
Sophisms of Friends,	118		Inward light, the grand error,	282
The Apostles,	121		Incapable of definition,	284
1 Tim. 5 : 24, 25,	127		Conscience all the <i>thing</i> at which they blindly aim,	286
Inspired Interpretation,	131		The Spirit,	291
Heb. 2 : 9,	133		1 John, 4 : 1-3,	292
1 Cor. 15 : 22,	134		CONFESSION of Friends,	295
The resurrection of the body,	135		Scriptures superfluous,	298
Education of Friends,	142		Different modes of getting rid of them,	299
Their excellences,	147		Inward-light patriotism,	305
			Rom. 8 : 14,	309
			Inspired actions,	311
			They make God himself to be—a rule of action,	313

All they truly know comes from the Bible,	316	Sealing of the canon,	490
Inward light among the heathen,	322	Good things in the theatre,	501
Anecdote,	328	Conclusion,	508
No salvation but that of Christ,	337		
Practice of the apostles,	339	PART THIRD.	
Their preaching,	346	Mottos,	505
Influences of the Spirit,	347	A sacrament,	508
Views of Friends,	362	Baptism,	510
Quakerism chance-begotten,	363	Apostolic practice,	515
The catholic views <i>not</i> those of Friends,	366	1 Pet. 3 : 21,	518
Texts <i>not</i> in the Bible,	369	1 Cor. 1 : 14-17,	519
"Winked at,"	370	Lay baptism,	521
Dr. Waugh, anecdote,	372	Matth. 3 : 13-15,	522
Sin of perverting the gospel,	376	Subjects and mode,	527
The scripture <i>vainly</i> quoted to support their views,	377	Eph. 4 : 5,	530
Barclay's great proof-texts ex- amined,	379	In the name of,	535
Gen. 6 : 3,	380	The Lord's supper,	537
Antediluvians,	384	Friends' view,	560
Facilities of tradition,	394	1 Cor. 11 : 17-34,	562
Rom. 10 : 8,	395	2 Cor. 5 : 18-21,	567
The word of God,	398	'Friends,' three &c.	574
Justification,	404	Cardinal's hat,	579
Barclay's view,	417	Beauties of nature,	583
John, 1 : 9,	424	Restraint,	586
Mistakes of inspiration,	432	Quakerism waning and to wane,	589
Tit. 2 : 11,	433	Col. 2 : 20-23,	591
1 Cor. 12 : 7,	438	The Christian ministry,	599
Plenary inspiration of Fox,	440	Life-devotement,	603
Peculiar testimonies,	445	How Barclay was converted,	608
Isai. 28 : 16,	448	A call to the ministry,	611
Isai. 30 : 21, the inward teacher,	449	Temporal support,	614
2 Pet. 1 : 19,	450	Matth. 10 : 8,	620
Fox in Nottingham steeple-house,	451	Example of Paul,	625
Naked "for a sign;" note 55,	454	Anecdote,	628
Friend Bevan,	454	<i>Very</i> ancient Friends,	631
Catacombs of Paris,	460	The first <i>gratis</i> preacher,	633
Sentiments of the General Assem- bly of the Presbyterian church,	462	Value of the ministry,	635
What saith the scripture,	466	Female preachers,	636
Quotation from Bishop M'Il- vaine's Evidences,	468	The rule,	638
Quotation from Josephus,	472	Their prohibition not partial, lo- cal, or temporary,	642
Isai. 8 : 19-22,	477	Flattery of the sex,	644
Accountability,	480	The proper sphere of female usefulness,	646
Barclay's vitiation of 2 Tim. 3 : 14-17,	487	Saying of Dr. Mason,	648
		The Bible commended to Chris- tians,	651
		Conclusion,	653
		Notes,	655

THIS VOLUME

*Is particularly and most respectfully addressed to the
Reverend*

Archibald Alexander, D. D. S. T. P.	Theological Seminary,	Princeton,	N. J.
Samuel Miller, D. D.	do.	do.	
Leonard Woods, D. D. S. T. P.	do.	Andover,	Mass.
James Richards, D. D. S. T. P.	do.	Auburn,	N. York.
Matthew La Rue Perrine, D. D.	do.	do.	
Nathaniel W. Taylor, D. D. S. T. P.	do.	Yale College,	Con.
Lyman Beecher, D. D. S. T. P.	Lane	do.	Cincinnati, Ohio.
* George A. Baxter, D. D. S. T. P.	Union	do.	Virginia.
Edward D. Griffin, D. D.	President of Williams' College,	Massachusetts.	
Heman Humphrey, D. D.	do.	Amherst	do.
Jeremiah Day, D. D. LL. D.	do.	Yale	do.
Eliphalet Nott, D. D.	do.	Union	do.
Joshua Bates, D. D.	do.	Middlebury	do.
John McDowell, D. D.	Pastor of the 1st Pres. Church,	Elizabethtown,	N. J.
Nathan S. S. Beman, D. D.	Pastor of the 1st Presbyterian Church,	Troy,	N. Y.
Ezra Styles Ely, D. D.	do.	3rd	do.
			Philadelphia.

* I insert this name with great pleasure here—though the place was reserved for *another*, now “triumphantly” removed to a happier world; whom I better knew than I have been privileged to know his worthy and honored successor; and whom it suits the feelings of my heart to commemorate, as best I may, since I can no more—except that I may strive to imitate and commend the example of one of the most useful and consistent characters in the christian ministry; one of the most judicious and sound divines, which our country and our church had to lose or has been called to mourn. I need not write his name. A thousand fleshly tablets and some more durable monuments, record and will consecrate it in the gratitude of coming ages! For strangers, however, it may be necessary—————I refer to the late
REV. JOHN HOLT RICE, D. D. of Virginia.

Samuel Fisher, D. D. Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Patterson, N. J.

* Thomas H. Skinner, D. D. Pastor of the 5th Presbyterian Church, Philad.

† Thomas McAuley, D. D. LL. D. do. 10th do. do.

James M. Mathews, D. D. do. South Dutch Church, N. York.
and Chancellor of the University of the city of New York.

Thomas De Witt, D. D. Assoc. Pastor of the Coll. Dutch Churches, N. Y.

John Woodbridge, D. D. Pastor of the Bowery Presbyterian Church, N. Y.

Benjamin B. Wisner, D. D. Sec. of the Am. B. of Com. for F. Missions.

Benjamin H. Rice, D. D. Assoc. Sec. of the American Home Miss. Society.

Justin Edwards, D. D. Cor. Sec. of the American Tem. Soc. Andover, Mass.

* Now (lately inaugurated) Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.

† Now Pastor (lately installed) of the Murray-street Presbyterian church, N. York.

PART FIRST.



INTRODUCTION MISCELLANEOUS.



YEA, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written. Rom. 3 : 4.

And that from a child thou hast known THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, WHICH ARE ABLE TO MAKE THEE WISE UNTO SALVATION THROUGH FAITH WHICH IS IN CHRIST JESUS. 2 Tim. 3 : 15.

God—spake in time past unto the fathers BY THE PROPHETS. Heb. 1 : 1.

For thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name. Psalm 138 : 2.

For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received THE WORD OF GOD which YE HEARD OF US, ye received it not as the word of men, but as IT IS IN TRUTH THE WORD OF GOD, which effectually worketh also in you that believe. 1 Thess. 2 : 13.

And HE said unto them, Full well [very piously] ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition; making THE WORD OF GOD of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye. Mark, 7 : 9, 13.

Howbeit, in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. Mark, 7 : 7.

And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail. Luke, 16 : 17.

Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. 1 John, 4 : 1.

To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. Isaiah, 8 : 20.

Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully. Jer. 48 : 10. ;

QUAKERISM NOT CHRISTIANITY :

OR REASONS FOR

RENOUNCING THE DOCTRINE OF FRIENDS.



FATHERS AND BRETHREN,

My veneration for your common character as ministers of the gospel of our glorious Lord, induces the present liberty which I adventure to take with your names. From no spirit of ostentation, and with no desire to commit you before the public for the contents of these pages, do I avail myself of the privilege. Nor, much as I esteem the depth and the correctness of your theological erudition, do I addict myself to call any one of you *Father*, in a sense which may imply a diminution of my own responsibility to Christ, or his obscuration as the only Bishop of bishops rightfully acknowledged in the church. But, as I suppose there is a substantial oneness of theological sentiment among you, in which I may humbly account myself to participate; as I know you will approve of every reasonable attempt to vindicate "the holy scriptures" against all who contradict or degrade them; as I am persuaded of your enlightened disapprobation, in common with all consistent christians, touching the

erroneous conceptions of the Society of Friends, especially in the matter of *the end and office of scriptural Revelation*; as I know you can [as well appreciate my feelings and sentiments in the premises, perhaps, as any persons who have never been by education faithfully imbued with their peculiar mistakes; as I sincerely value your christian and official qualities, and am delighted on any occasion, as on this, to publish my deep reverence for both; though you are distributed to different spheres and distant scenes of usefulness; yet, aiding one cause, preaching one gospel, having the same Master, the same motive, the same glorious and incomparable hope, I have judged it proper to prefix your names to this *Introduction*, and formally to address its pages, and virtually the entire publication, to yourselves; "though it may serve no other end" than to evince unity in the greatest and best pursuits, the communion of christian brotherhood, and the joint inheritance of all the disciples of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

It is certain, moreover, that your concurrence, in reprobating *the errors of the Quakers*, is in the main entire. I consider you, therefore, as representing the common creed of christendom, or rather of all enlightened protestants, in opposition to the system of Friends. I consider you as constituting for the time *a moral court*, before whom I may plead the cause of truth, and whose award, whether tacitly or formally announced, the christian public will respect, I doubt not, as well advised, principled and unanimous; for, in such a case, it is not learning,

piety and independence, that wavers or quails to human prejudice.

It will not be doubted that the sentiments of one of you, as cursorily expressed in illustration of a kindred subject, may be applied especially to this, and fully considered as the sentiments of you all. "The other opinion referred to, is that of fanatics in general, who, whilst they confess that the scriptures are divinely inspired, imagine that *they* are possessed of the same inspiration. And some, in our own times, have proceeded so far as to boast of revelations, by which the scriptures are entirely superseded, as a rule of faith and practice. Now, the difference between these persons and the holy men of God who wrote the scriptures, consists in two things. First, the inspired writers could give some external evidence, by miracles or prophecy, to prove their pretensions; but enthusiasts can furnish no such evidence; and, secondly, the productions of the prophets and apostles were worthy of God, and had his impress; but the discourses of those men, except what they repeat from scripture, are wholly unworthy their boasted origin, and more resemble the dreams of the sick, or the ravings of the insane, than *the words of truth and soberness.*"¹

Fanatical persons, who "cannot teach, and will not learn," abound in the daughter and the mother country, and are not confined to any particular community of professing or pretending christians. They are found in Scotland, Ireland, the United States, and throughout the christian world. It would be equally fatiguing and unnecessary to write their

different names. But whatever differences distinguish them, they all agree in the matter of degrading THE ONLY INSPIRED VOLUME ; and doing this, while we leave them to the disposal of the “blessed and only Potentate,” we can neither join in the worldly acclaim that praises their deeds of goodness, nor recognise them as members of the church visible of our glorious Lord. This, they and the world, their sympathetic allies, ought at least to know. If they are real christians, they will be so saved at last ; and our joy will, we trust, be full, when we witness the event in eternity. In time, however, we can acknowledge no man without the distinctive signals—not of a party, but of Christ. It may be a question how far the imperfection of those signals may extend without destroying their competency ; and that question we may hesitate to answer, since, admitting the defects of all, it is difficult to know with how much error, ignorance and eccentricity, piety may co-exist. “Nevertheless, the foundation of God standeth sure ; having this seal, *the Lord knoweth them that are his ; and let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.*” Signals also are not vitals, however necessary in their place ; and when they become vitiated and ambiguous in a high degree, even where the vitals *possibly* exist, we do not decide on the latter, when we so far pass upon the former as to withhold all christian recognition and fellowship, from the erratic or disguised individuals that carry them. The matter is much the same, when *all the king’s signals* are superseded by those of private invention and preference, or

when they are so mangled as really to forego their original form, color, and proportion. There are few religious radicals, however, who have so boldly retrenched the total livery of the service, as those *christians of their own sort*, who profess to be, very properly, not a church, but a "Society;" not brethren, but "Friends;" and who often, in their public statements, and sometimes in the peculiar symbols of their faith, think it quite sufficient, where we all expect some show at least of *divine warrant* for their singularities, to use, "Friends believe; the society prefer; it is our custom; it was the opinion of ancient Friends; we are content to adopt; it appears manifest to us; it was the practice of early Friends;" and other such phrases innumerable; which, though quite habituated with them, are as incapable of convincing any well disciplined mind, as they are destitute of all rational evidence. If it was the office of faith to *create* its own objects, and a thing became true simply because one believed it, the reality of faith would be the criterion of truth; the monstrosities of distempered fancy would become identical with the realities of godliness; and every insane zealot would create a new universe for himself! How melancholy the delusion of enthusiasts! "For he stretcheth out his hand against God, and strengtheneth himself against the Almighty. He runneth upon him, even on his neck, upon the thick bosses of his bucklers." Job, 15 : 25, 26. "Let not him that is deceived trust in vanity; for vanity shall be his recompense," 31. But *very certainly* do they know, whose knowledge has cost

them no labor, intellectual or moral ; and *very clearly* do they see, who discern intuitively all mysteries, actual, possible, and transcendental ! The conviction that comes without evidence, or with that only which it makes for itself, is very strong and venturous, as well as ordinarily incorrigible. To doubt its demonstrations, is profane ! To question its dogmas, is infidel ! To contradict its hallowed audacity, is absolutely impious ! And thus their career is sped. But will the eternal frame of things give way to them ? Alas ! it is impregnable. Its structure is more durable, changeless, and excellent, than their *inspired* imaginings perceive. To fall on a certain “stone,” is to break, not it, but one’s self : but to have that stone fall on us, is the judicial method of God, in “grinding to powder” his adversaries. Luke, 20 : 18. Hence they voluntarily and wantonly elaborate their own ruin. The moral enactments of God are the strongest fixtures in the universe. Jer. 31 : 35, 37 ; Matth. 24 : 35. Our temporal and eternal salvation must, in every instance, prosper or fail, in accordance—not in contravention—to the laws of his own unalterable constitution.

The rock must fall, when loosened from on high
Or—gravitation cease, when *you* go by !

But this is what enthusiasts do not credit, or visionaries see. They seem to think they can certainly control or reverse eternal laws, if they are only faithful and sincere ! And yet what is their history ? Their bones whiten the plain, to warn succeeding pilgrims ! Instead of changing the universe, they

only confound themselves ! Instead of altering the truth of God, they wildly sin against his nature and his name ! Instead of realizing their selfish anticipations of his favor, their reckless temerity merely challenges his wrath ! Of this he has fully warned them : “ Behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks : walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled. This shall ye have of my hand ; ye shall lie down in sorrow.” Isaiah, 50 : 11.

Ever since the charm of Quakerism, in which I had been nurtured, was dissolved by the *unmystical* verities of the Bible, I have held it *my especial duty* to publish something for the benefit of others, that might evince the main articles of difference between the two systems. As already intimated, you, fathers and brethren, can know *experimentally* almost nothing of the long troublous agony attendant on such a revolution ! In ordinary conversions from sin to Christ, it is in general *adventitiously* necessary to experience bitterness, anguish, and even convulsion of soul ; I say *adventitiously*, for all this results not from the constitution of the gospel, or the nature of religion ; but from the embattled elements of human pride, ignorance, and obstinacy, as they clash with the ethereal armor of the Almighty. But in a conversion from deep-seated and sanctimonious error, there are superadded and terrible obstacles to be surmounted. Often, especially in the first stages of the influence of truth, did I feel the terrific contest ! Often the strength of hallowed prejudice rose in its vigor to contradict the

plain and “true sayings of God!” Often had I to read it again and again, in the page of *genuine* inspiration, before I could realize the conviction that I had been speciously deceived by a thousand testimonies of a *counterfeit* inspiration! So great was my jealousy of influence from all Anti-Quaker instructors, that I received the books of their wisdom with dread, and laid them aside unperused, that I might “search the scriptures” alone. Providence had placed me, more than a year before that crisis—memorable to me, in a village (Newark, N. Jersey) where the Society had not one nominal member, with the exception of myself. There I often encountered those who differed from me, and with whom I was always prompt to argue in favor of the tenets in which I had been educated. That I argued uniformly, and with high conviction at least, many living witnesses can attest; and what sorely worsted me in the argument, generally, was—the apt and frequent quotation of texts, of whose scriptural existence I was ignorant! One female disputant, who, though not ineloquent, was fluent, and pointed, “and mighty in the scriptures;” the venerable, and now, I trust, glorified² Mrs. Douglass, (wife of the excellent, and also, I trust, glorified person³ with whom I then boarded,) a lady to whom, under God, I am happy in the opportunity of recording my deep obligations; she ever succeeded in disputation, by that celestial weaponry with which I was unprovided, and which she used, with skill and courage, against *the light within* and all its arrogant manifestations. *I attribute my conversion to christianity*

very much instrumentally to her wisdom, benevolence, and valor, for the truth! If I constructed a syllogism that appeared to me invincible, and confidently propounded the premises for her admission, that I might force her to admit the conclusion also, she would exclaim, “You are all wrong, my child, in premise and conclusion both; your soul is as blind as *the inward light* can make it; you are *dead in trespasses and sins*, destitute of every spark of godliness, and *must be born again*, thoroughly changed in your thoughts, affections, and reasonings, or you will be certainly lost.” She would then aptly quote some passages from the Bible, which, often like javelins projected by the force of the warrior, pierced my bosom and left me neither peace nor hope. But *still I neglected the Bible*, and ruminated, *more than I was willing should be known by others*, on the possibility that *inspiration itself*, as connected with the Quakers, might be wrong! My father had carefully educated me in the principles of Friends; and I may be permitted to say of him, though he lived but four days in the present century, that all his influence was, so far as I can recollect, (being only in my eighth year when he^d died,) *very different* from that of the generality of Friends; and this, particularly, in the grand items of reverence for “the holy scriptures;” a practical and conscientious regard for “the Lord’s day;” and boldness for the truth of religion among its adversaries; uniform decision in the cause of virtue; a nice sense of honor; an unfeigned charitableness toward all serious christians; and an inflexible consistency of deportment.

He was an example of universal temperance ; tenderly humane and self-denying in his offices of beneficence, and distinguished as the friend of the black-man in all his degradations. In these respects his eldest son may be allowed to pay a tearful, solemn, and most affectionate tribute to his memory ! I will add, that he was often pained with the scepticism, or, at least, the looseness of principle which he observed among his people, and even their preachers, in regard to the truths of religion, the sanctity of the scriptures, and the obligation of the christian Sabbath ! My venerable and sincerely honored mother had always, and with tears, followed the same course of inculcation ; only that she was, more than others of the society with whom I have been acquainted, distinguished, at least, for some decision of faith in the article of Christ's vicarious death—not that he dies, and rises, and ascends, and intercedes, *within* us, (as they often say,) but that he died “ without the gate ” of Jerusalem, and there made an atonement for the sins of men. This *I ascribe* much to the fact, that her earlier education was purely Presbyterian. She was baptized by the excellent Dr. Sproat⁵ of (Arch-street) Philadelphia ; and often listened to his instructions and exhortations with great interest—remembering many of his expressions, *especially at the communion table*, and venerating his devotional piety, sometimes not without tears, to the present day !

When, therefore, I found Mrs. Douglass⁶ so tenacious of the scripture, so disdainful of every pretender to superiority or even equality with these

“lively oracles;” when others also, with whom I less frequently conversed, appeared to me possessed of thorough knowledge in religion, and *really to believe the eternal truth of scripture* very much as I believed the facts of geography or the matters of daily life; when, also, I had frequent opportunities of hearing the gospel preached, and that by different ambassadors of God, and of witnessing the administration of the Lord’s Supper as well as christian baptism; neither of which I had ever before witnessed! I became uneasy and troubled in spirit. I knew not the cause, nor even the nature of my unhappiness. Sinners under the special influence of the Spirit of God, a revival of religion, I had never seen. I knew not that any creature had ever felt as I felt, or that there was any excellence of nature or promise in such agitation. So pungent was the misery, so undefined and unappreciated the influence, that I was not even aware of its connection with religion. Consequently I tried every means in my power to dissipate it. I went into company, frequented parties, invented sports, commenced the study of the French language with an accomplished French gentleman, whose manners and society pleased me, but whose principles of fatalism, and whose habits of profligacy, shocked me; for, to these things I had not been habituated. Finding, at last, that every effort was vain, and every resource insipid, I resolved to study more diligently, to try to excel in my profession, and to pursue this, to the exclusion of every thing else, as *my supreme good*, being then occupied in the office

of a respectable counsellor, as a student of law. Hence I studied laboriously, and with a kind of phrensied determination. I separated from associates, and tried to wear the vizor of misanthropy, that I might keep all intruders at a distance. Here a new misery disturbed me. *I could not keep my mind, as formerly, on the topics and paragraphs of the law book!* Not even the style of Blackstone, of which I had always been enamoured, could retain my strangely discursive thoughts. I felt a kind of romantic curiosity to study the scriptures, and made it a virtue to deny myself the pleasure. It appeared a random, unprofitable longing of the mind, that required, as it received, a resolute coercion. *I will study*, was my half angry motto. And so I did, laboriously, and to no purpose. I went over a page, perhaps ten times, and could not retain one line or thought of it. The book appeared like "vanity," and the study like "vexation of spirit." Still I persevered; grew daily more wretched; and felt that I had no friend in the world to whom I could unbosom my sorrows and disburden my soul! Alas! that "friend that sticketh closer than a brother," that "laid down his life for his friends," and who invites us all to "come unto him," especially when "weary and heavy laden," and promises that we "shall find rest to our souls;" who invites us to "cast all our care upon him, knowing that he careth for us;" that unequalled friend I little knew, and had never proved! One day, while vacantly meditating over a law book, not on its contents, but on the atheism of Diderot and other authors, officiously

loaned me by my French instructor, and which I had perused and returned weeks before, it was strangely impressed on my mind that I had better turn atheist, if I could, for the sake of consistency ; for he is consistent, thought I, with himself, who, never worshipping God, also denies his existence ; but for me there is no such honor. I acknowledge his being, and live as if I had ascertained the contrary ! I was much agitated, but broke the somnium with my motto, *I will study*. Thus passed away my days for many weeks ; till once, when particularly chagrined at the lubricity of law in its contact with my efforts of mind to retain it, my attention was suddenly fixed and charmed with the volume. I felt a relief and a recreation of mind such as had long been unknown. My two diverse objects were unexpectedly blended ; the desire to investigate scripture and the resolve *to study* seemed to meet at once, and be strangely reconciled.

This unexpected pleasure was produced by the occurrence of a scriptural quotation from Matt. 5 : 25, “ Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art *in the way* with him.” It was in the third volume of Blackstone, chap. 20, p. 298, on *Pleading*. The topic respected *preliminary* measures with the parties, with a view to produce a reconciliation and prevent a law-suit. The usage, in the opinion of that accomplished jurist, was founded on the above passage of the gospel ; which he seemed to commend and revere. His remarks appeared excellent *and applicable to those who have a controversy to settle with God*. So I applied them ; and thought, O

that mine could be settled *in the way* before it comes to bar! O that there could be a liberty of *imparlance*, or *licentia loquendi*, to “end the matter amicably without further suit, by talking with the plaintiff!” In other places⁷ also, my author, I remembered, had not infrequently quoted the sayings of scripture, particularly the writings of Moses, with reverence for the sacred volume and an implied panegyric on the Jewish lawgiver. I quickly reverted to several instances, and compared them. Here I felt, unknown before, the impression which atheistical writers had already made on my mind. Moses seemed a mean, deluded Jew; and I was astounded that such a writer as Blackstone should so compliment his law knowledge, and admit his inspiration. Reflection, however, corrected the revery; and conscience whispered, *you are the weak, mean, ignorant, deluded, sinful one!* My enjoyment notwithstanding was great. I was arrested, entertained, absorbed. From an ocean of agitating storms and incumbent night, I had suddenly found tranquil moorings, open day, a hospitable welcome, and a palatable repast.

Intus aquæ dulces, vivoque sedilia saxo;
 Nympharum domus; hic fessas non vincula naves
 Ulla tenent, unco nonalligat anchora morsu.—VIRG.

Within are waters of sweetness found,
 And couches of living rock surround.
 The home of the nymphs; where vessels moor,
 Fatigued from the ocean, and rest secure.
 No cables fix their hulls to the strand;
 Nor anchor chains to nethermost land.
 There zephyrs of peace screen the cove;
 Its breath is summer, its whisper love.

Serene

I was delightfully engrossed; and finding that to proceed with regular study was to lose the attractive objects—was to launch out again into the inclement element, and that the margin of the page on which my eye then rested, referred me to the chapter and verse of the Pentateuch where I might also study other words of that *ancient lawyer* at large, I arose with alacrity (being then alone in the office) and went to that corner of the library where our learned preceptor kept his very valuable volumes of theology. There I found a Bible, and hastily snatching it, I was soon fixed in the perusal of the connection to which I was referred. Thus a *quotation in a law-book* was, in providence, associated with my first or best convictions in religion; it brought me to read the scriptures, and was a link in that chain of causes that ultimately bound me in a relation not (I trust) to be dissolved, to the salvation that is in Christ Jesus. “Whoso is wise, and will *observe* these things, even they shall understand the loving kindness of the Lord.” Psalm 107 : 43.

Though my religious exercises were perhaps marked and interesting, possibly edifying, I have hitherto delayed, though often requested and sometimes importuned, to write their history. My reasons for this were several and satisfactory. One was, that I was new in religion, and always have felt a dread of dishonoring that holy name by which I am called, and sometimes (not habitually) an awful fear of ultimate rejection. This may seem strange to some who know that I profess the doctrine of *the perseverance, or rather the conservation, of all genuine*

believers. It would not, however, seem strange to them if they also *knew* that doctrine; of which I have no doubt at all, and am just as fully assured of it, as that these words and a thousand others are true: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father, who gave them unto me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one." John, 10: 27-30. This decisive passage, spoken to malignant Jews, is immediately preceded by these words: "But ye believe not; because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you." 26. I believe and am sure that such is the doctrine of the total Bible, and that there is *not one text that asserts the contrary, or that does not rather imply and teach the infallible perseverance of all real christians*; and this, after a very thorough examination of all the passages upon which some superficially rely to prove that chance, or Satan, or some other agent, "is able to pluck" the sheep of Christ out of his hands. Apostates from the faith might have had the experiences of "stony-ground" hearers, each of whom "dureth for a while, yet hath he no root, in himself;" but they were always actuated by some bad motive of deceit or sin, and so were always graceless. "They went out from us, because they were not of us." 1 John, 2: 19. But what of all this? Does this ascertain or imply that I am a christian, and shall not yet apostatize, and finally perish? Not at all! There is rational space for self-

diffidence and self-examination ; yea, there is NO DOCTRINE THAT SO MUCH INSPIRES BOTH, as that which I have just stated and confessed : nor are there any religionists whose personal assurance or presumption is so daring and void of all humility, as some, I might say many, who hold the opposite doctrine ! Yes ! persons who believe, *they say*, that *there are no spiritual attainments inconsistent with eventual perdition possible to be made in this world*, are the very persons whose confidence of ultimate salvation is at once most towering and secure ! Having however lived twenty years in the school of Christ, and “by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me,” Gal. 2 : 20, and being convinced that some history of my change ought to accompany this treatise, I do very diffidently consent to the sketching of its outlines as herewith presented, in the hope that the recital may benefit some readers, and will injure none. It ought however to be remembered that an outline is not a full picture ; and that the best finishing of a truth-directed sketch is that of a corresponding personal experience. Still, experiences are not the gospel : they are the mere results of the gospel, in its operation, in given circumstances, on the mind and heart and life of an individual.

Without more detail of incidents, dear to my memory, but of less interest to others, suffice it that I now commenced the reading of the scriptures alone, and in good earnest. My solemn purpose was to explore the sacred book, and know from itself what it contained, and what were the internal proofs

of its divinity. Conviction increased as I proceeded, and soon became overpowering. But here several things occurred to dissuade me, in vain, from decision in so plain and so high a course of duty. Among others, these two : first, " If you accredit the Bible, and adopt it as your highest rule in religion, what will become of *the inward light* ?" I saw that they were two, and rivalrous of each other's claims ; and that no Quaker could consistently appropriate the Bible according to its own demands as the word of God. Again, the awful revolution in all *my social relationships*, which must inevitably ensue, as the consequence of " obedience to the heavenly vision," *by the scriptures* manifested to my mind. These things, with others that I omit to name, held me in a suspense of agony. I was alone, and no mortal knew or sympathized with the solemn hour. The scenes of a future world ; the sanctions of eternity ; the insignificance of time ; the worth of the soul ; the absolute necessity of obedience ; the solemnity of the crisis ; the supremacy of the divine judgment in the case ; and the safety of securing the approbation of God ; together with the certain conviction that, at all events, there could be no ultimate danger in adhering " to the law and to the testimony ;" since, whatever might be true, with respect to my old doctrine of " the light within," must be somewhere indicated in a volume whose truth Friends themselves admitted. These considerations, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, at last prevailed ; my knees bowed, my soul bowed with them, for the first time in my life ; I wor-

shipped, prayed, and solemnly devoted myself to the Author of my being and the hope of my soul, *to be his for ever*, to follow Jesus Christ “through good report and evil report;” and by his “strength made perfect in weakness,” to glorify him in the ways of truth, through time and through eternity. As soon as I had made this surrendry, conscious as I was of its unspeakable solemnity and perfect irretrievableness, I was assaulted with a fierce temptation, with a succession of “fiery darts of the wicked” one, all mainly in this form: You have made a vow which you will never keep; you have perjured your soul for ever; you are lost! *You* be religious! You are a hypocrite, a fool, a fiend! You will apostatize in less than three weeks, and, at last, make your bed in hell—a hateful, ruined wretch! Alas! thought I, it is certainly true. I am wicked, and never felt worse than now that I wish to be good! Here my sins began to disgorge themselves to my view. “Sin revived, and I died—and the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.” And thus it was that sin “became exceeding sinful” in my renewed perceptions. For several weeks my situation was wretched, indescribably wretched. I had plighted my being to serve my Maker; but this implied that I should become qualified for the service that was spiritual, and filial, and august. Instead of this, it was gloom, sin, and fearful anticipation. I had

no peace, and hope seemed a phantom of indefinite characteristics that continually eluded my grasp. I was much alone ; “with other views of men and manners now, and others of a life to come.”

Forsaking, and forsaken of all friends,
I now perceived where earthly pleasure ends ;
Hard task for one who lately knew no care,
And harder still, as learnt beneath despair.

* * * * *

God’s holy word, once trivial in my view,
Now, by the voice of my experience true,
Seemed, as it is, the fountain whence alone
Must spring that hope I longed to make my own.—COWPER.

One thing that marked this dark hour, or rather month, in my memory, was a peculiar conviction of sin ! not only of its superlatively evil nature, that deserves all that God denounces against it in his word, and that I was such a sinner as his truth describes ; but that I had sinned unutterably much against his gospel, in slighting it, and specially against his holy word, in *daring* to reason against it ! The insolence and the insufferable abomination of such neglect of “the oracles of God” appeared to me, as seen in the light of the goodness and the greatness of their adorable Author, astonishingly evil ! And I wondered why I was not in hell ; it seemed to me that I ought to go there, and that if I had any virtue I should approve of the righteousness and excellency of such a measure, as what ought to be. It seemed impossible that I should ever be saved—translated to those halcyon seats of God, and admitted to his holy presence for ever ! The de-

gree of these exercises, depending, in part, as I now suppose, upon the singular ardency of my native temperament, I do not attempt to describe; and would scarcely rehearse to my nearest friend the forms of excessive perturbation that harrowed up my soul till the fearful conflict was over! This occurred one night, on my knees, by my bedside. The service of prayer had before seemed at once impossible to be, by me, either omitted or performed. Then it was easy, it was delightful. How long I now continued praising rather than praying in this posture, I know not. But this I know, that my soul seemed absorbed in the glory of God—the chamber luminous with his presence, the universe glorious for his sake, while alleluias kept me delightfully awake until morning!

The luminous appearance of the chamber and of the bed where I lay, continued from the sight of distant objects, which the darkness of a cloudy November night (1812) would have rendered invisible had there been no intervening drapery to deepen it, I have purposely mentioned, and now proceed to explain. A sober philosophy, as I then thought, and now know, can perfectly resolve it. The state of one's mind, in proportion to the intensity of its affections, as melancholy or mirthful, as vigorous or languid, as imaginative or plodding, imparts its own character to surrounding objects; and often induces the sensation that the character is in the objects, and not in the mind. Nearly the same sentiment is more scientifically given by that great father of sound reasoning, Lord Bacon: "*Omnes percep-*

contained

tiones, tam sensus quam mentis, sint ex analogia hominis, non ex analogia universi ; atque intellectus humanus instar speculi inæqualis ad radios rerum, qui suam naturam naturæ rerum immiscet, eamque distorquet et inficit." A little obstinate rationality, as Dr. Johnson calls it, kept me then and since from the profound or the sublime of religious enthusiasm. Had I yielded to feeling, to imagination, and *seeming revelation*, at a time when the genuine influences of the Spirit of God (as I believe) had made me happy in him, and thrilled my soul with holy ravishment, I might have been a devout madman, *inspired*, or any thing else, in my own esteem. But the balance of my mind was restored by reflection. "The truth and soberness" of christianity induced that reflection, and made me know that I ought to exercise my understanding, and "try the spirits" in every direction, before I trusted them. The case of Col. Gardner⁸ I had previously heard or read, and it then recurred to me. Were it not, thought I, that I happen to know better, I could see and tell of prodigies, of angelic apparition and miraculous glory, as well as others ; and now it seems clear to me how the excellent Gardiner was deceived, and how thousands of religious enthusiasts first come by their commission. I ascribe it, under God, to *the power of his written truth alone*, that I became not then a disciple of moonshine and extravagance. The wonder is the greater, that I was by education predisposed to it. The spring of the affections, or zeal in religion, however genuine, requires the balance-wheel of sound scriptural in-

struction to regulate its movements and secure its utility. Much am I indebted, whom nature made so ardent, and education so moulded to enthusiasm, much do I owe to the sober voice of scripture, for all the steadiness of faith, the sobriety of character, and the uniformity of action, which I have been enabled in some degree (yet imperfectly) to exemplify. "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying NONE OTHER THINGS than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." Acts, 26: 22. My soul has often leaped for joy and thankfulness that the Great Shepherd hath so led and kept me!—So will he keep for ever all who truly trust HIM.

I would not here imply that sobriety and moderation were the early characteristics of my religion. I was impetuous; decisive; perfectly assured; ecstatically happy in God; resolved to confess Jesus Christ any where; anxious to show others the way to blessedness; totally inexperienced; and not properly impressed with the necessity of experience in order to usefulness; supposing I should always "walk in the light, as he is in the light," and anticipating no reverses; ignorant of the wanton enmity of men actually cherished against the gospel; and often inconsiderate in the way, place, time, and style, of addressing them on the matters of religion. In *principles*, however, I have always been substantially the same: nor do I know that, since the period of spiritual nativity, I have ever had one deep deliberate doubt of the truth and excel-

lence of christianity, or of the general meaning of the scriptures. Reverses however I did experience—just as extreme, pungent and complete, as the joys that preceded them were high! My hope left me after a few weeks, my joys all dried away, and the deepest melancholy of darkness that could be felt embowered me. I felt that I had been deluded, hypocritical, wild in my rejoicings;—not that I doubted religion; I doubted only myself! Thus extremes and opposites succeeded, till “tribulation wrought patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope;” and thus “the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus,” is wont to accomplish his people; “establish, strengthen, settle them; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.” 1 Pet. 5: 10, 11. I have since compared my feelings in religion to the vibrations of the pendulum of an open clock, whose first movements, when energetically started, incline almost to cover one hundred and eighty degrees of the circle; but, gradually subsiding from extremes, and losing the momentum of extravagance, every movement becomes more regular; the deep central attraction influences more; its motions are more orderly and useful; and at last it assumes that state of punctual and measured gravity which it keeps to the end of its “appointed time;” and without which, however costly its material, or polished its exterior, or comely its proportions, it would be of no utility. That I have gained the point of perfect regularity, I am very far from asserting; but that I have held my way, in the main, progressive, I do believe, just

as really as I know that I am still imperfect and have much to learn.

One characteristic of my early and subsequent religion, was derived from its connection historically with the tenets of Friends. I read the Bible, meditated, prayed, conversed, and agonized spontaneously for their salvation. Thousands of times, in thought, did I find myself in one of their meetings, with the Bible open in my hand, "expounding and testifying the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and of the prophets, from morning till evening." *I did not intend to leave the society, if I could with peace of conscience continue in it*; though I did intend, by the grace of God, to follow "the Lamb whithersoever he goeth." I accordingly put myself in the way of conversing with the most eminent Friends in New-York and its vicinity, from whom I received no satisfaction; and then began, more than ever, to suspect that the truth was not in them.

Some Friends in this city advised that I should visit their great oracle on Long-Island for the resolution of my difficulties, and offered to accompany me. I accepted the proposal, and went in the season of snow a journey of (I suppose) near thirty miles. We arrived when he was preaching in a Friends' meeting-house: as he had just begun, however, we heard almost all of it. It was a declamatory *deistical* piece of prosing against the resurrection of the body, the *error* that sin is an infinite evil, and the abomination of the "divines, as they call themselves," whom he charged with teaching all

these fooleries. He inveighed against the doctrine of atonement in the coarsest style, in connection with his thesis that *sin is no such evil as they say!* Among other things that elicited his oracular wrath, as I well remember, was this: some of the wicked, carnal young Friends had come to meeting that morning with bells by twenties on the gears of their sleigh-horses; these were tethered to the trees in the immediate grounds of the meeting-house, yet not so near as to interrupt the speaker, though their sounds were audible through the closed apartments. But the preacher took a holy umbrage at the distant clatter of the bells. Music of all kinds appeared to be his aversion;⁹ and he indulged in a terrible episode against the frequent noises of the bells, which he said were put there only for pride, and to do as others did; they were, he said, wholly from beneath; for, he had no doubt, it was the spirit of the wicked One himself that prompted the dear young Friends to such a departure from the principles of the society! If the matter of putting on the bells, which has been generally thought necessary to the safety of passengers, and on that account is sometimes required by law, had been *an infinite evil*, he could scarcely have denounced it with more *inspired* zeal or devotional nonsense! We may regard this as an instance of the *stooping* of inspiration, the very bathos of illumined and genuine preaching; which, the privileged hearers of such prophets know very well, may *often* be witnessed in the communications of the *light within*. Whether Friend Hicks was inspired *just then*, and

in what degree and kind precisely, are questions which I shall not venture to discuss. Others may resolve them. It might, however, assist the grave inquirer, to settle another question *first*: Was the prophet *Zechariah*, in the conclusion of his fourteen chapters of thrilling developement, and when speaking of the perfection and blessedness of the *yet future and near approaching* MILLENNIAL STATE—was *he* inspired? He speaks, without *stooping* indeed, on the very same topic, in a very different style, and to a very *uncongenial* end! He seems to think that there was no sin, at least intrinsically, *in the bells of the horses!* He says they shall all be consecrated, INSCRIBED, made subsidiary, to the glory of Jehovah! “In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD.” Zech. 14 : 20.

In the afternoon and evening of that day, I was at his house, in close and solemn conference. Many, say ten or twenty Friends, were present. They sat with their large hats on, all listening to the *inspiration* of their host, and exhibiting an appearance of solemnity by which I was well nigh overawed—the instinctive and heathenish awe of a Quaker! Aware of the danger, I was resolved to resist the evil; which I did to the astounding of the company, by venturing, at the pause of a paragraph, respectfully to ask some questions. These he always attempted promptly to answer; and always to my astonishment and grief. Our main topic was *the death of Christ*. He asserted most boldly that Christ made no atonement for our sins on the cross;

that God required none but what the tears of the penitent could make ; that he died *to show us how to crucify our sinful propensities on the cross of our faith* :—this queer piece of heretical mysticism is, I think, *verbally*, much the same as his position, so far as I can recollect its terms. Other views were all in keeping with these ; and when I produced a host of quotations of scripture, *right in the teeth of his assertions*, he grew warm, degraded the Book of God, and made up for the want of argument by resorting to sonorous prophecy. This is one of their very common and very wicked arts of evasion. When cornered with an argument or crippled with a text, they usually (their preachers, I mean) become suddenly inspired ; and exalting their testimony above all height, put down all carnal doubts, all naughty caviling, all daring liberty of thought, in a summary way. This, though the details were worse, was the general sum of our interview ; and I returned as I went, only more disgusted with Quakerism than ever. Still, I loved the man, and resolved to think the best of him. Sometimes I thought, he is certainly an awful deceiver, an emissary of the pit ; and then tried to believe, so recent and infirm were my doctrinal impressions, that his ignorance and education might properly reconcile the idea of his errors with the possibility of his piety.¹⁰ My companion, too, said all he could in his favor ; but not enough to inspire me with any confidence in such a guide of souls.

Thus to write of that journey, and of those who entertained me at its end, seems, I acknowledge,

like ingratitude: for I was received and treated every where with the kindest hospitality, attention, and fulness. Could these things have compensated for the want of greater and better, I had been converted by their generous behavior much sooner than their arguments. *This is one of the worst things about them!* They lack the evidences of vital and genuine religion; but have so many *other things* resembling its secondary and subordinate attendants, that they *feel* safe, and wish others to *think* them so, on account of these other things. Now, I am far enough from censuring their hospitable and generous mode of entertaining strangers, and should not blame them if they were *even more given to this noble conduct* than many of them are: but, what I aver is, that *it is worse than boorishness and inclemency when it takes the place and becomes the imposing substitute of the religion of the Bible!* It blinds the eyes of host and guest; while spectators at a distance “judge according to the appearance” and forget “righteous judgment.” Hospitality, however, is only one of their sectarian virtues; there is a whole system of influence, *exactly of the same sort*, that diffuses itself through all the relations of society, and deceives every man who does not truly take the Bible as his oracle. I was, therefore, not insensible to their kindness, nor ungrateful for it; and what is much more, I was not deceived by it. Compare their courtesy and claims with the inspired mottos of the title-page of this volume! A maturer observation has confirmed my opinion of the general emptiness of their *christian* pretensions. Many of

them, especially in the city of Philadelphia, possess the social qualities comparatively in polish and perfection. Their families, some of their schools, and public institutions, are ordinarily well regulated. They have public spirit, fine manners, and good information. They live upon a noble and generous scale of things; and are evidently in the career of social and intellectual improvement. In many respects are they excellent and valuable members of society; and in many meliorated and altered from primitive Friends. They have refinement, elegance, and worldly respectability! In all these matters I would delight to do them justice, as I sincerely respect and even love many of them; while I wish nothing worse than salvation to one of them. This they may little appreciate, if they read these lines. I however record it, because it is the truth, and because others will appreciate it. I know them too well to expect the holy magnanimity that loves truth even when it condemns us; and when I reflect on the nature of unbelief and of Christianity, of worldly greatness and eternal glory, of the sanctions of God and the presumptions of men, their graceless excellencies appear *only the worse*, because they usurp the place that religion claims; they appear like Anti-Christ in the temple of God, splendid and saintly in his professions, so that "the world wonders after the beast," but false and hollow in principles, because an evident enemy to the cross of Christ, in which alone the apostle gloried; and the worse an enemy, because surrounded with all the show that indicates a friend.

On my return I was summoned, both by my anxious mother and by the heads of the Pine-street meeting, to which I belonged, to Philadelphia. I complied; and while there, (about two weeks,) lost no opportunity, as I thought it proper, and as my honored mother required of me, to attend all their meetings, and to have frequent interviews with their chief men, and to put myself sincerely in the way of receiving any explanation which might, if possible, reconcile it to my conscience to continue my birth-right membership. The uniform result of such occasions, when calmly compared with the doctrine of the Bible, was a deeper conviction of the fundamental errors of the society, and that it was my duty "to go forth unto Christ without the camp, bearing his reproach: for here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come." Heb. 13 : 13, 14. Without more detail, I will state the substance of an interview which I had with a committee of the meeting appointed finally to treat with me. They were five or six in number, though at present I distinctly recollect but three of them. These were two brothers, A. and B. and a third one, say C. After sitting through a long pause, which, as they accounted it worship, I was unwilling to disturb, I thought their embarrassment was manifest, and hence that it was my duty to break the silence. If, said I, we are all the servants of the same God, and the disciples of the same Lord, we need not be afraid of each other. I wish you, if you please, to commence business, as time is precious, and I am prepared. I regard you as the heads of

the meeting to which I appertain, and hope you are *Friends* not only to each other, but to God and his servants. If you can answer my sincere scruples against your whole system, I will state them, and rejoice in their dissipation.

A. We did not come here to engage in controversy.

Neither did I, having no fondness for it, I assure you. But do you not “watch for souls as they that must give account?” and ought you not, when a member deviates, as I appear to you to have done, to try to convince and restore him?

Here some allusion was made to a letter which I had written, acknowledging theirs, informing them of my intended compliance with their request to see them, and describing my visit on Long-Island, with the doctrine I had there heard and condemned. I found that the letter had affected them unhappily: as I kept no copy, I do not remember its expressions; while I doubt not that its style was energetic and peculiar, I can only vouch for its general correctness. I had also felt some of the bitter fruits of that letter before my interview with the committee. Being in meeting one week-day, just as they were about to pass from worship to “business,” I chose to remain. No one, indeed, but a member, had a right to do this; but I was a member, and was conscious of no bad motives or offence in remaining. Here one of their preachers—*what is he now?*—who was of the first in that meeting, rose suddenly and beckoned me to arise and follow him. I complied. As soon as we had passed the door he thus accosted me: “I think it improper that thou, who

hast so ‘vilified’ one of our noblest preachers in thy letter to the committee, shouldst remain as a member of the meeting.” I replied, “Am I not a member? Did I transgress any law? or has any one member a right thus to expel another without law, trial, or ceremony?” He, however, was *inspired* and inexorable. I thought it useless to return and state the matter to the meeting, though I felt that it was usurpation and oppression. I just bowed and left the imperious zealot. At that time he was very high, *inspired*, and rising as a preacher,—a man of singular audacity, and, I fear, of wretched principles, as he has lately been convicted, by the society themselves, of some real or alleged iniquity, for which they have degraded and “disowned” him. I know of other oracles that once were like the *urim and thummim* of old, and whom, when I doubted audibly to my relatives, it was next to impiety and treason! But now where are they? God forbid that I should glory over them, as I do not! But let Friends consider! The stars of their heaven have been shaken; their brightest luminaries have fallen! Any one who can recollect the preachers of Philadelphia and its *general vicinity* for thirty years, ought to review the foundations of his faith in their holiness and *inspiration*! I recollect and could rehearse a multitude of facts and names that speak terribly in this relation! But I forbear. Friends there *know* what I mean!

When I saw, in the committee, the effect of the letter I had written, I commenced an explanation. This was not well received, for it was probably too

convincing. At last said C. very abruptly, "Samuel, dost thou believe the doctrine of predestination?" I regretted the question; for sure I was that neither did they understand the subject, nor could I satisfactorily explain it to them. Still, as it was a plain question of fact, I replied, "I do." "What!" he rejoined, "that horrible doctrine! I am astonished! I would know why thee believes it!" I replied, "Because I believe the Bible; and because that book very clearly reveals it." I here referred to Ephesians, chap. 1, and some other places. It appeared evident from his air that he did not anticipate the hardihood of so full an answer; and I thought that he asked the question as if to awe me into a denial of what *he* was pleased to *predestinate* to condemnation. Here the whole circle sat mute, till I turned to B. whom I most respected of the company, a man seemingly of more honesty, intelligence and worth, than I commonly found among them, in argument about religion. "Hast thou, friend B. never seen," said I, turning to him and using 'the plain language,' as I did, respectfully to all of them at that time, "hast thou never read that doctrine in Paul's Epistles, as well as elsewhere throughout the Bible?" He seemed troubled; but at last replied, "I certainly have seen there what looked very much like it indeed!" said I, "And why then didst *thou* not believe it?" said he, "As I never can understand it, I always turn over the leaf."¹¹ I answered, "If one cannot at all understand it, why does it seem to chafe you so? If we may turn over the leaf of an inspired book that was written on purpose to in-

struct us in those things which God judges proper for us to know, and has therefore fully revealed, whenever we happen to dislike a passage, others may do the same; and so the whole Bible will be thrown away! I think this is a solemn and criminal slight put upon the Author of the Bible; and I, for one, should be afraid to do it. To me it seems modesty and piety both, to learn all that he condescends to teach, to trust where we possibly may be unable to solve, and at all events not to omit any part of his communicated wisdom, lest we should find our names *omitted* from 'the Book of Life,' in the last day: for he says, *He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings.*"¹²

I did indeed the more infer and feel that they were ignorant almost of "the first principles of the doctrine of Christ; unstable as water, that could not excel; children, tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive!" I felt too the horrible vanity of their vestimental signals of holiness; hence I pitied them with a bleeding heart, but felt divorced from their communion, and edified in utter detestation of their dreamy tenets. I shook their hands at parting, expressed my soul's wishes for their welfare, bade them farewell, and abjured them for ever. I went home to my mother's, happy and trusting in God, but more than ever penetrated with a sense that Quakerism was a hollow arid shell, in which neither truth nor grace resided, and which should yet be dashed and pulverized by the "iron rod" of the

despised Messiah! "As the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers!" Rev. 2:27. My soul was now in that frame which is expressed in the sober and excellent words of the 124th Psalm. I saw the way of duty clear, and was calmly happy to walk in it. The storm was over, the agony gone! I felt it sweet and easy to leave all things for Christ, and thought my crosses, crowns; my losses, gains; my privations, privileges!

If on my cheek, for thy dear name,
Shame and reproaches be,
All hail reproach, and welcome shame,
So thou remember me!

That evening, I think, or shortly after, my dear, tender, and most afflicted mother, seeing that all the means and opportunities prescribed for my re-conversion only confirmed me, when I meditated and read the Bible, in a sense of duty to profess Jesus Christ in one of his own churches, now grew inconsolable; and, in a transport of grief, solemnly *commanded* me, in the name of God, who has required "obedience to parents" in his own word, to yield my purpose and continue a member of the Society! It was an awful and severe crisis! I felt its bitterness, and sympathised with her, whose strong and dear affection deserved for her all that a parent could deserve of a child! My sisters and brothers (I think all) were present. I paused, and then, with entire decision, answered: "*We ought to obey God rather than man. Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. If any man come to me, and hate not his*

father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred-fold, and shall inherit everlasting life. No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God. (Acts, 4 : 19. 5 : 29. Luke, 14 : 26. 9 : 62. Matt. 19 : 29. Mark, 10 : 29, 30.) *I intend to take stage to-morrow morning, before day, and return to Newark, where I expect soon to be baptized as a christian confessor, and partake at the communion-table with them that believe and know the truth."* 1 Tim. 4 : 3. This purpose I was enabled to execute; and accordingly, on the seventh day of March, (Lord's day,) 1813, in the second¹³ presbyterian church, Newark, N. Jersey, I professed my faith in Christ, was baptized, and did "eat of that bread, and drink of that cup," which symbolizes the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, "who died for us and rose again," according to his own blessed commandment, "This do, in remembrance of me." I was then in the twentieth year of my age. No one *whom experience hath not taught*, can well imagine what a struggle, and what a triumph it is, for an educated Friend to come to this! Instances of the sort are about as rare in this country as conversions from the Jews; and, while almost equally difficult and desirable, they are much less appreciated by Christians. I did it, however, in the hardihood of principle; conviction of the truth, and faith in

God, elevated my soul above all considerations besides them: and while I thank God, in Christ Jesus, as "the author and finisher of my faith, through whom, strengthening me, I can do all things," I record it here to his glory and my own ineffable joy, that *I have never, for one moment, regretted that decisive initial measure! and would no more go back to Friends, than I would resign my hope and joy in Christ Jesus!*¹⁴

Shortly after this I came to the conclusion that God had called me to the work of the ministry. I pass over the details of self-examination, and trials in this relation, through which I was enabled to pass, by the help of God speaking to me in his word, and comforting my soul at the throne of grace. I was licensed by the presbytery of New-York, in the month of October, 1816, to preach the gospel; and ordained to that office by the presbytery of Jersey, at Mendham, July 1, 1817. "Then Samuel took a stone, and set it between Mispeh and Shen, and called the name of it EBEN-EZER, saying, *Hitherto hath the Lord helped us.*" 1 Sam. 7: 12. Having ever since felt that God hath invested me with an office of magnitude, and a commission of responsibility, I have equally felt that, *as a minister of Jesus*, I was bound to perform a service of point and plainness to Friends; that as I could have no personal access to their meetings, and as private conferences had often proved unavailing, having, from experience, very little hope in talking with a Friend, as it is mostly impossible to convince him, and having, therefore, for a long time, almost totally disconti-

nued it; and convinced also, that ANY *written treatise* that should honestly attack the fundamental errors of their creed would be, of course, denounced by the Society, come from whom it might, and being written with whatever care and calmness, I felt that there was no alternative. Hence the present volume, in which my purpose is “nothing to extenuate, nor set down aught in malice;” to fear God only, and leave consequences with him. “Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all!” I have, at different times, received letters from divers Friends, preachers and others; some commanding me to repent and return to the inward light; others arguing the matter, informing me that *I know* I am doing wrong, remonstrating, warning, prophesying, testifying; and all *inspired*. Some of them are documents of heresy worthy of exposure; and I have them all filed and at hand, whenever it may be necessary to publish them, when I can do it with names and dates entire, and suitable notes and illustrations. Some of them I have answered, and others, full of rampant infidelity and something worse, I have just filed in silence. Some have uttered divers *predictions* concerning me, with specifications of time, which I have already lived to confound. Some of their prophecyings used at first *instinctively* to frighten me; but, in the end, I was only strengthened by them, when I saw the time arrived in which they were at once due and dishonored. “When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass,

that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously ; thou shalt not be afraid of him." Deut. 18 : 22. If there were no eternity, no heaven, no hell, no Savior, and no duty to perform, I would let them alone.

With respect to the *style* of this treatise, it is, perhaps, full of peculiarities, and those who know the writer will find them all his own. He is conscious also of their blemishes and faults. All he asks of the critic is to consider that the profession, on the score of taste, is quite as humble as the performance. A man should be himself at all times : peculiarities, eccentricities, and even inaccuracies, are more tolerable than mimicry, affectation, and false consequence ; while, in respect to conscience, one ought to remember that his appetite or organs are diseased who cannot tolerate *even the truth of the everlasting gospel*, unless modernized, decorated with the beauties of artificial rhetoric, and spiced to the relish of a sickly taste. Such a reader desires not to know the truth, but to get rid of it ; and this he covertly attempts under a demand for style. There is much of this silly and wicked capriciousness in the world. Its votaries, one would think, must perfectly nauseate the Bible ! and retreat politely for respite in fresco to the profanely bewitching genius of Byron, or the brilliant romancing of Scott. I would rather be denounced by critics and Friends in league, than defer to this graceless appetite one single hair.

“ The preacher sought,” however, “ to find out

acceptable words ;” and if it be ultimately found that “that which was written was upright, even words of truth,” its faultiness in minor respects will little disturb me. Some, and perhaps not a few, of the peculiarities of style and sentiment, however, result from the subject itself, the relations of the writer, the manner he prefers to adopt as best suited to arrest the thoughts, and the very peculiar singularities of the people called Quakers. For them, indeed, the work is intended, *principally*, if they will ; *secondarily*, if they choose ; and for others alone, should they universally refuse. “And he said unto me, Son of man, go, get thee unto the house of Israel, and speak with my words unto them. But the house of Israel will not hearken unto thee ; for they will not hearken unto me : for all the house of Israel are impudent and hard-hearted. Behold, I have made thy face strong against their faces, and thy forehead strong against their foreheads. As an adamant, harder than flint, have I made thy forehead : fear them not, neither be dismayed at their looks, though they be a rebellious house. And thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God ; he that heareth, let him hear ; and he that forbeareth, let him forbear : for they are a rebellious house.” Ezek. 3 : 4, 7-9, 27. Isaiah, 41 : 15, 16. Hos. 6 : 5-7.

One great difficulty which every writer must feel on this subject, is polemically to ascertain *precisely what that is* which he opposes. That Quakerism is of difficult definition, has been the charge of christians against it from the beginning. They

have no authentic creeds or symbols of faith: and those who know them, know that their *inspiration* often differs from itself on many points, according to the number of its subjects, multiplied by the number of interviews had with them. Prove *any thing* wrong, which one of them has said; prove it to another of them, and you will probably hear the convenient answer: "O that is a mistake, it is not what *Friends believe*." If you insist, "What then do they believe?" you will meet some reply of ambiguity, evasion, or obscurity, which will convince you only of their general ignorance of their own tenets, and of the trust of each to the better inspiration of all the others. In general, they are, as a sect, *marvellously* ignorant of what the scriptures teach. Their contradictions have been shown by many writers. In order to attain some definite end, therefore, I have mainly taken *Barclay's Apology*; a book which deserves and receives, perhaps, more of their common confidence than any other of their public documents; and have assumed it as *a standard of what Quakerism is*, proving the positions that I oppose, by quotations from its pages, and valuing it as *by far* the most respectable performance of which the society can boast; the works of PENN IN TOTO, being postponed to it. In this, if I have been studious of convenience to myself, I have been equally favorable to them; for, not only in point of style and scholarship, but in approximation (though it be but fitful and occasional) to protestant orthodoxy, Barclay holds a high, perhaps a solitary, pre-eminence. I have read many books and ser-

mons of Friends, but never one that deserved a comparison with the real respectability of Barclay. In many things that he says passingly, he speaks the undoubted truth of God; and in his *Theses Theologicae*, the *fourteenth proposition* itself, "concerning the power of the civil magistrate, in matters purely religious, and pertaining to the conscience," is admirable, and worthy of the almost unqualified approbation of christians. He produced his *Apology* in his comparative youth, when in his 27th year, or, at most, his 28th, and about nine years after uniting with the Society, which occurred in 1667. That he was a man of unblemished morals and unsullied fame, there lives not one to question. *I sincerely respect him*; and considering his Roman Catholic training, his jesuitical education on the continent, in connection with his very youth, when (in his 18th or 19th year) the imposing pretensions of Quakerism first entranced his devout imagination, I rather pity than dislike him, as I have often and deeply compassionated thousands, whose noble minds, like lions taken in the meshes of a secret net, were entangled, and subdued, and prostrated, by an influence which they could neither define nor escape. Let it be remembered, then, that I do not *intentionally* assail the man, when I examine and decry his sentiments; that it really grieves me to appear often as if I were opposing *him*; and when I use freely *what he hath himself given to the public and posterity*, I only avail myself of a universal right, which any other man may exercise, upon his own responsibility to God, in animadversion upon what I have written. In his public

character as a religious teacher, and in this alone, do I denounce him and his peers. The great fault of *Barclay*, as a reasoner, is, in my opinion, the *anti-Baconian* style of his reasoning. Though that illustrious reformer of the dialectic art, died about half a century before the *Apology* was written; and though his immortal *Novum Organum* had been extant then so many years, it is most probable (slighted as it was by many of the visionary votaries of Aristotle's theory-making logic) that *Barclay* had never read it! I infer this from the whole style of his reasoning, which no one will call *Baconian* who knows how to define the inductive philosophy, and has ever read the *Apology* once through, with his thoughts awake. I infer it from his views and denunciations of logic, as an art by which men "may learn twenty tricks and distinctions how to shut out the truth," and which only impedes that "secret virtue and power" which "ought to be the *logic* and *philosophy* wherewith a true christian minister should be furnished, and for which they need not be beholden to *Aristotle*." And I infer it from the fact, that he never once mentions *Bacon*, or alludes to him, (as I can find,) in the whole compass of his nearly 600 octavo pages. The logic of *Bacon* is the logic of the New Testament. Its principles are opposed to those of the *Stagyrite*, as they are founded in universal experience, observation, and fact. They coincide with all we know; they lead to true results; they are universal and impartial; they delight in evidence alone; they aid the interests and demonstrate the claims of christianity; and they *just*

as certainly exalt the *Bible* and explode *Quakerism*. That knowledge is *not* innate ; that *inward light* is folly ; that any man is liable to err ; that we must make inferences from facts, which theory must *follow* and not *precede*, in order to the possession of *knowledge* ; that men come into this world without ideas, ignorant as brutes, and derive *all they know* by means of *sensation* and *reflection* ; that we must guard our premises, and make them sure, before we arrive at conclusions ; and that one fact is worth a thousand theories, and good against a million : these are the main principles of true reasoning, and the foundation of the *Baconian* philosophy—a philosophy which is not “falsely so called,” and the influence of which can be deprecated only by the contracted bigots of some fondled theory, begotten in darkness and instinctively trembling at the light. If *Barclay* was disgusted at the philosophy of *Aristotle*, and denounced it from a general conviction of its inutility, I agree with him : from his inference, however, from that premise, *that we ought to throw away all learned logic*, I dissent ; and for the following reasons :—1. *It is impossible to have none*. Men deceive themselves when they think that all philosophy is bad, and that it is possible to retain our senses and forego the use of all. All men think, right or wrong ; and they think also according to certain laws. To think aloof from all the principles of intellectual philosophy is impossible. The only question is—*whether our philosophy of thought shall be favorable or adverse to truth ; whether it shall be true or false ?*—2. *Barclay* himself uses much of

the wit of the schools, and is much indebted to it (as thence Friends are also) in his whole treatise. He acknowledges, indeed, that he has used *natural logic*, which he commends, and at the same time contra-distinguishes from that of the schools, which he totally denounces. But is he right in this? Can any man suppose that *natural logic* alone gave him all that dialectic subtlety which he certainly evinces, and sometimes with success? Was it natural or scholastic wit that cast so many formal syllogisms in mood and figure, and strewed them profusely over his pages in such anticipated order? *Method* is one of the loftiest and most important divisions of artificial logic; and, at the same time, that in which natural logic fails most frequently, while it is also a division of which *Barclay* avails himself with considerable address throughout his volume. Friends have often boasted of him on this very account. He is plainly wrong, then, in scorning all artificial logic; and had he been well acquainted with *Bacon's* regenerated and most excellent system, I cannot suppose either that he could have denounced it, or that he ever would have written his *Apology*. The whole system of *inward light* much more accords with the fictions of Aristotle than with the strict and sober principles of *Bacon*: with which last indeed it cannot consist at all! What *rational* evidence is there in the decision of *inward light*? What relation has that light to evidence? No more than declamation has to argument, or assertion to proof.—3. *Jesus Christ evinces the power of correct reasoning in all his preaching.* The connection be-

tween premise and conclusion; the necessity of evidence to thought, to obligation, and moral action; the power of the dilemma; the admissions of an opponent; the misery of sophism; the force of implication and inference; the *ad hominem* style; the *reductio ad absurdum*; the sorites; and almost every other manner of argumentation, is frequently exemplified in his reasonings. The same is true of all the sacred writers; especially of Paul, who was, at once, probably, the greatest reasoner, and the most useful man, that ever appeared as the *inspired* ambassador of Christ. My last reason is—4. That *nobody actually believes the statement, (though some may suppose they do,) that well cultivated scholastic logic is of no use in religion, and not a desirable and responsible gift of providence.* False learning, and the abuse of true, are both bad; but surely this does not impair the excellency and usefulness of true learning! A man's spirituality, just here, may be wonderfully influenced—unknown perhaps to himself—by envy! *He* may have no learning; he may feel their superiority who are not in his predicament; he may be unable, or unwilling, or without opportunity to study; and therefore he may set himself to *disparage* what he does not possess, and would—*from no good motive possibly*—very gladly attain, could “the desire of the slothful,” or the caprice of the vain, or the resources of the wealthy, procure it for him. Facts speak on this point. How much is the cause of the Reformation indebted to learning? Almost as much as learning has been also indebted to it! Look

at the map of the world. What but learning *ever* translated the *Bible* into our mother tongue, or any other tongue, since "Babel was confounded?" What a prodigious effect on all the interests of society has the art of printing exerted! Look at the Friends themselves. The writings of *Barclay, Penn*, and others, who were comparatively learned men, have procured for them all the theological respectability, or the most of it, which they have ever attained : and of this they are so conscious, that they continually refer to those writers for a vindication of their tenets. The sum is this : no man ever yet sincerely or consistently denounced true learning, who did himself possess it ; and they who possess it not, are no proper judges in the case. "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him." Prov. 18 : 13. The book of Proverbs is *Baconian*, to a wonder !

But there is one feature of the system of Friends which deserves a recognition here—*its inimical regard to classical and scientific learning*. I do not say that *all* Friends are thus hostile, or that they are all alike hostile to liberal learning ; but *I charge this hostility on the system*. That such is its character, appears from the denunciation, the indiscriminate proscription of *Barclay* ; and that not in a few places of his book. It appears in the general hostility of Friends to all colleges and seminaries where the elevated branches are thoroughly taught. Not one young Friend out of five hundred, even in this free country, ever obtains a liberal education, in fact or in name ; certainly never becomes gradu-

ated in the arts at any chartered institution; and where an instance occurs, it is always attended with special difficulties. *They have no college of liberal science in the world!* Some, I know, of the suspected worldly sort in Philadelphia, have proposed, and would have forwarded so excellent an object; but they were always awed into despondency by the unlettered, all-knowing *light within*. And in this, their obsequiousness was quite consistent; for, if schools, academies and universities are all *in their nature* wrong, and as such forbidden of God, it is certainly right to desist totally and at once from the prosecution of their cause! Incidental evils indeed they will always include; but *the system* is not chargeable with these, unless in its own nature it approves and fosters them. There will always, perhaps, be hypocrites at the communion table; but christianity does not make them: and the purest ministry of the gospel will often become “a savor of death unto death;” but sinners themselves, and not such a ministry, are to blame for the consequence. And so the best organized system of intellectual education that the world has ever seen, has often presented the appalling spectacle of profligate and wicked students perverting its privileges. But what of that? Shall we burn our colleges? Why not our primary school-houses too? What beneficent institution, what bounty of the blessed God is not perverted and abused in this naughty world? I return to the fact, and ask the friends of order, of religion, and of man, dispassionately to *consider*, at their leisure, the three following questions:

1. *Is Quakerism friendly to the cultivation and diffusion of scientific knowledge?* 2. *If not, is it congenial any more with christianity than with the real interests of the nation or the world?* 3. *When would the whole world be converted to Christ upon their principles, or by their influence?*

One painful consideration to any person who wishes and who endeavors to subserve the conversion of Friends to christianity, is *their characteristic aversion to investigate*. One special reason of this, beside others, not a few derived, in common with the hinderances of other men, from the "first Adam," results from the genius of their religion. To investigate, is to think, examine, analyze; and in religion it is to "search the scriptures daily;" to "ask wisdom" in prayer to God; to weigh evidence; to respect the opinion of others, so far as to "*consider*" what they say; to admit the possibility of one's own error on any subject; to deprecate and resist the dark tyranny of prejudice; to deny infallibility to men universally; to surmount the dictation of friends *just as sincerely* as that of enemies; to feel the incomparable value of truth, and to realize the obligation of the mandate, "buy the truth, and sell it not;" to feel and to own one's personal fallibility; to study the force and to sift the correctness of *educational* principles; to ply all proper means of right knowledge with candor and benevolence; to grasp known truth, after examination, with courage and tenacity; to *habituate* the exercise of investigation; to "incline one's ear unto wisdom, and apply the heart to understanding; yea,

to cry after knowledge, and lift up the voice for understanding ; to seek her as silver, and search for her as for hid treasures ; in order to understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God." Prov. 2 : 2-5. True, there are some minds comparatively incapable of investigation. They look back, and not forward, and they can see nothing out of the wake of their own random sailing. They perceive not *the other side* of the question. With them to investigate is indevotion, is danger, is scepticism—so *incredulous* are they of the ultimate truth of what they *believe*. With them abstraction is distraction ; the value of *principles of thought* is inscrutable ; and degrees of evidence are a profane supposition. What they believe they *know*, though they cannot prove it ; what they hold, they are *sure* is right, though they have no other evidence ; and what their conscience approves, they are *not afraid to venture*, because they are sincere. "The sluggard is wiser in his own conceit than seven men that can render a reason." Prov. 26 : 16. "Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit ? There is more hope of a fool than of him. 12." "My son, give me thine heart, and let thine eyes observe my ways." 23 : 26. "Brethren, be not *children in understanding* : howbeit, in malice be ye children, but IN UNDERSTANDING BE MEN." 1 Cor. 14 : 20. There are minds, too, so weak and insipid in their very structure, that, wherever is their place in "the body," it is plain that they were never intended for "the eye ;" although the perversion of their native training, mixed with the dregs of their own vanity,

may possibly intoxicate them with the notion of their competency to become leaders in religion. Such minds as these are easily brought to feel the flame of *inspiration*, and to surrender to all the phantasies of that serene delirium. But with respect to greater minds, those capacitated for thought and investigation, what are we, *in consistency*, to expect from them, after they have imbibed from infancy the sentiment of *a universal inward light*, PARAMOUNT to the scriptures, which every man is SUPREMELY bound to audit and to follow, “through faith in its effectual operation?” Hence is it that I aver their intractableness, and their *consistent* aversion to investigate, as resulting from the very genius of their religion. Their master spirits often, I might say *habitually*, resist the tendencies of rational thought, that they may *get still*, suppress “the motions and activity of the creature,” and *come to know a unity with the life, the power, and spirit within them*. This is their religion. It was the very soul of the scheme and conduct of George Fox. When I was yet recent in the faith of Christ, and before I was “disowned;” being in company with some eminent preachers of the society at a public inn, and conversing very moderately, but with decision, on the topics of difference; one of the preachers suddenly rose, beckoned me *solemnly* into an adjoining apartment, and then commenced his *inspired* advice substantially in this sort: “Samuel, thy mind is too active; if thee wants peace, I can tell thee how to find it: *get still, get still!* and thou shalt come to know the hidden

wisdom in the quiet of all flesh. I tell thee, my dear young friend, *get still.*" I thanked him for his intentioned kindness; but told him that was a very *inferior* answer to the question, *What must I do to be saved?* compared with the *inspired answer* contained in the scriptures. Acts, 16: 31. I told him I felt bound in conscience toward God, to prove all things; and that I deeply doubted the peace of which he spoke, as I desired none that could not look at the truth without blenching, and grow stronger and purer by a thorough investigation of the doctrine of Christ. I treated him kindly, and felt what I seemed. He however was offended, as I suppose, because I could not follow his advice, since I felt obligated to investigate:—I suppose this from several ungrateful and *unreciprocated* indications; especially this, that though I occasionally see him in the city of his residence, and have toward him, as the Lord knows, feelings of kindness alone, he never knows me! He walks by me in the street, or rides in wealthy dignity; and seems to say as we pass each other, "he was fairly warned; but he wilfully refused—to get still!" Alas! my memory and conscience both confirm the charge. May his mind never respond affirmatively to a more serious one!

Uncharitableness will probably be charged to my account. But (1) does it come with a good grace from Friends? From those who in their writings, their discipline, their preaching, and their common talk, denounce all the christian ministry, of whatever denomination, as "hirelings?" This word,

that abounds in their use, occurs in the New-Testament only in one chapter and one connection; (John, 10;) and means a false teacher of religion, who loves the wages more than work; who loves the wages supremely, and “careth not for the sheep.” It is there used three times only. In their stereotyped calumny, they unchurch and *eternally undo* every minister of the gospel who receives a temporal support for his spiritual services; though his whole powers and time and affections are devoted to the work of the ministry alone;—for, an “hireling,” that deserves the name, is certainly, as Judas, the prince of reprobates! How happens it that Friends have obtained, even by immemorial precedent, a license from public sentiment on this article? If what they allege is true, Tillotson, Watts—some of whose hymns they teach their children, and Blair, and millions beside of the noblest stars in the ecclesiastical firmament, are *now* “lifting up their eyes in hell, being in torments!” And are *they* the immaculate exempts that may cry out “uncharitableness,” when a minister of Jesus Christ undertakes to expose their errors and tell them the truth in its plainness, “according to the commandment of the everlasting God,” and as it is revealed “by the scriptures of the prophets—made known to all nations for the obedience of faith?” Rom. 16: 26.

There is one other fact worthy of notice, (and I could easily summon more,) in illustration of their claim to decry uncharitableness: Their polity, both in its organization and its known and frequent

administration, positively excommunicates, collectively and individually, all the true churches of Jesus Christ in christendom, and every personal professor of the faith of Jesus, who belongs not to their society! Proof—If one of their members of either sex, dares to contract marriage with *any other person*, however excellent and however exemplary in every christian virtue, they are immediately under the necessity to make a formal (written—if I recollect right) declaration of their REPENTANCE, as if they had committed a grievous sin; or—would you believe it, fathers and brethren?—be excommunicated, or publicly “disowned,” by the operation of “the good order used amongst them!” This, resulting *necessarily* from the genius of Quakerism, is a fixed and immutable statute, in England, Ireland, America, and elsewhere; and has been since the origin of the society. If they do not know it, I would tell them—that it is a pestilent limb of antichrist; a piece of covert popery; a legislation contrary to the certain constitution of God; a principle of organized and iniquitous misanthropy—and in every view criminal, tyrannous, and wrong! No community on earth have a right to make such an ordinance. It is proof that they are a “society,” and *not* a church of Jesus Christ. I, of course, speak this merely from a sense of right, having no possible interest in the subject but what I avow. But is it not a crying shame, a disgrace to the age, and a monstrosity in christian society? It often leads, as I know, to hypocrisy, equivocation, and all the sly arts of evasion; while its repudiated victims are many. Suppose, for example, that a

character as exalted and stainless as Dr. Chalmers, should contract an alliance, "honorable in all," with a lady of worth belonging to the society; and suppose that, when waited on "under dealings," she should find it in her heart rather to bless the God of Rebecca, for the Isaac of her pure affections, than to repent of the donation and the blessing together, that she might retain the *incalculable* advantage of "her birth-right" among such a people: why, the consequence is infallible! But this is not all. The register of her misdemeanor and her resolute impenitence, after being read to all the assembled meetings, (men's and women's apart,) is perpetuated to coming ages, with the added opprobrium—"by the assistance of a hireling minister;" or words very like these *ipsissima* of my present recollection. The result however is the same, as it respects "disownment," if the marriage is consummated by a magistrate, or in any other way of "the world's people." Their policy in this is obvious: it is to eternize their sectarianism—to divorce their members from human nature, and to excommunicate the species, in order to maintain their resolute peculiarities! *Odisse humanum genus!*¹⁵ Is Quakerism christianity? One final cause of the interdict of God, in respect to marriage within certain degrees of consanguinity and affinity, is doubtless to destroy, or rather to prevent, the clanishness of families; to interlace the centres and connect the circles of social life in one vast and catholic attraction; and to make every one "honor all men," and feel that every individual that has a soul, and for whom

Christ died, and who belongs to our common species, is an object of obligatory and reciprocal benevolence. Let me say again, I am not angry at *them*. It is a desire of their salvation that leads me to hold to their vision the mirror of truth. If the reflection is ungrateful, the rays of incidence come from themselves. I only wish to demonstrate to every reader that their talk about charity is not so congruous; and to remind them of the proverb applicable to those who "live in glass houses." Nor is the assumption here gratuitous. There is no people in the world more sensitive than they to the esteem of men. They are sensitive also to the importance of charity, and even clamorous for its exercise—when *they* are to be the objects of it. Their vehemence is prodigiously reduced in those relations where they are justly entitled to become the subjects of it. Many of them speak as if the obligations of charity were not reciprocal, and as if the lines of charity authorized its movement only in one direction—I need not say toward themselves. At its best, the charity of a Quaker for other denominations is mere feeling at the time, ordinarily one of the most capricious, flitting, and gossamer productions in the world. A soul without principles is about as strong and steady in moral action, as in ordinary life would be a body without bones. (2) They ought to remember, if they ever knew, the nature of charity. With the mere word, I confess myself on no very amicable terms; and wish sincerely it had never appeared in our English Bible. The original word *αγαπη* is rendered *love* very often, and should have

been so rendered in EVERY instance. It would then have prevented a vast amount of dotage, mistake, and lawless affectation. Love means, benevolence, "good will to men." And if I have outraged this pure celestial principle, how was it done? I have been satirical, ironical, sarcastic, possibly. True; and I wish I could have done it all with more address; "wise as a serpent and harmless as a dove." I wish that I could have maintained more palpably throughout the distinction between the persons of Friends and their individual interests on the one hand, and their corporate and public errors on the other. But may I not appeal to them and to all, in my turn, for honesty, for justice? Will they not credit me when I assure them that I *aimed* to honor the distinction adequately, and that it is *against their errors alone* that I have desired to be bold and even severe?

If they ask why I have been willing to make them appear ridiculous, and why, on such a serious subject, I have been so willing to excite sometimes the laughter of the reader? I answer, mainly for two reasons: first, because it appears to me that some of their chief errors are so antiquated, and at the same time so venerable in their own view, and incorrigible by ordinary measures, that it was like Elijah at Mount Carmel, when he demonstrated the ridiculous but most devout worship of the idolaters to be what it was, by holding their folly obvious to the multitude, in a vein of the most biting and acrimonious irony of which we have any example; and second, because the genius of their system, by inducing a spurious

solemnity on every religious subject, puts the whole matter ordinarily out of the reach of men, who ought to have religion familiarized to their thoughts, and interwoven with their daily associations, and engrafted upon all the objects of their converse in life ; instead of being shrouded in unapproachable solemnity and inscrutable mystery. I have therefore endeavored so to write, that if, through the infinite grace of Jesus Christ, we should meet at last in a better world, where prejudice shall be done away for ever, my charity will be accredited ; my motives unimpeached ; my reasons vindicated even for the alleged severities. Let them remember that charity, the name and the thing, is a matter among the most abused in our language, “the sport of mere pretenders to the name,” and the very antipodes often of christian benevolence. This “rejoiceth in the truth ;” and “hateth every false way ;” and will in any wise maintain pure the religion of heaven. I suppose it charity to abet the truth ; to expose and frustrate, by rational argument and moral means, all the errors that would corrupt it ; to become aggressively a controvertist or even a champion for its sake ; and in valor to “contend earnestly for the faith ONCE DELIVERED”—mark, not delivered millions of times, or oftener, but ONCE delivered—“to the saints.” “If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed : for, he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds.” This is charity of a genuine stamp ; charity coined in the mint of heaven, and having

“the image and superscription of God.” Of what kind of *love* becomes it the destruction, practically to honor such of his commandments? That kind that postpones the first table of the law to the second; talks well of both, and obeys neither; delights in those imaginings which truth denounces, and courts darkness rather than light, as the atmosphere of all its flourishing! It is charity to—self, dear self, partial, evil, deceitful self! And is not the selfishness of the original the reason why the picture is denied?

It may be proper here to view the subject in another aspect. There is a great schism in the body. Friends are divided, or rather subdivided into two distinct sects, at least in this country; the Orthodox and the Hicksites. I have reason to believe that the letter already referred to, written by myself to the committee at Philadelphia, A. D. 1813, had *some* influence, in the providence of God, in producing the event. It was the first bill of attainder that ever was filed in that city, I ween, against the oraculous Simon of the Samaritans; who had widely “bewitched the people, giving out that himself was some great one: to whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is the great power of God. And to him they had regard, because that of long time he had bewitched them with sorceries.” However that be, I wish to remark on the fact: 1. That *it is only a change in the progress of the times and the increase of evangelical light, which requires and portends other revolutions.* It has broke the charm of *infallibility*, in which the semi-papacy of the seventeenth century

(when other monstrosities were “spouted from the crater of a revolutionary volcano”) may be identified in Quakerism. That human infallibility must exist somewhere on earth, our ancestors held it sacrilegious to doubt. The Pope and Fox agreed in the general sentiment; and each of them claimed it as his own: only one challenged it by virtue of St. Peter’s investiture, the other as the result of interior illumination. Hence the dogmatizing of Quakerism is all “anointed” with infallibility. What could inspiration more? But the charm is broken. Altar is reared against altar; and opposite batteries, equally infallible, pour their polemical vollies into each other, with new methods of gunnery and fortification. I think this is well, rather than the opposite. It may yet open the eyes of both belligerents to the real light. “A living dog is better than a dead lion.” Any thing but stagnation, “silent meetings,” and a sleepy congregation—telling how “refreshed” they felt! Concussions in the atmosphere, with the glare of lightning, and the roll of thunder, and the terror of all terrestrial consciousness, may still be necessary to purity, health, and even life. “Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife: and some also of good will. What then? Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.” I allude mainly to the idea of action and inquiry on the subject of religion, as better than dotage and supineness—not that I think the preaching of either party is the pure truth of the gospel, or that either properly “preach Christ”

at all. I am convinced of the contrary. Still, there is no hope of those who take all for granted "even as they are led," and who examine nothing. Excitement is not religion—but it is ordinarily indispensable to it. This may be the very means selected by that admirable Economist who is "wonderful in counsel and excellent in working," to rouse them from the lethargy of ages; and necessitate their practical searching, so as to bring them, it may be, savingly to know the "truth and soberness" of the gospel. God is a real and glorious, though an invisible and little accredited agent, in all these teeming wonders of his sovereignty. O let us pray more, that his prospering breath may vivify, through the truth, an awakened and confounded population!

2. *We may be in danger of thinking too much of it; of dishonoring too much in comparison the one party, and of crediting the other prematurely for attainments they have yet to make; and so of injuring both parties, and really retarding their common proficiency.* I have something gravely to allege against those called orthodox—*only by contrast* with notions the most infidel, and sordid, and impudent in error; something, on account of which, while it remains, I feel pressed, in judgment and in conscience too, to *deny to them boldly* a recognition of christian character. I cannot at all fellowship them, so corrupt is their confession, and so equivocal their "professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ:" I say again, in the ear of earth and the eye of heaven, that I *cannot* do it; nor do I think, most excellent sirs, that one of you, or those whom

you represent and influence, ought to do it. Suppose they are, by possibility, genuine christians at heart; I still think that they are so exceedingly defective that God has a terrible controversy with them, in which we are in danger of taking side against him, by a course of fraternizing and congratulation, while they remain as they are. He neither requires us to search the heart, nor to admit a silly charity against evidence or without it. The defect to which I allude is pervading and universal. It is the stain, and, in my christian judgment, *the damning fault* of all their publications—the very best of them. I call them “orthodox” only by usage, and for distinction, and always with reluctance, while I witness that accursed leaven in all their published symbols. It is a qualifier downward of all their good promisings; it is the obscuration, if not the extinguisher, of all their heavenly light; it is the goal, and the limit, and the barrier, of their christian advancement; and it is an error which no one of you would allow, among any other people, to the man whom you would feel warranted to fellowship as a christain brother. It is this: **PERTINACIOUSLY REFUSING TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE PARAMOUNT AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, AS OUR RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE; AND REFUSING, WITH MELANCHOLY AND EQUAL CONSISTENCY TO FOLLOW THE EXAMPLE OF JESUS CHRIST IN CALLING THEM “THE WORD OF GOD.”**

Where got they all their honorable orthodoxy, but from that **BOOK OF BOOKS** which they dare to call “a secondary rule?” How know they one grand

truth, how can they prove it in controversy, but by resort to the scripture, that "cannot be broken?" They quote Barclay, in what he says with cardinal heresy, that the scriptures "are not to be esteemed the adequate, primary rule of faith and manners. Yet, because they give a true and faithful testimony of the first foundation, they are and may be esteemed a secondary rule, subordinate to the Spirit; from which they have all their excellency and certainty; for, as by the inward testimony of the Spirit we do alone truly know them, so they testify that the Spirit is that guide by which the saints are led into all truth; therefore, according to the scriptures, the Spirit is the first and principal leader. Seeing, then, that we do therefore receive and believe the scriptures, because they proceeded from the Spirit, for the very same reason is the Spirit more originally and principally the rule, according to the received maxim in the schools: 'Propter quod unum quodque est tale, illud ipsum est magis tale;' that for which a thing is such, that thing itself is more such." Of this caballistical aphorism more hereafter.

I have taken the above from a late publication of theirs, entitled, "AN EXPOSITION OF THE FAITH OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, COMMONLY CALLED QUAKERS, IN THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, PRINCIPALLY SELECTED FROM THEIR EARLY WRITINGS. BY THOMAS EVANS." With the family of the compiler, or author, I have some quondam acquaintance; and may add, that I sincerely respect them for their singular intelligence, and comparative deference for the scriptures; in

which they seem to me to go farther than others, and perhaps as far as they can, with the perilous enchantment of Fox and Barclay, and all the retinue of *inspired* errorists of the sort, obstructing them. For others of the party I entertain a similar deference—as real and as deep as they possess who flatter them more, or who dislike their errors less. The EXPOSITION contains 232 citations from early Friends, to prove “that they sincerely believed, and openly avowed, the great fundamental truths of the christian religion.” It is published under the sanction of the society, by their assembled “representatives.” The work is neat, showing great accuracy and great pains-taking in the selection. It is constituted throughout of precious excerpts from the writings of the society; and appears to me—and it would be affectation to imply that I did not think myself a judge in *such* things—to be the very best manifesto of their views, in seeming approximation to catholic orthodoxy, that I have ever seen, or which I believe it possible to compile or *select* from the writings of their authors. It proves, however, that in their belief they have been **CARDINAL HERETICS** from the beginning—the whole of them; and that the present “orthodox” intend to remain what their fathers were. Allow me, too, to express my wonder and regret at the facility with which some truly orthodox divines, under the influence of the imposing *name* of orthodox, have gloried in them, and recognised them as christian brethren, vastly increasing the satisfactions of the inward light! It is

really injuring them, and compromising the truth of God, which we are set to defend.

Let me state a case that is quite parallel in my own estimate. Some Unitarians, as they call themselves, in order to slander us of tritheism, are as low as Socinus himself, uncle or nephew; as low as mere humanitarianism can make them. Others of *hoc genus omne*, are hyperarians; they believe not only that Jesus Christ is the chief of all creatures, but so ancient and exalted and incomparable, that he is their constituted Head, and even very God—in a subordinate sense! i. e. that he is God, truly and properly, saving only that he is not the eternal Jehovah, and was indeed *created* to be, what he is, the glorious Chieftain of creation. Thus I have given *the scale of finite*, on which different degrees, between the two extremes specified, are selected, by different “deniers of the Lord that bought them,” as their resting-place—for the present. **HOW HIGH**, very estimable sirs, on that scale might I ascend, speaking divers good and true things by the way, in favor of your Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and at the same time denying his supreme divinity, before you, who understand *this* subject so wisely and well, would own me as a brother in the Lord? You would tell me, that though he was “of the seed of David according to the flesh,” i. e. in his proper human nature, he was also, in his superior nature, “**GOD OVER ALL, AND BLESSED FOR EVER;**” and that until I threw away my scale of finite, and forbore to attempt to measure infinite, and recognise Jesus Christ as the Jehovah of the Bible,

whom Isaiah saw in vision on his throne, ch. 6, (John, 12,) such a recognition could never be extended; it was morally impossible, and wholly out of the question; and you would, I think, answer as you ought, in consistency not more than duty. It is not by lowering, or altering the standard of God, that men are reduced to conformity and similitude.

And when a whole sect come, in effect, to you, and detrude "the oracles of God" from their justly supreme pre-eminence, call them "a secondary rule," and license them to be "esteemed as such;" and MAKE GOD HIMSELF A RULE OF ACTION; (the only way in which they can show a superior rule;) and profess to walk by the greater, and not by the less; and maintain the plenary inspiration of George Fox and all his satellites; and tell you that the scriptures can be known in their divinity, not *by faith* cordially honoring the rational evidence that demonstrates it abundantly, but *only* by having the same spirit that they had who gave them forth; thus "MAKING THE WORD OF GOD OF NONE EFFECT, THROUGH THEIR TRADITION WHICH THEY HAVE DELIVERED," as well as received; "and many such like things they do;" and when they say divers other things, and some that are true and important, which they affect to know irrespectively of "the secondary rule," or in a way of paramount authority—though you all well know, that there is not a particle of "light in them" which they have not borrowed, or rather "stolen," (a felony which the Bible itself indignantly resents,) from that dishonored rule, "that they might keep their own tradition:"

I say, in such a case as this, will you absolve them of the greater, for the sake of the less? This is not the way of absolution in a higher relation—"even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you." Nor do I see, by parity of reasoning, so far as the general principle and spiritual ethics of the case are concerned, why we might not recognise also some, or many of the deniers of the divinity of Jesus Christ, because they talk so much panegyric, and so much truth of him, and because they live and act so unblamably, notwithstanding! I am far from accusing *you* of any such recognition; and only allege, that, however benevolently your hearts may beat, as I know they do, toward their highest interests, you will be wrong in principle, and injurious toward those very interests, should you recognise, in your exalted stations, the visibility of their claims as a christian church, or the reality of their pretensions as individual christians. An opposite course would, I am persuaded, be a real injury to themselves. Their error debilitates all their principles of faith, and pervades the whole of their religious sympathy. I have no doubt at all, that it has, first and last, been the means of destroying more souls than the wheels of the great car of oriental idolatry have ever crushed of the bodies of men, devoutly prostrate before them! It is a *virus* that I know experimentally, and shudder at the thoughts of it: "remembering mine affliction and my misery, the wormwood and the gall, my soul hath them still in remembrance, and is humbled in me." As long as it lasts, we can never convince a Friend of one of his "legion" of subordinate mistakes! It completely NULLIFIES THE CON-

STITUTION! Like papacy, it pays great court to a certain volume, the legitimate use of which it forever precludes; awarding, it may be, a costly and gorgeous “envelope of purple, a casket and a lock, for the Word of Life!” If there is any doubt of this, I ask a Friend, *on certainly demonstrable scriptural evidence*, to submit most cordially to the ordinances of baptism and the Lord’s supper. And what think you of this *divine* test? *I* know what to think. He will not wait for the evidence! he is afraid to look at it! and as for doing it, not he! he will glide off, like an eel in his proper element, and resist the light that shines “outwardly” as plain as day; under the influence of his *viaticum* of interior illumination; walking by the greater, and not by the less!! And so of any thing else, contained, however plainly, in the word of God, which his carnal prejudices happen to dislike.

I dismiss this part of the subject with the remark, that it is, at all events, safer to withhold such recognition, in doubtful circumstances, than to extend it; since, if they are christians, many, or all, or any of them, such will not be ultimately damaged by the principled reserve; if otherwise, you will do nothing to assist their delusion; and, at all events, it should never be a question, in reference to *any* people, who, on any pretence whatever, professing a general christianity, still reduce the word of God to a rule of “secondary” importance. All I know, and all I have ever thought, and read, and prayed, on this momentous subject, has settled me in the conclusion for ever, that they are *fundamentally wrong* on this

article, touching the rule of scripture in religion; that they can never be rectified till they surrender, with all their heart, that *πρωτον ψευδος*¹⁶ of their heresy; that any reformation short of this, is nothing but an abortion, instead of a birth; and that any other sentiment in the case, especially emanating from centres of influence, and eminences of light, honored and dear sirs, such as God hath appointed you to fill with happy success in this our age and country, would dishonor the Master whom you serve, and injure the cause that you love, and frustrate the very ends that might prompt or tempt your benevolence, in any instance, to utter or to sanction it.

3. *For reasons similar to those just stated, it seems not justifiable that the 'orthodox' should be sanctioned in their severities against their brethren of the other party.* Into the merits of their controversies I have no mind to enter, referring to principles alone in these animadversions. I ask the 'orthodox' the following questions: Do you see the errors of the other party? Do you lament them? Do you feel, in their case, the criminality of religious error? Do you wish to correct and reclaim them? Well! I admit that you do. But have a care how you carry it toward them. Are yourselves much better, when you tell them doctrinally that *their* inward light (this is no fetch or perversion) is paramount to the book of their reputed scorn! that the Bible is not THE WORD OF GOD! that the Holy Scriptures amount only to a "secondary rule," and ought to be so "esteemed!" and that Fox (to say nothing of THOUSANDS of others) was truly inspired, accord-

ing to his towering pretensions ! You had better be cleaner yourselves, before you count their spots. You had better study self-knowledge more impartially, before you “ throw the first stone ” at them. In the name of Jesus Christ, my glorious Master and Redeemer, I am not at all afraid to say to you, Repent of your cardinal heresy, and accept the word of God as YOUR HIGHEST RULE IN RELIGION ! In vain do you vend your inspired argumentation against them ; they can answer you with arguments equally inspired. You will only break down one another, without building up any one in the “ most holy faith ” of christians. You have helped to take from them both the fulcrum and the lever, without which all attempts to elevate their views are vain. Like task-masters of old, you take away straw, and demand the “ full tale ” of brick. They will never be rectified, nor you either, till you both renounce together, or that party that shall be so rectified, your mysticising heresy of interior light and your consequent degradation of the word of God—a heresy in which there is, alas ! quite too little to choose between you. But, I have more to say on the schism.

4. *There may be such an unceremonious denouncing of the other party, as the lower and the more erroneous, as really to do injustice to some of their better characteristics ; regarding the men, rather than their wrong opinions, in this palliative reflection.* That some of them are very honest, and possessed of much moral courage of a certain sort, must be admitted. Their very confessions of infidelity are honorable, rather than covert hypocrisy.

Any thing but a hooded villain—a concealed and sanctimonious hypocrite in the church! There is always more hope of the conversion of an infidel, that knows himself such, than of a false pretender who mistakes himself for a genuine worshipper. A man had better, with respect to the hopefulness of his conversion to Christ, have no religion than a false one; had better know himself a foe, than mistake himself a friend. “Be not deceived: God is not mocked.” Till deceit can throw its veil of midnight over the eye-sight of Omniscience, its practisings, however ingenious, will be utterly vain. They may ruin and deceive their possessor alone. If to say this be uncourtly—I am acting for the court of heaven.

The grand rallying sentiment of the party now in question, has been that of their great champion—whose name is now burnt into them as Hicksites: **NO MAN CAN BELIEVE WHAT HE DOES NOT UNDERSTAND.** It is not with him original, as you well know: nor is the controversy novel that depends upon it. It affects every truth and every heresy; it belongs to some very interesting discussions in intellectual philosophy; and it deserves to be well considered for the sake of all men. It is a matter that actually enters into the experience in some way of every thinking christian, and of every doubting sinner. And I confess that it has elicited my compassion, when I have witnessed the hopeless contests, especially of Friends, in regard to it. That there is some truth in it, which of you, dear sirs, will question? How then ought the difficulty to be resolved? How does it

affect our moral relations to the mysteries of the gospel? How does it consist with the criminality of error and the obligations of faith?

As I have not lately first considered the subject, and have my own way of resolving it, in which however I am neither solitary nor original, I hope it will little startle you when I say—that THE POSITION IS NOT MORE SWEEPING THAN TRUE; in my judgment. I repeat the averment—NO MAN CAN BELIEVE WHAT HE DOES NOT UNDERSTAND. I extend it to religion and every thing else; but prefer the apophthegm that *faith and intelligence must be commensurate, at least in this respect, that faith can go no farther than intelligence, though intelligence may go farther than faith.*

To me it does not appear where there is either fallacy or peril in the proper import and use of this position. I certainly deceive myself greatly or I understand all that I believe on every subject. Take that of “the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” for a high example. You can easily show me the limit of intellection on this topic, dazzling with its own effulgence. You can show me the *fact* revealed; yes, I believe it, and I understand the fact revealed! But do I understand the *mode* of it also? No, I do not—nor do I believe the mode of it, either. The mode is no subject of revelation, no object of faith, no matter of intelligence. I believe that God is *one* in one sense; and three in another sense: and not so either as to exclude the other. But as to the mode or manner of it, or the question, How is it so? I understand nothing,

I believe nothing, I read nothing in the scriptures. So I take it is the truth with respect to every other matter of revealed instruction. But I go farther. I find every thing in the universe, as related to my knowledge, precisely in the same predicament. What are the premises of natural philosophy, but facts or phenomena, observed and classed, defined and methodized, with the exactitude of science? So of astronomy, botany, chemistry, geology, and the whole of physical science—not alone. But do not philosophers understand the modes of the facts? Not at all. They understand to some extent the relations of the facts; and facts subordinate which analysis discovers: but still they know no more of modes than essences. If this be true, we owe it to the Hicksites, fathers and brethren, just because we owe it to all others whom we can influence or assist in vanquishing the obstructions that intercept their return to the “obedience of the faith”—from what source soever they result, to disabuse genuine orthodoxy of the false metaphysics that have dishonored it; to facilitate THE WAY OF LIFE to the faith of men universally; and not to consecrate the errors of good men or even great ones, because some of them have gloomed the whole of christianity by protruding and aggrandizing the opposite position. I regard it as granting the whole cause to the enemy; as surrendering the total controversy; for one to require, contrary to the laws of mind, a homage to the gospel which, for that reason if for no other, the mind instinctively refuses to render! and this, if I mistake not, is an infinitely

interesting concern ! “ *We are debtors* both to the Greeks and to the barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise ; as much as in us is, to be ready to preach the gospel” to them. Isai. 57: 14. Hab. 2: 2. It would be sad for us in the day of judgment—I had almost said, even at the right hand of our glorious LORD, if he should there prove against us that, because “not skilful in the word of righteousness,” we had made dark what he had made clear, difficult what he had rendered easy, and unintelligible what himself had fully and with infinite condescension expounded !

Allow me here to relate an anecdote in point. I was once providentially (some few years since) thrown in company with several respected persons of this unhappy persuasion. One of them, an educated and regular physician of the city of Philadelphia, remarked that he would rather hear nothing on that subject, for it would be useless ; adding, I am so certain that *a man cannot believe what he does not understand*, that I never wish to listen to what confessedly contradicts this principle. Said I—may I not say any thing? No, was the answer ; if contradictory to the position aforesaid. I replied, but what if I avouch the same, for I certainly believe it myself? This greatly surprised him and others. I proceeded : explained some of the greatest facts of revelation in coincidence with it ; and elicited from him the concession—I never heard any thing so rational or convincing in favor of your side of the question before ! His countenance changed from the first moment he perceived my

meaning, from lightness to gravity. He always behaved differently to me and to these topics afterward; and on his lamented death-bed, besides the patience he showed and the confessions he made, he ventured with trembling to express a hope of redemption through the blood of the Lamb; welcomed a christian minister to his apartment; united with him in prayer; and called Jesus Christ *his Redeemer!* Forgive me, sirs, for a tear to the memory of my own dear late brother, James Cox, M. D. who left the world in December 1831, in the 35th year of his age. The Lord reigns! He was a man of unsullied character; in social and professional life universally respected. In chastity of manners, in justice of principle, in decision of conduct, his equals were few and his admirers many. And of his errors—liking them as little as you can, *I* can appreciate his prejudices, his education, his impediments, his real ignorance of christianity! Forgive the reference and the episode:—there are thousands of others in a similar condition. O that I could help them to “behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world!” I would labor for their salvation, and think their souls, gathered in Christ Jesus, the best hire in the world: for he whom such a motive would not supremely influence deserves truly the epithet of “hireling” or reprobate.

In view of this noble distinction between the fact and the mode, as related to the faith and the duty of men—that is, to their believing and practising “the glorious gospel of the blessed God;” while it

gives a lucid and legitimate facility above almost any other, and is of universal applicability; I would say to Friends of both parties, that it will leave them "without excuse" if, upon whatever pretence, they refuse that gospel. The end for which the gospel was written, is that for which the whole volume of inspiration was written. It is not to inform us of "a superior rule" within us—which it behoved to do, if any such thing exists; and so at once to nullify its utility and condemn its copiousness; for who could want such a massive volume, as a mere index-finger to the inward light—and then afterward need the more voluminous writings, equally *inspired*, of Friends, as a supplemental appendix to its contents? The design of the scriptures, of which Jesus Christ is the pervading subject-theme from first to last, is plainly declared to us: "These are written **THAT YE MIGHT BELIEVE** that Jesus is the **CHRIST**, the Son of God; and that, believing, ye might have life through his name." Hence the whole scriptures are said to be "**MADE KNOWN TO ALL NATIONS FOR THE OBEDIENCE OF FAITH.**" To believe, is to obey; for God *commands* us to believe. Mark, 1 : 15. 1 John, 3 : 23. The design of revelation then, and of inspiration as the way of revelation, is to disclose to us the lessons of truth which we are required to learn; the doctrines of God, which we are obligated to receive; and the duties of wisdom, happiness, and salvation, which we are privileged and commanded to perform. And all this under the sanction of—**LIFE OR DEATH ETERNAL!** Jesus Christ has plainly suspended our destiny on

this single point—whether we cordially embrace the gospel or not! Mark, 16 : 15, 16. And what shall we say to him, in the day of judgment, if *then* we are revealed to have been spiritual infidels; whatever we professed to be, or perhaps thought ourselves here, or whatever other frail mortals thought and said of us? Shall we say, Lord, how can a man believe what he cannot understand? He *may* answer—I revealed facts, realities, things that are, and those at once the most important for me to disclose, and for you to embrace: I revealed them in human language; fully, intelligibly, appositely, and required the universal assent of the understanding, and consent of the heart, to their supreme excellency. The mode of them I neither revealed, nor required you to believe, more than to understand or cavil about. I offered you salvation in those things; I offered it practicably, sincerely, universally: and ye would not! Ye loved your own superstition and tradition, more than my word; which you wrested, dishonored, made void, and treated at best as “a secondary rule:” Wherefore, “Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire;” that same fire which was “prepared for” original transgressors, “the devil and his angels.”

Will you, superior, and safe by presumption, scorn the representation; and count it methodistical and gross? Then know, my friends, that the experience—I pray it may never be yours—will be more gross than the representation—more humbling—more terrible! I fear that few of you ever have been, *as ALL MEN* ought to be, *rationaly afraid*, of the

“DAMNATION” which the scriptures reveal. Strange is the paradox on this subject, respecting the *doctrine* of the fact, that those generally who seem least afraid of the fact are most annoyed with the doctrine; those most exposed to the greater, most nauseate the less; those who can imperturbably brave damnation for a whole life-time, are most delicately timid of the word even occasionally told to them.

It seems impossible for Friends to distinguish wisely between the *figurative* and the *mystical* style; and because the Bible abounds with the former though *totally* destitute of the latter, and because Friends abound with the latter even more than the former, they are perpetually *mysticising*. In their interpretation of scripture especially, nothing will satisfy them, when in this vein, but mystery: every figure must be *mystified* before it can be held to contain any thing *spiritual*. This propensity does infinite mischief to their religion: it ruins the sober influence of scripture, or rather wholly prevents it. The best interpreters (and *the best men* are also *meant* by these) have shown that mysticalness is no attribute of revelation: which is the disclosure of things otherwise secret, and the attestation of things otherwise uncertain. What God says is true. But in what he says, the grand matter is *what he means*. Meaning is the soul of truth. To suppose that there is no sober coincidence between his words and his meaning, or that his meaning is unintelligible, or recondite beyond all the laws of language to contain, and all the fairest laws of interpretation

to evolve, is monstrous. It is the same as to charge God with deception and shuffling. It is a contradiction also. For, what kind of a *revelation* is that, which purposely obscures what it professes to unveil? Now *mysticism* is nothing but double and doubtful meaning; where all is more dark and senseless, after the *explanation* professedly given. The facts or realities revealed in scripture are grand; and mysterious, it may be, in the *mode* of their existence. But *as facts* they are all intelligible, and the propositions in which they are expressed are all intelligible: and to believe the facts in the propositions is properly *faith*, and saving faith also if we believe them *with the heart*. But the *mode* of them, and the mystery of them, have nothing to do with *faith* any more than with *intelligence*. Mysticism draws a veil of its own weaving over *the open face* of revelation. What God reveals, *as far as he REVEALS it*, may be understood; and in that respect it may be said that we understand all that we believe. Thus the proposition that *God exists* is plain, and I believe it. As a fact it is intelligible, credible, and not at all mysterious. But the *MODE of the fact* is mysterious. *How* does he exist? I do not know. I do not believe or preach or care *any thing* in respect to the mode: so that I am wholly without faith, where I am also without knowledge and understanding, on the question *HOW does he exist?* So also of *ALL the facts* of revelation; while a consistent practical recognition of this plain distinction would answer all the ends of faith and piety, without any of the absurdities of our own

making on this article, which are wholly adverse to those ends.

But some of you will say; After all, your distinction is of little consequence! Why? Because it sheds too strong a light on the subject? Because you hate the facts revealed? Then know that this is the quintessence of—depravity. You are the unconverted children of the first Adam, and not the converted children of the second. To hate the facts of revelation—is just the character and the crime of our total species, since the primeval apostasy! it is that very fundamental fact which the scriptures reveal and which heresy sophisticates! the fact without which the whole fabric of the gospel falls, and the right experimental knowledge of which is necessary to all true spiritual discernment. The depravity of man is his fault, and not his misfortune. For it he is to be primarily blamed, not pitied. He is voluntary in it all. He never excuses its ebullitions in others, especially when it injures him. God will not excuse it in him. And yet it is not peculiar to Friends, but to the species, to deny, conceal, and most reluctantly to own it. Still, it is the statute of Jehovah's mercy and the limitation of its sway of glorious sovereignty, that the person of an opposite character, and he alone, shall be pardoned and saved. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." Prov. 28 : 13. Friends, however, have some peculiar ways of "covering" sin; and very few ways of confessing

it. In the "Journal" of their founder there are repeated asseverations of an almost immaculate innocence;¹⁷ but scarcely such a thing as one humiliating confession of sin in all the two octavos! And this characteristic, not without some exceptions, pervades the mass of their writings. They mystify the acknowledgment of their depravity; throw it mostly into the third person universal; and seem much estranged to the petition of the publican—especially its formal allusion to the atonement, which, you know, dear sirs, though unperceived in our translation, is a prominent excellence of the original. They speak of their wickedness as "a seed, a principle, a root," and so forth; as if it were a physical malady, for which they were to be more pitied than periled or blamed, and not a mere moral evil for which they, and they only, are to blame;—or, sin is no longer sin; and the difference between physical and moral evil is no more to be discriminated or believed. I need not add that to confound this primordial distinction, is to explode all moral government; to violate the public sentiment of mankind; to be condemned by the philosophy of more enlightened heathenism; to contradict our own moral organization and consciousness; to confound the day of judgment and the Judge himself! If men are moral agents, absolutely and perfectly such; if all their moral conduct, right and wrong, is entirely voluntary, and subject to the jurisdiction of the Eternal Lawgiver; if their responsibility is necessary and entire; if they can disbelieve the gospel, only by neglecting it, perverting it, avoiding

it, contradicting it, and sophisticating it, or opposing it with resolute antipathy; if their impenitence or unbelief or heresy is all the acting of moral wickedness, “an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God” so that they become “*hardened through the DECEITFULNESS of sin;*” if the cause is faulty, criminal, “exceeding sinful;” if their impiety and consequent perdition (should they die as they live—which is probable) results from a faulty cause alone, and is itself essentially criminal and blame-worthy in the moral estimate of God; if their alienation is voluntary as well as habitual, and guilty as well as ordinarily invincible; if it result not from want of capacity to be accountable, nor evidence quite sufficient to convince, nor provision amply made in Christ for their redemption, nor the free and importunate offer of a full salvation, nor the stirrings and remonstrances of “the Spirit and the Bride” that “say, Come:” and these premises are all true and demonstrable, I am sure: then it follows—but, I am overwhelmed!!—“WHERE shall the ungodly and the sinner appear? WHAT SHALL THE END BE of them that obey not the gospel of God?” I hear the irrevocable sentence, “Ye shall die in your sins, and where I am ye cannot come!” So they must die, if so they continue to live. To warn them as they go, and to warn them as “prisoners of hope,” is a strong and a mighty incentive with me in this publication.

Of the one party it is a favorite excuse that there are so many mysteries in scriptural theology. What if there are? They are all parts of the great “mys-

tery of godliness"—and the alternative of "godliness" is "hell-fire!" But what mystery is there, the fact of which, in appropriate propositions, a man cannot both understand and believe? I know of no such mystery in the scriptures; and should like to have one discretely pointed out to me. To some it will appear that the word and the idea of *mystery* is fatal to the validity of the distinction between the fact and the mode: because, if the distinction be valid, all mystery is precluded; and the objects of faith may be, and indeed are all molded into rational and intelligible propositions; and so entirely denuded of mystery. The difficulty results from confounding two different senses in which the word *mystery* is used; and from misconceiving its scriptural sense. If this is correct, I am sure it is so important as to be worth reading "in season and out of season." The first may be called the metaphysical and popular or colloquial sense—for they are the same; and its definition is, *That which is essentially incomprehensible or inconceivably superior to our mental perceptions, so as seemingly to violate the laws of evidence and the possibility of intelligence.* The other is simply, *A secret; a thing previously and inscrutably unknown, till disclosed by authentic evidence.* This last is the scriptural sense; and *not* the other. The word *mystery*, singular and plural, occurs near *thirty* times in the New (*not once* in the Old) Testament. But I cannot find a solitary instance where it means any thing but *a secret*; not to be discovered indeed by human penetration; but, being 'revealed' to the holy apos-

bles for our profit and their own, both credible and intelligible as any other fact: "according to the revelation of the mystery (the disclosure of the fact) which was kept secret since the world began, but NOW IS MADE MANIFEST, and BY THE SCRIPTURES OF THE PROPHETS, ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT OF THE EVERLASTING GOD, MADE KNOWN TO ALL NATIONS FOR THE OBEDIENCE OF FAITH." Rom. 16 : 25, 26. No inward light here.

The only text which might seem as an exception, and which as such, has been not infrequently quoted, will be found on examination to be rather a more illustrious example. Permit me to quote it as it is not (though it ought to be) translated in our Bible. 1 Tim. 3 : 16. "The pillar and ground of the truth—and without controversy great is the mystery of godliness—*is this* : God was manifested in human nature ; vindicated by the Spirit ; beheld by angels ; preached unto the nations ; accredited in the world ; received again to glory." In our version, the first clause is put in apposition with "the church of the living God ;" making the church the foundation of the truth, when plainly it is only the superstructure. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus, the Christ." As we have it, it becomes a kind of apotheosis of "the church ;" which would suit Rome rather than a protestant community. The false rendering, here and elsewhere, has often helped their error. Rom. 11 : 18. As it is rendered above, however, it gives, I am persuaded, the very sense of the original.

THE INCARNATION OF JESUS CHRIST AND THE GRAND

AFFECTIONS OF HIS HISTORY; is declared to be the great secret of godliness, which the scriptures reveal; the substantial theme of their total testimony; the illustrious fundamental of true religion; the body and soul of inspired theology; the centre of the circle; the sun of the dependent system; “the pillar and ground of the truth.” The mystery is given in its parts; each constituent proposition is a plainly intelligible fact and equally a credible one; the secret is divulged, each part and the whole: to believe it is the way and the manner of “godliness.” Wo be to “the mystery of iniquity” that rejects it, and seeks for a safer foundation! And wo be to the sorcery that sophisticates its truth, or mystifies the facilities of faith in its august and most salutary disclosures! Spiritual sorcery is the worst sorcery in the world. The greatest and most confounding mystery that I know, is—the desperation of voluntary and obstinate impiety! the indolence, presumption, and fool-hardiness, of irreligious men!

One observation more in respect to the schism. 5. It has been made with both parties a capital question, and one of conflicting and exclusive claims; *which of them approaches more to the standard of primitive Quakerism, or rather which party identically constitutes “the society” in this country, as the proper counterparts or the genuine successors of the foxian Friends.* It were perhaps a more correct account to say that neither party has made it a question at all. Either arrogates the honor and denies it to the other: and which is right?¹⁹

Grammatici certant ; et adhuc sub judice lis est.—HOR.

A quarrel 'tis, where sages disagree
And vainly strive to solve the mystery.

Inspiration, however oraculous, is of little avail; because it can be so soon counteracted with opposite inspiration. Here "Greek meets Greek;" and when "the tug of war" will end, or on whose standard the eagles of victory will perch, is a question for prognosticators. My own opinion is twofold: (1) That either party can perhaps equally prove their positions from Fox, Barclay and others. I know of no latitude of mysticising or heresy to which the Hicksites have gone, for which precedent of the primitive sort may not be cited from their books: nor any summit of orthodoxy to which their more intelligent rivals have advanced, for which I have not myself perused the sanction of the same authority. This is my full conviction: and I would burden this long chapter with ample quotations in point, did I conceive it of any adequate importance. Their respective publications however sustain the assertion. But, convinced more powerfully that they are all wrong together; that there is error enough among the best of them to annul their visibility as christian professors, and fix them with the fanatical corrupters of the truth of God—all of them, as long as they remain voluntarily in their not-half-reformed imbecility; my opinion is (2) That the care they take, and the pains they are at, to make out their exclusive title to primitive Friendism, is a demonstration of their childishness and

vacuity : a question not worth settling ; and which “it argueth,” as Bacon says of such disputes, “more real subtlety to despise than consider.” I instance it as a proof of their real puerility. It shows also at what they are aiming—not at heaven, but earth ; not at proficiency, but retrogradation ; not to be christians, but Friends ! This is the truth of the matter, and the sum of it. Has God promised salvation to their attainments, even should they succeed in making them ? In some respects they seem as completely abandoned of the temper of logical candor and honest susceptibility to evidence, as the Jews themselves ; of whom says the apostle, with some terrific parallelism ; they “both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and have persecuted us : and they please not God and are *contrary to all men* ; forbidding us to speak²⁰ to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins always ; for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.” 1 Thess. 2 : 15, 16. The infatuation of men, we know, is often judicial and desperate : “that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.” 2 Thess. 2 : 10–12. I hope in God for better things in store for some of them !

I will here state numerically some reasons why the ecclesiastical visibility of the ‘orthodox’ or of Friends universally, as a *christian* church, cannot be recognised by the churches of Christ. (1) They do not even PROFESS to be a christian church—they are only “the religious *society* of Friends.” Their body too is composed mainly of birth-right

members, those who *from the birth* have been full and entire members without any confession or covenanting of their own: while *few* unite with them on “convincement.” They used to be called “seekers” at first. (2) They deny “the holy scriptures” to be **THE WORD OF GOD**. (3) They deny them to be **THE PRIMARY RULE** of religious action; declaring them to be properly “esteemed” only as “a secondary rule.” (4) They declare that every human being has **SOMETHING “WITHIN” HIM**, which is by way of eminence his highest and the primary rule, all-sufficient for duty and salvation. (5) They expressly affirm this internal rule to be **SUPERIOR TO THE SCRIPTURES**; and they walk by the greater and not by the less. (6) Their confession of **THE REVEALED DOCTRINE OF THE GODHEAD** is equivocal, Sabellian, and *adverse, expressly adverse*, to the tri-personal nature of God. (7) They deny in theory and practice **THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS**, positively deny them—though these are the constituted signals of visibility, putting the *paternal name* on all the children of the visible covenant family of God. (8) They have no such thing as a **PROPER CHRISTIAN MINISTRY**, of *either* sex, among them. (9) They do not believe in **THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY**; and they “overthrow the faith of” many in this prime article of the creed of christians. (10) They give no proof of honoring or achieving those **GREAT ENDS** for which mainly the visibility and organization of christian churches exist on the earth:—such as maintaining the **PURE CONFESION** of “the truth as it is in Jesus;” the **TRUE WOR-**

SHIP of God, according to his word; the DIFFUSION of evangelical influence; the PROPAGATION OF GENUINE CHRISTIANITY through the world; the CONSTANT AND CLEAR OFFER OF SALVATION, with all the proper facilities for OBTAINING IT, to every individual that has capacities to heed and accept; and the MUTUAL EDIFICATION OF BELIEVERS in "the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness, in hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began, but hath in due times *manifested his word* THROUGH PREACHING, which is committed" to competent men, "according to the commandment of God our Savior." Tit. 1: 2, 3. (11) They FUNDAMENTALLY VITIATE THE WORSHIP OF GOD, rendering it visionary, mystical, impracticable: a system of refined will-worship and schismatical folly. See synopsis *infra*, Art. 21 and note. (12) They have DISTINCTIVE MARKS ONLY AS HERETICS AND MYSTICS AND SECTARIANS; NONE of a christian church. (13) They EXCOMMUNICATE AND DENOUNCE ALL VISIBLE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES, RECIPROCATING NO RECOGNITION WITH THEM, and preferring their own way with *jure divino et exclusivo* claims to be themselves the only authorized religionists and genuine worshippers in the world. (14) They are DOING NOTHING VISIBLY for the conversion of the world to Christ. (15) They will HAVE TO BE ENTIRELY SUPERSEDED before the millennium; as one of the real obstacles that retard its advent. (16) I know not WHAT BODY OF PERVERTED RELIGIONISTS WE MAY NOT RECOGNISE, if we may them; nor ON WHAT PRINCIPLE

of evangelical truth and order, we could possibly proceed in such recognition; nor what *piety* we ever promote by lowering the standard or by throwing it away. 2 John, 7-11. Rev. 2: 2, 9. 3: 9, 22.

(17) They are NOT ORTHODOX. The word is only a caricature as applied to them; and is just, only as discriminating them in contrast with the most extravagant and virulent specimens of infidel error.

(18) Such recognition would ONLY INJURE THEM—I mean their ultimate interests, not their present *feelings*.

(19) THEY ARE TO BLAME BEFORE GOD, AND THEY ALONE, in the extant light and state of things, for not being recognised. It is wholly their own fault. Let them change, and be wise and sound and thorough in christian principle; then they will be owned “by the whole family in heaven and earth,” and by the Father. (20) To RECOGNISE A COMMUNITY in this superlative relation is SOLEMN business. The laws of courtesy and kind neighborhood have nothing to do with it. We have no right to consult social feelings, or any other *feelings*. We must proceed according to principle, truth, scripture. No discretion is committed to us by the Great Head of the church, in the way of making or changing or vacating the laws that govern the case, and for which the responsibility is not ours. Let those who dissent from these positions, show that they are unscriptural; or censure the Lawgiver; or expect no notice from the officers of Christ, whatever they say in controversy.

Some of these reasons may partially imply each other; still, a correct *exposè* required the different

aspects of the matter to be seen. The true way to determine the question is—1. To consider the ‘orthodox’ absolutely, as though *Hicksites* were not; allowing no partial or *party* influences to affect us. 2. To ascertain what they believe and profess, the whole of it, and the necessary implications of their system. 3. To compare the result with the revealed criterion, fully, impartially, clearly. 4. To decide, *first*, for eternity—and *then*, for time! But many a *sentence* will proceed, no doubt, from many a person that is no *judge*.

Friends will probably think I have forgotten the exhortation—“endeavoring to keep THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT in the bond of peace.” Eph. 4 : 3. Here they are again at fault. They ordinarily mistake *wholly* the meaning of the duty and the sense of the phrase. Read verses 1-6 of the context. They are all addressed to *the church*; that had *one baptism*, as I suppose all christians have, (visibly such,) who have been baptized into one name—that “of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” For, THE UNITY OF THE NAME to which it visibly devotes us, I take to be the true criterion of *the unity of baptism*. Friends have never been baptized, in the sense of scripture, at all! Besides, “the unity of the Spirit” means—THE CONSISTENCY AND IDENTITY OF ALL HIS INSPIRATIONS: all are one; a unit of harmonies, not a multiple of contradictions. It is objective, not subjective. Essentially, *our feelings toward each other* have nothing to do with it. Friends may feel unity toward each other, and toward good people of other denominations,

and yet have the Spirit, or know *his unity*, not at all! All *his influences* are like each other and like HIM—and hence we ought to conform to his truth and “endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit” as displayed in all his ways.

The “Journal” of George Fox is indeed a curiosity. He was from his early youth an eccentric and extraordinary character. While yet in his teens it was remarked of him, he says, “If George says *verily*, there is no altering him.” Vol. I, p. 84. Here was the identical germe in the acorn, I take it, whence sprang the great oak and its umbrage. In reference to the old shoemaker with whom he served, he writes; “While I was with him he was blest, but after I left him he broke and came to nothing.” Ibid. He adds, p. 85, The Lord “said unto me; ☞ Thou seest how young people go together into vanity, and old people into the earth; thou must forsake all, young and old, keep out of all, and be as a stranger unto all.” It was now that his famous “openings” began. God, he continually says, told him this, that, and the other, *totidem verbis*; ²⁰ just as his old master, I suppose, was wont to do. Of one of those favored occasions, he writes, “I saw there was a great crack to go throughout the earth, and a great smoke to go as the crack went, and that after the crack there should be a great shaking. This was the earth in people’s hearts, which was to be shaken before the seed of God was raised out of the earth.” p. 100. He was at this time in doubt about which of the learned professions he should select. He was determined,

however, by an "opening;" as follows: "The creation was open to me; and it was showed me, how all things had their names given them, according to their nature and virtue. I was at a stand in my mind, whether I should practise physic for the good of mankind, seeing the nature and virtues of the creatures were so opened to me by the Lord." P. 104. One might almost regret that he had not selected the profession of medicine, since all its departments were so opened to him! In botany, pharmacy, materia medica, pathology, and prognosis, modern improvements had been anticipated; Sydenham and Rush and other lights as certainly precluded! A learned physician once said to me, "You preachers have the advantage of us; our science involves such uncertainty: we have no oracles of medicine, no Bibles of practice." True—but how near they came on one occasion to realizing such a *desideratum*! What discoveries in physical science had been the consequence! We need not have waited for the experiments of Sir Humphrey Davy to demonstrate the non-entity of phlogiston; or for Cuvier to set the world right about geological strata and the cosmogony of Moses. It is a fact, however, that many very respectable physicians of the society, who profess to believe, *pugnis et calcibus*²¹ for ought I know, in the inspiration of George, have sustained a very useful and honorable place among "the professors of the healing art;" without possessing one iota of such extraordinary "openings" or any science sublimated above common comprehension. In fact the medical profession is

a favorite resort of intellectual gentlemen of the society; and many of them in the city of Philadelphia have I known, and honored, as have thousands of others, since the commencement of the present century. Some of them are men of eminence—to whom I would propound the dilemma: If the founder of your sect was *not* inspired, most surely he was a deluded and well nigh a delirious fanatic: a case possibly of mania connected with some classifications known to your science. But if he *was* *not* so merged in hallucination; if he was truly inspired; then you ought, gentlemen, to know or to remember that you are all in the same awful condemnation with the clergy and the bar; for George had an “opening” on the subject, that is quite conclusive equally against the incumbents of the three professions. They are all in the same category; their professions are all in a common dishonor:—and I call on you, by all your sincerity and by all your consistency, as Friends, to repent of this your wickedness, in presuming to go to school to learned lecturers instead of the inward light which shines in you; a light that is grieved at your carnalities of that sort, and is so clear that fools can see it. Listen then to your indictment and your sentence, gentlemen! “I went to Clauson in Leicestershire, in the vale of Beavor; and the mighty power of God appeared there also, in several towns and villages where Friends were gathered. While I was there, the Lord opened to me three things, relating to those three great professions in the world, law, physic, and divinity, (so called.) He showed me,

that the physicians were out of the wisdom of God, by which the creatures were made; and knew not the virtues of the creatures, because they were out of the Word of wisdom, by which they were made." Of the priests and lawyers he had openings in the same unity: when he sums up the matter thus; "And that these three, the physicians, the priests, and the lawyers, ruled the world out of the wisdom, out of the faith, and out of the equity and law of God; the one pretending the cure of the body, the other the cure of the soul, and the third the protection of the property of the people." He then proceeds to show that "all might be REFORMED:" and by what process? Truly, this Reformer had a unit, a catholicon, *unum pro universis*, which we might anticipate. It was "the light!" p. 106. But how impiously scientific some medical gentlemen of the society remain to this day!

With respect to his *miracles*, instead of enlarging on their history or nature, I will just transcribe the article in the "Index" to the second volume under that head; where we may see a summation of them as received by Friends in this our day! Is it the *nineteenth* century—or the NINTH!

"Miracles wrought by the power of God, I. 297; she that was ready to die raised up again, I. 301; the lame made whole, I. 214; the diseased restored, II. 208; a distracted woman healed, I. 117. See trouble of mind; a great man given over by physicians restored, I. 121; G. F. prays for a distracted woman at Chichester, I. 303; restores J. Jay's neck, broke (as the people said) by a fall from a horse in

East-Jersey, II. 161; speaks to a sick man in Maryland, who was raised up by the Lord's power, II. 164, and prays the Lord to rebuke J. C.'s infirmity, and the Lord by his power soon gave him ease," &c. II. 321.

Concerning his whole productions and influence, it may be justly said that he was one of the most indefatigable zealots, and at the same time one of the most deluded religionists that ever lived. His mission plenipotentiary from God, is remarkable equally for its super-apostolic claims and its entire destitution of rational evidence. "I saw; it was clearly showed me; the power of the eternal God came over me; the Lord said to me; the Lord opened to me; the Lord moved me;" and such like seals of evidence abound multitudinous, to a degree which no one of the sacred writers can parallel; which not even the apocryphal history of "Tobit" can be thought to rival. Let no man condemn Ann Lee and the Shakerism she introduced; nor the more recent votaries of Mormonism; nor the blasphemies of Matthias; nor any future outrage upon the laws of evidence or the feelings of piety or the proportions of truth; if they are sufficiently obtuse or wayward to confess the inspiration of George Fox. If to hate and denounce all other religionists on the face of the whole earth, beside himself and his deluded retainers; if to vaunt himself a paragon of perfect innocence, an intimate or familiar of the attendant divinity, on every emergency perfectly inspired, a worker of miracles, victorious (as *he* says) on all occasions of

dispute with learned men, knowing the contents of scripture without reading them, and ordained of God immediately for the rare work of utterly revolutionizing his own constitution; if sincere confidence in his own qualifications; if a bold and impudent invasion of the worship of others, interrupting and insulting it in the name of the Lord as did *not* the apostles, and bestowing the coarsest epithets on *every other ministry* whenever he could find it; if calling the Episcopalian edifices “steeple-houses,” and contradicting their ministers publicly when in their own pulpits; if disturbing other congregations, hundreds of them, wherever he went, “to draw away disciples after him,” without respect to individual and corporate rights or the laws and constitution of society; if provoking persecution by such means and then complaining of it; if illiterate effrontery in denouncing all liberal learning and all its possessors and professors; if a literalizing, mysticising, imaginative vein of theological dictation; if resolute perseverance in devotion to his object: if all these things can constitute his claim to confidence—“*Credat Judaeus Apella! non ego.*”²² Such an instance ought to convince mankind, without sacrificing another of the species in the needless experiment, of THE INFINITE IMPORTANCE OF THE SCRIPTURES; as supplying the very *desideratum* of an adequate rule in religion, by which all opinions may be tried and all errors condemned, with unsparing and impartial steadiness, and with supreme authority. All false religion, and all infidelity, and all heresy, unite in this—to put down

the volume of inspiration ; though they differ illimitably in their ways of doing it. Yet I know of nothing that makes it “ void ” more effectually than the leaven of Quakerism !

We ought too to be humble at the spectacle of our dishonored species. Poor human nature ! where is thy boasted intellect ! where thy strength of judgment, thy sane integrity, thy virtue, thy wisdom ! And yet this system of distempered thought is in some of its aspects so imposing and so importunate, that in an intelligent and cordial attachment to the religion of the scriptures, and IN THAT ALONE, is there any rational safety or protection from its fascinations. The ignorant bow to it, of course ! Yet who, beside the enlightened christian, is not ignorant of the contents, systematically viewed, of the word of God ! Fox is the root and the trunk of the tree of Quakerism. Some of the radical sap nourishes every branch ; swells every bud into a blossom ; matures the fruit ; qualifies the surrounding odor ; constitutes the shade of its darkness ; and sustains all its homogenous parts, that have stood for nearly two centuries uplifted on such a supporter. But it is split ; it is becoming weak ; it is found to be hollow ; and there is in it a strange *inward light*, which will turn into *a flame of fire*, and reduce it to ashes, for the good of mankind. It cannot fall too soon for the interests of christianity and of man. The heavenly dove is not seen in its branches ; even when its imposing foliage and a still serenity as of death, seem to invite or

to indicate her presence. "It is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned."

We often hear it said that *apostates are always strenuous in opposing the community they have abjured*. This may be a general fact; but *as such* it is no argument. The word *apostate* is commonly used in a bad sense alone, and as such it becomes a brand with which to stigmatize any man who at any time and for any cause renounces any society or sect. But the word, meaning to *stand off from*, does of itself imply no criminality: because one may certainly *apostatize* from error as well as truth, from evil as well as good, and from folly as well as wisdom. When therefore they blame me for the mere fact of apostacy from them, they *assume* the very thing which they ought to *prove*; namely, that their religion is right and not wrong, is true and not false, is wise and not foolish. To *apostatize* from what is wrong, is the grace of repentance. Apostacy is right or wrong *in reference to its object alone, and inversely as that object is right or wrong*. If therefore Quakerism be what I think it is, the fact of my determined apostacy from it is what I shall recollect with pleasure in the day of judgment. "Wherefore come out from among them," &c. (2 Cor. 6: 17, 18. Rev. 18: 4.) As to the *strenuous* opposition of apostates in all cases, it is probably a fact: we have however no concern with it unless it can be proved that such are always wrong in proportion as they are strenuous and because they are strenuous. Paul *apostatized* once for all (he was no changeling) from "the Jews' religion;" and

they might call him an *apostate Jew* and apply to him the proverb that *apostates are always strenuous in opposition to the community they have abjured*. Would that prove their own rectitude or refute his arguments? Would it prove that he sinned when he apostatized from a corrupted, worldly system, which was also abandoned of God and execrated by mankind, as connected with its degenerate abettors? So Luther apostatized from popery; and was often gratuitously reviled as an *apostate* by the Romanists. But if that word is bad in itself then know that it may be retorted. Barclay was an *apostate*. He left the Romish church for the society at nearly the same age in which I left the society:—and what then? The inference is that all the *talk*, in which many seem to glory, about *apostacy*, is a show of words without sense—unless it be the sense of malignity. But here let it be observed that it requires moral courage and moral virtue, which for ever *dare* to exemplify, to brave the frown of thousands in apostatizing from antiquated educational error, on the single principle of faith in the testimony of God! It is true in modern as well as in ancient days that men often countervail their secret convictions from mere moral cowardice—they dare not do their duty! John, 12 : 42, 43. There is perhaps no sort of pusillanimity at once so common and so despicable and so ruinous as this!

But admitting the fact of this strenuousness, and supposing any case, as that of Paul for example, where the apostacy was right, it does not follow

that the *strenuousness* is wrong. There are reasons why such apostates should be strenuous.

(1) *They are better acquainted with the evils of the system than others.* Their knowledge is *experimental* as well as theoretical. Their impressions are comparatively vivid, their views comparatively clear, and their convictions comparatively just. Paul's knowledge of Judaism could not, without a miracle, have been what it was unless he had been one of them. My knowledge of Quakerism could never have been what it is, had I not been educated a Friend. I know they can say that I did not understand their sentiments when I was with them; and if they mean that I was ignorant of them in contrast with christianity, that is, ignorant of them as wrong, they say truth: for I was ignorant of christianity. Not so, if they mean that I had never heard hundreds of their preachers with attention and confidence, read their books, *especially George Fox's Journal*, and understood their doctrine. They may say indeed that I do not understand it now, as they often have said; the *light* may tell them so, as it has told them many other things equally credible; but I know that *I do understand their system as far as it is intelligible, and that I did this in fact before I left them.* For the rest, let others judge.

(2) *Apostates are more interested than others in the explosion of the errors they have renounced.* Paul often alludes to his own case in illustrating the condition of the Jews; he had been one of them, and was near the verge of perdition with them; his rescue was wonderful; and his zeal was strenuous,

from this fact, for the conversion of others. Perhaps he had unbelieving relatives, or friends and intimates, whom he tenderly loved; and for whom he could never have felt so deeply had he not previously been of their number. He could appeal to God that he had²³ “great heaviness and continual sorrow in his heart” on their account. It is reasonable and *natural* that sincere converts, from any false scheme, should always show their zeal in a similar way.

(3) *They are under peculiar obligations.* If they have peculiar knowledge and peculiar interests, they have also peculiar facilities; and they *ought* to exert a proportionate influence in favor of the truth. Who shall attend to the case of their former associates, if they neglect them? Do they not owe it to the Author of their own illumination in the truth, to try to bring others to its blessings? and especially *them* with whom themselves were once associated? Thus I have ever felt it my duty, since the commencement of my “faith in Christ Jesus” and knowledge of “the grace of God in truth,” to try to do something for Friends; because, while I knew their sublime self-complacency in religion, I knew also their deep ignorance and error in respect to the true doctrine of Christ. But there never was a people perhaps so inaccessible to all instruction *not of their own making* as are they. They will call meetings of other denominations to hear them; but they will *never* (exceptions are not rules) return the homage in kind, by going to hear other preachers than their own. The only way then is—

to publish. This I do:—yet with diffidence, I confess, in my own powers to perform the difficult service; but without diffidence, real or professed, in regard to the questions, *What is truth? Is Quakerism christianity? Did George Fox preach the same doctrine with Christ and the apostles?* With this explanation I acknowledge that I am an apostate from Quakerism, and strenuous in devising the extirpation of the system:—and strenuous also, and on the same account, in desiring the salvation of all those who are “my brethren and kinsmen according to the flesh.”

I can however adopt the language of Tully on the score of charity, as applicable here. *Vehe-
menter me agere fateor, iracunde nego. Omnino
irasci amicis non temere soleo, ne si merentur quidem. Sine verborum contumelia a te dissentire
possum, sine animi summo dolore non possum.* “For while I confess a peculiar earnestness of manner, I must wholly deny malignity of motive. In converse with *Friends*, I am not accustomed rashly to incur their resentment; even when they probably deserve the castigation that would lead to it. I may indeed differ from one without contumelious language; but in the present instance not without real anguish of mind.”

It will be a great question doubtless with many, *What are the motives of the writer?* Is it not plain that this is rather his concern than theirs? Men there are who never seriously set themselves to search for the truth; and yet are often found meddling with the motives of others: especially with

theirs who aggressively espouse the *positive* of a question in religion, professing a knowledge of the truth and a desire to communicate it, for the benefit of others and the glory of God. Hence *many* will probably neglect, or in character omit, the perusal of this work, though considerably occupied, it may be, in speculation on the motives of the author; where *one* will be found so wise as to leave persons and motives to the arbitration of God, while he candidly searches for the principles of truth. Rom. 14 : 10-12. With my person and motives the public have little concern; while *with the matter of the work* their concern is incalculable. My motives, *I know*, are supremely important to myself; since mine is the solemn responsibility for them "at the judgment-seat of Christ :—" and though I deem them of little moment to the public apart from their influence on the character of this treatise; and though I have generally conceived it to be one of the common and sordid arts of false teachers to be continually boasting of their good motives, which however deceives the hearts of multitudes; and though I have generally written as if it were comparatively of no importance to others what my motives were, and indeed none of their business to inquire, unless the treatise itself so indicates them as to furnish all the evidence of which the case admits; still, I will venture here, to the best of my knowledge, frankly and fully to state them: *I am actuated by a sense of duty to the cause of truth and its Author; of duty to the souls of men, and especially to the immortal interests of the people, one*

of whom I was born and educated ; and whose distinguishing views I formerly and sincerely believed : with the desire of bringing them to see the divinity, the fulness, the excellency of the scriptures, as properly our highest, holiest, safest rule of religious faith and practice—a rule that is disparaged or disclaimed only by the policy of the kingdom of darkness. This profession will very possibly be impugned. In making it, I am sensible of the abuse which may be made of it by the adversary. Well I know that every breathing man upon the footstool, who remains unchanged in his native character, is the enemy of christians and of Christ. “Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves.” And to me it seems not credible that the exterior habitude of meekness, with which Quakerism so mechanically and so *cheaply* invests its votaries, can do any thing more for “the natural man” than injuriously to misrepresent him to others and himself. If it were of use to affirm, never so solemnly, that these are my motives, that I have consciously no other, and that I beg to have my positions refuted rather than my name and person assailed, I could easily and would cheerfully make the affirmation. But well I know “leviathan is not so tamed.” The truth too is stubborn and invincible. Presumption cannot change, nor authority awe, nor sorcery charm it. Hence those who fight with the weapons of truth, sincerely forswearing all others, must never allow feeling to govern, or sympathy to preponderate, in the strife. Otherwise they may conciliate the foe, but they lose the cause: the foe is pacified *to them*,

but not to *the King*, for whom they are engaged. Hence it is that severities (as they appear perhaps to all who neither know nor love the truth) abound in what I have written; as they more terribly abound in the word of God.

Unhappy indeed is the condition of a fault-finder. Yet with some such main intention came I to the present service. If I say, it is ungrateful to my feelings—it will be but repeating what every one in similar relations has affirmed. But the laws of moral and social feeling are immutable. I will say the truth; to me it is disagreeable, it is painful. Still, I have no doubt it is necessary. “Necessity is laid upon me; yea, wo is me if I” do not discharge this duty to the cause of truth. The surgeon that amputates a limb, or pierces an abscess, or inflicts any other suffering in the way of his vocation; must preserve a steady hand, an equal eye, a firm tenacious nerve: nor is his kindness then suspected; he is not ridiculed, scorned, calumniated for his faithfulness. The world acknowledges that he willed not the misery, but the cure; not the pain, but the restoration. But, neither mercy, nor justice, is commonly done to the polemic. His case is trying; his duty difficult; his obligations high. Who will give him credit for his motives, even if they are purely benevolent? The vain world, whom his argument condemns? the errorist, whom it exposes? the reprobate, whom it convicts? Men are not so fond of seeing their faults, as to thank those who help their vision, however honestly. If one fail in the difficult attempt, he is condemned; and

often, if he succeed, those whose errors he detects are pitied and caressed for that reason. Few realize the interest which all men have in the truth; and hence they as little appreciate the injury of error or the necessity of correcting it. Beside, men incline generally to resist aggression, seeming or real, without reference to equity; and if one is deemed the assailant, they instinctively take part with the assailed, and resist him. But let equity be honored: and let it be ascertained by a wiser criterion than mere appearances. Truly, this treatise is rather a defence. Friends are the assailants. They assail all christendom. They are the reformers and the innovators. They denounce all others; and that in terms utterly inconsistent with the allowance of their piety: "hirelings, the world's people," and such like epithets, abound in their authentic writings. I never said that they have all no piety; I only say that it is too much mystified, where it possibly exists, to be recognised by the church of God; that their system recognises no denomination but their own; and that ordinarily I have *little confidence* in the piety of a Friend, whatever other qualities of general worth I may, and freely do, accord to him. God is my witness that there is no affectation in this averment—I am painfully "shut up to" it by moral necessity and all the evidence that affects the case. I never said that they would none of them be saved, but rather the contrary: but then I have said, and do say, that the principles of salvation are immutable and very little understood by them; that they are often mistaken, and egregiously misstated, by their

inspired ministers, especially of the tender sex ; that their theological system involves much fundamental error, and is “ another gospel, which is not another ”—as, if a ‘ will o’ the wisp ’ should aspire to be the sun ; truly it would be “ another sun, which is not *another* ;” that their views are bewitching to all that are not established in “ the truth as it is in Jesus,” and destructive in an awful degree ; that God requires his people not only to hold the truth, but to “ hold it fast,” and in modern phrase to *go the whole* in its due support ; that there can be no such thing as religious compromise with error more than with sin ; that even the religious public ordinarily misunderstand it ; that Quakerism must dissolve and disappear as “ the baseless fabric of a vision,” since nothing but truth is immortal, and with respect to his own kingdom hath the Savior said, “ Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up ;” that in America the exotic declines, since here are none of the storms of persecution, and I sincerely hope never will be, to give it vigor by endurance and circulate its genial fluids by extraneous action ; that it is sophisticated in its very texture and soul, and will make a specious sophist mainly of any vaunted reasoner who espouses it ; that it is mystical, and as such heathenish and false, christianity having many sublimities indeed,—but nothing properly *mystical* in its whole constitution ; and that, leaving persons with God, and contending as we ought for principles, and that valiantly, and not as when “ a standard-bearer fainteth,” we ought to inscribe on our banners the word

CHRISTIANITY, and resist for ever the counterfeit of earth in favor of the current coin of heaven. Let earthlings oppose the sentiment, if they will! their retribution flies swiftly and predominates for ever!

Respecting the capital sophisms of the Quakers, especially in the argumentation of Barclay, I would specify one or two.

1. To argue from the historical or noted *abuse* of any thing, to its *disuse* as both expedient and obligatory on that account: instead of arguing *from the proper nature of the thing* as right or wrong; as sanctioned by divine authority or fraudulently imposed by men; as natively tending to goodness or productive of harm; as intrinsically a part of christianity or surreptitiously and superstitiously appended to it. This is the very acme of logical absurdity and sin!

This capital sophism, with which the *Apology* abounds, is perhaps the most absurd and abominable in principle that can be found in all the circuits of nominal religion, in all the errors of spurious logic, or throughout the encyclopedia of universal heresy. According to it, we have only to *abuse* in order to abominate a divine institution; while we graduate its evil exactly in proportion to its abuse. On this principle the religion of Christ may be legitimately proved to be the *worst* system that ever claimed the confidence of men—incomparably the worst; since no other system has ever been, as all admit, so much, so wantonly, so universally abused! On the same principle the Divine Being himself—but, I forbear!

The man who does not *utterly forswear* this prin-

principle, and that at once, intelligently and cordially; the man who acts upon it at all, either knowingly or doatingly, either confessedly or—what is both much more common and much more mischievous—covertly, such a man is utterly disqualified for the business of fair argumentation on any subject; and on the superlative subject of religion is he qualified only to disparage, corrupt and destroy it!

The principle directly *opposite* to the sophism, the true and proper one, the one dear to the mind exactly in proportion to its wisdom and its goodness, is *to judge of things according to their nature*; to call their abuses *abuses*, and as such to condemn and avoid them; and to graduate the *evil* of the abuse *in exact proportion to the goodness of its subject!* and conversely, to value an *evil* thing as one neither liable to abuse, nor ordinarily capable of it: while it should be our aim directly to rescue *religion*, in her own celestial beauty, from the wrongs and calumnies of her enemies; and resolutely to view her heavenly countenance *MAINLY as reflected in her own perfect mirror, the scriptures of inspiration.*

Let any man who has capacity and honesty, and a very little of both is sufficient, read Barclay with the rigid application of this principle to all his sentences; resisting the fascination of his *inspired* audacity; and see how much his argument is every where indebted to the sophism! Especially when he speaks of the gospel ministry and the two sacraments; to mention no others. How it avails him, and blinds his reader, to inveigh against—what no way touches the question—the vices, sordid motives,

and abominable practices, of some, say many, of the clergy ; the dissensions, angry controversy, and maddened blood-shed, that have arisen about precedency, transubstantiation, the cup to the laity, and a thousand other matters of human abuse, which no way affect our obligations ; except that they all become stronger from the premises, to resist abuses and to exemplify christianity as Christ and the apostles gave it to us—and not to despoil it of all its peculiar characteristics till nothing be left, except what no man can abuse !

Barclay is fond of the *implication* that the abuses as abominations, which he alleges, are abominated only by himself and his confederates of the society : though he oftener declaims than adduces authentic facts ; yet he has no right to *imply* that he is alone with his people, in so loving christianity as to be equally alone in execrating its corrupters. Love for christianity is my *sole* reason for disliking him and his fraternity. To this sophism, I shall have frequent occasion to advert in the progress of these pages.

2. Another capital sophism deserves a place, which I am rather at a loss to designate. It consists in a rapid and daring application to all christians, and especially—of course—to themselves, of any thing and every thing contained in the Bible, without considering *the laws of application*, or the necessity of discriminating, or the native sense of the passage where it occurs, or the misery of mistake in matters of infinite moment to all. Particularly, *it makes almost nothing of the* PERFECT AND SOLITARY

EMINENCE OF THE APOSTLES ; it discriminates little or not at all between what was spoken or promised to them exclusively, and what is equally appropriate to all believers ; it seems to assume that miracles and inspiration (the latter necessarily) were not all confined to the first century, or merely adapted to the initials of the last and most perfect dispensation, and so having performed their office and fully accomplished the cause which they were given to subserve, have passed away with the occasion that required them ; while vital religion, *quite another thing*, reaps the perpetual harvest of their usefulness, and flourishes without their repetition. It implies that those things are revealed for imitation, rather than faith.

But let us reason the case. The apostles wrought miracles, and for this they were expressly trained by their Master. Directions, prohibitions, and promises of a peculiar nature, were hence propounded for them. If the Quakers are just as much inspired, then indeed *all the furniture* above referred to is equally their own. But mind ! *all or none* is the word. For, *if some and not all* appertains to them, then there must be discrimination ; then it is not enough to show what is written in the scriptures, as having been spoken to the apostolic disciples, since the passages may refer to *them* alone ; then it may be delusion and sin for Friends to apply, as they do, to themselves, whatever was said to the apostles. If however all, saving mere local circumstances, appertains to them, then let us see them dispose of such passages as these, which, if not

confined to the persons of the apostles, are confined wholly to the age of the apostles. "And these signs," &c. Mark, 16 : 17, 18. Luke, 17 : 5, 6. This last, we think, respects *the faith of miracles* alone ; or the faith necessary to work a miracle ; and which it behoved them to understand, who were soon to be put upon that perilous service in the sight of maddened adversaries. Mark, 13 : 11. Such passages abound in the New Testament and afford a fine paradise for sincere visionaries. The Friends, those of them who are not degenerate formalists and nothingarians, are distinguished for this devout insanity ; though they are not alone in its fits and excesses. *It has been the partial and occasional error of millions of christians, who have in general avoided it.* Ultimately, it is in principle *the very thronal error of the papacy.* The fact is, THE APOSTLES, AS SUCH, HAD NO SUCCESSORS ; SUPERSEDED often, they have been SUCCEDED never ; while the assumption of apostolical powers, apostolical derivation, and apostolical succession, in this style of feudal reasoning and military commission and romanizing pride, has been the bane of visible christianity since the apostles "fell asleep." It were well if an assumption so ignorant and criminal had been *totally* confined to the pale of the papacy. For one I am as much opposed as Barclay, to an earthly politico-ecclesiastical hierarchy ; but, while I see this shameful error at the very basis of many organized corruptions, I can see *the same principle*, a little spiritualized and of a more *tranquil* aspect, arrogating the commission and the honors of the

apostles of the Lamb, in the persons of Barclay and his associates, his predecessors and successors of the *foxian* school, for nearly two centuries. It is enough for sober christians to belong to a church whose profession is pure, whose officers are "sound in the faith," and whose practice is humbly in coincidence; enough to be "built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord; in whom they also are builded together, for a habitation of God through the Spirit." To these foundations of divine sanction and certain immovability, the christian of intelligence would be very sorry to add, "and built also upon George Fox, Robert Barclay, Sarah Grubb, and a thousand other prophets and prophetesses, who have been recently commissioned and inspired, exactly as were Moses and Isaiah, Matthew and Paul, and all the other writers of the holy scripture!" It is however *much more* evident that the whole massive structure of Quakerism rests on Fox, Barclay, and others, than that it touches "the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Wo be to it, if it be found in eternity not on this foundation! "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ!" "For their rock is not as our rock, even our enemies themselves being judges."

As to the way in which Friends manage to resist the appeal; Why do you not pluck up trees by the roots and transport them into the midst of the ant-

arctic ocean ; why do you not take up venomous serpents and fondle them with impunity ; why not drink poison or other *deadly thing* without prejudice to health ? Their way of rejoinder we know, having often listened to the responses of the oracle within, on that article : “ Why, dear Friends, it is plain to the vision of my mind that nothing is wanting but faith. The Almighty is *the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever. Be it unto you according to your faith. If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established. His hand is not shortened, nor his ear heavy: he can both hear and save. But where is your faith? Alas! in what days do we live?*” True ! degenerate times. Not a soul to be found on the earth who can, for example, transport the Alleghany mountains one mile to the east of their present lodgment, or even remove a bramble bush that grows on its breast six inches from the position of its local obstinacy. No faith to be found ! And what is to become of us all ? *He that believeth not, said the Savior, shall be damned !*

Who can doubt the necessity that preachers of religion should be *apt to teach?* who can *knowingly* approve of those, whose *à priori* illusion, resulting from its parent illusion of “ inward objective manifestations in the heart,” so metamorphoses and mangles the doctrine of Christ ? and at the same time removes *them*, (instead of the *mountains*,) to the very antipodes of sober sense ? The Spirit of God denounces those busy teachers, who need themselves to be taught ; “ understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm !” Now, as they

assert when they answer, I shall just take the same liberty ; and assert that their light is darkness, their confidence confusion, and their solution utterly ignorant and utterly false ! The reason is—that *what was said to the apostles, as such; and all that related to THEIR working of miracles, is FORMALLY APPLICABLE TO THEM ALONE*, and of use to us only in a way of instruction, advertisement, and sober accommodation. Other sayings of God apply to us, and are objects of faith to christians of our age ; our want of faith, toward objects that properly relate to us, may be rebuked by what was said to apostles in other relations : and this is what I mean by the use of *sober accommodation* under the guidance of the great moral truths of christianity. Faith is indeed sufficiently and quite *criminally* infirm, even in true christians ; but if we were all as destitute of it, as we are of *all attained or attainable power* to remove trees and mountains, the plain consequence were that no true church exists on the earth, and we shall all perish for ever ! Let them father the consequence, who hold the doctrine ! and let every Friend, who cannot perform these prodigies, “examine himself whether he be in the faith !”—for I can inform him that it is possible to be a true christian without them : and more, that “many will say to Christ in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name ? and in thy name have cast out devils ? and in thy name done *many wonderful works* ? And then will he profess unto them, I NEVER KNEW YOU : depart from me ye that work iniquity.” Judas may head this forlorn company, as their “chief speaker ;” for

we know he never departed from *iniquity*, though there is some evidence that he wrought miracles: we *know* this, because (1) there is not a particle of evidence that he ever had any piety, that Christ *ever knew him*; and (2) there is direct evidence to the contrary. Said Jesus, "Have not I chosen you twelve? and one of you is a devil. He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." John, 6: 70, 71. Matt. 10: 4, 8. He called Judas "a devil" in the early stages of his ministry; nor did he then first learn his character, as if in thus associating him, in his deep providential wisdom, with the others, he had mistaken that character. The Son of God was not used to mistakes: "because he knew all men; and needed not that any should testify of man, for he knew what was in man." Besides, *it is expressly said*, that "Jesus knew *from the beginning* who they were that believed not, and *who should betray him*." John 2: 24, 25. 6: 64. How perilous to the soul is the darkness of the inward light! If it were a mere absurdity, as innocent as it is silly or sincere, I should say *dream on*—at least should not write a book to arouse it with the order, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." I will just add, there is more force in the frequent averment that *Jesus knew the traitor* (in one sense, as he *knew him not*, in another and a nobler sense) *from the beginning*, that he certainly seems never to have been either known or *suspected* by the eleven! "Lord is it I? so said they all." No one said, *Is it not Judas?*

“Some men’s sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment;” as in the case of the openly profane and profligate : “and some men they follow after ;” as in the case of saintly seducers and hypocrites, whose real character is revealed (like that of Judas) late, or only in eternity. “But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.”

I have just adverted to a passage of scripture, and used it too in its correct import, which may as well here be considered more at large. Friends abuse it very sincerely, if not universally. If they knew its meaning, it would mock their inspiration terribly. It is this. “Some men’s sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment; and some men they follow after. Likewise also the good works of some are manifest beforehand; and they that are otherwise cannot be hid.” 1 Tim. 5: 24, 25. The original word *προδηλος* means simply—manifest, palpable, clear as day, not to be mistaken. It is rendered in the passage, ‘open beforehand,’ and ‘manifest beforehand.’ It occurs only in a third place in the New-Testament, Heb. 7: 14, and is there better²⁴ rendered “evident.” The passage then means in substance this; Beware, Timothy, in ordaining officers or receiving members or supervising the general interests of the church; beware of specious appearances. Some men indeed could not deceive you: they are too palpably wicked; their sins are notorious; their lives are scandalous; you and all men know them, and so anticipate for them very correctly the sentence of eternal

judgment, to which their enormities proceed, as it were, before them; expecting their arrival and the retribution then to be displayed against them. But there is another class of wicked men of a description precisely opposite. They are good looking, celestializing, imposing hypocrites. You must be wary and penetrating to see them. Their sins are more covert; less manifest; not preceding them but "following after" to judgment. Beware then of appearances; and *lay hands suddenly on no man*.

Not knowing the sense of this text or the words of the original, Friends spiritualize it into a very good meaning indeed! so that what the apostle used to denote flagitious profligates or open contemners of goodness, their inspiration interprets to mean a high and holy spiritual experience which Friends of an exalted character, or saints alone, realize. Often have I heard their preachers insist, with all the unction of holy sonorousness, on the necessity and blessedness of this rare experience! Saying substantially as follows: "Ah! my Friends, you must come to know this for yourselves. Can you say in truth and from your own assured experience, 'My sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment?' Happy those who can adopt that language of the apostle! They know of a surety how good and how pleasant it is! O the excellency of this experience! I say again, my dear Friends, have you ever known it for yourselves? Be assured that without it you are only as 'sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.' I can testify to the excellency of the experience, from certain

knowledge and with undoubted clearness made manifest by the inward Teacher to my soul. O how much better than all the learning of the schools! How great the 'learned ignorance' that knows it not, and yet affects to preach unto others in the learning of the letter! As I sat in the stillness and solemnity of all flesh, the word was sounded through the secret chambers of my heart, in the present meeting: and it was made manifest to my inner man that I must communicate it for the benefit of others. I deliver it as a message from the Lord to some of you. To whom it appertaineth I know not; it was not revealed to me. But sure I am, my very dear Friends, that some soul will feel that its state is reached by what the Master gave me to communicate." Friends will probably think that I am now sinning against conscience, if not committing the unpardonable sin, by thus exposing them. My motive is with the Lord. As to the facts I have declared, their truth is the most venomous thing in the statement. Often, often have I heard this sublime experience recommended; I could narrate several pretty facts in this connection—but I forbear; having answered my object by rescuing the true sense of the passage from their inspiration, and giving to the impartial reader another facility of ascertaining the soundness of their pretensions, in connection with their incomparable sublimity! I think, however, that to any judicious and just beholder, we may here apply the passage to Quakerism itself personified, with conviction of its righteousness: "O degrading counterfeit! O ignorant and

vaporing cheat ! O dark and dreary meteor of light ! thy sins are manifest beforehand, going before to judgment. Thy inspiration is the veriest folly in the world. It is the dishonor of God and the confusion of men. It is piety to detest thy character, resist thy usurpation, and open the prison-doors to them that are bound in the miserable caverns of thy influence." More than once have *I* been solemnly asked, since I left them and before, "if my sins had ever been opened beforehand," &c. I hope to be spared the trial of a repetition of the pious concern, from henceforth !

3. A third sophism, that characterizes their reasoning and results—how I pity them—from a sense of consistency in maintaining the prerogatives of oracular inspiration and the diapason of religious sing-song, is this—*whatever breaks upon the mind in connection with a text, is the INSPIRED solution of its meaning, is the true and orthodox interpretation.* Hence it is that their preachers, with their prince Barclay himself, (the most rational Friend that ever thought himself inspired,) *are the worst interpreters in the world !* There are two reasons for this: (1) *their liability to be wrong* ; resulting from their disdain of sober investigation ; their general ignorance of the laws of true, and the facilities of false, interpretation ; their *religious* dread of any helps that appear learned and that savor of the wicked *schoolmen* ; their real and educated destitution of the best helps in judgment ; and the force of system and of sect *prejudicing* their perceptions ; and (2) *their necessary and sublime self-commitment to defend their*

positions—all the sparks that they have kindled. This is only consistency! Who would not defend his positions as infallible, who believed that they were all given by inspiration of God; and so were proper codicils to the volume of prophets and apostles as in common “the oracles of God!” Hence they *cannot* confess error, without blowing up their system. They ought to be right indeed, so right that miracles could add nothing to the evidence of their infallibility; otherwise there may be *inevitable* perdition in the necessity under which they lay themselves of defending at all events the positions of their preaching! To be *incorrigibly* wrong, on such a central matter of one’s creed, is just as ill omened to the welfare of the soul as it seems possible to conceive! To confess error, when proved, is the privilege of a freeman of Jesus Christ. He is willing to own himself wiser to-day than he was yesterday.

The instances of false interpretation that abound in the sayings and writings of their preachers are “so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea-shore innumerable.” They quote in a loose, hap-hazard, and often most erring way in point of fact. They educe a doctrine *from* a text that never was *in* it; though it might have been *in* them. They infer from premises what was never contained in them. They give to their own imaginings, beside the unction and sanction of the oracle, a certain *homogeneousness* of the system which the text never had before, and which is both specious and satisfactory to all; then

they frequently exclaim ; “ and now, Friends, only behold it ! was any thing ever plainer in the world ? How rational, how excellent, how consolatory ! What need of the vain learning of the world, to unravel what *hath been revealed to sucklings and to babes ?*” And thus the whole meeting are convinced ; all bowed under the influence ; all gathered into the clear light and life of the spirit ! And what abhorred impiety to breathe a breath against all that incumbent glory ! *I know* how horribly profane such an aggression would be held by them : and yet I very calmly declare it the spell of a more horrible delusion !

Take one more instance of false interpretation : *et crimine ub uno, disce omnes.*²⁵ It occurs in the formal statement of the *fifth* proposition of the *Apology*, “ concerning the UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION by CHRIST, and also the SAVING and SPIRITUAL LIGHT, *wherewith every man is enlightened.*” Its object is to prove the *universality* of the light. It occurs in the quotation of the following passage ; “ Nor is it less *universal* than the seed of sin, being the purchase of his death, *who tasted death for every man : for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive.*” 1 Cor. 15 : 22.

These specimens I have purposely selected, as being suited to my object, without being outrageously bad or as exceptionable as others. They are as decent instances as can be found. One remark here—*we ought to give no quarters to an interpreter of INSPIRED resources, whatever may be due in clemency to others.* It is bad enough when an

uninspired preacher mistakes the meaning of scripture and misrepresents the mind of God: especially, as is generally the case, if it occur from a criminal carelessness in dealing with his words. But an *inspired blunderer*—what a monster! shall we spare him?

Though these remarks principally affect the latter quotation; yet, with respect to the former, Heb. 2 : 9, as I am persuaded *he* mistakes its meaning, I will remark, that the word *man* is not in the original, and the strict rendering of *ὑπὲρ παντός* is *for each*, or, *on account of every one*, as Dr. Macknight has it; thus, “that he should taste death for every one *of them*.” Now the connection evinces that the apostle is speaking of the church, and not of the world; hence “*they who are sanctified, many sons brought unto glory, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee*,” are the associated expressions of the context. I do not think therefore that *that passage* proves *universality* in any relation, with respect to the species of man. I indeed believe that the atonement, made by Jesus Christ on the cross, is *in its own nature* amply sufficient for all mankind,²⁶ and that nothing but their voluntary pride and obstinacy of unbelief prevail as the means of exclusion to any one who hears the gospel; that the atonement is designedly large enough for all, and *applicable* to all, but *applied* only to them that believe! that it is offered to all; to them that reject, as really, as consistently, and as sincerely, as to them that accept it; and that to reject it is a

deep and damning sin, which any man indulges at the peril of his soul, in a matter where his guilt is manifest and his doom revealed: still, I do not believe that *any such doctrine* is taught in the text now under consideration. Am I right in this? How then does it consist with the views of Barclay or the use to which he has applied it?

The text from 1 Cor. 15 : 22, is however a worse perversion. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." He plainly here *infers* or *sees clearly* that the word *die* refers to spiritual death. This will be for a moment admitted. I ask then if its manifest opposite *made alive* means not *shall be spiritually quickened and born again*? If so, the passage as Barclay interprets it, proves *universal salvation!* I will not take upon me to say *how much* such a view would afflict the sentiments of Friends: I am safer in saying that such a view is no more the native sense or proper meaning of the passage than if he had used it to prophesy what shall occur in heaven a million of ages hence or had told us that it means—a certain youth of Scotch nativity, French education, Romish predilections, and very respectable talents, was converted to the sentiments of George Fox, and inspired to write a book as good as the Bible, if not better, called *Barclay's Apology*.

The word *die*, in the passage, is to be *literally* interpreted, meaning nothing but natural death—as it is *improperly* called: for *death* was a part of our sentence as sinners, Gen. 3 : 19, which has been executed from the beginning. But what if we "all

die" in Adam! we "shall all be made alive" in Christ. The dominion of death shall be destroyed and his vast prison depopulated.

Those ruins shall be built again,
And all that dust shall rise.

"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Acts, 24 : 15. John, 5 : 28, 29. 1 Thess. 4 : 13-18. Matt. 10 : 28. "The resurrection of the just" will be ineffably and consummately glorious; and this doctrine, in connection with the general subject, it is the formal object of the apostle *throughout this wonderful chapter* to prove beyond all contradiction. The passage concerned is in perfect keeping with all the other parts: while the *importance* of the doctrine is such—a doctrine denied by "some" at Corinth—that the apostle has declared it to be *just FUNDAMENTAL to christianity!* The great argument of the apostle for the resurrection of our bodies is the fact that *Christ's body rose, ascended, and is sublimed and glorified for ever in heaven.* His position is—that *our bodies shall rise just as certainly; and the bodies of saints, to everlasting beauty and beatitude.* He considers the position however *in reference mainly to the resurrection of the just.* In proof of this view we might quote the whole chapter, and innumerable other passages of *genuine* inspiration. 1 Cor. 15 : 12-22.

To many readers this argumentation of mine will appear unnecessarily minute. But my object shall soon appear, to explain and vindicate the

seeming prolixity. It is two fold; (1) to evince that Barclay has miserably mistaken the plain and certain meaning of the passage, when he spiritualizes the ideas of *dying* and being *made alive*, and then applies them to *prove*—yes, to *prove* his doctrine of “universal redemption by Christ, and also the saving and spiritual light, wherewith every man is enlightened!” I call this most miserable and guilty blundering, which, in a man of scholarship and professed inspiration, who writes a voluminous polemical tractate, ought to be universally appreciated. He addresses his book to “the CLERGY of what sort soever, unto whose hands these may come; but more particularly to the DOCTORS, PROFESSORS and STUDENTS of divinity in the universities and schools of *Great Britain*, whether prelatial, presbyterian, or any other:” a book abounding with just such wild, rash and false interpretation of scripture passages; that makes a great show of scripture authorities and references, while on examination it appears that his very proof-texts are (I do not say *intentionally*, but I do say, *through a criminal and hurtful assumption that he is INSPIRED*) wrested from their original meaning—and wrested with the greatest and the most imposing confidence! The imposition is very grateful (not of course as such) to Friends; and they think that, apart from the oracular wisdom of their school-learned prophet, his positions are all fortified by scripture, and not to be answered by the “hirelings” to whom they were in defiance addressed. Many of them boast to this day, in their deep do-

tage, that *the APOLOGY has never been answered and is truly unanswerable*:—a very convenient sentiment for “the Society.” I do not examine other texts, only because I think it unnecessary here to pursue the subject. To correct all his wrong and wretched misinterpretations of scripture, for which—observe—I do not oppugn his sincerity or charge him with conscious fraud, were an invidious and an elaborate task, to say nothing of the mass of paper it would require. Any man of sober sense may *make an inference by the way*, in respect to the validity of his claims to inspiration! Inspiration is itself a miserable thing if it cannot interpret its own words, previously uttered and recorded! What could more tend to make infidels by thousands and millions, in respect to all the claims of christianity, than to represent its basis to be a dark, self-contradictory, mystical and blundering inspiration?—such an inspiration exactly as that of Friends in all ages since the time of Cromwell!

But I have a further though a kindred object in urging this matter of interpretation. (2) *Friends do none of them believe in the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.* To some readers this will be strange even to astonishment. Very few, who believe that doctrine, on the simple authority of scripture, could imagine that it was any part of the darkness of the inward light boldly to deny and denounce a fact so plainly revealed in the oracles of God, and there made so fundamental to christianity! But it is even so! I venture the assertion that a Friend who believes it is a rarer phe-

nomenon than an eclipse of the moon. Rightly to believe it, according to the sure testimony of God, is *well nigh impossible* to any man who does not believe in the paramount authority of scripture; and to no man more incorrigibly than to a Friend. They call it *a gross conception, a heathen notion, a piece of folly, and a thing impossible*. They use the stale arguments of mere deism against it. I have heard especially²⁷ one of their preachers most scornfully declaim against it:—any mere hearer would have thought that his sermon was the libellous harangue of a deist opposing revelation. Though young (as a few weeks only) in the knowledge of God, and then a member of the society, I longed to say unto them, “ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God! why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead? Be not deceived; evil communications corrupt good manners. Awake to righteousness, and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God: I speak this to your shame. But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. Who art thou, O man, that repliest against God?” Matt. 22 : 29. Acts, 26 : 8. 1 Cor. 15 : 33–36. Rom. 9 : 20.

This topic is *immensely* important. *Christianity stands or falls with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body!* That man ought to doubt his piety who can look at the heresy of Friends on this article and feel indifferent. Is it nothing that the hopes

of the whole world or those of them that are alone legitimate, should be ruined by a heavenly-looking heresy that sinks their common basis into nothing? I would just as soon turn atheist outright or—what is the same thing—sadducee entire, as fellowship any man who dares to violate the only hope of men by denying the scriptural account of the resurrection of both soul and body!

The word *αναστασις* translated *resurrection* occurs nearly fifty times in the New Testament. Its proper meaning is *re-existence*, or *a standing up afterward* of those who are here prostrated by death. It refers to the soul and body both; yet so essentially that the Bible treats those who deny either as denying both, and so denounces them as reprobates. Friends do not, I know, deny the *anastasis* or resurrection of the soul. They believe, in form as we do, that the soul goes to its allotment *immediately* at death. *So far* they believe *professedly* the scripture doctrine of the resurrection. Thus Christ taught it in the case of the patriarchs, *whose bodies are not yet raised, but who “sleep in Jesus,”* by quoting a passage from “the scripture,” and then declaring, “God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.” But not a Friend—far from it—believes in the *gross conception* that the body shall rise! This point, except by some pretty certain implications, Barclay wholly omits. I have read his book often and much; and on one occasion lately read it regularly through; but remember no sentence in which he formally touches the subject. This was, I must think, policy! Few suspected

him to deny what he did not discuss; and fewer still would mark an *omission* that was not by them anticipated. Their blank infidelity here ought to be known. This single but important matter is to me proof positive that they are all deluded by some spirit that rules their darkness.

They do indeed use the word, passingly, in reference to Christ, and even claim to believe the fact of him; as when they give out one of their best aspects to the public, speaking of the "birth, life, crucifixion, *resurrection*, and ascension," of the Redeemer. But farther than this I never knew them go. If any authentic treatise of their authors contains it, I never saw, I never heard from one of them, a declaration that "ALL THAT ARE IN THEIR GRAVES" shall "come forth" in the last day at the word of Christ. If it is one of their 'orthodox' theses, how happened the "Apology" to forget to mention it? Was it less important than the "plain language," &c? or did inspiration lose its self-possession in the authorship of that lucid volume? I believe verily that I am uttering the truth, when I say, they are either utterly ignorant or utterly infidel on the point. And very cardinal is this, not only absolutely, but as *a matter of test* in the controversy; for no man living believes the doctrine, except simply on the authority of scripture; and it is a doctrine not at all *peculiar* to any denomination of christians. What kind of a homogeneous inspiration then is that of Friends, that leads them not to know it, to disbelieve it, or forget or deny it? I say again, it is A TEST MATTER; it is a demonstration that confounds

for ever their high and false pretensions ! I know indeed that in *Sewel, Gough, Penn*, and others, the word is used, and reference had to its general import. But how brief, passing, inconclusive ! It may mean (and it occurs *very rarely*, even thus) that Christ rose from the dead—and not that the whole species shall rise also. I have heard the doctrine, as christians hold it, often disclaimed and ridiculed by Friends of different classes, long before the schism. Mosheim signalizes their denial of the resurrection of the dead, as one of the known and central attributes of the heresy. So do other authors, and those of the first respectability. Here the reader may inquire, “Why, if Quakerism *is* Christianity, has it been so doubted, impeached, denounced, by wise and holy men in all ages and places since its rise ? The men who have been its characteristic oppugners, are the first in the evangelical world, especially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries ; and they are *all agreed* in exploding it, as a sophistical delusion and an impious deceit. Says Dr. Owen, among other solemn and pertinent declarations, “Sin will not be mortified by the power of their *light within*, nor by their resolutions, nor by any of their austere outward appearances, nor peculiar habits or looks, which in this matter are openly *pharisaical*.” He says that in his day they only *gratified* deceitfully the impulses of sin, by “exciting and provoking themselves to exceed all others in clamors, railings, evil speakings, reproaches, calumnies, and malicious treating of those who dissented from them, without the least discovery of a heart filled with kindness

and benignity unto mankind, or LOVE UNTO ANY BUT THEMSELVES." And this is a specimen of the common sentiment.

I cannot leave this matter without remarking *the power of education, especially with Friends!* THEIR MODE OF EDUCATION IS THE MAKING AND THE KEEPING AND THE SECRET OF THEIR SECT. They subdue the infant mind and awe the infant conscience, with the direct rays of the inward light. They identify all divinity and right, in the associations of their children, with the light within and its *friendly* fruits. Here the spell commences that "grows with their growth and strengthens with their strength." Investigation is much akin to scepticism and so is devoutly precluded:—but what *worse* scepticism it is to suppose that investigation *could* rase the foundation of our faith! They must take every thing for granted or *see it* in the light! They must wear a ridiculous cut and color of clothes, such as are orthodox or common to the clanship; and use the *plain language*, and act like Friends: and then if they feel awkward and foolish; if their garb appear ridiculous to themselves; if their manners expose them to jeering and affront; if they are insolently struck (as I have often been) in the street by worthless boys and cursed as "a Quaker;" if their effeminate holy whine is profanely mocked—as it often is by saucy passengers; and if a thousand other inconveniences accrue; especially if they are sometimes asked for *one good reason* for such singularity in gratuitous opposition to mankind, they must *just bear it all for righteousness' sake; not be afraid of the cross, but*

remember EARLY FRIENDS, *how much more they endured in the same cause!* Now, much of this, which they call "a guarded education," is just the worst kind of sorcery. It is fascination and religious tyrannizing over the blighted attributes of mind! It is a system exactly calculated to prostrate every noble, courageous and manly sentiment; and to transmute a fine, ingenuous boy into a sorry, sly, and often simulating creature in the form of man.

'Tis liberty alone that gives the flower
 Of fleeting life its lustre and perfume;
 And we are weeds without it. All constraint,
 Except what wisdom lays on evil men,
 Is evil; hurts the faculties; impedes
 Their progress in the road of science; blinds
 The eyesight of discovery; and begets,
 In those that suffer it, a sordid mind,
 Bestial, a meagre intellect, unfit
 To be the tenant of man's noble form.—COWPER.

The strength of the educational influence is wonderful. It is so identified with the voice of God speaking in them, at them, to them, and [through them; and that constantly and audibly; that its witchery is unparalleled. Hence it is almost impossible by any means to break the charm, where once it has gained a commanding influence *in early life!* The power of association, the homogeneity of the scheme, the visible uniform in which they always appear, their peculiarities of language and behavior, their family interests and relationships, with innumerable other matters, all unite to make an influence and an atmosphere of the sect,

which they easily identify with goodness and heaven, and from which it is next to impossible to escape. Hence in general to be born a Friend is to die a Friend. Argument, evidence, truth, may all be against them in vain: they feel it not, they know it not: and there they are, stagnant and immovable. This is a *portentous* character of the system, and ought to make *especially the young* to pause and consider! When I look back on that influence as it affected me, my feelings are unutterable:—I have never spoken or written their intensity! I bless “the only wise God” that I am not what I was, a Friend! By this however I do not mean that I had any “godly sincerity” or did my duty according to knowledge, while one of them. So far from this, I then knew that I was no christian, and felt that I was unfit to die; inasmuch as I often and even habitually acted contrary to the “light within:” by which I *now* mean only my natural conscience armed against me, as it was, with a very superficial knowledge of the scriptures. I did however believe that Quakerism and christianity were just the same; and so deep were my convictions in favor of the scheme, that the operation of scripture, in that respect revolutionizing my mind, was truly agonizing. It was also difficult and terrible! To find one’s self wholly wrong in first principles; to see the necessity of repentance; to renounce all the hallowed and long habituated associations of infancy and childhood; to see scripture every where contradicting what you before *knew* to be true; and to embrace “that which is good” after “proving all things:”

what is this but difficulty and anguish ! The system ought to be right that so rivets its principles to the very being of its disciples ! It ought to be right, for it is very seldom renounced at all ; and much more seldom for the sake of Jesus Christ ! It ought to be right, for otherwise all its present votaries will probably live and die in error : so great the power of educational religious prejudice ; I feel it to this day ! I never see a very *plain garb*, without some of the reverent associations of childhood :—it looks so good, so patriarchal, so *inspired* ! This proves only *the power of education* in general, and of *religious* education in particular, and of *early* religious education more especially, as it does *not* prove that Friends are right in *the lessons of religion* which they inculcate ! A Friend is ordinarily made before he is five years of age ! the stamp of character is impressed on a yielding surface so deeply, and *so seemingly* by the hand of God himself, that its print is indelible ! This I call the cement and the secret of their system. In addition to this all their children are born, not *spiritually* but *naturally*, into full birth-right membership ! and it needs no evangelical regeneration or subsequent profession to constitute the *finished Friend* ; which a child commonly becomes, as soon as he becomes of mature age. But when some are recreant to the light, and sin against the costume and other ordinances and sacraments of the society, they are still Friends in their consciences—in their associations—in their convictions ! They were made such without catechism, intelligence, or evidence. In some solemn

flashes of the light, they felt its reality and they *know* (no religionists speak more confidently) that it is true. If ever they reform, it will be *of course* according to all the formalities and usages of Friends; now they are gay and dissipated, but they are still Friends:—and education has decided their creed! Hence a Friend is always established and unalterable; and this without examination, without knowledge, and (I fear) without prayer! Hence he never changes, but plods onward and dies as he lives.—a Friend! In this Friends often, *very often*, glory. If a man is once made acquainted with Friends' principles, say they, he can never wholly "get rid of it." Of this I have often been myself reminded! And in general it is truth! But is this any argument, or one of their best, for *the truth of their system*? It may prove the strength of false and early and habituated impressions alone! It may prove that the system has nothing to do with evidence; that it is purely mechanical, and that it only enslaves its disciples: it may prove that the whole concern is nothing better than an organized system of prejudice. Such a process may make *Friends*, just as, in a change of circumstances, it also makes *Deists, Mahommedans, Jews, Romanists, Pagans*, or even *Atheists*! Now, it is a known principle in the philosophy of mind, that a man can seldom be by evidence corrected from that course of which he was not by evidence convinced; he cannot be reasoned out of error, if he was not at first reasoned into it! If it were reasoning that makes an infidel, reasoning could much more convert him.

But when passion, pride, prejudice, education, personal influence, social sympathies, interest, fashion, worldly considerations, or profligacy, or a combination of such causes, make for a man his principles or persuasion in religion, he is ordinarily shut against the light of evidence; he is proof to the truth and the grace of the gospel. *His soul is the victim, and heaven the forfeiture! and justly*, for no man, young or old, has a right to believe without evidence, and to be led by mere dictation, in the awful matters of salvation and eternity! God has furnished us with full and perfect evidence of his own being and perfections; of his ways of administration with men; and of the unalterable principles of his moral empire; of the person and offices of his Son, and of the only way of salvation "through his blood" and by faith in his name! And "how shall we escape, if we *neglect* so great salvation?"

I do not however deny that there are good things, such as they are, in the style of education adopted by Friends. There are many good things in it—*for the present world*, which would be infinitely better, were it not for the world to come! They make their children commonly industrious, orderly, economical, tender in their affections, obedient to parents, regular in their habits, moderate in their desires, comfortable in their dwellings, and respectable—often rich! in society. This they do in a certain form, to a good degree, and *with a fearful amount of degenerate exceptions not equally recognised by ordinary observers*. But what is all this *to an immortal*, who must obey the gospel of Jesus

Christ or—perish for ever! What is all this, if, with so much of temporal convenience, they undermine the welfare of his soul and effectually *prejudice* him against the religion of Jesus Christ? What of all this, if they have given him principles of religion perfectly incorrigible and fundamentally wrong? *They have done him the greatest possible disservice, which is all the worse for the good things that accompany it.*

Friends have one advantage in respect to reputation, touching apostates and delinquents of the society “disowned,” which is peculiar to themselves. Their degenerate sons forego the costume, and so exonerate the society. Hence their relation to Friends, being no longer advertised along the streets, in “plainness of speech, behavior, and *apparel*,” becomes as though it was not or had never been. Thus the public in effect grant them total *irresponsibility* in this matter; and judge of them as if their best appearing specimens were all; and so frame all their associations in their favor. In the mean time, Souvenirs, and Tokens, and Amulets, and all the harplings of semi-pagan minstrelsey and popular sentimentalism, the sickliness of *refined* religion that proposes a way to heaven less vulgar than that of “repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;” all these influences report them well, and view them as moving citadels of light and purity.

The Quaker stood under his smooth broad brim,
In the plain drab suit, that simple and trim,
Was better than royal robes to him,

Who looked on the inward part;
 Foregoing the honors and wealth of earth;
 And emptied his breast of the praise of birth,
 To seek the treasures of matchless worth
 Reserved for the pure in heart.—EXTRACTED.

In effect, the world is a great forest, in which a renegade Friend ensconces himself, and relieves the fame of the society. Hence *seemingly* they have no such characters. The individual instances that occur, though terribly numerous, are known each by a comparative few, and not by the public. This is one cause of their popularity with the superficial, the sceptical, the morbidly sentimental, and the weakly charitable—who seem to love every thing alike or at least to profess that impracticable folly. How noble, as well as different, is the prayer of the apostle for his Philippian converts! “that your love may abound yet more and more *in knowledge and in all judgment*; that ye may approve (DISCRIMINATE) things that are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ; being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God.”

There is no heresy, says an ancient father, in which, taken as a whole, there is not more of truth than error! So, there might be more of food than poison in a fatal dish, in which, *but for the food*, the poison would never be tasted; still, the poison is more than sufficient to kill: and is the food then an advantage? This simile shows the real state of the case, the gospel being umpire. The fatal chalice of the “murderer” of souls, must be made

palatable, and is often bountiful and luxurious beside: or, it would not be so eagerly quaffed even by the multitude. I, for one, little thank Quakerism for all its imposing worldly excellencies, since I am well persuaded that their scheme deprives me of my only glory and hope—“*Jesus Christ and him crucified,*” and the worship of God according to his own authority and grace! Take from me this—and I would you could rob me of existence too! since, being without blessedness, is not desirable; and blessedness without Christ, is impossible; and Christ without his truth and worship is a vile illusion. *The Christ of Quakerism is not the Christ of the scriptures.* The gospel sends us *out of ourselves* to Christ by faith, for eternal life: Quakerism sends us feeling in the dark for the *inward light*, which is *Christ in every man from the foundation of the world!* Is this the Christ of the New Testament! I have no words with which to express the horror of my soul at the perversion! *How many worldly good things* ought Quakerism to give us in compensation for such a robbery? I would say to Quakerism personified with its lures, “Thy money perish with thee! for I perceive thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity!” Take Christ away, only quench the glory of the mercy-seat, only put out the sun of our day, and all your lighted tapers, your festivity and your *friendship*, your banqueting and merriment, but mock the melancholy

Of him whose thought can stretch beyond an hour.

I know that all this will appear—*poetry*, to those who prize not “the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord!” But with them it is notoriously an easy reckoning every day to live without him, forget him, and count themselves “rich and increased with goods and in need of nothing;” while they are “without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.” Eph. 2 : 12. And such will say *what aileth thee?* and compassionate the softness that can mourn for such a visionary absence! “And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, **BECAUSE THEY HAVE TAKEN AWAY MY LORD, AND I KNOW NOT WHERE THEY HAVE LAID HIM.**” John, 20 : 13. These are *rational* tears, worthy of the cheek of men and angels. It is wisdom weeping at the grave of hope, and trampling on sceptres and diadems! It is immortality humbled in despair, and abhorring her sins while crushed beneath the burden! It is penitence without pardon, religion without peace, holiness without salvation! How different the light of scripture!—the index-finger of truth pointing to the Savior! “Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.”

By many these pages will be censured for their harshness and for utterly disparaging the excellences of Friends. With respect to their excellences I say comparatively nothing: and this not that I either deny or disesteem them. Some quali-

ties they undoubtedly possess that are amiable and useful; and I cordially wish that these, whatever they are, were more increased, more enlightened by "the truth of the gospel," and more widely prevalent in the earth. I expect to be scarcely credited by them, when I "protest unto them," that I am conscious only of benevolence to their true temporal and eternal interests in all that I think, speak, or write, concerning their erroneous scheme. But whether they believe it or not, God is witness. If I did not *at least* fully believe that my motives were benevolent, I should myself have no hope toward God. But my hope is happy and my faith perpetually gathering strength. I have a hope, which, in degree of excellence *at least*, I am sure I could never have derived from Quaker principles. What then could induce me thus to oppose their scheme? *Solely the conviction that it is wrong!* Why did Paul oppose judaism or Luther popery? They were both benevolent. "Glory to God in the highest," was associated in their moral feelings with "peace on earth, good will toward men." Yet we see how their good will acted! It often induced them to expose, confute, denounce, and even anathematize, the corrupters of the gospel. And in this they were not less benevolent, and much more self-denying, than when they were administering consolation to the contrite. I speak not of the excellences of Friends, because I think they are quite too conscious of them; because they have been overrated by the world; because they do not necessarily imply piety toward God; because, if mere

social and apparent excellence be all they have, so living and so dying they will perish for ever; because *their errors* is the grand matter which moves me to write at all; because the things in which they are wrong are greater than those in which they may be right; because while they talk and act against vain amusements, war, slavery, and spiritous liquors, they also talk and act against the supremacy of the scriptures as the word of God, and against the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, which are most demonstrably and even evidently divine institutions; because, while their imposing appearance is a passport to the confidence of the superficial, their carelessness or denial of the sanctity of "the Lord's day," is a grief of heart to the most intelligent christians; while the vagueness and vacuity of their confession, on fundamental articles of christian truth, as the doctrine of the trinity, the person and offices of the Redeemer, the value and relations of the death of Christ as connected with human hope, the depraved moral character of man, the true doctrine of the influence of the Spirit, the nature and the indispensableness of regeneration, the wonderful divine method of justification, the resurrection of the body, and the eternal states of men; the vagueness and vacuity of their creed, and the imbecility or ambiguity of their practice, in respect to points like these, necessarily and righteously induce the suspicion, of all well informed and honest disciples of the Son of God, that they are radically apostate and graceless. Another reason for the alleged omission is *the ex-*

treme sensitiveness of the Quakers to the matter of human approbation. I wish we all cared practically half as much for the approbation of God! Any observer, who has eyed their manners and read their books, will see how ill they can endure the moral frown of the community. If public sentiment were enlightened and humane in its general testimony against them, they could hardly maintain their distinctive character in this country. Here they pay no tithes, church-rates, or other legal exactions, for the support of the "hireling" clergy. They have all the immunities of citizenship and are eligible to all the places of eminence: and they will never (as I think and hope) be *persecuted* into consequence by their countrymen. I am as utterly and as sincerely averse to all persecution and physical coercion on religious accounts, doing or suffering, as they are: and do as cordially condemn the *wholly unchristian* persecutions which Friends have suffered in either hemisphere. This, I fully believe, is the present sense of every sincere protestant. But the value of the truth is not less, because we have learned *wholly to abjure* the use of carnal weapons in its support. The war must be continued, but the armor must be of celestial temperament alone. Nor yet, because of this, are we to consider a truce with the foe as expedient, or obligatory, or allowable. Christianity can never steal a march on the world or succeed by ambush or skirmishing. All she wins must be by fair battle, under the open eye of day. She scorns concealment, treachery, stratagem. "She challenges in-

vestigation and defies refutation." She opens her bosom to the foe; and if he will not be conciliated to her person and besought to draw the precious nutriment of her consolations, he may violate that maternal bosom with his impious dagger—he will find it strangely invulnerable to his assault. Only his weapon and himself, will be broken.

The charge of harshness is much in the same predicament. If what I have written be justly styled harsh, my reasons for adopting that character of disputation are the following.

1. *The importance of the matter.* To doubt that importance is to discredit all religion. Look at it as related to all other religionists; specially to all who *knowingly* reject their doctrine. They will all be lost, according to the gospel, if the Quaker doctrine be true! for, *he that believeth not, shall be damned*; and they most decisively disbelieve and denounce it. On the other hand, what will become of Friends, with all their placidity, philanthropy, and high pretensions; if at last it should appear that they had accredited "another gospel, which is not another," instead of that of Christ? They will all be lost together who have nothing better than pure Quakerism to defend them from the fire! These are my convictions; and I know that they are just as true as the New Testament.

2. I really believe that *the plain attire and speech of Friends, which give them such a saintship of appearance, are the veil that covers many an abandoned infidel.* I might think this from the nature of the case. Externals cannot change the heart;

otherwise, the “hirelings” of the British establishment must be as holy as their vocation, as stainless as their surplice, as unsullied as their lawn. But I know it from actual converse with individuals ! with multitudes, preachers of both sexes, as well as their commonalty ! and I have yet to learn what is the definition of that INFIDELITY to which Jesus Christ hath pledged himself to award DAMNATION, if they are not legitimately and most awfully in danger of it ! When one of their first preachers tells me, in personal conference, that Jesus Christ made no atonement ; that God exacts none except what the sinner makes with his tears ; and that the resurrection of the body is a monster of absurdity ; when he ridicules “ the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ;” when he doubts the miraculous conception of Christ, thinks it probable that Joseph was his proper father, and at all events considers that to err in this is nothing to the sin of eating West India sugar ! When another tells me that Ezekiel bore the sins of his age *just as Christ bore ours*—being melancholy on account of them ! When another takes a little child and pronounces him “ without all sin, as holy as an angel,” while the scriptures say, “ that which is born of the flesh, is flesh ; ye must be born again : the wicked are *estranged from the womb* ; they go astray *as soon as they be born, speaking lies* : we were *by nature* children of wrath, even as others ;” and while their whole tenor teaches the “ enmity of the carnal mind against God :” when all this, and *a million other things in perfect keeping with this*, are taught and held by the society,

the known holders and teachers uncensured by their authorities, I am reduced to the fair necessity of contradicting the New Testament, or discrediting the piety of the Quakers, or defiling my conscience with the charity of the world which "rejoiceth [NOT] in the truth," or abandoning the laws of rational thought and evidence.

3. Another reason for my alleged severity is that I believe *they have been greatly injured* by a luscious and spurious clemency ; and that nothing but "great plainness of speech" and uncompromising applications of the truth, can reach the seat of their malady. They are natively just as sinful as other men, and they equally require all the specifics of the gospel for their restoration. But who shall tell them what they are, and what they must become, by "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," as the *only* alternative of perdition ? Their preachers have altered very much since I have heard them, *if they will ever do this wisely and faithfully !* What then is my office ? To apologize for the gospel and flatter them in the name of the Lord ? "For we are not as many, who corrupt (dilute, as wine is artfully reduced by dishonest mixtures) THE WORD OF GOD : but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ." I know of none who more dilute and enervate the genuine discriminating might of the gospel than the preachers of Quakerism, especially their tuneful female preachers. These are frequently charmers. They sing their inspired fascination, that affects the *physical* sensibilities, acts rather soothingly or in some

indefinable way on the nervous system, comforts the unregenerate, and instructs nobody.

4. *Any other course*, than that herein pursued, would do violence to my own convictions of the immutable nature of the gospel and of the contrariety of Quakerism to that nature ; would afford no peace to my conscience or pleasure to my memory. My views of the duty of a preacher may be found in the second and third chapters of Ezekiel, in the first of Jeremiah, and in the last four verses of the second of second Corinthians. If I have said any thing that is untrue, let it be demonstrated, and (if need be) I will publicly confess and retract it ! Not being inspired or infallible, I may commit errors : and bound to nothing but truth, I can confess them. Nothing else shall move me. And by *demonstration* I mean a sound argument from *scripture* against the doctrinal, or from witnesses against the historical, or from self-contradiction against the didactic averments. And let no professor of christianity join the popular outcry against the alleged harshness of this treatise, who is not prepared to show its essential contrariety to the religion of the Bible. There is no people in the world who more deal in softness or are more injured by it, than Friends. *It is not at all my primary aim to please them—I expect to make them angry : but this is not my desire ; it is rather at once my anticipation and my GRIEF !* Tell me how the truth of scripture can be faithfully displayed against its inimical corrupters so as to please them, and that way I would like to adopt : still, if they must be goaded with truth or remain ignorant

of its nature and hostile to its charms, then I say let them feel it!

I have called their preaching, especially that of the *feminine* department, tuneful; for such it eminently is: operating like a charm, as pouring on the soul the freshest tide of heaven's eternal minstrelsy, through them. With all their opposition to singing, which they "cry against" and by profession totally disuse in worship, I know of few denominations who do so much at it, in a sort, as Friends. They sing their preaching, and their praying—which seldom occurs, almost all of it. Their inspiration moves with difficulty when not on a canter. This *inspired* singing, is mainly what I mean by sorcery, as applied to their ways. Still, it is a fact that the effect of their devout cantation is very considerable. It arrests the attention and enchains the sympathies; and is quite entertaining and agreeable often, while it dispenses with thought-work and conscientious self-application. Friends might learn, one would think, that singing is natural to us; that it suits our constitution; that it is founded in principles that never vary; that its powers will become adverse, if not consecrated; that God has incorporated it both in the body and the soul of his worship; that its sanction and its evidence pervade the whole Bible; that it deserves scientific and philosophical cultivation; that it is a delightful and most excellent part of worship; that Jesus Christ practised it; that his apostles established and regulated it; that his church has evermore maintained it; and that Fox and his company nullified the divine constitution when they

professedly exploded it, with "all sorts of music," from their hearts and voices.

A great fault it is in any people which I am now about to expose; and common, wherever the truth is not known and duly honored; yet, more rife among "the religious society," and more embodied in some sense surreptitiously in their religious system, than among any other description of religionists known to me: it is this—SINCERITY IS ALL. The sophism consists in the generic vagueness of the word sincerity, that determines nothing as to the moral qualities of the mind in religion; while it requires us to accord the superlative dignity of christian character to men "who obey not the gospel of God," and who insist on salvation, nevertheless, because they are sincere. This is probably the whole hope, if not the whole creed, and the whole religion, of thousands of ungodly men, especially of the *foxian* school. There are many such reposing in hope among Friends. They hold to the *word*, as if it were the thing; or to the thing, as if there were possibly only one way of being sincere—and no way of going to perdition with "a lie in the right hand." Hence they are serenely comfortable in their graceless attainments. They apply their minds with no intensity of earnestness and *prayer*, to ascertain the truth. They live, in numerous instances, more ignorant of the contents of the Bible than many a six-year-old pupil of a well-taught infant school; they are imperturbably satisfied with their own doings; believe in the "effectual operation" of the light

within; dress plain, use the plain language—and very seldom (whatever they smother) utter a word of evil audibly; desire to be industrious, lay by something, be economical, grow rich, and dislike all priest-craft and hireling preachers; and being *sincere*, who is better in his prospects for another world, one would like to know? Will such an one go to heaven at death? “Straight as an arrow from a bow, I tell thee.” Certainly! How unjust to send him in the opposite direction! What harm has he done? Who has a better *chance*? He was always peaceable, kind to the poor, paid his debts, and was a member of Friends’ meeting. A pretty reason for doubting his safety, to be sure!

The only difficulty is—that all this, though “highly esteemed among men, is abomination in the sight of God;” being just as far from the truth of the gospel, as darkened infidelity can make it! Where is *any sense* of our moral ruin, as fallen creatures, “children of wrath—that which was lost?” Where is faith in Christ? Where repentance, humiliation, and the evidence of a change of heart? Where self-knowledge, religious experience, or spiritual joy? Where the MEDIATOR, the covenant of grace, the succor of the promises? What distinctive feature of *christian* piety does such a character manifest? Where is there any sense of sin, any peace at its pardon, any mention of “the only name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved?” Where is their professed faith in the doctrine of *regeneration*? or are Friends all regen-

erated of course, because full members that have retained their birth-right to—delusion? Suppose, by possibility, in any given case, the individual was at heart a true and spiritual worshipper; and is saved, as Job says he “escaped with the skin of his teeth;” still, the objections to this facile favor, presumptuous charity, and *uniform* construction of safety, are two-fold: *first*, It proceeds with utterly insufficient evidence, declaring what is not proved, what no man knows, and what, even probably, may not be true; and *second*, It is a positive, efficacious, insidious, INJURY to the living, without any possible benefit to the dead.²⁸

Still, they affect not to know it, many of them. “I am sincere,” covers all. And there are other ways, much allied to the former, by which they try to evade the responsibility of evangelized men. (1) I am conscientious. (2) If this is not duty, I am not to blame, for I know no better. (3) I know enough already. If a man has more required of him, in proportion to his advantages, I shall only increase obligation by increasing knowledge: if we should all do, as well as we know, it would be better for us. They seem “willingly ignorant of” such principles as the following: that ignorance of duty may result simply from a sinful dislike to it; that ignorance of duty is sin, where we have the means of knowledge; that all men are OBLIGATED TO KNOW GOD, and to improve all the means in their possession to this INFINITELY EXCELLENT END; 1 Cor. 15 : 34, that God will hold them to account not only for all they have, but for all they might

have had, not only for all the sound sermons they hear, but for all they refuse to hear, not only for attainments and achievements, but for facilities and means and opportunities and privileges, not only for what they use, but for what they abuse; that their conscience is not higher than his authority, and not exempt, in any *possible* instance, from the jurisdiction of HIS law; that a man may be *to blame for his sincerity* as well as his profligacy; that there is no neutrality in religion, so that we are the enemies if not the friends of Jesus Christ; that sincerity merely is no proof of piety, since a man may be sincerely stupid, and stupidly practising a wicked course of conduct; that it was sincerity of a specific kind, “godly sincerity,” that characterized the apostles; that Paul was as sincere before his conversion as he was after it—when “breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord,” as when edifying them in goodness—when he “verily thought with himself, that *he ought to do* many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, which things he also did in Jerusalem,” as when preaching among the nations “the unsearchable riches of Christ;” that the time has long since arrived which the Savior predicted, “when whoso killeth his disciples shall think that he doeth God service;” that some indolent and corrupted sinners, infatuated by the judgment of God, *sincerely* “believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness;” that few penitents ever “repented themselves” more sincerely than Judas,

when he "brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood; and they said, What is that to us? see thou to that, and he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself;" and that there is a perfection in the moral government of God, which such excuses will never prevail to destroy, blind as they may be to all the principles involved in that perfection. A principle of requisition in the government of God, from which he NEVER departs, they seem not to know or clanishly to resist and sophisticate—that "without faith it is IMPOSSIBLE to please God;" and that of consequence "they that are in the flesh," that is, who act on carnal or worldly principles, continuing in them, "cannot please God;" do what they will in forms of excellence, with such expectancy. Rom. 8: 8. Heb. 11: 6. James, 1: 6-8. Hence in general they do not understand the doctrine of faith. The only faith required in their system is that—in the "effectual operation" of the internal principle. And what is this, but faith in a worse than moonstruck fallacy? Hence the system cheats the souls of men—cheats them of knowledge, of sound doctrine, of mental liberty, of evidence, of instruction, of christianity; and substitutes a thing of "will o' the wisp" dimensions, that rose from the bogs of "Drayton in the clay, Leicestershire," England, some two centuries since. If any one accuse me here of actually hating Quakerism, I beg he will never attempt to prove his position;

as it is wholly unnecessary. My confession shall forestall him : I certainly do hate it ; by all the hope of heaven that I cherish consciously in Christ Jesus at this moment, I abhor it ; by all the love I bear to the souls of men, my own and others, I abhor it ; by all the sense I have of what christianity is, and what the scriptures mean, and what men infinitely need in order to salvation, I renounce and execrate it ; and make it a part of my piety to detest it, as a composition of spiritual sorcery, presuming ignorance, and deceitful dogmatism ; offensive to heaven and deleterious to the noblest hopes of men, in “the life that now is and also that which is to come :”—and I qualify the written solemnity *only* by remarking that it is wholly and only against the system, and not at all against individuals, that it aims the honest and hearty declaration. I have no wish to “snatch from His hand the balance or the rod,” who decides on persons according to truth ; can be deceived by no specious counterfeits ; has himself anathematized “an angel from heaven” who should vend “another gospel” or vitiate the true ; and who has of right and of power the independent sway of destinies, both mine and theirs. “Amen. Alleluia.”

That there is *criminality* in all religious error, misanthropy as well as impiety, and essential sin in cherishing it, is plain to any honest reader of the word of God, or any common thinker on the nature of its contents. I can express the truth, however, in a better way, by a quotation from my honored friend, Dr. Miller. In his excellent sermon on “The enmity of the human heart against the character and

government of God," published in the MURRAY-STREET DISCOURSES, he inquires, "Does error spring from deficiency of evidence? Is there not, in the arguments by which the scriptures are proved to be divine, a variety, an amplitude, adapted to carry conviction to every mind not stupified by passion, or rendered impenetrable by prejudice? They never have been, they never can be, undermined or shaken. And as it regards the general features of the system which the Bible has inculcated, is it not a reflection on the wisdom of him from whom it emanated, and subversive of the very design of its promulgation, to say that it cannot be satisfactorily ascertained, by any diligence of research, united with candor of mind and purity of moral feeling? Radical error, in one who applies himself to the study of the sacred records, cannot arise from any want of perspicuity in them, but must be the offspring of a heart hostile to that Being who has impressed upon the gospel the image and superscription of his own glory. The conclusion cannot be evaded, but by assuming at once all the monstrous dogmas of infidelity." To that conclusion I find myself *painfully* reduced in reference to the erring system of Friends, whenever I ponder the affecting subject—from which my thoughts are almost NEVER away! Hence I judge their "foundation" to be "sandy;" needing to be "shaken" not only, but utterly subverted and supplanted by that of the gospel—which is ANOTHER SYSTEM AND THE ONLY SURE ONE! Friends are not alone in the magnanimity, that likes truth *only*

when it suits them. But among all *tellurians* or *lunarians* of my acquaintance, they are distinguished for *liking those that like them, and liking no others*. Matt. 5 : 46, 47. To refute them, especially if it be *unanswerable*, is a great injury. It mars all "the unity of the Spirit" which is identified with—their feelings! and this is the highest idea that *any* of them seem to have of the matter. Their feelings are—inspiration!

I regard Quakerism also to be one of the most heavily oppressive systems that ever became prevalent, as the voluntarily cherished incubus of mind. "While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption." While they vaunt themselves peculiarly free in their mental action, it is plain to a dispassionate observer of facts on both sides, that they are perhaps the most priest-ridden community in christendom. This fact I know somewhat experimentally—contrasting present freedom with former bondage. The principles of priest-craft, properly such, are organized into the very structure of their society. A few have rule; control every thing; forestall argument; check investigation; propound doctrine; imprison thought in their spell of influence; enunciate the last advices of their inward oracle; tell how it was with "early Friends;" denounce all priest-craft except their own; and dogmatize serenely away all wicked doubtation and worldly propensities to examine. Hence mind is suffocated with smoke, called "light;" and the more "ductile" they are, to the invisible monitor, the impalpable fanaticism, the most celestial-

looking forgery, the more saturated are they with inward light according to "the unity in the silence of all flesh!" Hence the deception is a perfect spiritual fascination too. Fox was, while he lived, the *Loyola* of the order, for authority. No convent was ever ruled more completely by sanctimonious abbot or fastidious prioress, than the whole society by a recent forgery from heaven, delivered by one or more (for they generally confirm each others' reports) male or female functionaries, in great "sincerity." I have myself witnessed facts of doating folly which it would be sullyng these pages to rehearse—all "sincere," I have no doubt. In the spell of this influence are they all, more or less:—except perhaps those *hickory* allies, who have merely a nominal relation to the society, and have been educated with very little of its realized influence. The feminine venders are more numerous. Their spirituality is loquacious. They see more visions; more frequently uncover the head to usurp the headship of a large assembly: and often virgin diffidence itself, is taught to deny itself, and brazen the looks of promiscuous thousands, sonorous and superior, infallible as the *Delphian* oracle, clothed cap-a-pie in spiritual sincerity, bronzed in the holy impudence, and willing sacrifices in the cause of "the light!"

Priest-craft may be defined—Any system of influence, maintained by religious officers or others, under the assumed sanction of the name of God, which is *not* authorized by evidence that can be demonstrated, and which may not be so resolved

into the authority of God alone. According to this definition, it may be observed; 1. That **PRIEST-CRAFT IS AS OLD AS SIN**; and as wide, in its seminal existence and tendencies, as the depravity of men. They reason most perversely who charge it **IN ANY SENSE** on christianity: for (1) It ordinarily abounds most (though never most hated) where christianity is least known and possesses no influence. It is the very soul and body of paganism. The Druids, as Cæsar's Commentaries tell every school-boy, practised a most perfect system in the British Islands, before christianity, as such, was known in the world. Chaldea, Egypt, Troy, Carthage, the cities of Greece, the story of pagan Rome, the altars and oracles of heathenism, the facts of universal history, and the false worship of the nations since the age of Nimrod, all attest it. An illegitimate spiritual regency, a system of imposture with its mystagogue or its hierophant its priest or its *priestess*, in gorgeous and glaring or simple and "plain" habiliments, is the brief description of false religion in this apostate and benighted world. This is priest-craft. It is the disguise of the devil as the great deceiver of the nations. But (2) How can christianity be oppugned for this? There is no system like christianity. It is its own original. It exposes, denounces, execrates, all priest-craft; and has really taught even infidels among us, all they know in principle against its evil nature and impious usurpations. I observe 2. That **CHRISTIANITY IS THE ONLY CURE FOR PRIEST-CRAFT IN THE WORLD**. Man is "a religious animal," as philoso-

phers tell us. It is true. He has a conscience; is a mass of wants and fears; is weak and knows it, even against his vanity and his vaunting; infers by necessity the existence of a superior power, from the attestations of the visible universe; is a moral being and a sinful one, and knows both—even when he *owns* neither; as mutual censure, and mutual crimination, and mutual ambition of praise, every where demonstrate: and he WILL HAVE a religion of some sort. All history proves it. If not the true, he will have a false one: and HE PREFERS A FALSE ONE NOTORIOUSLY! Yet, just in proportion as you indulge his preference, you will morally imbrute and degrade him; you will make him servile, superstitious, sanguinary; you will indulge priest-craft of some sort, and facilitate the irruption of every sort and every degree of that ruinous and soul-murdering leaven! What shall we do? What is the inference? Where the alternative? It is plain, as the vision of angels to the shepherds of Bethlehem; sweet, as the music of their song; efficacious, as the salvation of their Prince: GIVE HIM CHRISTIANITY; PURE, LUCID, FULL; AND MAN WILL BE NEITHER SLAVE, NOR SIMPLETON, NOR COMPARATIVELY SINNER. Christianity is the grand catholicon; the only one under heaven that deserves the name; the only one that abhors all quackery, all false profession, all forged certificates, all money-making imposture, all abuse; the only catholicon that meets the case, suits the wants, equals the malady, restores the ruin, answers the intellect, and reinstates the total being of man in

the perfection of his God. True, it does not operate mechanically ; nor by chemical affinity ; nor by electrical conductors ; nor by magical effect. It is alone by contact with the mind, that it generates its own transcendent good. It does not profess, by mere proximity, or local residence, or geographical classification, or pious ancestral eminence, to restore and save us. By understanding it, loving it, doing it ; and in no other way, are its eternal restorative excellences divinely realized to a human being. Where then or when was there ever a proper instance of failure ? To understand, and love, and do, its truth, is the philosophy of experimental religion. Where not so entertained, *it does not profess* to confer the benefit. Whence I observe, once more, 3. **THAT THE ONLY GENUINE ENEMIES OF PRIEST-CRAFT ON THE GLOBE, ARE TRUE ENLIGHTENED CHRISTIANS ;** and this, just in proportion to their real conformity to the gospel, that infallible institute of God. Hence these are steadfastly and comparably the only friends of diffusing the scriptures ; of enlightening the people ; of circulating sound intelligence ; of multiplying and universalizing the facilities of knowledge ; of correct and manly reasoning ; of proving what they hold and what they teach, inducing the people every where to be “ more noble than those in Thessalonica, receiving the word with all readiness of mind, and **SEARCHING THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS ARE SO ;**” of exposing all imposture ; of having their own credentials searched ; and of having Jesus Christ, and not themselves, glorified in the salvation of men ; saying, “ not for

that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy : for by faith ye stand." Again, I observe, 4. That INFIDELS AND HERETICS, GREAT AND SMALL, ARE THE GREATEST PATRONS OF SECTARIANISM AND PRIEST-CRAFT IN TERRITORIAL CHRISTENDOM. This paradox is still a truth. They are, it may be, opposed to all sectarianism—EXCEPT THEIR OWN ; since they are themselves a sect ; and their interests are as completely one as were those of Herod and Pilate—when Christ is to be put down or slain ! Under their nominal guise of opposing sectarianism, they cloak their spiritual theomachy—their opposition to all religion, and to God himself : they wish to put down christianity, and put up the priest-craft of infidel sincerity, philosophizing atheism, and the apotheosis of reason ! How silly the victims of their devices ! They would take from us all the shield and all the sword we either have or desire, against the very priest-craft of which they are the vaunted enemies ; “the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God,” and “the shield of faith” invincible in combat. I observe lastly, 5. That QUAKERISM IS EVIDENTLY A SYSTEM OF DOUBLE-REFINED PRIEST-CRAFT. Its influence over mind is confessedly as great as that of the ancient Druids or the followers of any heretical delusion ever broached. Is it warranted ? Is it a legitimate influence ? Can it be demonstrated ? Can they “render a reason” for their towering pretensions ? Can they rationally resolve their spiritual *regime* into the manifest authority of God ? Is their domination at one identically with that of the holy

scriptures ? Is Quakerism christianity ? Let candid examination, attending dispassionately to evidence, answer. As a witness, if I may speak, I am not afraid to record that if Jesuits and Roman priests are in favor of the circulation of the scriptures, and opposed to the maxim that "ignorance is the mother of devotion ;" if the papal hierarchy are not mainly an organization of infidels ; if THEIR KNOWN PRIEST-CRAFT, and boasted infallibility, are in favor of the universal diffusion of knowledge ; if they are wont to prefer evidence to authority ; and if they allow the right of private judgment in religion ; then is Quakerism a system of evidence, aloof from imposture, and involving none of the vital elements of spiritual tyranny, potent priest-craft, and servile submission : then, and only on those suppositions, is it not a system of imposture. They will say, this is mere assertion. Possibly not. However, some argument may appear in this treatise. But I speak also with the privilege of a witness. If I do not know both sides, namely, Quakerism and christianity, it has scarcely been for want of opportunity or application : and I surely know my accountability. Besides, I know the accountability of others. No one is obligated to believe what I say, without evidence, or against it ; and no one will reject truth, adequately shown, from whatever motive, without an inevitable responsibility to God. "But all things that are reprov'd (reprovable) are made manifest by the light : for WHATSOEVER DOETH MAKE MANIFEST, IS LIGHT. Wherefore he saith, Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall



give thee light." The word of God makes manifest.

Some will say, Why so severe in the abstract? We must judge Quakerism by its fruits. I answer, certainly, by its fruits; but *what is to be the CRITERION?* The whim of human softness, or the caprice of the million, or the philosophy of infidels, or the partiality of worldlings, or "the friendship of the world which is enmity against God?" or, his holy word alone? If the latter, I fully consent; and say, this is exactly what I have done. With the word of God for the criterion, I judge the system; and pronounce its fruits to be mystical, deceptive, fallacious, and ordinarily any thing but genuine christianity. I sincerely believe that—*Hickism* is one of the genuine fruits of Quakerism; and that its common appropriate fruits are different in kind, and contrary in nature, when compared with the wise, intelligible sober, practical, holy, catholic fruits of christianity. "Judge not according to the appearance; but judge righteous judgment:" and let those who flatter Friends now, remember that Jesus Christ will call them to account for it at a tribunal where flattery will be shown to any one, only as a sin to be branded and condemned. How specious is the practising of "them that glory in appearance, and not in heart!" How imposing is their glorying; how superficial; how irradiate with the glare that betokens "an angel of light!" But what right has an impenitent or unconverted sinner, no matter how 'plain' and no matter who, to arrogate the prerogatives of the children of God! to vaunt as if *any thing* was good enough, as a substitute or an equi-

valent, for a changed and sanctified heart—a heart purely at “peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ!” Let men beware of democracy in religion! Christianity is not a republic, but a kingdom. It is an eternal theocracy; and monarchists alone can constitute its subjects. Reader, surrender your heart, your mind, your being, fiducially, to the Prince eternal, “on whose head are many crowns;” accept his salvation in cordial obedience to the truth, and yours it is for ever! O—will you?

It may be thought that what is here exhibited, and the manner of it, betrays a degree of confidence that wise men will only compassionate? What can *I* expect to effectuate? What does it imply that I should think to assail with effect a structure that has stood the brunt of intellectual chieftainship for so many generations? Will Quakerism go down now, because I write? To all this, I answer—My confidence is indeed singular and very steadfast; but its nature perhaps and its objects may not be well understood. I would ask the curious and the penetrating, and especially the judicious christian, to resolve these questions: Is it confidence in myself, or the cause, that is here exemplified? in any thing of my own, as such; any thing to which I am sufficient as of myself; any thing that is to happen as the mere result of what *I* can do? Or is it confidence in God? I TRUST IN GOD ALONE—in his truth and his cause: in his purposes and prophecies and providences and promises—that quadruple alliance of faith, that everlasting and harmonious chain of strength omnipotent, in which to confide

is simple and happy piety. "There is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few. Be not afraid of sudden fear, neither of the desolation of the wicked, when it cometh: for the Lord shall be thy confidence, and shall keep thy foot from being taken.—I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me. Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in him; and he shall bring it to pass. Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him; fret not thyself because of him who prospereth in his way, because of the man who bringeth wicked devices to pass. Delight thyself also in the Lord; and he shall give thee the desires of thy heart." Under God, my confidence is in the display of his truth, as that chosen instrumentality by which eminently he works. I have endeavored to explain several very important passages of scripture, in their true and native meaning—and am sure that if in these I have succeeded as an interpreter, I have carried the point as a polemic. The reason is—the strength of the word of God! Till these scriptures, to which I now refer, are just shown to be falsely expounded, I shall calmly view the victory as won; and give all the glory to HIM to whom I resign the arbitration of events, with pure satisfaction in his government. To the exposition of these texts mainly would I invoke the attention of the inquisitive reader; for, after all, what God has spoken, and what he means, are the decisive matters. "The word of the Lord endureth for ever. There is no wisdom, nor understanding, nor counsel, against the Lord." And hence it is that "a false

witness shall perish; but the man that heareth, speaketh constantly;" i. e. he speaks with decision and uniform steadfastness, because he listens and learns of God. I will here request the serious reader  *To keep his Bible at hand, and peruse carefully THE PASSAGE AND ITS CONNECTION, in every case where the allusion is important or the explanation attempted at length.* He will thus be better qualified to judge of what is truth; and to see "if those things are so," which he will find declared: and if they are, and he be *really* a serious reader, he will be too wise to blame so poor a worm as I am, who had no agency in the matter, for what the scriptures teach! He must then settle the controversy with God—till which be seen and felt, tenderly and deeply, by a man, he will ordinarily play the fool in sacred concerns, both in his censure and his praise, his cavilling and his commendation. "And what are we? Your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord." I add that *in the scriptural positions is all the ultimate strength of this treatise.* If these are valid—so is the cause which they support. Till these are refuted, it is impossible to do any thing effectual in opposition to the publication. Till they are refuted nothing is done for Friends and their cause.  Hence a man is scarcely competent to condemn this work, whatever his general sense, or fame, or station, unless he possesses probably the following qualifications: 1. He must have a correct and thorough knowledge of scriptural truth; 2. He must know in full comparison what Quakerism is; 3. He must be prepared to JUDGE

RELIGIOUSLY, and not from any worldly motives, between christianity and Quakerism as here displayed. Friends can find worldly-wise men, superficial and interested persons, venal and capricious editors, plenty of them, and perhaps some persons ILLUSTRIOUS in the world—"in form and gesture proudly eminent," and even some weak and facile religionists of different denominations, to side with them, and condemn any publication that honors the supremacy of truth and vindicates the scriptures impartially as "the word of God." But all this will avail them nothing, so long as the expounded quotations of scripture are obviously against them. For the rest—I trust in God; leaving all in his hand, feeling my own weakness and deep unworthiness in his sight; and praying that he would deign to make useful what I have written!

A class of thinkers there is, some of them of considerable consequence in life, to whom, anticipating their estimate of this work, I would venture a respectful caution. They are men of manners and of mind, of influence and reading, of great social respectability and general soundness of intelligence, of professional eminence or retired dignity, of experience in the things of the world and of large observation in human affairs: in short, they are men for whose opinion on *almost* any subject, the public would be willing to yield their confidence in anticipation. But are they equally competent to judge and to pronounce on the subject of religion? on that ethereal theme of themes, that is of its own class, its own eminence, its own criterion? Here is

the blunder exactly that some great men make:— religion is the only subject, we may say, which they do not understand; which they have *never* patiently and impartially and thoroughly examined: the only subject concerning which they venture to pronounce presumptuously! And is it the only subject that is worthy of their neglect? It is here too, and here alone comparatively, that they are wayward and intractable; suspecting the motives, and overlooking the demonstrations, of those who kindly wish to help them in the paramount concern, and who (even on the humble principle—*ne sutor ultra crepidem*²⁹) are quite competent to the task. They are, it may be, speculative believers; semi-converts; and willing to pass *in religion* for considerably more than they are worth! **BY WHAT STANDARD DO THEY JUDGE?** Demonstrably by a false one; one condemned by the law of God, and preparing for the scorn of demons in the day of judgment! “For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness; but unto us who are saved, it is the power of God. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world!” With all their glorious intellection and envied superiority, they never can *comprehend* the nature of evangelical humility, or the way of “life” and the only way revealed “as it is in Jesus,” or the principles of vital piety ascendant. They are described, if they did but recognise their own like-

ness, in many places of the scriptures ; as “ heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God ; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof ; EVER LEARNING AND NEVER ABLE TO COME TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE TRUTH.” Of them is the order of God to his ministers, and his people too ; “ From such turn away !” that is, as I understand it, keep away from their influence ; mark them as such and let your estimate of them be independent of popular appraisalment ; keep distant from their power and their society, as aware of their seductive qualities, unless when and where you may possibly do them good ; as the physician frequents the places of infection, not that he may catch the disease, but if possible assist or administer the cure. But in the *supreme* concern, how great the fatuity of these intellectual nobles ! How they elaborate their own confusion and rush to the catastrophe of all their greatness ! How they dupe their own understandings in religion, expecting God to defer to them and provide some special conveyance for their dignified transmission to heaven ! the vulgar way—would be shocking and intolerable to think of ! Yes, here in this country of no stereotyped nobility, or hereditary grandeur, or names of heraldic eminence, it is becoming more and more a *desideratum* with this class, to have A RELIGION FOR GENTLEMEN ; one fit for scholars and dignitaries ; one that can be sustained without all vulgarizing or mingling with the herd ; one that will be competent to opulence and philosophy—and that shall intoxicate also the pretension, the pe-

dantry, the insolent ambition, of all the underlings and upstarts and tributaries in the community! To all which, I would only oppose the naked point of "the sword of the Spirit," radiating with more than electrical efficiency: "Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness. And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that THEY ARE VAIN."

One of the wisest things perhaps which such men, the best of them, can say, is what one of them (now in thought—for whom I cherish more than mere respect) has substantially said, on this general subject; nor do I aver that there is *no* wisdom in it: "The clergy will not give the Quakers credit for their real improvement; nor recognise their certain melioration; nor, it seems, permit them to grow better; nor let them alone." To all this, I reply; that it seems to me to be in the case the mere wisdom of a liberally educated pagan! no knowledge of christianity; no perception of THE GRAND CRITERION IN RELIGION—THE LAW OF GOD AND THE TRUTH OF HIS GOSPEL; no justice done or allowed to the motives of benevolence, that would rouse the sleeper in a house on fire; no spirituality; no sense, no truth, no goodness; but merely the superficial views of worldlings, elegantly temporizing, and talking as if religion were not the *terra incognita* of their travels, their investigations, and their discoveries! As for the

‘improvement’ of Friends, to what does it all amount *religiously*, if they are *not* on the foundation, the only one that God has laid in Zion? If they give no proper evidence of this, it is real misanthropy, and not the wisdom of the kingdom or of the King, to “let them alone!” They will not be let alone in the day of judgment; why should they in the day of mercy! Besides, the declivity of things, or “the course of this world,” is not “the way, and the truth, and the life.” Things do not meliorate toward heaven by neglect, or self-prompting. Men are saved IN CONTRAVENTION of “the course of this world;” and not by drifting with its tide. No man grows better by abandonment of the appointed means of grace. “Ephraim is joined to idols: LET HIM ALONE.” And what is this, but the dirge of his soul! Let Friends accept the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, cordially, intelligently, as revealed in “the lively oracles” of “grace and truth;” and let them abjure their folly and their mysticising fantasy, for the scriptures, as “the word of God,” honestly acknowledged, and as their HIGHEST RULE IN RELIGION, devoutly loved: and *then* let the clergy be blamed if they do not rejoice over them, with the angels of God! Otherwise, you blame the clergy for their fidelity alone! for their invincible attachment to the gospel! for their immutable preservation of an eternal testimony! for their plainly unpopular adhesion to the truth! For one, and with no strong hold on time, and consequently no known motive or prospect of worldly advantage, I can declare that it would

sweetly sooth the last or any other hour of my life, and give a new delight to my song of triumph in redemption by Jesus Christ, could I think that the whole society, or any number of them, were becoming genuine converts to the faith of the gospel! I feel more—but cannot express it.

“Visions of glory” throng my cherished sight,
And “*unborn* ages crowd” upon “my soul!”

One other sentiment, common among the general class I have described, deserves animadversion. It is this: ‘A man ought not to change his religion; especially the religion of his ancestors, the religion in which he has been educated, and in which all his social relations and domestic sympathies reside.’ This is very specious; it appears very amiable; it is quite full of respect for temporal convenience and homeborn tranquility: and it is perhaps one of the most common, really influential, flatly unchristian, and mostly incorrigible, principles of human action. It is adopted by the Friend, the Romanist, the Jew, the Mahomedan, the Infidel, the Sectary, the Nothingarian, and the votary of any one of a thousand other casts of religion. Strange too that it should be advocated by those who pique themselves on their philosophy and elevation of mind! But so it is. Fashion is omnipotent. It can “change times and laws,” reverse the nature of things, revolution the ways of God, canonize reprobates, and stamp the most senseless and impossible positions with the indisputable impress of truth! But before the sen-

timent to which I now refer is adopted and practically hazarded by any one, I would entreat him to consider the following things: 1. Whether every different system *can be* equally right, or safe, or worthy? or, if not, whether such views will not be overruled confoundingly in the day of judgment? 2. Whether truth *can be* other than a unit, or possibly consist with contraries? 3. Whether such a sentiment obeys any precept of the decalogue? or, if it can possibly *obey* the fifth by violating the FIRST, second, third, and fourth? 4. Whether domestic peace and the kind treatment of relatives, excellent ends as they are and by none more valued than by me, may not be purchased at *too dear* a rate or perhaps overrated in our tender or instinctive estimate? Whether some sacrifices may not be required of us for Christ's sake; and whether one can be saved while loving others more than *him*? 5. Whether Christ has never anticipated the difficulties which it was framed to suit? and whether HE would not have us meet them in a different way—a way that cares more for eternity than time, for the soul than the body, for the creator than the creature, for salvation than ease and elegance of life! I would refer (not for one who cares not to examine) to the following places for an answer; Luke, 12: 49-53; 14: 25-27. Matt. 19: 29. Mark, 10: 28-31. John, 12: 25, 26, 42, 43. And having said this, "from such" we "turn away."

I turn, honored fathers and beloved brethren in the gospel of Jesus Christ, most affectionately to you, in whom the whole church glorifies God with rea-

son: and before I conclude this introduction, will adventure a word of animadversion on a different and yet a related subject; if your kindness will suffer it, from one so consciously your junior and your inferior in the service. Emboldened by the peculiarities of my own religious history, and of feelings and estimates of things thence necessarily resulting, I may speak freely in the audience of all men, even to you whom I justly revere. Most tenderly do I esteem and love you all, and those hundreds of kindred spirit whom you properly represent. Sincerely do I suppose that you hold heartily in substance one system. The enemies of God are of the same opinion; they group you together, in their antipathy, their caricature, their defamation. They regard you as the steady and the mighty advocates (as well as the sincere disciples—a more heavenly character,) of the religion of Jesus Christ; and they make common cause against you.

Fas est et ab hoste doceri.

'Tis wise and oft subserves the noblest ends
To learn of foes, that teach us more than friends;
The act may profit, while its aim offends.

Is there no demonstration here of substantial unity and general identity of sentiment? How useful is christian union! In what then do you possibly differ? and in what may you agree to differ? I answer; Simply as your metaphysical philosophy may differ, in explication of THE GREAT THINGS OF YOUR COMMON FAITH: simply as it differs in its forms of solution or its felicities of inculcation and defence.

This I solemnly and cordially believe. How great and how many are the matters in which you are agreed; in which you aim decisively at the same thing! and profoundly may we question, whether, from the certain imperfection of christians in this world, and the variety of your educational and local influences, and the individuality which the plastic hand that formed has stamped upon your minds, and the acknowledged idiosyncrasy of character which has always existed in the church and diversified her modern as it did her ancient ministers—men of conscience and independent thought and habituated investigation pre-eminently; we could ever wisely anticipate, in the true church of God, a much greater degree of theological coincidence on earth, than now exists among you! In the great facts and principles of a common system, you are certainly united. What insipidity and stagnation and supineness, might we not expect as the sure result of perfect uniformity! Now, there is debateable ground enough to keep acumen awake; and not enough to rouse or authorize any alienation. You are brethren and ministers of the same Lord Jesus Christ. I know and love and honor you all. So do thousands of better judges. What I now write is rather for others than yourselves. I believe you hold the truth in common; the truth of the Reformation; the truth of christianity. I believe you all hold the truth, as the world all hate it; and as it would be now corrupted or opposed by its enemies; and as contradistinguished from the errors of Sabellius, Arius, Pelagius, Arminius, Socinus,

and Fox—and from the more abstract errors of antinomianism, stoicism, fatalism, fanaticism, radicalism, ultraism, neology; “and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which is committed” respectively to our “trust.” From a general acquaintance with all, and a special intimacy with some of you, I aver, that I am unable to see any differences among you which should alienate you from my christian esteem and confidence, or that could properly engender alienation among yourselves. You differ indeed ecclesiastically, as belonging to several denominations of christians; who are all allied in mutual correspondence and engaged nobly in the same missionary action. You differ theologically, only in the mode of explaining and vindicating and applying the same great truths of a common system. Suppose then, fathers and brethren, that there was among us more of a manifest assiduity of kindness; more of magnifying the things of unity and diminishing the things of dissidence; more of liberal and generous allowance where variance might be of reason and in a sort of right expected; more of personal conference and prayer on topics of ambiguity or doubt; more intercourse, frankness, and love, according to the temper of the blessed Paul; more of manifested confidence and holy magnanimity and reciprocal esteem; more dependence on moral and evangelical influence, and less on the machinery of church government; more of a practical sense of *personal* responsibility to a common

and a reigning and a witnessing Lord ; more of an unwillingness to misunderstand, suspect, inculcate, or avoid, one another ; more of a just appreciation of the motives and the sanctions and the symbols of professed sincerity ; more of watchfulness against the spirit so often censured by one that " made himself of no reputation " for our sakes ; Mark, 9 ; 33-50. 2 Thess. 2 : 7, 8. 3 John, 9 : 12. Rev. 1 : 20. more of unity in action and service, as indispensable, and very eminently efficacious, to promote unity of vision ; more of the spirit of benevolence, and of the sympathies of goodness, and of the living portraiture of piety ; more sense of what is common and identical in our interests and duties, our principles and dangers, our histories and prospects ; more of the wisdom that discerns our common enemies and necessities and weaknesses and exposures ; more in short of the temper and the acting of the gospel of our Lord, the Lord of Glory, our example as well as our expiation and our righteousness : what would be the result ? I answer ; it would be excellent, manifold, certain, permanent. It is just what God is waiting for, what the church desires, and the world *perishingly* needs ! Some of these results I could venture to predict : such probably as these ; we should see that in the things of faith we were all more alike than perhaps we supposed ; that it was easy, and sweet, and safe, to forbear with each other in minor peculiarities ; that imperfect phraseology, and the passion for philosophizing, and specious logomachy, make a great quantum of all our con-

structive or real differences ; that evils could now be a hundred fold better corrected, when love came fresh from the cross to qualify orthodoxy into rectitude, and when our colloquial and printed rhetoric always honored heaven's rule of demonstration, "speaking the truth in love ;" that the moral power of each, and the collective power of all, would be increased, refined, amplified, in all legitimate influence ; that the spirit of the ministry would become every where elevated, purified, homogeneous ; that other denominations and the whole country would derive a kindred benefit ; that our theological seminaries would become schools of experimental piety and the culture of gracious affections, as well as the high places of theological lore and exercise and accomplishment ; that we should all increase in practical wisdom ; that religion's power would be quadrupled in all directions ; that the evident blessing of God would attend us, making our ministrations living and effectual, as "the ministration of the Spirit and the ministration of righteousness ;" that conversions would abound and revivals of religion become the steady order of the day ; that the churches would more and more love their ministers ; that the wicked would be confounded, and refuted by their own consciences ; that error would die of necessity or retreat to courted and distant solitudes ; and that jealousies would fade away, antipathies expire, sectarianism wane to its destined dishonor, and the vices of bigotry, superstition, fanaticism, mystical divinity, unsanctioned observances, with other and kindred evils that annoy us now, would be continu-

ally reduced and superseded, by the triumphant influence of the gospel. Of these results, proportionate mainly to the reform or the advance attained, I have no doubt : and always does the thought occur, when I see with pain **THE LITTLE DIFFERENCE** magnified reciprocally into **THE MIGHTY ALL** of the controvertist, that if those brethren had been educated as thoroughly in the inward-light scheme, or any other grand error of the earth, as some of their acquaintance were, they would know how to appreciate each other better ; and they would thus begin to brighten the prospects of the nineteenth century before *the history should be written* of its earlier and its less honorable years.

Allow me to advert to some evils that especially claim correction. 1. *Sectarianism* ; a love of sect, that seeks its *praemia laudis* in this world, and as the reward of mistaking *the denomination to which one happens to belong* for “the kingdom of heaven,” or at least the frequent implication of such a shameful sentiment. How often do we hear “our church, our denomination, our judicatory, our people,” spoken of, in such terms of personal appropriation as carelessness or earthiness alone could inspire ; such as seem to forget who “purchased the church with his own blood.” The first epistle of Paul to Timothy was written to instruct that lovely young evangelist, “how he ought to behave himself in **THE HOUSE OF GOD, WHICH IS THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD.**” The proprietor of the church is its claimant too ; and if not “his glory,” neither will he give his property to another. Besides, do those

more honor the denomination to which they belong, who continually prefer, and even *oppose*, its separate interests, to those of the whole kingdom of Christ on earth; or those who judge the interests of that kingdom steadily and purely preferred by all its members and officers, to be the very best way of promoting those of the denomination? each in his own sphere and place, certainly; but each for the kingdom of heaven! The sin of sectarianism appears to me to be rottenness at the heart of the body and poison in the very soul of the church. It is *a deadly injury* to any denomination of our vaunted fondness! It consists in exalting local against universal interests; private against catholic views; party against piety; policy against principle; and *our* men, *our* measures, *our* doctrines, *our* views, *our* prosperity, against the glorious commonwealth of the King of Israel. And what is this, but exalting earth against heaven? It hardens the heart of a minister of Christ, and saddens the soul of a private disciple: converting the former, while it justly lessens his influence, into a cruel inquisitor, or a facile jesuit, or a wily politician; the latter, into a sickly bigot, or a dissocial monachist, or a barren devotee. Piety hence is nothing—but as party feels its influence. It soon loses the liberality that rejoices to pronounce, “grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity;”—“to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with ALL THAT IN EVERY PLACE CALL UPON THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD, BOTH THEIRS AND OURS.” This to me appears the elemental mischief

of the papacy; the very "mystery of iniquity," whether it "works" in embryo, or is developed in living vigor of monstrous youth or more horrible maturity. It dethrones the King of Zion, just in proportion as *self* is exalted to the supreme episcopate. If there is any sin denounced in the "oracles of God" as the very quintessence of deceitfulness, the very sublimity of treason, the very hypocrisy of spiritual usurpation; in short, the very personification described as "the man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth HIMSELF above all that is called God, or that is worshipped;" we have here the identity of the evil in the temper of sectarianism. If this temper were well analyzed, it would be found to consist of very unlovely and anti-christian ingredients. It is *wholly alien* from "the fruit of the Spirit." The elements of its composition would be found probably to be deceit, hypocrisy, ambition, selfishness, apprehension, suspicion, envy, jealousy, sordid feelings, false zeal, and the wrath of man "which worketh *not* the righteousness of God." Its holy pretensions constitute one of its worst characteristics: but another of its worst is—the stealth and the address with which its influence often invades the truly good! The evangelic histories confirm this position in reference to the apostles themselves, and illustrate the terrible sinuosities of the sin: all other history demonstrates its influence over common mortals; and that of the church particularly, its too potent spell over ecclesiastics in every age of the christian era. In short, no man is more deceiv-

ed by it than he whose self-complacency, beguiling him from a needful vigilance against its approaches, presents him to himself as an exception to the rule! "Do ye think that the scripture saith in vain,³⁰ The spirit that dwelleth in us" (the native moral temperament of every individual) "lusteth to *envy*?" Hence he neglects himself, in that very matter, in which the care of others can do least for his preservation; and cares for others, in those very relations in which he ought to honor the supreme Inspector and feel as much the solemnity of his own accountable action.

As envy pines at good possessed,
 So jealousy looks forth distressed
 On good that seems approaching;
 And, if success his steps attend,
 Discerns a rival in a friend;
 And hates him for encroaching.—COWPER.

There are personages, of other denominations than those to which any of us belong, and on both sides of the Atlantic occasionally found, whose *high-church* childishness is as proverbial, as their *low-christian* manliness is notorious. For them—the high-church party, I mean—it is less incongruous, possibly less criminal, to identify themselves with "the church;" to view their own sect as "the kingdom of heaven;" and sublimely to abandon their more evangelical and better taught brethren, to the *imaginary* resource of "the uncovenanted mercies of God." For them, exclusive pretensions may be less shocking; possibly more in the way of

their characteristic vocation ; less dishonorable, it may be, to their intellectual vigor. " When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child." But for us, there is no such apology. We were never taught it, I think, by " holy mother church." It is no part of our profession. It is not congenial with our creed. No one of us could avow it. Our churches would not endure it. Our piety, all of heaven that there is in it, reclaims at the perversion. The apostles of the Lamb teach it not ; and while they every where remind us that the kingdom of Christ " is not of this world," they also " beseech us by the mercies of God," if there be " any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies," to " fulfil their joy, that we be like-minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind." They say to us, " Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory ; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves." This exhortation may be considered a sovereign recipe, prophylactic and therapeutic both, against the mighty malady—the epidemic of ecclesiastics since the primitive ages. To follow it, is perfect freedom from the influence. No one would thus become the stern spontaneous censor of his brethren ; none would find his spiritual wardrobe empty of those desirable garments or heavenly mantles, with one of which a brother's nakedness could be concealed and a covering furnished, without connivance, even for " a multitude of sins." We should think it then as necessary to our theological

accomplishment to be "simple concerning evil," as it is obviously to be "wise unto that which is good." This is true wisdom. "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." And let us not forget, while "the purity of the church" has ever been the persecutor's plea and passport to all enormities, that "the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace"—and not in war of them that make war. Let us remember that Jesus Christ hath said, "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." If I mistake not, this is the age, and this the country, and this the crisis too, for the obligations of anti-sectarian christianity to be felt, its characteristics exemplified, its excellencies acknowledged. What I know of Quakerism has quickened my sense and matured my detestation of the evil.

2. Another evil, kindred in nature to the former, is this; *A too strict and even an illiberal construction of doctrinal orthodoxy.* I mean here to sanction *nothing* like latitudinarianism; nothing like denying the propriety of conscientiousness even in little things; nothing like indifference to truth, in its major or its minor relations; nothing like servility or tameness in any of the details of faith or practice. We ought to be as really conscientious in little things as in great ones: to preserve the *mens sibi conscia recti*³¹ in the least, as truly as in the greatest. But ought we to insist alike on all in the creed of visible communion; and make every thing a term of recognition which has

become to us identified, in whole or in part, with the truth of revelation? as if whatever may be necessary to the perfection of the church, were equally necessary to the visibility of the church! as if every thing that a christian ought to be, is that without which a christian is not! as if what belongs to growth and accomplishment, were indispensable in the same degree to existence itself! These monstrous suppositions could not be sustained in argument, and are perhaps very rarely affirmed in practice. But are they as rarely implied? Are they never couched covertly in our sentiments; insensibly in our conduct; devastatingly in our influence? How easily is the brand of *heretic*, or the impeachment of *unsound*, or the suspicion of *innovating*, or the whisper of *erroneous*, admitted or applied!³² And to whom? Men, whose piety perhaps has been long and well demonstrated; with whom "the spirit of truth," and not "the spirit of error," holds manifest communion; who are, and have ever been, "in labors more abundant," it may be, than most others, their allies or oppugners; and whose success in the ministry, both in conversions multiplied and fruits unequivocal, has been the palpable seal of God on their commission as his own ambassadors. I know it is objected here, with something possibly of wisdom, in show or in reality, that success is not the criterion! Grant it—Is it not still *a* criterion, and a tolerably good one? one which any man would plead or consider in his own case, but simply for the reason—that there it has no applicability probably? Yes! says the objector, but success attends

many a hereriasch, many a fanatic, many a heathen corrupter. Look at Mohammed; look at Peter the hermit; look at George Fox. I answer, all this is true. But what is the inference? that success is only of one kind? or that success in mischief is all? or that success in "winning souls" to Christ, and "turning many to righteousness," proves nothing? Not a christian on earth, nor an angel in heaven, believes any such extravagance of folly! I repeat it; no good man soberly believes any such thing. Do heretics and schismatics and heathen corrupters, ever appropriately succeed in converting men to holiness, to the faith of Christ, and "the blessed hope" of the gospel? "By their fruits ye shall know them." We estimate fruits, I think, first by the quality; and then by the quantity. Suppose they are good and numerous—are we to infer that they grew in the devil's garden and resulted from the culture of his emissaries? They are not "the grapes of Sodom;" they are not "the clusters of Gomorrah." This will be generally admitted on all sides. Is success in rearing *such fruit*, no demonstration of an alliance with the master of the grounds? with the giver of the increase? How then are his allies to be known? By imperious indolence? by arrogant denunciation? by an everlasting clamor or insinuation of their heterodoxy who do all the work, who brave all the dangers, who meet all the questions, and who bear all the "evil report" of "the master of the house?" by such an outcry raised or nourished by men, it may be, who never were success-

ful in the ministry? who never had a revival of religion probably under all their preaching? who dwell in libraries and abstractions; and know little experimentally of contact with the rude million, in a way that brooks their boorishness, and encounters their very reviling, for the sake of showing them the love of Christ and the way of salvation through his blood! The heartlessness with which the success of a preacher in the credible conversion of souls to God, is sometimes philosophized away to nothing; and the nothingness of their success who thus reason, as sometimes exalted into a foil of their glorious orthodoxy while they thus pervert the argument, and to their consolation it may be who have cause rather to be humiliated and ashamed before God and man at their own official barrenness; are equally melancholly and portentous! Success is better estimated in heaven; where "they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever. For what is our hope, our joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming? For ye are our glory and our joy."

A man cannot be right by conformity, though he may be by conviction. It is evidence, not dogmatism, that corrects him. The force of great names and the power of uninspired authority, are not only less than the power of the gospel; they are different in nature too. They are also as much inferior, as they are different, in the influence they exert. They may make partisans; but they will never

make christians: nor is it mainly by such means that God makes christians. "The word of God, which is contained in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is **THE ONLY RULE TO DIRECT US HOW WE MAY GLORIFY AND ENJOY HIM.**" He honors his own word; he respects the laws of mind; he violates nothing but sin. He so effectually and tenderly persuades, whom he converts, that duty is seen as privilege and service relished as enjoyment. The love of the Savior invests all the legislation of the king; and the grace of salvation facilitates all the mandates of righteousness. Ought we not to proceed in a way similar, when our end is corresponding? Is it not safe to copy an example so illustrious and superhuman? Good reason is there to suppose that such a way is that of your common desire; and that you all approve, as I do, the following sentiments. "I have endeavored," says Dr. Woods, "to guard against any mixture of bigotry, being fully aware that this tends to produce narrowness of feeling, and to prevent improvement. **MOST HEARTILY WOULD I WELCOME EVERY RAY OF NEW LIGHT WHICH MAY SHINE UPON THE GREAT SUBJECTS OF REVELATION. FOR WHILE I REGARD THE UNCHANGEABLE WORD OF GOD AS A PERFECT AND INFALLIBLE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, I BELIEVE THAT OUR PERCEPTION OF ITS TRUTHS, AND OUR MANNER OF EXPLAINING AND ENFORCING THEM, ADMIT OF VAST IMPROVEMENT.** And although, in the extent of their knowledge of christianity, and their ability to defend and illustrate its doctrinal and practical principles, the

older divines seem to me far superior to the generality of late theological writers, whether in Europe or America; I cannot but think that some real progress has been made during the last century in the right understanding of the christian religion, and in the right mode of setting forth its truths, for the conversion of sinners and the spread of the gospel. And it is my persuasion, though some may regard it as partiality or weakness, that this progress is chiefly owing to the labors of those whom we call New-England divines; and I am supported in this persuasion by some of the ablest advocates of divine truth in Great Britain. But while I say this, I am ready to deplore whatever has been among us of erroneous opinion, and of unchristian feeling and practice. I cherish the pleasing hope, that the multitude of young men who have recently entered the ministry, or are now preparing for it, will seek and obtain larger measures of divine illumination, than their predecessors, and that in the happy results of their studies and labors, they will exceed all former generations." In this extract, I have taken no other liberty than to capitalize two sentences, that deserve to be written permanently on conscious tablets of the heart. To the estimate of the author, respecting the theologians of New-England, I can fully subscribe; without any imputation of indelicate praise, as *I* am neither a native nor a resident of that distinguished district. To them do I confess the indebtedness of the country and especially of the church. I wish indeed that here we could be unqualified,

and without exception, in the benediction! But—there are weeds as well as flowers, poisons as well as fruits: and however genteel, or honorable, or literary, or eminent,—**IF ANY MAN LOVE NOT THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA, MARAN-ATHA! 1 Cor. 16 : 22.**

Still, with respect to those who hold generically and with good proof of soundness, the same evangelical system, there **OUGHT TO BE—TESTE CHRISTO**—increasing union; and as the means of it, increasing forbearance and affectionate regard. All government is founded in concession. We defer to others reciprocally, and for ends of mutual benefit. If no latitude is to be given to thought; none to investigation; none to the free inspection of things debateable; none to the calm and kind interchange of honest opinion or demur on minor points; none to the best modes of **PHILOSOPHIZING** on the **REALITIES** of our common faith: the consequences are equally disastrous and evident—all government is at an end; no conventional union can exist; organized combination however excellent its object, and regular co-operation however inspiring or evangelical its cause, must be utterly and indefinitely abandoned! I am well and deeply convinced that there are elements of excellence and resources of strength in those circles with which we are connected, that require only a wise and a christian economizing, in order to secure some of the noblest and the purest achievements. And this consummation we should at least approximate, if we and ours were all so piously purposed and concentrating in our tenden-

cies, as to show a more child-like obedience to the divine exhortation; "beseeching us that we walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called; with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; ENDEAVORING TO KEEP THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE BOND OF PEACE."

It comes here happily to the purpose to avail myself of another extract from the writings of one of you, fathers and brethren, memorably, and with reciprocal accord, addressed to another of your honored number. "It has been my deliberate opinion," says Dr. Beecher, "for many years, derived from extensive observation, and a careful attention to the elementary principles of the various differences which have agitated the church, that the ministers of the orthodox congregational church, and the ministers of the presbyterian church, are all cordially united in every one of the doctrines of the Bible and of the Confession of Faith, which have been regarded and denominated fundamental: and that the points wherein they differ do not subvert or undermine any one of these doctrines, or justify the imputation of heresy, or the withdrawal of confidence or co-operation in every good work. I would not be understood to say, that I think the points of difference to be in every case of little consequence; or that, by being made centres of assault and defence, they may not be driven to hurtful extremes; nor yet that earnest discussion, conducted with christian courtesy, is to be deprecated. Without something of this kind the public

intellect might fall asleep, and truth be transmitted by tradition through the memory ; and an unthinking theology, cold as winter and powerless as the grave, might extend a 'dead orthodoxy' over the land—a sure precursor, as in Germany, of a coming age of heresy and infidelity.”

Most heartily do I appropriate the sentiments of the father ; and could add, were that decorous or required, my junior experience in attestation of their wisdom and their excellence. Equally for charitable allowance toward all substantial christians, and for absolute explosion toward all fundamental heretics, ought we to be theologically and ecclesiastically characterized. So have I learned Christ. So I intend immutably to act, by the grace of God. So to act, is most certainly the wisdom and the duty, especially in this age and country, of those whom I consider you, honored sirs, as representing, and in reference to whom I have been so bold in making this appeal. Your example, especially in coincidence and concert, as perfected and manifested and known, would, I think, under God, move and influence our vast christian community. This I heartily desire, from motives, which, I trust, eternity will not denounce. The interests of religion require it. The wants of the world, the glory of Christ, the progress of orthodoxy, the regeneration of souls, require it. Particularly, I long to see the glorious consummation for the sake of those wanderers from “truth and soberness,” in reference to whom these pages appear. We need light in our atmosphere, so pure and abundant, that heresy and extravagance

will die in it instinctively ; that infidelity will repent and trust the name of Jesus exultingly—or, retreat delirious to some far distant wilderness of night ; and that sophistry and sorcery will be too obvious to the common vision of mankind, to encourage any longer their traditions or their triumphs. Shall I add, *upon what equal number of men in the United States, if not upon yourselves, rest such signal and noble obligations in reference to the results desired ?* “The light of the body is the eye : if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.” May “the Father of lights” most affluently endow you with his precious gifts ! and use you, in this eventful crisis of things, as co-agents with himself illustriously, in effecting the wide and holy pacification of his Israel, the consolidation of the tribes, and the conquest of etherial arms against an embattled world !

How different from what we all believe, is the system of Friends ! I would denounce that system as “another gospel,” I would denounce it in the name of Jesus Christ, if I stood alone, and if “all men forsook me,” in the principled detestation of its abominable doctrines ! I have *felt* the misery of its priest-craft, its perversion, and its bondage. I will here present the reader with a SYNOPSIS of it, as I suppose it properly constituted, in answer to the frequent question, *What is Quakerism ?* The inference will be evident—we ought to be engaged and united in endeavoring the diffusion of the truth, for the extirpation of cardinal error ; this is what ought to occupy us primarily :—and *after* we have

achieved the victory, we may perfectionate our common creed, comparatively at leisure, and comparatively with a good conscience !

But it may be well here to enter previously a *ca-veat*, as pertinent to the times and the places of this work. Some have said to me ; Beware that you look at all the best symbols and the most recent specimens of their doctrine ; and give them every advantage, regarding always the *last* regular emission or document of their views ; for these are thought to *improve* considerably as years and months proceed. Are you not willing that *friend-ism* should grow better ? should approximate nearer and nearer to the true standard ? and at last or perhaps soon become identical with christianity ?

Answer—No ! I am not so willing : and for the following reasons ; 1. The idea is absurd. *That* grow better, *which*—as a system—is contrary to christianity ! Friends may grow better, may “repent and believe the gospel,” may become (would God they should !) christians, walking in the light of genuine oracles : *they* may thus improve—but their system, *friendism*, is another thing. It is a homogeneous compound of hurtful error. Hence, 2. Its character is fixed ; and so is its definition, its nature, its history. It is not hereafter to be ascertained. The only proper criterion of what it is, is—THE QUAKER SCRIPTURES ; the *sacred* writings of Fox, Barclay, Penn, and others. 3. We are, therefore, *not* to expect any revised editions, or modern emendations, or transformed improvements, of that old and well established identity. Let those

paragons of light (I mean the orthodox) that are swung from their ancient moorings, not deceive themselves. If they improve—I am glad of it. *Incumbite remis, pueri—bend to your oars, boys*, would I say to them cheerily, as they proceed to safer stations and a firmer hold. Only let them not suppose that *they* and *Quakerism* are identical. They will have, if they are sincere in striving to know and worship the true God in his own revealed way, to make changes more and greater than they now anticipate; and happy they who make them: happy *I*—by the grace of God—that have made them: I would do it again, O how quickly—were it now to be repeated: only let not these changes, as they proceed, be construed as if *Quakerism* was changing! The idea of mutation is ruinous to its life. In that respect it is like the permanent decrees of the council of Trent. It professes to be based *infallibly* on the inspiration of God! to be identified with christianity itself! with christianity in its greatest purity, spirituality, fulness, and perfection! And its professions are the most impudent, exclusive, and vain.

If any one object, that this is discouraging to those that would reform, I reply; no such thing! Would *they* reform truly, or to salvation, who wish to do it by stealth! who desire to be smuggled noiselessly into the kingdom, that prefers to “suffer violence” and be “taken by force!” who act like the disingenuous and indolent scholar, that asks every one to inform him about his lesson, and then says—I knew it before! A man who is unwilling to

“come out from among them and be separate,” may be unwilling to go to heaven in the only possible way ; and as for a reform which the plain and practical truth, that illustrates its proper nature and objects, must not be permitted to influence, it is a kind of *truthless* reformation, of which the ungodly world is continually furnishing the apt and the miserable examples.

I. In doctrine, it is at once the policy and the character of the system, to be often vague and negative, in substance if not in form ; more opposing the things of others’ faith, than magnifying aggressively the positives of its own.

II. The CARDINAL ERROR or central heresy of the system, is identified with a prodigiously important nonentity, which they call by different names ; as “inward light, the principle, the seed,” &c. This is said to be a certain divine influence, apart from the substance and the faculties of the mind, resident in every human being, in all ages and nations of mankind, as “universal as the seed of sin.”

III. The great business of every one in religion is to mind that inward mentor, and walk in all things according to its demonstrations.

IV. By due attention uniformly given to this rule, salvation is attained infallibly and in the best manner. “And indeed this is the surest way to become a *christian*.”

V. This rule in religion is plenary and paramount ; the most noble and the most excellent : far surpassing every other rule conceivable.

VI. As a consequence, the scriptures are only

“a secondary rule,” and ought to be so “esteemed.” For they sustain to this nobler one, the relation of the streams to the fountain; the effects to the cause; the production to the producer; the offspring to the parent; the moon to the sun: and so, however good in themselves, inferior quite to the other.

VII. The scriptures are not “THE WORD OF GOD,” although they contain his words; nor ought they ever to be so called or entitled.³³

VIII. Immediate inspiration has not ceased in the church; but exists in all true ministers as really as it did in the apostles: so that “where that doth not teach, words without do make a noise to no purpose.”

IX. The same influence specifically is indispensable to the existence of a *christian*, and “absolutely necessary to the building up of true faith;” so that not to possess it, is to be only a vile and hypocritical pretender to the name; and hence “how many *christians*, yea, and of these great *masters* and *doctors of christianity*, so accounted, shall we justly divest of that noble title!” says the same luminary—Barclay.

X. There is no true knowledge in religion, or none worth having, but that which depends on “inward *objective manifestations in the heart*” or “immediate revelation:” and such “testimony of the Spirit is that alone by which the true knowledge of God hath been, is, and can be only revealed.”

XI. All such revelations of the “universal and saving light,” must be consonant indeed with the scriptures, since both have a common and compe-

tent origin; they “neither do nor can ever contradict the outward testimony of the scriptures, or right and sound reason.”

XII. Still, these modern revelations are in no wise to be tried by the scriptures; they “are to be subjected to the examination, neither of the outward ³⁴ testimony of the scriptures, nor of the natural reason of man.”

XIII. Man is such a degenerate creature that in his natural state he “can know nothing aright; yea, his thoughts and conceptions concerning God and things spiritual, until he be disjoined from this evil seed, and united to the *divine light*, are unprofitable both to himself and others.”

XIV. “God, out of his infinite love, *hath so loved the world, that he hath given his only Son a light, that whosoever believeth in him should be saved*; and this light enlighteneth the hearts of all in a day, in order to salvation, if not resisted: nor is it less universal than the seed of sin, being the purchase of his death, who *tasted death for every man*.”

XV. By this doctrine the difficulties of religion “are easily solved,” and the catholic view of *the means of grace* entirely superseded; since the heathen every where can be saved in Christ, “if they suffer his seed and light to take place (in which light, communion with the Father and Son is enjoyed) so as of wicked men to become holy:” so that it is an error to aver “the absolute necessity of the outward knowledge” of the death of Christ, “in order to the obtaining its saving effect; among

whom the *Remonstrants of Holland* have been chiefly wanting, and many other assertors of *Universal Redemption*, in that they have not placed the extent of this salvation in that divine and evangelical principle of light and life, wherewith Christ hath enlightened every man that comes into the world, which is excellently and evidently held forth in these scriptures, Gen. 6 : 3. Deut. 30 : 14. John, 1 : 7, 8, 9. Rom. 10 : 8. Tit. 2 : 11."

XVI. Those who "resist not this light—are justified in the sight of God;" since "in them is produced an holy, pure, and spiritual birth;" so that "*justification*—is all one with sanctification."

XVII. Those in whom "this—birth is fully brought forth," become presently "perfect;" in a somewhat qualified sense, that "admits of a growth;" connected with the possibility of sinning, where the mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord."

XVIII. There is no such thing ordinarily as the conservation of saints, or their infallible perseverance to glory; many saints on the contrary apostatize utterly: yet there may be attained, by some rare ones, a condition of maturity, "from which there cannot be a total apostacy."

XIX. The inward light in the *instar omnium* of the ministry; by which all its acts are to be plenary guided; by it alone can there be a true call of God to the work, or a valid ordination; with it, the authority is full, "without human commission or literature;"³⁵ in its exercises and services, no salary is to be given or received; though possibly, in case

of want, what is “needful for meat and clothing” may be received by preachers, if they feel “liberty given them in the Lord;” about which, however, the inward counsellor is in every case specifically to be consulted.

XX. Women have as good a right to preach as men, and are as legitimately and as often called to the work of the ministry.

XXI. “All true and acceptable worship to God, is offered in the *inward* and *immediate* moving and drawing of his own Spirit,” without all restriction “to places, times, or persons.” Other worship, the whole of it, is resolvable into “superstitions, will-worship, and abominable idolatry in the sight of God; which are to be denied, rejected, and separated from, in this day of his spiritual arising;” whatever favors from God or man it might have anciently received.³⁶

XXII. “Baptism is a pure and spiritual thing, to wit, the *baptism* of the *Spirit* and *fire* ;” attended with no outward observance: and “the baptism of infants, is a mere human tradition.”

XXIII. The Lord’s supper is much in the same predicament. It might have been “for the cause of the weak—even used in the church for a time,” with other obsolete and unprofitable ceremonies; “all which are commanded with no less authority and solemnity than the former; yet seeing they are but the *shadows* of better things, they cease in such as have obtained the *substance*.”

XXIV. The magistrate has no right to inter-meddle with the affairs of the church or the laws of

conscience ; but ought to do his duty impartially in his own secular sphere.

XXV. All outward and ordinary signs of reverence and respect ; “ such as the taking off the hat to a man, the bowings and cringings of the body, and such other salutations of that kind ;” and all vain and unprofitable sports ; all heathen numbering of months, days, and so forth, contrary to numerical simplicity ; all plural speech to one person ; all gay and beauteous clothing ; all war and resistance of evil ; all swearing, before magistrates and elsewhere ; all slavery ; and all proud conformity to “ the world’s people,” in words, manners, or equipage : all these are absolutely unlawful and wrong.

XXVI. God hath no absolute purpose of salvation to any individuals ; and it is all a matter of chance who gets or stays converted to the truth ; as all have equal opportunity in the *light*, and the will is left in every sense free and fortuitous.

XXVII. Respecting the “ eternal damnation ” of the wicked ; the reality of hell torments ; the certainty and evidence of a state future and immortal ; the resurrection of the body ; the millennium ; the end of the world ; and the day of judgment : there is a remarkable *vacancy* in all their enunciations. Barclay almost wholly omits even the incidental treatment of these topics ; and is very unsatisfactory, loose, and cursory, in what he says. Some of the most important of them, I believe, he never mentions. In an index or “ table of chief things,” of sixteen pages, suffixed to his volume, there is no such “ chief thing ” as *punishment, wicked, deprava-*

vity, resurrection, perdition, hell, damnation, immortality, eternity, futurity, regeneration, repentance, humility, hope, despair, assurance, fanaticism, bigotry, martyrdom, incarnation, trinity, atonement, expiation, propitiation, sacrifice, justice, satisfaction, penalty, unpardonable, pardon, confession, supplication, intercession, mediation, mediator, means of grace, mercy, righteousness, orthodoxy, heterodoxy, wisdom: while such “chief things” are there as, *woman, William Barclay, voices, vespers, turks, titles, tithes, theseus’ boat, taulerus, talk, tables, silence, shoe-maker, servetus, seed, sect, saxony, rustic, recreations, ranters, quakers, plays, physics, oil, number, liturgy, letter, laic, hai eben yokdan, freely, exorcism, ear, dancing, clothes, clergy, calvinists, bow, appearances, anicetus!* Their views of sin, law, justice, atonement, mercy, accountability, repentance, perdition, genuine affections in religion as contra-distinguished and discriminated from spurious, and the truth so clearly revealed in the word of God that a man (no matter who) will be *lost for ever* in point of fact, who dies without obeying the gospel; their views of these vital subjects of “truth and soberness” are, I fear, exceedingly superficial and worthless, vague and erroneous:—while, for the honor of their omniscient light, they have to *act as if* they knew all things about all things!

XXVIII. On the subject of *the christian Sabbath*, or as the beloved apostle calls it, **THE LORD’S DAY**, Rev. 1 : 10. Friends have discovered that there is no such thing under the gospel; that all that was

judaical and evanescent, as the vapors at the rise of *light*; that to observe *the first day of the week* is probably convenient and of christian expediency: but that the "*fourth command*," either virtually or literally, has any "moral obligation," they are "not so superstitious as to believe;" nor do they "superstitiously strain the scripture for another reason" besides that of expediency, as they "have *meetings* also for *worship* at other times."

This is a very evil feature, I think, of their orthodox system. Those who *know* Friends, in this country at least, may judge of the principle by *its fruits*. Let all observe their *practices*. They regard *the day of rest* as abrogated, and judaical; and typical merely, and so temporary: although its obligation is fixed in the decalogue, where NO OTHER COMMANDMENT OF THE TEN is abrogated; and though it is there declared to be no judaizing day, but continued from the creation of the world, and at that time *two thousand five hundred years old* when the Jewish dispensation commenced; and though no statute of abolition can be found in the New Testament, but simply an indication, sufficient and conclusive, of *its change* from *the seventh to the first* of the week, in commemoration of THE NEW CREATION FINISHED and all "very good" and infinitely more glorious than the former! and though Jesus Christ declares to us that "the Sabbath was made for man;" mark, he says not *for the Jews*—centuries before they existed, but—*for man!* and though all the moral reasons now exist, for something stronger than *expediency* to bind the conscience of man to

the service and worship of his Creator, which ever did exist! and though God hath put his seal on its observance most notably in all ages of the christian era, and his brand of *judgments marked and terrible* on the violators of its sanctity! and though to take away *the time when* God is to be worshipped, is to take away *his worship* from the earth! and though the scath of ruin, menacingly rests on those places of profligacy and infidelity, in nominal christendom, where the Sabbath is profaned; so as to demonstrate palpably the fact that ☞ **WITHOUT THE SABBATH, IS WITHOUT CHRISTIANITY.**³⁷

But I have sketched an outline which exhibits Quakerism much as it is, in its best features; for all the symbols which they show, are the masterpieces of the society, of which the vast majority know only enough for implicit confidence, in what their *inspired* leaders have, with care, concert, and some perplexity, prepared; as their “yearly epistles,” and other public documents; which are generally, in my judgment, both more correct, and less exceptionable every way, than their primitive and standard writings; and much better than *one in twenty of their members*, either knows, thinks, or feels. You, who know what christianity is, can judge whether Quakerism is at all consistent with it; whether it ought to be doctrinally tolerated and practically approved; whether I err in having some special zeal for its extirpation, as a moral nuisance in the community; and to how great an extent I may have mistaken my duty in matter or manner,

while inveighing against a specious counterfeit which is not only *not christianity*, but seductive and false to the hopes of the soul! and which (by its ostentatious pageantry of plainness and some qualities of sensible comfort and economy involved in it—which are prodigiously over-valued ordinarily and the appeal of which is to the sympathies and the senses and the temporal convenience mainly after all) obtrudes itself plausibly on the feelings of the “unlearned” and the “unstable;” who like Quakerism remarkably; even while they dislike “the holy scriptures,” and impiously “wrest them to their own destruction.” It is no slander of the society, but a plain and proveable verity which I can myself most solemnly attest, that of all sects of serious professors in christendom, they have a solitary preference, or rather pre-eminence, in the estimate of infidels! It was the dying declaration of the author of *the Age of Reason*—very like the age of *foxian* light—that he decisively preferred them and wished to be buried in their cemetery! the distinguished praise of the *sage of Lanark* and his FEMALE coadjutors, has not been more equivocal or less cordial, in their late memorable *missionary* illuminations toward “the natives” of the United States! And sceptics of all sorts, socinian and others, give them a preference, which a *christian* would abhor! See ☞ John, 7: 7. 15: 16–21, especially 19. “The seed of the serpent” is NEVER pleased or pacific toward “the seed of the woman”—that is toward Christ and christians; James, 4: 4, though sometimes robed in celestial attire, its smooth-

ness, and softness, and passivity of tenderness, and love to every thing, commend its pretension to the confidence of thousands. "For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Matt. 24: 24.

Before I conclude this prolonged introduction, I would offer some remarks on two topics in connexion with the synopsis; which, *quoting from BARCLAY alone*, I have endeavored so to display as hopefully to stand proof against even the suspicion of intentional wrong.

The first is the subject of the TRINITY. It is my own persuasion that the received orthodox statement of our common creeds, (those of the church of England, the Methodist Episcopal, the Baptist, the Lutheran, the Moravian, and all other protestants even generically of the stamp of the REFORMATION,) is *not* that of Friends. On the contrary, I believe them all, and especially the 'orthodox,' to be at best, *sabellians*, or most equivocal mystics, on that grand article. **THEY DENY THE DISTINCTION OF PERSONS IN THE GODHEAD; THE HYPOSTATICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DIVINE NATURE!** and yet they say so many things that are true, and so many that are imposing, that the absence of sagacity will always favor their 'orthodox' pretension, more than its presence. Penn is their great champion on this article, which their greater champion, Barclay, plainly evades: on whose lucubrations respecting it, and those of the modern 'orthodox,' I also would "show mine opinion."

1. Penn utterly mis-states what he vilifies; using *person* as we and all protestants use it not, as it is used on common subjects, implying a distinct existence. Hence he resolves our doctrine into *tritheism*; and entertains his readers with playing off a *reductio ad absurdum*, with scintillating fireworks and other "sparks" that his *light* "has kindled," against the absurdities that he makes himself; insolently and unfairly sporting about "three eternal entities" or "three eternal nothings," and so forth. He does it all too, on the assumption that our doctrine is essentially ruinous to the unity of the divine nature, as if *we* believed in three Gods; and as if *he*, and the lights that see with him, were the only sound defenders of the faith that "there is but one only, the living and true God." He implies that "separate and distinct" personalities, is our creed; as if what is "distinct" in some respects, must necessarily be "separate" in all or in the same respects: and so, when he has got, by that jesuitical sophism or rather "sly" involution, the *persons* of the Godhead "separated," his inductive absurdities become considerable.

2. It is impossible for enlightened believers of the truth to acknowledge the corrupters of this revealed doctrine: and all the sect are in this condemnation. Of one party, no one will doubt that this is truth. And who are the 'orthodox?' Those who uphold William Penn as an inspired and illustrious teacher in religion, and a most worthy minister of Jesus Christ! who endorse his Socinian or Sabellian errors, and canonize his revilings against

the truth! who vindicate equally him, and Barclay, and Fox, as *inspired* teachers sent from God! and who place their writings on a par with "the oracles of God;" declaring them, and more constantly honoring them in conduct, as of even "greater" authority.

3. Their confession on this article is very ambiguous and insufficient. At best it seems to me rather an obscuration than an elucidation of what they believe—if indeed they do formally and fully believe any thing. To tell us that they believe in "the sacred Three," or "the Three that bear record in heaven," is not enough; nor yet, in the words of Penn, that they "never have disowned a Father, Word, and Spirit, which are One, but men's inventions;" nor yet that they believe them "according to the scriptures:" which last is a mere circle. It is like saying, "I believe in all truth; my creed is orthodoxy; I believe exactly right; or, I believe the whole Bible!" It is plainly no symbol of faith, and no symbol at all, where one will not state, in plain and definite language, the premises, and what he does *totidem verbis* believe. In such case a man may refer to cited passages, for illustration or for proof; but never properly for statement! This, honesty requires him to give in the language and style of definition, using the perspicuous language of his mother tongue and the words of his own conceptions on the topic. It is plain that *to quote scripture*, is not the way of showing *what I believe* or *the sense of scripture as I entertain it*. The truth is given to the church, for confession

and diffusion; and through the church, to all mankind "for the obedience of faith:" and hence the policy of a private creed, or the privilege of holding one thing and preaching or professing another, is abomination, is odious sin! It is just the way which apostles did *not*; 2 Cor. 2 : 17; 4 : 1-3. 1 Thess. 2 : 3-20; and the very way which any moderns do *sinningly* alone. Paul merely uses the language of his slanderers, in 2 Cor. 12 : 16, that he may indignantly refute it, as he does! it is shocking to observe some authors (though Friends I now mean less) mistake it utterly; and abuse it too, as the sanction of an odious system of priest-craft and dishonesty!

4. Friends are hence "tender" of adopting the common language of trinitarians; disapproving it and substituting the words of scripture, in a way faulty and deceptive! "They have carefully avoided entangling themselves by the use of unscriptural terms, invented to define Him who is undefinable, scrupulously adhering to the safe and simple language of the holy scriptures, as contained in Matt. 28 : 18, 19, and 1 John, 5 : 7." Evans' Exposition, p. 39. I object to this (1) that the "terms" were not so "invented." It was not to define *Him*; but *the doctrine* which we believe to be revealed of him, that the terms are used: and when used, they were not *invented*, but only applied. (2) Friends would become "entangled," it seems, by using them. Why? Other professors are disentangled and relieved by their use. Do they believe something *very different* from the common faith, after all, 'ortho-

dox' as they are? (3) But they say the terms are "unscriptural." Which one? that of *trinity*?³⁸ but this means only *threeness* or the quality of being three in some sense! Do they believe then that "the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost," are *three* in no sense, because they are confessedly *one* in a more obvious sense? and yet do they believe in the sacred Three? Three—what? Is there no noun in the language, with which a grammatical conscience, that peculiarly respects the affection of *number*, can parse it possibly? *We* say, three persons or personalities; and if you ask us what we mean by such "unscriptural" words: we reply, *first*, what do *you* mean, by a plural adjective that agrees with no noun? what do Friends mean, or do *they* mean nothing, by the word "three?" Here I think, if the glory of the mercy-seat did not awe us to reserve, so near the ineffable SHECHINAH that abides there, we might well adopt the facetiousness of Penn, and say that Friends believe in three "nothings;" or, believe nothing in the "three!" It is just, to press them here: for the difficulty on their part is real, it is demonstrated, and it is evaded. Sometimes they even claim to believe the *trinity*, in an unqualified averment. Says Barclay of an opponent, (Brown,) "he will needs infer our denying of the trinity, albeit he cannot deny but he finds it owned by me." Strangely "owned" indeed! If Jesus Christ should "own" him, in the day of judgment, as ambiguously, it will be at least questionable which side of the Judge is the "right" one! Shortly afterward, he would "know of"

Brown, "in what scripture he finds these words, that the Spirit is a distinct person of the Trinity?" He so "owns" the trinity then, as to deny the personality of the three that constitute it! or does he deny this only of the third, and not of the second, or the first? What evidence has he that the Father is a person; and not a principle, the mere *primum mobile* or 'eternal cause,' of Plato? or impulsive light of Fox? Will Friends then (and *Barclay* is their confession of faith) divest *each of the three* of personality? and so have an *impersonal* God? a divinity without a person? a God who is—the mere effigies of mechanical atheism! And is this their vaunted and precious 'orthodoxy?' If otherwise, where will they attach personality? To the Father? what! and deny it to the Son? To the Son—and have two Gods, according to Penn? To the Father and the Son, and not to the Spirit? or, to all three—and have three Gods, according to the same *inspired* authority? or, to some one or two of the three, exclusively? Pray, what evidence have we of the personality of any one of them, which does not also demonstrate the personality of each of them? Is the Father not a person? Or, when Friends profess to believe in the Spirit, do they mean to deny his personality? and yet say that he "is God?" what! is God impersonal again? or, is it less than atheism to resolve the divinity into an *impersonal* existence; the mere *principium et fons* of necessitated being! The God of Friends, I experimentally know, is little other than an *impersonal* influence or principle. In short, nothing is plainer than

that the revised modern 'Exposition,' of what "Friends believe" on this high article, needs farther expounding, and is necessarily liable to all the difficulties which Penn infers against the true and full trinitarian symbols. It is even in a much worse predicament than that into which he reduces the true doctrine sophistically; since it simulates away the advantages of the doctrine, which are adamantine, and which, while sinking in its own muddy waters, Quakerism still assumes or affects! Yet really, it has *no* advantages. It makes more difficulties than it finds, and teaches all its *friends* to make them continuously. It defines nothing, and it settles nothing. Besides, it leaves them to believe—*what?* I answer, vagueness, words, smoke, a mere code of negatives, and a great parade of '*inspired*' orthodoxy! My great reason, however, for saying what this context contains, is two-fold—to show them that, if they are sound in what they profess, the very same difficulties (greatly increased) rest oppressively upon them, which the UNITARIAN PENN, and all other revilers of the truth, allege against our doctrine: and to show also that there is no solution possible to language or to thought, which so elucidates scripture, establishes faith, and breaks an adversary—*debellare superbos*³⁹—as that doctrine, which the wise and the good of universal christendom, that have been at all distinguished for these qualities, have eminently believed! *Second.* I would tell Friends that it is puerile and silly to object to any word, merely because it is "unscriptural." Where is the expression "inward light" found, in

those scriptures! Were it well in me to object to *it*, merely on that ground? or to *silent meetings*, *convincement*, *outward testimony*, *plain language*, and a number of others used by the society? What man, that objects not to the *thing* affirmed in John, 1 : 14, would ever object to the *term*, ‘unscriptural’ as it is, of *incarnation*? Besides, this silly softness ought much more to object to the translation of the inspired scriptures at all: since every word, it may be, of the new language is ‘unscriptural.’ Our word *God* is unscriptural, primitively heathen and druidical; for no such word occurs in the scriptures, before they were translated “by the will of man!” I say again, the softness, so “tender,” of which I speak, is infinitely silly. It would disgrace a school-boy! I add—those who have studied the circumference, and the radii, and the centre of the wheel of universal heresy, as successive errorists are developed or as history turns it to the view, (and nothing actually *new* comes up in its modern demonstrations,) know that where the *thing* on any subject is soundly believed, the *term* that suits it is seldom an offence or a difficulty. And I can “see clearly,” as well as *feel* powerfully, that Friends *may have* some deeper reason than the allegation of “unscriptural,” when they reject the terms *trinity*, *person*, and others of the sort, in their confession of what they believe.

It sounds rather queer to me that Friends should all at once grow more enamored and reverential of that book, which is *not* “the word of God,” than all its noblest *unsuspected* friends! Just here they

must have—nothing but scripture language! Just here “inward light” becomes very scriptural; and what is scriptural becomes “a more noble and excellent rule,” if not “all their salvation, and all their desire!” *Third*. We use the term *person*, because, among other reasons, it suits the case better than any other: we use it in a sense special and appropriate—to suit exactly that discrimination of the GODHEAD, as “the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost,” which the disclosures and the usages of scriptural revelation abundantly warrant and require! As previously shown, we neither understand nor believe any thing about the essential mode of the divine existence, the mode of the trinal deity; or *how* it is that “the Word was in the beginning with God!” We only believe the FACT. This is revealed, definable, intelligible; “the great mystery of godliness,” incontrovertibly! The distinction is indispensable in all correct language and thought, touching the *economical* relations of the divine persons. The Father sent the Son; the Son came into the world; the Spirit applies and seals redemption in our hearts. Did the Father die for us? did the Son accept the atonement? did the Spirit pronounce our absolution for his sake? Is it not in certain aspects *proper* to one to perform what it is not proper to the others to perform? Must we then distinguish or confound? And can we be correct while denuding the Godhead of all personality? or restricting it to any one, and denying it of course to two others of “the sacred three!” We use these ‘unscriptural’ terms, for reasons so valid and so

worthy, that we see no reason to intermit their use; but more and more to retain it. They are fundamental in their archetypes; and indispensable in the symbols of "a good confession." But *fourth*, I deny that they are 'unscriptural.' Most evidently the *thing* is there, which they signify. If it is, then a proper and apposite term, a term expressive and philosophically legitimate, as *person* is, to represent the thing, is every way correct and not rightly termed 'unscriptural.' This is more important to be seen, on an article of faith that is primary even among fundamentals; and which, like an everlasting rock of central ocean, the surges of heresy dash against, only to break themselves. "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come," &c. says Christ. John 16 : 7, 13, 14. In the same connection, he often calls him *Comforter* (παράκλητος) or Paraclete; the same word which is applied *personally* to the Savior himself, in 1 John, 2 : 1. In the passage above, *he* is masculine in the original, although it refers to "the Spirit of truth," in immediate apposition; and the word *spirit* in the Greek is neuter: as used on purpose to indicate personality. Thus the masculine pronoun *εκεινος* and the masculine *ον*, are used familiarly in the same connection. See 14 : 26. 15 : 26. 16 : 8, 13, 14, to which I refer for specimens of the style that pervades the Bible: a style that will bear inspection, experience, usage. What diluting folly would it be, as Dr. Dwight and others have successfully shown, to render the phraseology of scripture on this subject *impersonally*, almost any where! But the very term *person* is used. See 2 Cor.

2 : 10—" in the person of Christ ;" says the blessed Paul. The same word or phrase exactly, in 4 : 6, is repeated ; and might be well rendered, " the glory of God in the person of Jesus Christ." 2 Thess. 1 : 9 is another instance ; " who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence (Greek—*person*) of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." I will quote only one other example ; Heb. 1 : 3. " who, being the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person :" whose ? The person of the Father ! yes, and as distinguished, by necessary implication, from the person of the Son : and both as persons in the Godhead ! But, I forbear. In adverting to these specimens of what is scriptural, it is not my plan to write a dissertation on the trinity. I must remark, however, once more, *fifth*, That Friends are in a dilemma which their *light* has made, and from which to be extricated is possible only in one way—and that is, candidly, as individuals or as a society, to renounce the great meteor of their delusion ! They are at best in the common predicament of men. In truth, i. e. apart from a wonted simulation of being inspired, **THEY KNOW NOTHING** in theology that the Bible has not directly or indirectly taught them ; and why will they not honestly acknowledge so certain a truth ? If they would only acquire a release or manumission from the spell of ignorance, and fatuity, and **REAL DISHONESTY** ; and willingly own their indebtedness to " the oracles of God ;" they might then be helped, by " the Bridegroom " and " the Bride," to make a proficiency in heavenly wisdom, from which now

their sincere sorcery necessarily precludes them! God will be no party to a cause "that loveth or maketh a lie"—as Quakerism is! I have little or no hope of their valid improvement until their foundations of falsehood are exploded; and so *convinced is my whole soul of this*, that I avow it as steadfastly: whatever some judicious ones, who have comparatively never attended to the subject, may think or pronounce in the opposite. "They that forsake the law, praise the wicked: but such as keep the law, contend with them." Prov. 28: 4, 5, 9, 13, 18, 23. I reject therefore the idea that Friends, at their "best estate," are 'orthodox' or unequivocal, on the revealed doctrine of the GODHEAD.

It is my own conviction that the power of the Quaker system is much more *human* than divine; excessively more of the man than the Master; more fixed in dogmatizing, incomparably, than in demonstration: that, apart from influence sectarian and clanish, there is *precious little* of pure christian influence among them. Their leaders know not, learn not, study not, teach not, the pure expounded sense of "the oracles of God;" and hence their *christianity* is mainly as equivocal and false, as their vaunted inspiration is a ridiculous conceit, a most impudent lie, a fundamental delusion and cheat of the destroyer! The whole system is a mystical and false invention of men; founded in falsehood of the most insidious kind, which pervades and characterizes the whole concern of principles and persons—so far as they

are purely and exclusively under its influence. Who can honestly or consistently deny this? I answer—*only those* who are willing to endorse their pretensions to immediate inspiration! I do not say that *no better influence* comes on some of them in spite of their system. “The sun of righteousness” may shine through a mist, and *vivify even* the mental surface that his beams affect: and is the mist to be praised for that?

One ill feature of their system is that implicated in the forementioned topics—the virtual *impersonality* of their God. They, all of them, refuse to allow personality to the names of the Godhead. They say, the Spirit is God—but deny his personality: and they just as much deny it, distinctively, and wholly, to the Father and to the Son; resolving this into their “tender” respect for the “secondary rule”—almost as if that were *a person!* Now what I furthermore allege is that in effect they deny it to the Godhead. I allege this as a fact, rather than an argument; and write it as a witness rather than a disputer. Their theology is debilitated, and rendered effete and powerless, by their totality *within*; by an impersonal divinity of uncertain attributes, confused definition, and most mystified sanctity. Their God is—a principle, seed, light, and so forth, inserted in the soul; “a measure of that power, virtue, spirit, life, and grace, that was in *Christ Jesus*: thus the seed of the kingdom, as a redeeming principle, is placed in the heart of every individual, ready to expand with the opening faculties of the soul, and to take the government of it,

from the first dawn of intellectual life : the gift of grace, as an operative power in the hearts of men, was universally dispensed to the whole human race : by whose inward operations in our hearts, we are sanctified and prepared for an inheritance eternal in the heavens :” so that the greatest condemnation “ would be to resist that holy seed, which, as minded, would lead and incline every one to believe it as it is offered unto them ; though it revealeth not in every one the outward and *explicit knowledge* of it, nevertheless it always assenteth to it where it is declared.” It “ ought to be distinguished from every other influence which actuates the human mind. We therefore profess and firmly believe, that the light of Christ, in the heart, is an unerring guide, and the *primary rule of faith and practice*—that it is the ☞ only medium ☞ through which we can truly and livingly attain to the ☞ knowledge of God, and the mysteries of his heavenly kingdom. That the influences of the Holy Spirit must be *sensibly* experienced, in order to be availing to us, is evident, in the very nature of things. To experience this essential qualification, it is our duty to retire inwardly to the measure of divine grace.. We believe that the solemn duty of vocal prayer requires a special impulse. ☞ Whenever the gospel is really preached, it is preached baptizingly ☞ ☞ in a greater or less degree. We profess the same faith, and the guidance of the same unerring principle.” I have selected the above ‘orthodox’ specimens from “The TESTIMONY of the Society of Friends on the continent of America ;”

published in 1830; as one of the most *improved* specimens of Quakerism; in which however, as the last sentence shows, they identify themselves with the whole *foxian* mass of by-gone inspiration: evincing, what is morally necessary, that *any* consistent Friend must *go the whole*, for the system. And why do they exclude the poor Hicksites, who are *certainly Quakers, and just as much inspired* as was Fox himself? In that famous ‘Testimony,’ they call the persons of the Godhead, in the sophistical abuse of Penn, “separate and distinct;” and declare that they “reject the terms” not only, but consider them “as conveying ideas too gross to be admitted;” while they deny all distinct personality to each of “the three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and” believe “[that] these three are one.” I have endeavored to select the above fairly, as showing their sense of them, altering *nothing*, except by the *hands*, which I have placed near passages that I wished to be particularly observed. Let no one forget their ‘orthodox’ patronage.

Let the reader consider that this impersonal divinity *within*, is the great leveller and leavener of their system; that whatever it appears, when dressed up in its best to go abroad over “the continent of America,” its *home* character, its matter of fact identity, its real influence and pious practisings every day, “in meeting” and elsewhere, is interior, indefinite, delusive, fanatical, super-spiritual, “unerring,” and *inspired!* In the name of the great God I proclaim—that the system is funda-

mentally wrong ; it is *not christianity* ; it is an abominable delusion ; which it is the duty of all men, AND VERY SACREDLY OF ALL CHRISTIANS, unitedly to reject, deny, and reprove ; “having no fellowship” with the works of its “darkness,” its pretension, and its pompous folly ! All its efforts will not do, for those who have their eyes open and are *satisfied* with christianity. It is sinking in the waters of its own perturbation ; and this conspiracy of “yearly meetings,” and the charity of the ill-informed, may only avail to elevate it above the wave for—a little longer breathing, before it sinks, by its own weight, to rise no more—till the day of judgment ! The anathema of the eternal God, “the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost,” rests on that system that dares to mystify his revelation, declare it *not* his word, and tell the world, as one of its ‘orthodox’ statements on “the continent of America,” that the *universal inward light* is “an unerring guide, and the *primary rule of faith and practice* ;” italicising it themselves, and proclaiming it at the same time “the only medium” of the saving knowledge of God ! And this is orthodoxy !—this the stuff which the church of God is required charitably to succor, sanction, fellowship !

Any unprejudiced man of sense can see that it is all nothing but ‘orthodox’ materialism ; with its *sensible* influences, “the *operative* power—placed in the heart of every individual ; ready to expand—and take the government,” no doubt. Very much like the little cramped mainspring of a just-wound-up watch, tending mechanically to start all the

wheels, "ready to expand and take the government," and make all the subaltern machinery hum again; if one would just "retire inwardly" and clear the way for it, and unfix the balance-wheel of a sound mind. It is ignorant and void of spirituality:—as spiritual as *impulse*, and *sensible* influences; as spiritual as clock-work, and the difference between rest and motion; as spiritual as—machinery, stagnant or going, with its "measure of that power, virtue, spirit, life, grace, seed, principle, light within," and so forth: but not so spiritual as—chemistry or common sense. Blind is the dotard who can think it the same with christianity.

I have always observed that when the human mind adopts *any* false system of religion, it commences its ingenious toils of devout sophistry and specious *lying* to sustain it. Hence he that either "loveth" or "maketh a lie," turns to it in conformity, and is thereafter sincerely and sinfully deceived: and the lie in turn makes him! O the danger every way, to character, to state, to destiny, of a false system of religion! I regard it as beyond conception or description cursed of God and execrable to saints. I do not say that the advocates of Quakerism *know* that they are lying: but convinced I am in the sight of God that they *might* know it! they might but for this—a false system of religion is the most deceitful thing in the world: for, it *seems* as if its helpers were helping God, doing duty, defending holiness, co-operating with Jesus Christ, and performing prodigies of be-

neficence. In this way the mind *feels*, whatever it thinks, as if it was prosperously 'working its passage' to heaven: hence, the greatest enemy it meets, is one that incorruptly holds the truth and manifests it. Hence the only way to make an opposing demonstration of any value, is to withstand it courageously and with aggressive onset. Half-way measures will only nourish the hydra till more heads are grown. And who knows not that such wisdom is not "from above," and hath its denunciation only in the book of God! That sorry softness with its eyes shut, that asks quarter for error, would, at some safer opportunity, ask license for sin: for often the brood of its sympathies are marvellously like "a generation of vipers," whom true benevolence would rather warn to "escape the damnation of hell."

The other topic, on which I design to remark, is that of war and the passive endurance of injuries. Barclay gives the strange views of Friends in the following formal proposition, on which he enlarges; "That it is not lawful for christians to resist evil, or to war or fight in any case." This is in brief exactly what they profess. Without discussing the voluminous theme, I will state at least some of the results, in which my own conviction rests, in opposition to their views, which I once "verily thought" true.

1. Friends magnify the relative importance of the matter, out of symmetry and against apostolic example. They appear to me, many of them, to place their views of pacification,—just where Paul

puts "Jesus Christ and him crucified;" at the centre of the system. The most important pacification in the world is that with God through the glorious atonement! Thus, often have I conversed with a Friend about the way of salvation—when, instead of any fixity of thought to the point, he would go off at a tangent and with a noise, inquiring, 'Does thee believe in the lawfulness of war? or that any christian can be a soldier?' Barclay indeed seems to think that the things are totally incompatible; so that the man who can reconcile them, "may be supposed also to have found a way to reconcile *God* with the *devil*, *Christ* with *anti-christ*, *light* with *darkness*, and *good* with *evil*. But if this is impossible, as indeed it is, so will also the other be impossible; and men do but deceive themselves and others, while they boldly adventure to establish such absurd and impossible things." This, it must be confessed, is not *begging* the question!

2. They say many things here, which, however true, are not to the purpose: As that war is a great and dreadful evil; that revenge is wrong; and that soldiers are often wicked and revengeful. There is no need of saying what nobody disputes. The question is—Is war, or the taking of life in certain cases, or all sorts of resistance of evil, positively unlawful? and that not "for christians" only, but for all men; so that, if their position be true, it can be done at all by any one, only in a way of sinning against God? This is what I understand them to affirm; and their doctrine, in argument and fact,

extends to capital punishment, and the power and functions of the magistracy—nay, to the very organization of society; to its order and protection; to the nethermost foundations of civil government. If a thief may be justly slain with the sword by the ministers of law, why not a gang of them? if a bandit, why not a banditti? and if a foraging party of freebooters, why not an iniquitous or an invading nation? Friends say, ‘Apprehend them, treat them kindly, and confine them for life; but not take life, for this is what we cannot give.’ What folly! How are we to *apprehend* them, when *we* may not use the sword, or any hostile force, or “resist evil in *any* case:” while *they* use sword, pistol, musket, and cannon? Admirable! “He beareth not the sword in vain;” saith “the outward testimony of scripture!” and here this inward-light testimony expounds the way of it! It is not necessary to travel very far south to find *nullification*. Their views are treason against common sense, against their own safety and fire-side enjoyments, and against the commonwealth, to say nothing of the sanctions of christianity! I should think the proper means of *apprehending* them, would be to coax them to become Friends. By this means, it is hoped, the prophecies are all to be fulfilled, in turning “swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks;” so that the nations, becoming quite *friendly*, are to “learn war no more!” So we go, swimmingly along, down the stream of prosperity, to halcyon moorings and a certain port! We are all to become Friends, it seems.

3. Friends often speak of the present dispensation, as if the *principles* involved were not of moral and perpetual obligation, or of unalterable eternal sameness. "It is not lawful for *christians*." If it was ever right to take life or to wage war, it may be right again. The principles concerned are all anchored in the nature of things, which results from the nature of God, and is therefore unchangeable. If revenge is wrong (as it certainly is) in the nature of things, then it was never right, and never will be, irrespective of dispensations.

4. They often forget that the sin of taking life consists wholly in that, which is more abundantly sin where life is not taken—in malevolence or personal hatred and ill-feeling. "Whosoever HATETH HIS BROTHER, is a murderer : and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." From which I infer (1) that there are thousands of "murderers" that no human law can implead, and millions, that appear as respectable as Friends. (2) That murder is properly distinct, and separate too, from taking life ; so that it exists, in THE IMMENSE MAJORITY OF CASES, where life is not taken ; and consequently may not exist where life is taken.


5. The argument is vain, which, premising that God alone is the author and arbiter of life, as he is alone its great proprietor too, declares inferentially that *therefore* the thesis of Friends is true : for, obviously, if God is so the owner of all life, HE may take it in any way he pleases ; mediately or by the agency of others, as well as immediately by his own agency. Hence, men hold the life of all the irra-

tionals in *possession*; for God hath given us the responsible usufruct or *quasi*⁴⁰ allodium, in the *magna charta* of his empire: for use, not abuse, indeed; and to the end of time. Gen. 9: 1-7. 1 Tim. 3: 5. show our title.

On Noah, and in him on all mankind,
 The charter was conferred, by which we hold
 The flesh of animals in fee, and claim
 O'er all we feed on, power of life and death.
 But read the instrument and mark it well:
 Th' oppression of a tyrannous control
 Can find no warrant there. Feed then, and yield
 Thanks for thy food. Carnivorous through sin,
 Feed on the slain, but spare the living brute!—COWPER.

Brutes can feel. They suffer and enjoy; and are proper objects of benevolence, human and divine. "A righteous man regardeth the life of his beast; but the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel." Prov. 12: 10. But does it necessarily infer cruelty, in the man that takes their life, under this charter? May not a man, with tender christian feelings, immolate them for food? If he is cruel, is cruelty necessary to the act? and is not cruelty to brutes, of the very same quality, though the form and the degree may differ, with cruelty or malevolence in higher relations? A feeling of cruelty in any aspect, is like a feeling of cruelty in all other aspects; it is homogeneous, it is bad, it is contrary to the law of God. But if merely to take life does not necessarily make a murderer, or a fiend, or no christian, of a farmer, or a butcher, or a fisherman, we may here see in its lower relations the certain

difference between taking life—as one thing, and malevolence—which is another. Whence,

6. God has frequently and in recorded instances authorized the former, but *never*, NEVER THE OTHER. God NEVER DID, and morally he never could, (it is not improper to say that “he cannot deny himself,”) AUTHORIZE ONE MAN TO HATE ANOTHER! He authorized Israel under Moses and Joshua, and subsequently under many other leaders, to exterminate the wicked Canaanites and others: but did he authorize malevolence to their persons? or necessitate it, by the order or the service? not at all. Take a case; 1 Sam. 15: 3, 22, 23, 32, 33, “Then said Samuel, Bring ye hither to me Agag, the king of the Amalekites. And Agag came unto him delicately. And Agag said, Surely the bitterness of death is past. And Samuel said, As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women. And SAMUEL HEWED AGAG IN PIECES BEFORE THE LORD IN GILGAL.”  Would not *Barclay* have denounced him, had he been there? would he not have rebuked, among “absurd and impossible things,” an attempt to show the utter consistency of the act of the prophet, with “the mind of Christ?” or, because it occurred under a former dispensation, are we to neglect the everlasting principles on which it is founded? or, because Saul spared Agag, are we to panegyryze his “tender mercies,” to the dishonor of the holy man of God, who, with his own hand, sacrificed him “before the Lord in Gilgal?” Did Samuel hate Agag, or was the act on his part malevolent? We

might almost as wisely ask, was God malevolent in issuing the order which Samuel simply executed? or, was it not "murder" in Samuel to obey the authority of Jehovah? or, was not Saul the better man of the two, at least the calmer in the case, and the more like—a Friend? How many frothy declaimers might have appealed to the million, the majority, very plausibly against him; and settled by acclamation the point "that it is not lawful for christians to resist evil, or to war or fight in any case!" Just as now, the superficial multitude believe according to their selfishness, their education, or their caprice; and even the plurality of "the great vulgar" yield to the same control, undisciplined by evidence! Hence


7. It comes to pass observably that many opposers of the plainly revealed doctrine of eternal punishment, (as universalists, unitarians, infidels, pseudo-philanthropists of every description,) grow very specially tender in their clemency on the topics of capital punishment, war, the importance of the "peace society," and the superlative excellence of the ethics or creed of *passive endurance!* I do not say that the "peace society" may not be in the main a good and valuable thing; or that some very sound and worthy allies are not to be found with it; or that it will not become (as I sincerely pray that it may) *increasingly* useful, wise, and powerful, in the pacification of society. I only say that there is an affinity or element congenial, between punishment in time and punishment in eternity; punishment of law, human and divine; punishment

by the magistracy, of this world and that which is to come: and that, as the principles are much the same in both cases, it is as easy, and almost as perilous, to reason wrong on either as the other. Hence some and even many maddened apostates or virulent infidels, who are not altogether *dispassionate* or disinterested *inquirers*, are found to oppose those wholesome principles of society, without which its civil or domestic existence would become impossible—as sure and full experience shows. They endeavor to prove the wickedness of the executive act; of the judiciary that sanctions it; of the legislation that ordains it! as if wickedness were necessary to it; as if Washington did not sign the death-warrant of Andre with emotion and with tears; as if benevolence itself would not sacrifice a man who makes himself a nuisance against the life of others; as if Quakerism *ought not* to be put down, if it is false; as if justice were hostile to mercy; as if one ought to have mercy less on the commonwealth, than on him who would burn it to ashes for the sake of pilfering among the ruins, the relics of its treasure; as if there was but one way of cheapening human life; as if God could not punish, without spite; as if his punitive justice were any other than a modification of his infinite benevolence; as if benevolence itself were not the inspiration of his way, when he “punishes the wicked with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power!” By such reasoners, it is often alleged that capital punishment is useless, since it does not prevent

crime notoriously. I reply (1) This might prove possibly its inexpediency, but never its unlawfulness. (2) It is absurd to say it prevents none, because all is not prevented. And it is manifestly false. The fear of capital punishment prevents millions of murders—that would otherwise be perpetrated! It prevents, and controls, and intimidates, to a degree incalculably great. What but moral restraint ordinarily coerces the mutual hatred of men? and what moral restraint exists, beside the sword of armed authority, sufficiently gross and palpable to check their fury who fear no retribution from the throne of God? (3) All their reasoning is sufficiently refuted from the ordinance of God, establishing capital punishment, by his own authority in this world, and by more than this—his own awful agency in the next.

8. The right to take life, and consequently to redress wrongs equitably in any other way, has been solemnly and fully delegated in the word of God to the magistracy of this world; which is hence his own ordinance, obligatory alike on the actions and the consciences of his creatures universally. This could be proved from innumerable places of the New Testament; from the crucifixion-scene of *three* sufferers, and the history of *the abuses of power* attending it; and from one or two selected passages soon to be considered. It is even implied in the “fourteenth thesis” of *Barclay*; where, in reference to the power of the MAGISTRATE, though he says nothing of divine authority with him, he avers that “the law is for the transgressor, and

justice to be administered upon all, without respect of persons." And how could this be, if armed authority in the state, with the power of life and death in its possession, were morally wrong, contrary to the will of God, a system only of legalized and impious murder? Without the power of life and death, government is a nullity and law contemptible; the foundations of society are everted, and the hopes of the sublunary universe expire! Yet, what Friend could wear a sword or wield one? He who thinks *all war* and *resistance of evil*, necessarily a diabolical crime, and "unlawful for christians?" or, he who thinks war in some cases just? But such an one is no Friend. He has lost cast, and gone away from the luminary within. I refer here mainly to Rom. 13 : 1-7, or the whole chapter; where we are plainly taught the following things: (1) That civil government, as such, is a divine institution; "the authorities that be are ordained of God," as a regency of his own. (2) That their power includes the prerogative of life and death, according to equity. (3) That they are hence authorized to make war, on certain occasions and responsibly to the Supreme Commander, against malefactors of all sorts; one of them, and any one, and millions of them, other things being equal. (4) That they are charged with the repose and order of society, against all insurgents that would disturb it; for the magistrate "is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to

execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Hence (5) That it is the duty inalienably, and ought to be a part of the religion, of all men, to honor and obey the magistracy, in the due and lawful exercise of their power. "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath," (or fear of them,) "but also  FOR CONSCIENCE' SAKE." (6) We see the treason against God of one of the principles of Friends—that on which they refuse incorrigibly, either to bear arms in any case, or to pay the fines very properly levied against delinquents or exempts. They plead conscience! What right have they, I ask, to keep such a conscience? Is it conscience "resisting the ordinance of God?" And what respect deserves it from man? I answer, just as much as it gets from God. It is nothing better than a piece of will-worship, according to the *inspiration* of a man's deluded feelings, ignorant or cowardly or perverse or indolent or perhaps compounded of all these, leading him *religiously* to have his own way at all events. Hear the word of God: "For, for this cause PAY YE TRIBUTE ALSO: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render THEREFORE to all their dues: TRIBUTE TO WHOM TRIBUTE IS DUE; CUSTOM TO WHOM CUSTOM; FEAR TO WHOM FEAR; HONOR TO WHOM HONOR." It was the MILITARY government of the CÆSARS to which was the direct reference of the apostle at the time. But Friends say, we cannot pay militia fines; nor do any thing to uphold the military power. Ah! truly:—and why do you ever become adjuncts and

allies and officers of such a civic dynasty? or *vote* for the ministers of such a power? What are you doing at the *polls*, but upholding that very power? What *moral* right have *you* there? to vote or be voted for? And yet all of you (generally⁴¹) exercise the right of suffrage. And you virtually **APPEAL TO THE SWORD**, **WHENEVER** you sue a man, and invoke the armed interference of the law to **COERCE** him to his duty! Have I no right here to suggest that casuistry is sometimes marvellously convinced, not by evidence but by influence; not by the Bible, but the—**PURSE**! If the government charged a pecuniary *bonus* or capitation tax for the privilege of voting, I presume there would be heard some new conscientious groaning against the military power—even by Friends! But it gives them influence in a cheap way; and hence they forget the dreadful horror they sometimes feel in doing *any thing* to uphold a military government. Without such a government, there is not a right, nor a possession, nor an endearment, they could call their own, one single day or night! And yet—others must do the fighting or pay for the war: they only enjoy the privileges; which blood and treasure other than their own, procured for them and still preserves. In the defence of the commonwealth, they refuse all responsibility: and just so—by proxy—do they support and diffuse christianity in the world! translate the scriptures, defend them, and so forth! The Father of his Country, in answer to an address of the society, congratulating him *in their way* on his accession to the presidency of the Union,

gives a marked and just reproof of their *unequal* principles, "receiving benefits and rendering none," to the power of the State. His words are very kind, dignified, and worthy of himself; commending their principles in reference to order and peace, "*except their declining to share with others the burthens of the common defence.*" He also *very exemplarily* assures them that "it is *his* wish and desire that the laws may always be as extensively accommodated to the conscientious scruples of all men, as a due regard to the protection and essential interests of the nation may justify and permit." Thus nobly wrote WASHINGTON in 1789. He had witnessed during the revolution some of their twistical proceedings; and taken several of their luminaries into his own custody, lest their "scruples" might incline *rather too far* toward royalty and England. In the last war (1812) some became sudden converts to Quakerism; growing quite conscientious in the time of danger against such profane exposures of life—and either joined the Society, or pleaded a kindred exemption from military responsibilities. In the revolution, a number of courageous and patriotic men of the society, took the field; who were called, on their return, "Free Quakers," being disowned by Friends. What a pity that their own good sense on some other subjects, can not be brought on this to act with equal light and love of evidence! "Render therefore unto Cæsar, the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God, the things that are God's." Mat. 22 : 21. ¶ 1 Pet. 2 : 13-17. We suppose it taught also (7) That the principles of

the magistracy, as divinely sanctioned, are to be held virtually to extend to all communities less than that of the State; as a school, a family, a ship's crew, a caravan, an army, or a company socially organized in any way. The means must be adequate to the ends of government. There must be order, law, authority, headship, concentration; and equally there must be subordination, self-denial, harmony, and obedience. There ought also to be, as always there might, mutual benevolence and wisdom. Hence the father or head of a family is a domestic magistrate. He is legislature, judiciary, and police. He presides over the commonwealth of home. He must be able sometimes to coerce obedience; sometimes to repel invasion; sometimes to protect his charge by an appeal to the *ultima ratio*⁴²—when there is no time to wait for the *regum*⁴³ of ordinary safety or the *legum*⁴⁴ of adequate redress. Nor is there any need of anger or malice in the administration; so that where such passions find sway, it is the *man* himself, and not the system or sphere of his duties, that is culpable. Malice is incidental, adventitious, corruptive; and of consequence infers nothing against the established equity and wisdom of the divine constitution.

Hence (8) that abuses in the administration of civil or political government do not affect the principle for which we contend. Those abuses, as *such*, the worse for what they impiously mar, may be wisely shown, justly resisted, and equitably redressed. In such a world as this, all history proclaims their horrible abundance. But on the *pas-*

sive endurance scheme, passive endurance is all! When would this principle have achieved the liberties of America? The system of magistracy reacts on its incumbents. It tells them to be "just, ruling in the fear of God:" or, his providence may let loose upon them a revolutionary tornado that shall hurl them from their seats, or conduct a regular impeachment which shall instate their successors. Such a *lex talionis* or *in terrorem* influence, exists in this country in the civic majesty of the ballot-boxes. Thus society is tempered, balanced, and founded, in obvious principles of reciprocal dependence and responsibility; and the fierce passions of the worst, for whom especially the criminal code is enacted, 1 Tim. 1: 8, 9, are held in check serene; like the rumbling central fires of an unbroached volcano, with the turbulence of its imprisoned lava surging, beneath the adamantine crust on which a city stands stately and secure!

9. The texts which Friends quote so confidently in favor of their views, show only in their hands what an interpreter the inward light is! ☞ Matt. 5: 38-48. Must these orders be all *literalized*; or, interpreted in their spirit according to the analogy of faith? In the latter way, they appear in beautiful symmetry and keeping; as absolutely forbidding all malevolence, anger, revenge, and every modification of these diabolical passions! But do they forbid Paul to stand on his rights as a Roman citizen, at Philippi? Acts, 16: 35-39. 22: 25-30, or to use legal measures, backed with a military cohort, for his redress? 23-28. Besides, Friends

require us to literalize those orders ; and yet they practically *do it not themselves!* Let us see. “And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also?” Is *this* the way of Friends, Orthodox or Hicksites? Witness their mutual litigations for “the uttermost farthing” in dispute between them! Witness their practice when one of “the world’s people” would wrong them out of their own, or “take away their coat!” The style of the passage is plainly proverbial and figurative ; and it is for those only to be privileged to literalize its meaning, whose practice discredits the interpretation they maintain, and whose ordinary *spiritualizing* of passages plainly literal has become itself a proverb! But “How can thee love a man and yet strike or slay him with thy hand?”⁴⁵ Answer—As well as Samuel could “hew Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal!” How can Friends think it *not* murder, to carry *passive endurance* to its extravagance in any case “outwardly,” while probably real malice lives and practises *within* them? Matt. 23: 24–28. ↵ Mark, 7: 14–23. There must be a deeper and more thorough cleansing of their characters than the hue of Quakerism can impart, in order to their knowing or showing true wisdom! Their religion, just here, is so *external alone*, so formal and ceremonial, so hollow and heartless, that appearances, not realities, carry it in the favorable estimation of the populace. What I allege is—that their views are puerile, impracticable, false ; and that christianity is not responsible for them. And if

those views ever allow them (as I have reason to think the remark not uncalled for) to enter the temple and the jury-box of their country's justice, when a manslayer is to be tried for his life, and refuse to convict him—because their views condemn all capital punishment; and so influence or fatigue their juror peers into a verdict of acquittal; and this although the evidence may be conclusive and they (virtually) sworn to render accordingly: I feel it to be my duty to write it ☞ as no better than a clear example of anti-christianity, fraud, perjury, and covert treason against the commonwealth! Deut. 25:1. A christian could weep with tenderness, glow with benevolence, and hesitate with interjected prayer for his salvation; and yet inflexibly—utter the verdict of truth and righteousness! Such is the conduct of principle.

10. Friends often adduce Matt. 26:52, (see also Rev. 13:10; and 16:6,) where the Savior said to Peter, "Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Their views here are very objectionable: 1. As they interpret it, it proves that no good man or christian can use the sword at all. It thus *disposes* of Washington, Colonel Gardiner, Cornelius the centurion of the Italian band, old Samuel, and millions of others not to be numbered. But 2. Does it say any such thing?—"shall perish *with the sword*;" he shall die by a violence like that which he exerts. Is this necessarily—perdition everlasting? Such navigators ought to look ahead a little, and they could see the rock against which

they are dashing themselves. A Friend once argued with me as follows: "It can't mean temporal punishment, for they very often escape. It must mean therefore that which is eternal; for the words are express—'shall perish;' that is, 'with the sword' hereafter." This is a summary way of settling the matter, truly. But we may well pause before we sanction such enormous error. For

3. It proves too much quite—it nullifies the thirteenth of Romans; where the *clear* explains or at least coerces the *doubtful*. Many a man "beareth the sword" by the authority of God, as his civic "minister." Inference—their inspiration is at fault again: it dogmatizes what is false, as it is wont to do.

4. A credible interpretation does more honor to the passage: Peter was ardent to fight for the kingdom of his master, and thus to carry the fortunes and the cause of MESSIAH. But this was not the way to propagate his religion. He that resorted to such means would fail of the end and destroy himself. That spiritual tyrant who affects to sit in Peter's chair (in which Peter himself never sat) and resembles him only in his errors, unites in his own *regime* the power of the sword with that of the keys—and how much of *the religion of Christ* does he propagate? Generally, the passage is an interdict against all such military measures and sanguinary means of grace: while it had a special applicability to the duty of that unparalleled crisis, to suffer rather than resist. If resistance had been wise, he would have employed it. "Twelve legions of angels" had "presently" appeared for his res-

cue, asking no human sword to add its imbecility to their arms. "But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" 54. John, 18 : 36.

Friends are often asked, what would be your course of duty as the head of a family, if a desperado in quest of "beauty and booty" were to break into your house at midnight? They answer, (1) This is an extreme case, and it is not fair to try principles in that way. I reply, why? because a principle is not to be judged by looking at its native tendency, its proper fruits, its practical relation and utility? Must we then go to the sky of utopia for all our ethical light? But it is *not* an extreme case: far from it! It occurs virtually every day in the year; our newspapers groan with the records of violence, and society is bleeding in every member. Take a fact—A lady at the South was once left, in the absence of her husband, alone in the house, or with no other protection than sleeping infancy in her chamber, and a few slaves in other apartments. Just as she was about to retire, she was alarmed by the sudden appearance of an athletic negro of the neighborhood, who plainly announced a purpose more terrible than death to the thoughts of conjugal virtue. What should she do? With calm self-possession she concealed the agitation of her feelings—requested him to *wash his feet* in water that she would procure for him—and watching her moment while he was so engaged, having seized an axe that she had prudently concealed, she despatched him with one well directed blow on his head! Suppose her husband had been

a Friend—*could he* have blamed her at his return? Would any jury of men or *women* condemn her? She deserves to rank with Judith who decapitated Holofernes, and “Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite” who “shall be blessed” for the nail she drove through the temples of Sisera! Judges, 4 : 5. Hence when Friends say, (2) that if we are faithful we shall never be brought into such extremities, they utter what is foolishness itself. Was not Isaiah faithful, whom Manasseh “sawed asunder?” or Paul who was beheaded under Nero? Let the blood of the martyrs answer.

That war is ordinarily iniquitous and wrong on both sides, and that TERRIBLE ABUSES of the power of the sword have always prevailed in our world, though WITH SPECIAL CRIMINALITY in an age so favored with the means of knowledge and righteousness as this, must be at once admitted and maintained. Wars of conquest, ambition, martial glory, or posthumous fame, are utterly unauthorized and wrong; are “earthly, sensual, devilish;” are worthy of the combined abhorrence of earth and heaven. If our PEACE SOCIETIES would all be DEFINITE AND SOUND in principle, aiming at things proper and practicable, and at these alone, I, for one, have no doubt not only of their high utility, but of their rapid prosperity and ultimate success. Let them honor the principles of magistracy as laid down in the New Testament; maintain the rectitude of war when strictly defensive, when absolutely necessary in the last resort, when so prosecuted that the guidance of THE LORD OF HOSTS

can be devoutly invoked on its movements; let them make no canopy or cover for law-hating infidels and universalists; let them recognise and honor the doctrine of penalty and the armed puissance of the state; let them show rights and duties reciprocally and wisely; let none of them misrepresent the religion of Jesus Christ, as if it contained "the old wives' fable" of PASSIVE ENDURANCE, or as if a man could not have prowess or "show himself a man" or act valiantly *pro aris et focis*⁴⁶ without malevolence: let them so act and so proceed, and they will take hold of the public mind; they will arrest the attention of cabinets and statesmen; they will disarm a mighty prejudice and attach devoted millions to their cause; heaven will bless their labors of philanthropy; the nations of the earth may hear their voice, feel their arguments, and echo their wishes, in the universal pacification of the globe and through the "blessed and holy" ages of the MILLENNIUM.

11. While I fully believe all that I have written on this momentous subject, I feel bound to add—that it is no part of the argument or the motive to authorize wars, feuds, and bloody rencounters, such as actually occur in almost every page of universal history! There is no need of war comparatively, on the earth; either individually or generally. The real necessity for war is very different from the assumed necessity. There is no need of it absolutely—except what wicked passions mainly foment and make. For *abuses* of principle or practice, I am no apologist. DIPLOMACY, EQUITABLE, CALM,

PACIFIC, OUGHT TO SETTLE ALL INTERNATIONAL DIFFERENCES : justly dreading an appeal to the sword, as a most terrible calamity. To exemplify this wisdom, is transcendently the duty especially of CHRISTIAN nations. My very soul deprecates war ! It is indeed a mighty and a monstrous evil—"a game, which, were their subjects wise, kings would not play at." Ruin to finances is nothing compared with ruin to morals. It depraves a nation ! Private differences too might easily be settled in every case, but for bad passions ! And for all these maladies, can nothing be done ? There is apanacea, which I would here record as infallible : it is a compound in due proportions of James 4 : 1-17. Matt. 18 : 15-18, and 2 Cor. 5 : 10-21. Whence, I observe,

12. The pacification of society and the regeneration of the world, is to be realized **ONLY THROUGH THE PREVALENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ; ONLY BY THE ASCENDENCY OF CHRISTIAN SENTIMENT AMONG THE NATIONS !** I believe that such a period will arrive : for it is certainly and credibly predicted : but I believe as much in *the only appointed means*, as I do in the desired end of the glorious consummation ! It will occur not by rendering magistracy weaponless and imbecile ; but by superseding its occasions of using the sword. There is **NO INWARD LIGHT** of any sort in man, that will correct his errors or convert his soul or reform his millions on the earth. The grace of the gospel alone can work his melioration. It is only by the diffusion of "the glorious gospel of the blessed God," and its cre-

dence in the world, that such a period ever will arrive! The means are revealed, just as much as the end, in the scriptures of truth: and the opposers of missions to the heathen, of the operations of Bible societies, Sabbath-schools, and other evangelical instrumentalities of communicative goodness, however they may say or think themselves desirous of the result, are really its most formidable and guilty retarders. Meanwhile, the magistracy is not to be disarmed or divested of the thunders of God. Quakerism has had a trial of its plenipotentary light, for nearly two centuries. What state has adopted it; or what promise does it unfold of its own ultimate prevalence, or of its EVER pacifying the nations? It is an obscuration of the light of christianity and a delusion that supersedes its influence. Is. 2: 2-5. Matt. 23: 18-20. Rom. 16: 25-27. Dan. 7: 26, 27. 12: 9-13. Rev. 20: 1-6. These passages show the reality of the millennium and the theory of its eventuation. Inward light can only retard and prevent it. "FOR OUT OF ZION SHALL GO FORTH THE LAW, AND THE WORD OF THE LORD FROM JERUSALEM. AND HE SHALL JUDGE AMONG THE NATIONS, AND SHALL REBUKE MANY PEOPLE: AND THEY SHALL BEAT THEIR SWORDS INTO PLOUGH-SHARES, AND THEIR SPEARS INTO PRUNING-HOOKS: NATION SHALL NOT LIFT UP SWORD AGAINST NATION, NEITHER SHALL THEY LEARN WAR ANY MORE. O HOUSE OF JACOB, COME YE, AND LET US WALK IN THE LIGHT OF THE LORD!"

My fathers and brethren; in what follows of this work, I shall address you really, but with still less

directness and form. The volume, as it is now to go forth, is, I hope, destined in providence to do some good. Again, I say, with the matter I am comparatively contented. The manner is much more vulnerable. It has indeed very little of my own confidence. I entreat you, however, to reflect on the exceeding difficulty of doing *such a service* in a style felicitous and acceptable: especially for one so situated; so interrupted and hurried with other duties.⁴⁷ You will defend the cause of truth, and the fortunes of my humble book, only as they appear to you congenial or identified. I can ask no more—unless it be your prayers for me and “my kinsmen according to the flesh!” The junior prophet exclaimed, while the patriarch sage ascended; “My father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof!” It was well and eloquently said. The genuine prophetic service, the christian ministry more eminently, the pious and the learned fathers of the church, are the defence of the country; the munition of the nation; the treasure of the state: nor will I wait the time to catch your falling mantle, or lament your departure, if permitted to survive, before I express my grateful conviction of the truth. The ministers of the gospel—that deserve the name—are “the messengers of the churches and the glory of Christ.” Jesus Christ holds them as “stars” in his own right hand. He defends them too; “saying, Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm.” The history of this country demonstrates the same

truth in every chapter : and so long as christianity, pure and free, shall continue to throw over us the mantle of celestial influence, we shall endure and flourish, the hope and the wonder of the world. This is the only *inspiration* we need. The institutions of our civil freedom are comparatively congenial with the principles of the gospel. "In comparison with the rest of the world," says Baxter, "I shall think that land happy which hath but bare liberty to be as good as the people are willing to be." How much more liberty do we enjoy or—pervert ! Here we may think and act and worship without fear. There is no temptation—I had almost said—*not* to be honest. It is the vantage-ground of evidence : and we are all willing to make this league even with infidelity and heresy—that we will on all sides freely examine, so that evidence only may lead us : and THAT SYSTEM shall alone prevail that can stand the shock of all rational discussion. Christianity, I venture nothing in saying it, is such a system ; and just as evident is it that there is no other : consequently, Quakerism is not that system ; and THEREFORE ONLY do I benevolently desire to see it universally superseded. "Prove all things : hold fast that which is good." It is strange that any one should so err respecting the nature of benevolence, as to question either its vital connexion with truth, or its fearless delight in evidence, or the vigor and the principle of all its proper demonstrations ; since the predominance of selfishness alone can adequately account for the apathy or the antipathy of millions toward the gos-

pel. "AND THIS IS THE CONDEMNATION!" "For 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."

PART SECOND.



THE GRAND ERROR.

Sint castae deliciae meae, scripturae tuae ; nec fallar in eis, nec fallam
ex eis. AUGUSTINE.

O be thy written Word my chaste delight ;
Guiding my earthly pilgrimage aright !
In it I know my soul is not deceived ;
From it I speak the truth to be believed.

It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that YE SHOULD EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS. Jude, 3.

For there must also be heresies among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest among you. 1 Cor. 11 : 19.

Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked ; between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not. Mal. 3 : 18.

The prophet that teacheth lies, he is the tail. For the leaders of this people cause them to err ; and they that are led of them are destroyed. Isa. 9 : 15, 16.

The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream ; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat ? saith the Lord. Jer. 23 : 28.

For without are dogs, and SORCERERS, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and WHOSOEVER LOVETH AND MAKETH A LIE. Revelation, 22 : 15.

I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran : I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. But IF THEY HAD STOOD IN MY COUNSEL, AND HAD CAUSED MY PEOPLE TO HEAR MY WORDS, THEN THEY SHOULD HAVE TURNED THEM FROM THEIR EVIL WAY, AND FROM THE EVIL OF THEIR DOINGS. Jer. 23 : 21, 22.

But though we, or AN ANGEL FROM HEAVEN, preach ANY OTHER GOSPEL unto you than that which we have preached unto you, LET HIM BE ACCURSED ! As we said before, so say I now again, if any [man or angel] preach any other Gospel unto you than ye have received, LET HIM BE ACCURSED. Gal. 1 : 8, 9.

PART SECOND.

THE GRAND ERROR.

FOR the sake of argument and for the sake of benevolence we ought, as in all controversies, so eminently in this, to ascertain the grand points in respect to which the parties are agreed. To state all these might not be useful; but some there are upon which, I suppose, our coincidence will be admitted by all. These shall be carefully recorded in the outset; and by the writer assumed as *principles of reasoning* in the subsequent pages. As Barclay can be shown to sanction several of them, Friends will probably assent to as many of these principles.

1. The scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as generally received by the protestant world, contain, in their proper and native meaning, the truth, and in respect to that meaning are evidently THE TRUTH.

2. These scriptures were given by inspiration of the Holy Ghost for the benefit of mankind.

3. Truth is a unit; that is, it is always consistent

with itself; as “no lie is of the truth:” and hence REVELATION IS ONE SYSTEM, of different but related parts in divine harmony.

4. It is impossible that the same Holy Spirit, that equally inspired Moses and the beloved John and all the intervening prophets and apostles, should ever contradict himself or reveal things contrary to his own revelation on any other theme or occasion: we hold this, distinguishing between verbal and virtual contradictions; as, for example, man is mortal—man is immortal: God can do all things—God cannot lie.

5. Whatever is proved to be contrary to scripture, is necessarily false: and consequently, whatever is proved to coincide with scripture is necessarily true.

6. Whatever duty is, according to scripture, binding on the present worshippers of God, is binding by divine authority and cannot be habitually omitted or violated without sin: though duties and sins differ illimitably in form and degree.

7. Almost every rule has its exceptions; which however do not impair (they rather confirm) the rule: as, this proposition—*it is appointed unto men once to die* may be styled *the rule of our faith* in respect to the mortality of the species; but *Enoch* and *Elijah* never did and never will die, though they are of the species and were once alive on the earth; they become *exceptions to the rule*, by which however *the rule* is confirmed rather than impaired.

8. It is monstrous and mischievous to invert the foregoing principle; that is, to make a rule of an exception, or to mistake the exception for the rule:

thus, for example ; Enoch and Elijah were men, and they never died and never will die ; therefore I and all other men will never die—we shall either be translated or exist in this world for ever !

Take another illustration. Iscariot was an apostle of Jesus Christ ; he was also “ a devil,” a sordid traitor, one of the worst of men and “ the son of perdition :” *therefore* the apostles of Jesus Christ were—but I forbear ! Iscariot was the EXCEPTION *and the only one*, to the RULE that the apostles of Jesus Christ were in holiness resembling the angels of God, in fidelity incorruptible, in goodness superlative, and in salvation for ever glorious. There are, however, some subordinate exceptions, of constancy rather than of character, in the history of the holy apostles, that do not disprove their exalted excellence in general, while they reveal notwithstanding their *imperfection* in particular instances.

9. The best thing may be abused, and abused to a dreadful and intolerable degree. Still, the thing itself remains the same ; and to disparage it, on account of its abuse by men, or to make it responsible for that abuse, or to infer the obligation of its disuse from such premises, instead of judging of the same by a correct standard *according to its proper nature*, is illegitimate in reasoning, and would in its consequences empower the wicked to destroy (by merely abusing) universal goodness ; while, at the same time, it would enervate the strength, degrade the cause, and ruin the friends, of all righteousness ; since the abuse of any thing may be ad-

mitted by a christian, and also abhorred and deplored by him, without destroying the moral relation between that thing and him ; and since also the very idea of its *abuse* presupposes its intrinsic goodness and affirms the wickedness of its abusers alone. For example : the ministry of the gospel is a divine institution, and one of incalculable excellence and usefulness ; but none perhaps beside it (unless that of marriage) has been so sacrilegiously and horribly abused in every way : is the institution *therefore* bad, as bad, and as worthy to be execrated and scouted by the whole community as are its abuses and abusers ?

10. He cannot be wrong who goes really according to the scripture.

11. The Bible is a good book.

12. It is *possible* that a knowledge and love of the contents of the Bible may induce a man to defend it with vehemence, and even to oppose men with decision for its sake ; while his feelings toward their personal interests, whom he judges to be adverse to that book of God, are not the less benevolent, *but the more so*, because of his supreme regard for truth, and for God, its Author and avenger.


13. Purity is properly before peace, and properly before unity ; while purity, unity, peace,—*just in that order of precedency*,—are all desirable.

14. Communion of feeling is founded on communion of sentiment ; so that doctrinal coincidence always induces (or tends to induce) union of affection ; doctrinal contrariety or divergency equally inspires alienation ; and no combination of senti-

ment, soul, or action, is comparatively desirable, except that which results from "the truth as it is in Jesus."

To the last two of these statements, I doubt indeed if Friends will agree. *I* however believe them. Instead of others, let us mind a standard passage in James, 3 : 17. "But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy." Mark!—the celestial wisdom is *FIRST pure*—then peaceable! If I mistake not, this is the very reverse of the wisdom of mankind. They wish us to be *first* "peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits," and other benignities, and then—*after* all these harmless qualities—then—if ever—"pure!" But purity must *precede*, or—the wisdom "descendeth not from above; but is earthly, sensual, devilish." Here is the point of divergency! The great question is, *shall PURITY or PEACE precede?* If peace had always been preferred in the church, such a thing as *persecution for righteousness' sake* had not been known. I would however wish always to retain the spirit of moderation and benevolence, even when engaged in controversy respecting fundamentals. To use the excellent words of an esteemed cotemporary; (Dr. Fitch, of Yale College;) "the heat does not enable us to see, it is the light only. Truth is learned only at the pure fountains of *evidence*. Authority does not create it; dogmatism recommends it not; neither does violence impose it: from such task-masters conscience

retreats that she may hear, in the still silence of her musings, the voice of God."

15. It is proper to use the scripture in all religious investigation, since it was given to this very end, that the man of God might be accomplished for every good work; according to that signal testimony of the apostle, which I thus alter in the translation, to make it more orderly and like the original; "All scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for instruction, for conviction, for correction, for education in righteousness; so that the man of God might be accomplished, consummately furnished for every good work." 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17.  The last six verses of the chapter ought to be read in their connection and thoroughly *digested* in their common scope, especially by Friends.

Having thus stated several *principles of reasoning*, by which to be governed in this work, I will now state some POSITIONS OF TRUTH, or *things that I believe* and *shall endeavour to prove* as we proceed. As *in the former* I have stated what I suppose will be mainly admitted on both sides, so *in the latter* will appear what I indeed believe with very high conviction; but what (or the most of which) Friends characteristically, (if not universally,) disbelieve with very great decision.

1. The scriptures are the PARAMOUNT rule of faith and practice; they were so given and designed by their divine Author; and are never duly honored when they are equalized or subordinated, to reason, conscience, feelings, private spirits, dreams,

revelations, impressions, visions, or influences of any other description.

2. The scriptures are given by *that kind* of divine inspiration (I forbear all technical names) which procures the result of written truth, without any mixture of error, in the original Hebrew and Greek : of which our translation is in the main a very excellent representation.

3. The scriptures have been providentially preserved from all substantial corruptions of the text, so that they answer the original design of their author in remaining a volume (or rather many volumes) of divine inspiration, virtually and wonderfully pure. Psalm 12 : 6, 7.

4. Divine illumination or spiritual discernment characterizes the saints in all ages, and is vital to the existence of religion ; that influence, however, of the Spirit of God, which produces and matures it, is *specifically* different (in nature and result) from that of proper inspiration.

5. In true religion, which is substantially the same in all ages, the truth of scripture, affecting the mind in the forms of preaching, reading, admonishing, meditating, or some other and yet kindred form, is the grand instrument of the Holy Ghost in all his saving operations.

6. All the moral excellence of man is the supernatural production of the Spirit of God, and is properly resolvable into "the fruit of the Spirit : " which is not indigenous to the soil, or the spontaneous growth of nature, or one of the fruits of the

flesh; and this is mainly what I mean by the epithet (not *miraculous*, but) *supernatural*.

7. Inspiration is a gift and not a grace, a gift that may more benefit others than its subject; and so is not necessary at all to be personally experienced in order to salvation; since otherwise, all that were not divinely inspired, as the apostles were, are infallibly lost; since wicked men, as Baalam, Caiphaz, and many others, were divinely inspired, but never (as we must think) regenerated; and since the inspiration of the writers of scripture, though they were "holy men of God," in no part constituted, however it might have occasionally and even eminently assisted, their personal religion.

8. We have no evidence that, since (or near) the apostolic age, there has been one proper miracle wrought, or one human being divinely inspired, or that there exists any more *the necessity* than *the reality* in our age of such wonderful endowments.

9. To pretend or affect inspiration, without possessing it, or being able to give any proof, either miraculous or rational, of its reality, is either capital impiety or terrible delusion, or probably both. It is *incalculable* misery and guilt!

10. No man evades or habitually disparages the authority of scripture, who is not to be suspected, as secretly conscious or timorous that the scripture itself is his moral enemy.

11. To disparage or corrupt the influence of scripture upon the minds of men, is enormous sin; a sin especially against the first three and indeed all the commandments of the decalogue; a sin that

awfully jeopardds the souls of those who are engaged in it, teaching or taught.

12. A man who is afraid of investigation, in respect to the principles of his faith, is most probably destitute of the Spirit of Christ.

13. A man who knows the truth and loves it, does, in every instance, desire its universal recognition and diffusion.

14. The knowledge and love of "the truth as it is in Jesus" is a proper definition of vital religion. "True religion," says President Edwards, "in a great measure consists in holy affections. A love of divine things, for the beauty and sweetness of their moral excellency, is the spring of all holy affections." Such love of things invisible, however, presupposes knowledge and discrimination; of which revealed truth is the only medium, and faith in it the indispensable way.

15. A man whose personal religion cannot stand the test of scripture, is much more evidently unable to endure the ordeal of eternal judgment—to which he goes.

16. It is the highest interest, the present and ultimate happiness, of a man to come to the knowledge and acknowledgment of the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth: and it is duty too!

17. To be prejudiced against evidence, is sin; and the strength of prejudice, however strong it may be, is sinful in proportion to its strength; and perilous to the soul in proportion to its sinfulness.

18. To oppose prejudice with truth, with scrip-

ture, with argument; to oppose whatever is adverse to these by the same means, is the office of genuine philanthropy and the signal of divine benevolence.

19. To believe a proposition only because others believe it; or because I was educated to believe it; or because it suits me; or because it *seems to me* honorable to the divine character; contains in it not a particle of religious virtue; and is a course that has led thousands of souls fatally far from God, but has probably never brought one to him.

20. Truth is no pensioner on human opinion, but is as really independent of what we think, as it is of what we wish or of what we are; while it is identified with "every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Truth is greater than any of us—considerably.

21. No man can ever savingly possess the truth, who does not appreciate it; and whose appreciation is not practical and commanding, leading him to use the necessary means, and to make the necessary sacrifices, and to show the necessary decision, for its attainment. What self-denial could be more promising or profitable?

22. THE OFFICE OF HUMAN REASON IN RELIGION IS IN SUBSERVIENCY TO SCRIPTURAL REVELATION; and is properly three-fold; this—not to anticipate its sovereign disclosures, or to imply its superfluity, or to invent its proper contents, or to dictate to it in any way; but—(1) to *examine* the evidence which is said to sustain its pretensions, as a communication from God;(2) to *ascertain* THE MEANING *of its contents*, under the gracious assistance which

it proposes to the ingenuous inquirer—which is the noble art and science and service of interpretation ; (3) WISELY TO APPLY TO ALL PRACTICAL USES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE THE KNOWLEDGE SO ACQUIRED.

23. It is the *duty* of all men to “come to the knowledge of the truth ;” and to this end to exercise the reasoning faculty honestly and in the fear of God—and love him “with all thy *mind* !” 2 Tim. 1 : 7.

24. The sin of reasoning in religion is not at all intrinsic to the exercise ; since Christ reasoned, as also did all the apostles ; but it consists in reasoning to serve some evil purpose, of pride, passion, party, or perverseness ; and “meekness of wisdom” does not imply tameness or insipidity of argument ; but only integrity of motive, candor, and love of the truth. James, 3 : 13.

25. Personalities in controversy are always improper, if not malignant ; they can scarcely proceed from a good motive or to a good end ; but, to implicate persons as the mere result of principles, however severe the implication, or however tremendous the consequence, is at once legitimate and unavoidable.

26. Whether a Friend is ever a christian, so as to be saved ; whether this is possible, probable, or common, or the reverse ; if savingly pious, how many and who are such, and in what proportion these to the comparative chaff of the society ; these questions, and all such as these, belong, I think, to the solemn arbitration of God ; they are questions which I wish not at all to decide ; and though

Friends must necessarily be affected by the principles discussed, in common with all other people, or with special emphasis and application, yet I can truly say, before the Searcher of hearts, that "my heart's desire and prayer to God for them is, that they might be saved," and that I desire benefit and not blighting to their souls as the result of this publication.

27. Irony, when founded in truth and directed to its vindication, is sometimes a lawful and perhaps a necessary weapon of religious controversy. Satire is in the same predicament. Neither however should be used with frequency or freedom. There are certain usages of sanctimonious absurdity, to which mankind become addicted as custom and tradition prescribe; which, having no foundation in truth, though most tenaciously practised as divine ordinances, can be successfully assailed, it may be, only by some of those modes of reasoning which make their folly manifest and glaring to every beholder.

28. Truth is the doctrine of facts or realities or things. As these are the great archetypes of truth in religion; as they exist separately from the testimony that describes them; so it is not even the testimony of God that makes them as they are. His testimony is the highest rational evidence of their existence; but still they exist independent of that testimony. Heaven, and hell, and the resurrection of the dead, are realities, whether known or unknown, whether believed or disbelieved, whether revealed or unrevealed. The testimony of God

concerning them, affects us, not them; makes them no more real or important intrinsically, but communicates the certain information respecting them which we infinitely need to possess. Thus also the things of Quakerism are true or false intrinsically: if true, it will not be in the power of investigation to injure them; if false, what harm is done by the investigation that discloses it? Do we *make them false*, by showing that they are so? Are we to blame for their falsity, or for showing it? Is it a privilege to be fundamentally wrong? Is it the interest of a man not to know things as they are? Is error good for him? Is it misanthropy to assist in the hopeful substitution of truth? Must Quakerism be kept and cherished and defended at all events? living, dying, and hereafter? "The day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is:" 1 Cor. 3: an agent sufficiently penetrating and impartial, truly. Nothing that is not INCOMBUSTIBLY durable, can survive that ordeal of fire; even if a true christian minister has reared it, and reared it too upon the right and only foundation. Nothing but "gold, silver, precious stones," can last and emerge unscathed. What then shall be the result with "wood, hay, stubble;" especially if it be very questionably or not at all connected with the immovable foundation? Let no man tempt the possibilities of eternal judgment! or, let hell be confounded, as well as outdone, by the desperation of traitors on the earth, for whose redemption "the only begotten Son"

laid down his own precious life! an infinite sacrifice, worse than in vain for them! Truly, they “deny the Lord that bought them; and bring upon themselves swift destruction.”

29. One cardinal doctrine of christianity may in our theological reasoning be never forgotten with impunity or safety: it is—THE SINFULNESS, THE POSITIVE ILL-DESERT AND JUDICIAL EXPOSURE OF THE WHOLE SPECIES. To deny this, is to deny the gospel, as well as the law, of God. A system devised on purpose to save sinners, to save them from sin and hell, has no mercy to offer to the innocent and the safe: and if these are all, that system is superfluous and vain. But to admit this, namely, the sinfulness of every individual as morally fallen and obnoxious, is also to admit, in honesty and consistency alike, that none of us has any thing to claim or pretend on the ground of desert, or any thing to fear but from the justice of God, or any thing to hope but from his grace, his free and rich and wonderful favor toward the guilty and the lost, through the glorious and only Mediator.

30. On the last fundamental principle rests another, or is allied to it as its proper and pervading counterpart; the importance of which is properly infinite and most demonstrably true: namely, that God, in conferring favors on the guilty, that is, where all *deserve in justice* the precise opposite of favor, may be a most sovereign and independent Potentate, and may show himself such, in realizing to whom he will, such favors, in kind and degree, in manner and in form, as to himself seems good

and proper. With this, however, we are to remember that sovereignty divine is not arbitrariness—or caprice or partiality or favoritism, or any other unprincipled or ignorant quality. God has reasons for all he does. They are infinitely the best reasons in the universe. They are infinitely benevolent and infinitely enlightened. They are measured on a scale of infinite, intending the best and the greatest good of being: and securing this end perpetually and gloriously in a manifold and perfect dispensation. He cannot be ignorant of opposing interests and opposite considerations: nor can he act against the stronger motive, or prefer in any case a less to a greater good, or a greater to a less evil. Accordingly, he does all he morally and wisely can, in the circumstances, for the salvation of every human being. But IT IS FALSE AND RUINOUS, FUNDAMENTALLY SO, to affirm that he must make no discriminations of sovereign donation and grace; that HE must do as much in every sense for one man as another; and that HE MUST NOT decide HOW MANY AND PERSONALLY WHO *shall* hear the gospel, obey it, do their duty, embrace the Savior, and be saved by grace for ever. Rom. 11: 4-7. 4: 13-16. Matt. 20: 13-16.

My *chief proposition* is that

QUAKERISM IS NOT CHRISTIANITY.

My meaning is—*not* that Quakerism is, in all its parts, separately taken, hostile to christianity; nor that it is in none identical with christianity; nor

that in all its parts it must be repudiated by christians: but only that *its distinctive characteristics, major and minor*, constitute a system, which, as such, is not christianity, is radically wrong; and consequently that it ought to be universally abjured—since it is neither the duty nor the interest of any individual to mistake the truth or not to know what it is. The views of Friends, touching the scriptures, the light within, the nature of worship, the office of reason in religion, spiritual duty and the way of performing it, are among their MAJOR characteristics; from which all the others homogeneously flow. It will be no refutation therefore to show that in minor respects Quakerism is right, or that in such I am wrong; the distinctive characteristics, that make the system, must be honestly analyzed and shown not only to be consistent with christianity, and identical with it, but THE IDENTITY ITSELF—or, nothing is shown that sustains its unequalled pretensions, or properly relieves it from the impeachment that the wisest and the best, of all ages since its rise, have never ceased to maintain against it. It has been constantly denounced by the noblest servants of God that have lived as its cotemporaries since the times of Owen and Baxter, Bates and Howe;—and it is lauded by the loose, the infidel *liberal*, the volatile, the heretical notoriously: by those who, all grouped together, constitute an anti-evangelical assemblage, whose praise is dishonor and whose censure commendation.

One specimen of what the most excellent Baxter, “the ecclesiastical Demosthenes of the seven-

teenth century," thought, may here be subjoined. At Kidderminster, a place favored and transformed through his powerful ministry, he says; "The Quakers would fain have got entertainment, and set up a meeting in the town, and frequently railed at me in the congregation; but when I had once given them leave to meet in the church for a dispute, and, before the people, had opened their deceits and shame, none would entertain them more, nor did they get one proselyte among us." I ask any *christian* who is not afraid of the truth, whether Baxter *would* have built them up on their own foundation? and whether he *could* have done it, without deserting Jesus Christ, at least for the time?

In saying that Quakerism is *not* christianity, let then the proposition be properly understood.

I mean that, while it claims identity with christianity, and while its claims are perfectly seraphic and exclusive, it is itself a delusive corruption and a hideous caricature of that divine system. *Principia non homines*—we write *impersonally* of the system. My *great reason* for this is a conviction, which I shall attempt to evidence to others, that *it is not the religion of the scriptures*; but a scheme often fundamentally opposed, in doctrine and spirit, to the genuine import of those "lively oracles." I of course identify christianity with the religion of the scriptures.

My *practical inference* is that Quakerism ought to be universally abjured and the scriptures universally received as the superlative substitute: and

this, at the hazard of all consequences ; since he who knows his duty toward God, and refuses to perform it, must, without repentance, sink into “everlasting destruction.” There can be no compromise in our known spiritual duty.

My *predominating hope* of doing good by this treatise is not necessarily that it will be extensively read by Friends ; or—consequently—that it will immediately benefit them ; but, satisfied as I am that Quakerism shall yet be dissipated by the influence of scripture, it is that others who read, may know what that system is, (which however is properly no system,) as contradistinguished from christianity ; and thus that this work may, by the blessing of God, in some measure subserve the advancement of the knowledge that shall ultimately make “the light of the moon as the light of the sun ;” and which, investing all objects with its genial flood, shall dissolve that formidable iceberg on which so many barks have foundered and so many men—I fear—perished for ever !

My *source of proof* shall be mainly the scriptures. In adducing however for refutation the cardinal and known peculiarities of Quakerism, I shall not encumber these pages with unnecessary proofs or quotations. I know the system, and have read and studied many of their standard books, particularly *Barclay's Apology*, which I have often read, and have recently and thoroughly reperused. I am of course responsible, and I hope not incorrigible, in respect to mistakes or misstatements.

Some respectable christians will doubtless cen-

sure the *radicalism*, as it may seem to them, of this way of procedure. Professing no love of innovation for its own sake, nor inclining at all to mistake it for improvement, as if the two were always identical, I confess myself unable to accede to the sentiment that Friends are to be meliorated and edified on their own foundation. I believe their system, as such, to be **FUNDAMENTALLY FALSE**: hence I **CANNOT** trifle with them or be other than **RADICALIZING** in opposition to their system. For this, on *their* account, I am cordially sorry and consciously grieved at heart; having no wish to make enemies or to hurt the feelings of a human being. Often have I tried to find some *Tarshish* conveyance, from the great **NINEVEH** of my apprehended duty: but, in that direction, I as often anticipated a storm, a shipwreck, a whale. To me indeed it seems *only wonderful* that christian men and christian ministers should ever take the ground of compromise, in relation to the system. Did they ever *intelligently* compare 1 Cor. 3 : 11, with Gal. 1 : 6-9? I ascribe their lenity mainly to ignorance and superficial judgment respecting it: while I have "counted the cost" of a more thorough position, in view of possible consequences.

Still, to the persons of Friends, I am *conscious* only of good will and tenderness. Could I not distinguish between *them* and their system, in certain modifications, I should have hope for none of them. As it is, I am quite willing to *entreat* them; to expostulate with them; and to **BESEECH THEM TO HEAR ME CANDIDLY**. If they see my faults, my

prejudices, my extravagance, my severity, let them show the magnanimity of *their* own christian condescension; and put such a construction of charitableness on the deed, as will suit their own ideas of its *indefinite* largeness. To their youth, especially their young men, I would speak with some hope of being rationally considered and generously appreciated. I have been *such an one* myself. Then I venture to counsel as I would my own soul. Experience enables me to know and to feel as they do. I sympathize with them. Still, I summon them to manliness and moral courage of investigation. Will they so *believe* the system of their sires, as if it were true only because *they* taught it to them? or as if examination would ruin it? A strange way to *believe* it! What is this but *disbelief* of its ultimate truth? Do you, I would say to them, think it a privilege to err? to be Friends, even if you are not christians? to think Quakerism and christianity identical, while fearing to consult evidence or look at the nature of the things? Then must you live and *die*—Friends, just as your fathers did: and certainly *they ought to have been right!*

I commence with an investigation of their doctrine of the INWARD LIGHT. That doctrine is that *there is in every man, by the goodness of his Creator, a certain 'inward light,' which is equally in all men of all ages and of all countries, by attention to the monitions of which men come into a state of spirituality and salvation; and "the only cause why some men are more benefited by its beams than*

others, is this—that some men pay more attention to it than others.”—Barclay.

Every sect that radically deviates from pure christianity, is characterized by some fundamental error, which is called THE GRAND ERROR of the system. Such an error do I conceive *the inward light* to be in the scheme of Quakerism. It is the centre of the system; the basis of the structure; the parent of all its obliquities. And if, after all, it should appear to be an *ignis fatuus*, a meteor of a troubled atmosphere, an airy and mischievous illusion, what is their condition, what their end, who have consigned themselves to its fatal guidance? “If the light which is in thee,” &c. I once utterly believed it true—and it was the search and the faith of the scriptures that cured me of the prejudice. My reasons are the following: the impossibility of an intelligible definition of its nature; the argument, from the admission of its truth, that the scriptures are superfluous; the fact that all the real knowledge and intelligible preaching of Friends are derived from the scriptures; the condition and practice of those nations, who, being destitute of the scriptures, but not on this theory of the inward light, have had nothing to embarrass the growth of its natural fruits; the missionary practice of apostles, in carrying the gospel to distant nations and preaching it to all the world, as if the gospel so preached, and not the universal inward light, was to be the instrument of salvation “to every one that believeth;” the character of their preaching, and also of his who commissioned and preceded them, as

wonderfully destitute of all force and propriety, in respect to the doctrine of inward light, if that doctrine be true; the fallacy of all the evidence upon which the doctrine affects to be supported by scripture; the powerful decision of many passages against it; the innumerable contradictions of that *light* as it shines from Friends; the paramount office of scripture, according to its own claims, as our rule in religion. On each of these reasons I propose to enlarge.

I. THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF AN INTELLIGIBLE DEFINITION OF ITS NATURE, if there were nothing else to impeach its credibility, would authorize a denial of its claims, would absolutely require this at our hands.

What is this inward light? is a question which we have a right to ask; and which they ought to answer, who say of its *authority* that it is paramount to the scriptures; and of its *efficacy* that by attending to its influence, we come into a state of salvation. Is it reason, or conscience, or knowledge, or holiness, or blind impulse, or spontaneous action, or monitorial suggestion, or the Spirit of God in his person or his influences? What is *the thing* which they mean, if they mean definitely any thing, when they speak of "the light within?" Let them not scorn this question. It is worthier of their consideration than their contempt. We are serious who ask it. We cannot indeed help our conviction that there is no such thing properly in existence. Friends are wont to use the pronoun and the relative, instead of the direct antecedent, when they

speak of this indefinable influence. They say, for I have often heard them, *it will teach thee, it will guide thee, it will keep thee from the enemy, and bring thee under the shadow of the Almighty.* This is all very fine; and concerning the scripture instrumentally, or the Holy Spirit personally, or religion personified, it is both intelligible and true. But here I demand a definition of "it." To *what* must I attend, *what* must I follow, by *what rule* must I go, in order to these halcyon and heavenly results? They do not mean *the scripture*, unquestionably. Do they then mean *the intellectual faculty*? This they often disclaim. "We look upon reason as fit to order and rule man in things natural—yet that not being the right organ—it cannot profit him toward salvation, but rather hindereth."—Barclay.

Is it *conscience*? As often do they deny this version of the inward light. "Our adversaries—calumniate us, as if we preached up a natural light, or the light of man's naturalconscience:—as if this which we preach up were some natural power and faculty of the soul, and that we only differ in the wording of it, and not in the thing itself—this light of which we speak is not only distinct, but of a different nature from the soul of man, and its faculties."—Barclay.

Take one specimen, however, of his own "preaching up." It evinces their common style, and either exalts conscience into "a more noble and excellent rule" than the word of God; or,—what does it mean? He says that Friends "cannot cease

to proclaim the day of the Lord that is arisen in it," (the light) in order "that others may come and feel the same in themselves, and may know that ☞ that little small thing that ☞ reproves them in their hearts, however they have despised and neglected ☞ it ☞ is nothing less than the gospel preached *in* them; *Christ, the wisdom and power of God*, being *in* and *by* that seed seeking to save their souls." What a body of divinity there must be, in "that little small thing" that lives so uncomfortably *in* us! I have transferred his words, *just as they are* in the *Apology*—except the *hands*! How much greater the day (misty as it is) that Barclay sheds on that miserable little nondescript, than any of its own! As if a man should take a blazing flambeau into a dark damp grotto under ground to see—a suffocating firefly! and as if this, when seen, should puzzle all the entomologists, in the country and out of it, to ascertain its definition, species, genus, order, class, or kingdom!

If it be admitted that they mean something, of which their rational conception is bewildered, one might be allowed to say, it seems certain that they ignorantly mean nothing but natural conscience. I have often heard their preachers, in their *inspired* communications, and others in common parlance, appeal to us, if we had never felt *THAT in us that condemns us when we trespass*, the witness that cannot be hid "in a corner," or bribed or doubted; that is "a terror to evil doers and a praise to them that do well." This is in substance one of their very common forms of popular inculcation and ap-

peal; and as it is addressed to all without discrimination, and not to saints in particular, I see not how it substantially differs from the *unmystical* appeal often heard from our pulpits; as when the preacher says; "Have you not often violated or defiled your own consciences? done what you knew was displeasing to God at the time, and so sinned directly against his majesty and goodness?" But they reclaim at the sentiment. Their meaning, they say, is far sublimer than mere conscience. And plainly their doctrine would be ridiculous, thus stated, *every man has a natural conscience*; a truism which nobody disputes. Neither is it *knowledge* that constitutes this wonderful light, unless knowledge be innate, or unless it be of some supernatural description altogether above definition. Is it *holiness*, moral excellence, conformity of heart to God? This will hardly be affirmed. When God defines the human heart for the human species, he defines it as "deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." What an omission, if there be somewhat radically excellent and allied to his own beauty in the moral countenance of man! That some of the Friends believe in a remaining particle of goodness in the human heart, I know; that many have this infidel belief, I fear; and that their very erroneous conceptions of that fundamental article, *the depraved natural character of man*, take their rise from the dogma of *inward light*, I fully believe. They often speak of *the inward seed* which God hath planted in all the hearts of his human creatures, and which strives

to take root and grow and bear fruit ; but is too much oppressed, by “ the activity of the creature ” and other causes, to come to perfection. They speak of “ the principle ; ” they say they “ believe in the principle. ” They speak of following “ the principle. ” But all this is no definition. It is not gospel, it is not sense. It is mysticism and indevotional cant ! And it is worse—to infinity, precisely, worse—because of the darkness and uncertainty it sheds upon a subject of vital import to the souls of men ! They tell us too that it is in “ the openings of the principle ” that their preachers are “ clothed ” with power to speak to the states of their auditory : i. e. the expansion of this *inward light* it is that makes the *inspiration* of their preachers. This is probable. But still the question returns ; what is “ *it* ? ” What is “ that which ” and so forth ? Is it *blind impulse*, a mere *actuating* of the mind ? This they will hardly affirm. And yet *I have seen and heard* such things in their preachers as seemed to me to imply that they felt themselves to be each a mere mouthpiece or mechanical echo to some superior mind ! They often rise as if by physical impulsions, stand through a long introductory pause, inform their hearers that they know not what they have to communicate—that they had “ premeditated ” nothing—but, that “ it was impressed with indubitable clearness in the secret of the mind that, ” &c. according to the matter “ revealed ” to them : and this, while they preach *almost the same sermon throughout* which they have delivered *frequently* before. Sometimes

the stamp of their commission is for the moment not quite so legible or certain to themselves. Then the light teaches such a style as this ; “ My mind hath been exercised—I felt a concern to address—I should feel easier to say a few words—perhaps I should reach the state of some present, if I gave utterance to what hath been communicated to my own soul.” This indeed is strange *inspiration*, and we shall not feel relieved by the adduction of a thousand similar specimens, in regard to a definition of *the true nature of the light within*. What christian does not pity an audience of many hundreds, listening to such *oracular* edification as this ! I have instanced *spontaneous motion* or *action*, meaning a kind of free-spiritedness, by which, because they “ feel easy ” to take a particular course, they infer that it is divinely sanctioned and all in the light : and also *monitorial suggestion*, because they often act, as if an aerial prompter or angelic mentor were behind them, telling them the way. This is seen in their wonderful occasional abruptness. Sometimes darting up to speak,⁴⁸ as if by electric influence ; and then darting down again, as if, almost in the middle of their subject, the inspiring influence was withdrawn or an inspired *veto* administered. If this be a ridiculous picture, I am sure it is a true one ! Friends also know it, especially the more intelligent. The quality of *ridiculous* is not in the painter ; nor would it be in the portrait, but for the features of the original ; which are not exceeded in the delineation. It is a picture over which I could weep and groan ! What will

eternity reveal as the consequence of all this degradation of the worship of God? Can the God of the New Testament approve of such soft and silly management?

But do they refer to *the Spirit of God*, in his person or his influence, these powers and properties of *the light within*? I am aware that sometimes in theory, and perhaps in practice, they do; nay, that this is their grand pretension. But, allowing for a moment that the *light itself* depends for its existence on the Spirit of God, still, this does not answer the question, *what is its nature*? The Spirit may affect any one of the mental faculties, may approach and influence the mind in a variety of forms and degrees, and through different mediums; but what is that influence *in every man and in every age and country* that constitutes their idea of *inward light*? I believe it is properly indefinable—because it is a sheer nonentity, a mental creation, a dream of an undisciplined mind that runs before evidence, or rather without and against it—a mind that makes the objects that it sees, and very sincerely (this is not ironical, for sincerity is not synonymous with correctness) mistakes its own imaginings for the suggestions of “the eternal Spirit!” But is it not awful! Must the divine Author of the Bible be made responsible for the lawless visions of men? and these visions of extravagance be held co-ordinate with the written “oracles of God;” nay, *paramount* to them? But, aside from the manifest impiety of this, (which is perhaps one of the worst things in Quakerism and one of the most danger-

ous corruptions in christendom,) what is its *moral* influence on the abettors of the scheme? Does it make them *christians*? does it sanctify them acceptable to God through Jesus Christ our Lord? If salvation be possible in consistency with such error, which plainly challenges a doubt, it is not by the error, but in spite of it, that the mercy of God "rejoiceth against judgment." Error is poison; the poison of the soul: and though we might possibly receive a given quantity of poison, mingled with our food, and eat it without death, yet no one is to be commended for such an act, especially if, by repetition, it becomes a habit; while the example may influence others whose judgment of the safe proportion may not be advised, and whose exit by the indulgence may be inevitable.

The assumed connection between *inward light* and the influence of the Holy Spirit, (of whose person and *name* we know nothing that the scriptures have not taught us,) is of prime importance in this controversy; and worthy, if possible, to be rationally resolved. By *the Spirit* they intend that same divine Agent by whom the scriptures were inspired. But if He is not the author of *their inward light* or at all chargeable with their *inspired* communications, if the proper characteristics of Quakerism arise from some other source, how unspeakably important that this should be known by all! *It is my full and deep conviction that THE AUTHOR OF THE SCRIPTURES IS NOT THE AUTHOR OF QUAKERISM*: that they are two and distinct and opposite spirits! and that Quakerism hath origi-

nated from neglect or violation of this *scriptural* commandment, in common with innumerable others, of the Holy Ghost; "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because **MANY FALSE PROPHETS** are gone out into the world. Hereby **KNOW YE** [ASCERTAIN YE—*imperatively*] **THE SPIRIT OF GOD**: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God. And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of anti-christ, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." 1 John, 4 : 1-3.

On this important passage, of the known and genuine words of the Holy Ghost, permit a few reflections. It is given as a criterion of discrimination between the Spirit of Christ and the spirit of anti-christ. The words *that confesseth* do not mean *that admits with reluctance or constraint*; as if tortured to the admission; but that boldly and *in a way that* CHARACTERIZES, asserts the important fact, without disparaging its amazing value or corrupting its sublime intention. It refers to the *profession* of cardinal doctrine. This might easily be demonstrated—and shall be, when the comment is respectably denied. The *object* of this confession, the proposition that *Jesus Christ is come* [*has come*] *in the flesh*, means (as can be rigidly shown, when necessary) **THAT JESUS, THE MESSIAH, HAS OUTWARDLY COME IN HUMAN NATURE; plainly according to the historical testimony of the four evangelists: verses 9 and 10.** From these I infer that *whatever*

spirit is not CHARACTERIZED *in his influences, by professing and magnifying that grand proposition, is a limb of anti-christ.* Now let us “try” Quakerism by this inspired criterion. It is *the spirit of Quakerism to confess that Jesus Christ from the beginning of the world, comes INWARDLY, SPIRITUALLY, IMPALPABLY, in the hearts of all men, as a “little small thing.”* How is this *coming in the flesh*, according to *the sense of scriptural phraseology*? He “came into the world to save sinners;” and this “is a faithful saying and *worthy of ALL acceptation.*” He “came to seek and to save that which was lost:—not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and *to give his life A RANSOM for many*: Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree; *When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.*” *This is THE WAY in which “Jesus Christ came in the flesh;”* and the CONFESSION of that fundamental fact is made (by the criterion) the signal of the Spirit of Christ, and its non-confession the index of anti-christ. But the confession is too OUTWARD for Friends.

In regard to the expression *in the flesh*, it may be remarked that the word *flesh*, in the style of scripture, is (not *mystically* though) often *figuratively* used: that it means either (1) *flesh literally*; or, (2) *flesh morally*, as the moral character of man; or, (3) *flesh*, referring to the species or human nature or mankind; that in this last sense is

the expression to be understood when it is said *Jesus Christ has come in the flesh*; that is, *in human nature*. Compare Rom. 8: 3. 9: 5. 1 Tim. 3: 16. 1 Pet. 3: 18. 4: 1. 1 John, 4: 2, 3. 2 John, 7. John, 1: 14. There are doubtless other senses; but these are the main ones; with which however should be mentioned another, namely, (4) *the state of human life temporal, as distinguished from that beyond the grave*: as Paul says, Phil. 1: 24, “to abide *in the flesh* is more needful for you.” I have heard one silly version of the proposition which is proposed as the criterion; it was given to me very confidently by a preacher of Friends. “*In the flesh*,” said he; “*Christ has come in the flesh*: that is *the inward light*, because it is in our flesh, it is inside of us. He is anti-christ that denies it!” Though the sage seems to think himself withal one of the wonders of the age, and though in divers *singular* respects he is truly a wonderful character and as certainly *inspired* as any other of his fraternity, yet is he one of those whose letters I never answer and whose positions I have ceased to deny. *Tale portentum refutatione indignum est*, as Calvin says of universalism:—a monstrosity of this sort is unworthy of serious refutation. He is too impervious to common sense and scripture, to be worthy of sober argument. “For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an anti-christ.” 2 John, 7.

Now take a few specimens (thousands might be given) of the CONFESSIO of Friends. “*Christ is*

in all men as in a *seed*, yea, and he never is nor can be separate from that *holy pure seed* and *light* which is in *all men*. In this respect then, as he is *in the seed* which is in *all men*, we have said *Christ is in all men*, and have preached and directed all men to *Christ in them*, who lies crucified in them by their sins and iniquities, that they may *look upon him whom they have pierced*, and repent: whereby he that now lies as it were slain and buried *in them*, may come to be raised, and have dominion in their hearts over all.”—Barclay.

This mysticism and heresy is a true, but a *very moderate* specimen of their general *confession*. As a fact I can attest its truth that they do thus *say* and *preach* and *direct men*. IT IS THEIR GRAND AND THEIR VERY DISTINGUISHING CONFESSION. It is the great metropolis of the *foxian* empire: and its native influence and actual result are utterly to disparage and obscure the real advent, the real crucifixion, the real atonement, of the Son of God! It is the hostile opposite of the criterion proposition, JESUS CHRIST HAS COME IN HUMAN NATURE! Speaking of the Jews, the apostle puts it as the climax of their dignities that “of them, as concerning the flesh, CHRIST CAME, who is over all, God blessed for ever.” Here he teaches that Christ is both God and man in one person; that in his human nature he is descended of Jewish parents; that in his superior nature he is the supreme God: and that he thus “came” into the world. This splendid fact is worthy to be made the CONFESSION of the church of Christ.

I now appeal to the conscience of the reader ; and to his intelligence, if he have habitually and candidly perused the scriptures ; *whether the spirit of Quakerism be not the spirit of anti-christ ?* I do not here accuse them, of what they disclaim. They believe *the historical fact* of the mission of Christ to our world. They admit “his miraculous conception, birth, life, miracles, death, resurrection and ascension,”⁴⁹ as matters of fact. But this is not the question. Does this *outward* matter CHARACTERIZE them ? Is it their CONFESSION ? “We require no formal subscription *to any articles*, either as a condition of membership or a qualification for the service of the church.”⁴⁹ How then do they “try the spirits ?” By the anti-christian dogma that—“Every man coming into the world, is endued with a measure of the light, grace or good Spirit of Christ.”⁴⁹ This is their confession !—a thing, especially in reference to a universal and equal and native participation of the Spirit of Christ, which I intend to disprove in the course of these pages. Barclay admits the fact of the personal advent, here and there, and states it passingly, in his big volume ; but no more. I infer that their spirit is not of God.

Thus, though I cannot define the nature of what they mean by *the inward light*, I have traced it to its source ; or at least evinced that it is very different from the influence of the Spirit of God, according to an inspired criterion. The counterfeits of a perishable currency we are all wise to detect : but the infinitely more deleterious counterfeits of

christianity, we are strangely slow to discriminate. If men valued their souls as much as their property, they would wisely resist the imposing fabrics of the enemy. This, bible christians are taught to do by the *outward* light of scripture, in the commencement of their religious course; "lest Satan should get an advantage of us; for we are not ignorant of his devices." How necessary this to the safety of the soul! "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but *inwardly* they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits." But THE CRITERION-FRUIT, the PRIMARY index of their genuineness or corruption—REMEMBER—is their "confession," their doctrine, the moral scope of their influence, as tested by "the oracles of God;" and not their "sheep's clothing," their arts of ingratiating, their placid and benign appearance, their sublime professions, their overflowing love for every body, their regular irreproachable morality, or any of their personal or active characteristics; (in which things many of the ancient pharisees surpassed them;) while their CONFESION is vitiated, defective, or heretical.

No man who has a just conception of the death of Christ as an "offering for sin," through whose atonement and mediation alone as a Savior by his cross, one human being ever was or will be saved, can think it other than congruous that the CONFESION of his advent in the flesh, as a *historical* (as it was before a *prophetical*) fact, should be divinely

made a criterion of discrimination between Christ and antichrist; or that Quakerism should be condemned by that plain test, since its confession is so very dissimilar and mystically different, from the facts of his mission and passion as detailed by the Evangelists.

Before I leave this question of *the nature* of the light, it may be proper to suggest a suspicion long entertained and (I believe) valid, that there is some, perhaps much, of pure *materializing* in their view of it. An *inserted flame* that tends to kindle into glow and splendor, but is well nigh suffocated with humid air and adverse influences; a *seed* that strives to grow, but cannot; an embryo Savior within struggling to be delivered, and a people sitting still in silence to suffer the physiological operation! These are their ordinary figures of illustration! But—consider, is it not a *mechanical* representation? What has it to do with our *own moral agency*, which scripture *every where* describes as the mediate arbiter of character and destiny? It is *not* spirituality at all! It is blindness, grossness, materialism, presuming folly, and essential falsehood.

II. *The argument, from the admission of the truth of this UNIVERSAL LIGHT WITHIN, that the scriptures are superfluous*, is, I think, rational and sound. Why should we prefer the difficult to the easy, the obsolete to the recent, the less to the greater, the distant to the near? What use of the *inferior* when we have the *paramount*? The *consistency* of some Friends on this article, makes them at once malignant fanatics and delirious infidels!

The policy of the powers of darkness is one of great moral unity. Unconverted men, who "hate the light that has come into the world," are all united in the end, however they differ in the means, to get rid of it. They all however require some specious substitute for "THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, WHICH ARE ABLE TO MAKE US WISE UNTO SALVATION, THROUGH FAITH WHICH IS IN CHRIST JESUS." It is also necessary that this substitute should somehow be made to appear *intrinsically and relatively* superior to "the oracles of God;" that so they may support the character of candid and philosophic men, who prefer only what is "more excellent," and prefer it rigidly on that account. Thus the papist, the socinian, the deist, the philosopher of scepticism, the mere man of the world, the Friend, and all other impugners of the paramount authority of scripture, have each a favorite mode of avoiding and disparaging the volume of God. But it is manifest that their common aim is one. Their common cause is one, their common character; and with some possible exceptions and probable differences in degree, one shall be their common doom. Their security is presumption—at least it is a far different thing from their safety. "For when they shall *say* 'peace and safety;' then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape." Their *sincerity* will not save them.

The papist has *the tradition of the church*, and *the infallibility of "the man of sin,"* for his supposed vindication; while his Bible moulders un-

read, covered with dust, enshrouded in the web of the spider, and hid in some unfrequented nook of his cloister. His responsibility is all devolved upon a mere abstraction—the church. *So say the church, and I must believe it*, is the summary of his creed. What a conveniency! almost as good as “a measure” of inward light. But who is *the church*? Of this community each one is a constituent member; but, in his creed, each depends upon all the others; all manage to alienate their individual responsibility; the whole of them elude its pressure; the Pope himself believes as the *church* does; the voice of the Bible is drowned in the din; and iniquitous superstition, bigotted, bloody, persecuting, blind, and *infallible* as Quaker inspiration, performs its pagan orgies of execrable devotion—besides maintaining the lateran council, commissioning the Jesuits, canonizing sinners, vending indulgences, managing the fires of purgatory, comforting the Inquisition, and wielding the *Propaganda*.

The *socinian* admits the general truth of christianity: but makes *his own reason*, i. e. his selfishness, so to *interpret* the meaning of its documents, that he learnedly ascertains from them all his peculiar views. Reason is his substitute;—a goddess well bred and vastly genteel, but often as fanatical as the priestess on the tripod; as perfidious, not to say as profligate, as the deity of revolutionary France. To Reason he can latently prescribe what she must sanction; and thus he manages to anticipate what scripture must reveal. There are no

mysteries in his creed:—except that *he* should need any revealed help from heaven, seeing he can teach and reform it when it comes! With him Jesus Christ is only a creature; his death a mere sentimental display of suffering virtue, or conscious truth, or sublime martyrdom; and at all events no atonement for our sins: Satan is a mere personification of evil; and hell a nonentity. With him experimental religion is not revealed in the Bible; eternal punishment is a pure impossibility, which *no evidence* can prove; regeneration is an absurdity; serious religion the effect of ignorance; and the Holy Ghost himself no person, no being; but a mere attribute, energy, relation, quality, virtue, influence. Thus he evades the whole power of the gospel, and is—a gentleman.

The *deist* comes to the same result by extravagantly magnifying *the light of nature*. So great is this light, that the Bible is unnecessary. He can demonstrate that God is not prodigal of his gifts; and when “the heavens declare his glory and the firmament showeth his handy work,” as there is no necessity, so neither is there any reality in a revelation of another sort. And we must admit, he says, his conclusions, if we grant his premises: for God is a wise economist, as well as a most munificent king; and what is altogether unnecessary, he will assuredly not communicate: and of *what is necessary*, the deist is a competent judge.

Safe in the hands of one disposing power,
Or in the natal or the mortal hour.

The *sceptical philosopher* is the disciple of the lights of science. He is above the need of celestial guidance. The Bible will do for the herd, but he is elevated above the necessity of such antiquated rules. He is as well assured as if his geography had mapped the interior of the eternal world. He understands the wonderful facts of natural, and the sublime discoveries of contemplative and experimental science: He has learned to doubt where others are sufficiently gross to believe; having ascertained that the philosophy of the Bible is radically wrong. It may be a good book to awe the world and aid the magistracy. But if all men were as enlightened by philosophy as *some* are, the Bible would be utterly exploded. In the times of Robert Boyle and Sir Isaac Newton, philosophers were not "renewed up" to these heliocentric discoveries.

The mere man of the world finds *pleasure*, and wants no more. This divinity is with him a succedaneum for God and goodness. The Bible is good for the squalid and the unfortunate;

As beads and prayer-books are the toys of age;

But if all could be as happy without it, as he is, its room would be better than its company. What a pity that such voluptuaries should ever get sick and die; and *possibly* come to judgment in a future state! But every now and then it *happens* that one drops off.

The *Friend* gets rid of the Bible as effectually

as any one of the foregoing, and much more speciously. And why not, since he has something better *within*? why not, when the *inward light* is paramount? They have the spirit, that teaches them to disparage the words of the Spirit! They drink at the fountain, and what need of the streams? They walk by the Lawgiver, and not by the law! Their preachers are just as really inspired as was Paul; and why go to his antiquated writings, when they have fresh inspirations at hand? Beside, Friends doubt sometimes whether Paul was inspired in all that he wrote. There are some things in his epistles that look rather carnal; as if he was not then “delivered from the letter,” or as if he had strayed away from his guide; as they often do!

That Friends do, ALL OF THEM, in London, New-York, and Philadelphia, and of all ages since their rise, unite in denying *the PARAMOUNT authority of scripture*, is infallibly a fact. That they do this with much subtlety of argumentation, I believe;—as I also believe that their argumentation is in its process pure sophistry, and in its result pure heresy.

Their grand sophism may be detected by distinguishing *the personal dignity of the Spirit*, compared with all his *influences*. It is a more general truth that the Agent is greater than the action. The Holy Ghost is greater than the scriptures, and greater than a miracle, and greater than creation. He is greater than any or all of his influences, miraculous or ordinary. Why are Friends so elaborate, with Fox and Barclay at their head, to prove what no christian ever denied? The Holy

Ghost is God, and God is greater than all his works. The inspiration of the scriptures, for the use of men, proceeded from the Holy Ghost. Now, what is the position of a consistent protestant here? It is this—*the Bible is a code of laws which I am obligated, in reverence for its DIVINE Author, heartily to obey as my PARAMOUNT rule of faith and action.* What the position of a Friend? *As the Spirit that inspired the Bible is greater than the Bible, I am determined by the light within to walk by the greater and not by the less.* That is—the Friend makes a rule of the Ruler, a law of the Lawgiver; and a practical nonentity of the volume legislated by rightful authority on purpose to regulate all his actions! This I call **THEIR GRAND ERROR**—the monstrous and mortal sophism of the Quakers. Hear their champion. Though the scriptures are all true, “nevertheless, because they are only a declaration of the *fountain*, and not the *fountain* itself, therefore they are not to be esteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the *adequate primary rule of faith and manners.*—Therefore also the Spirit is more originally and principally the rule, according to that received maxim in the schools, *Propter quod unumquodque est tale, illud ipsum est magis tale.* Englished thus: *That for which a thing is such, that thing itself is more such.*”

Let us see how this reasoning, applied to the legislature of the nation, would evince the superior patriotism of its disciples. Ordinary people think it right to honor “the powers that be” in a way of

peaceably obeying the laws. But suppose a political sect should arise to reform us all in that gross conception; and should assume to know a better way, a far more excellent style of patriotism. We listen to their wisdom; and this is its sum: "These laws, fellow citizens, can never make you patriots. They are all indeed very good, and ye are in the habit—we hear—of having every family in the country provided with a copy of them. For this you have large societies and levy a fearful tax upon the coffers of the poor. We are afraid that ye are all trusting to the dead letter of ordinances; and much concerned that ye should be brought off from these outward things to hunt for patriotism in the secret of your own hearts. There after all is the place for it. Types and paper and law phrases never yet made a patriot. It is all *within* that the true virtue is to be found. Beside, if ye would be wise, remember that this dotage of yours, in obeying the laws of your country, is a great affront to the legislature. Are the laws greater than the law-makers? Is it not plain that if you respect them for the sake of these, these are themselves worthy of much more respect! *That on account of which any thing is such, the thing itself is more such.* If therefore you respect the laws, for the sake of the legislature, how plain is it that you are continually offending the legislature by such astonishing reverence for the laws! But we have risen above all these vulgar influences. Our minds are all full of the light of patriotism, and so we can do just as we please. But because our patriotism is all one

with that of the legislature itself, it is quite a thing impossible that we should ever transgress the provisions of the statute-book.⁵⁰ We do not however submit our doctrines or our actions to be judged by that material volume; especially, because who are the judges? none but our doating countrymen! But they are not proper judges; and never can be, till their minds become enlightened with our doctrine; and then they will think just as we do. Beside, the statute-book is a very mysterious composition. There is no possibility of knowing what it means, without our superhuman illumination, even if one sincerely desired nothing so much. The legislature contrived it on purpose that it might not be understood by common patriots. But as soon as you become sublimed by our instructions, fellow citizens, (for whom our bowels yearn with tenderness and universal love—just like that in the legislature,) by simply “attending to” the light of patriotism in the secret of every heart, (as it is there made plain to the suckling and the fool,) you will come to know all the mysteries of political science, state polity, legislation, jurisprudence, and law practice; yea, you can teach others also, and that without all learning and skill in the statute-book. You will come to discern the vanity of all legal forms and phrases, which the statute-book doth indeed appear to you to require, but which we see clearly to be cumbrous, *expensive*, and non-essential. Then indeed you will not be fleeced by the lawyers, and doctors, and judges. You will utterly retrench all these ‘hireling’ orders. You will see the non-neces-

sity of all such learned officers, and a thousand others, which our countrymen have continued to revere only because they have never known the liberty of true patriotism; in which *women* are as wise as men in the anointing, and just as capable of lecturing on patriotism and instructing large congregations—while others are misled to believe in the paramount authority of the statute-book.” In such a case of political radicalism as this, every real patriot would know how to dispose of it. He would see the hypocrisy of the argument, even if he believed the sincerity of its venders. The maintenance of the civil state would be impossible upon their reforming principles. He would view their doctrine as an abscess forming near the heart of the body politic; and though the million might be taken with it, though they might praise the goodness and fair appearance of its apostles, masculine and feminine, and even mistake them for “angels of light,” the men whom thought distinguishes, and evidence affects, and principle controls, would think it patriotism to expose the fallacy of their scheme, and denounce the innovation as ruinous to the commonwealth. And what is time to—eternity?

In particular, it is manifest that the poor statute-book would soon become the victim of their ascendant argument. They would think it, to say the least, superfluous. A quotation from its pages, in opposition to their views, would be like a straw on the case of the crocodile. They would ride in their imaginations, *especially if they were sincere*, over the heads of the disparaged community. Fanati-

cism, sublimed and ethereous, would make a football of civic virtue !

Such is the practical tendency and the actual result of the light within. The Quakers treat the Bible as at best a very subordinate help. Many of them openly defame it. One very celebrated preacher has publicly and often said that mankind had been better without the Bible. And why is he not correct, if all men have a portion of the Spirit within them SUPERIOR to it, by simply attending to whose monitions they practice righteousness and attain salvation ? I am aware of the double (not hidden) character in which I appear before the christian public : a witness as well as a disputant. But how could I be a mere disputant ; since it was *what I had witnessed*, and what I renounced, on my knees with the Bible open, as an act of worship to “the only wise God,” and what I have with much anguish and many tears experienced as the consequence of my education and relationships, that brought me thus publicly to dispute at all ? As a witness, aware of my accountability to the Searcher of hearts, “whose eyes are upon the truth,” I shall at least make no *intentional* misrepresentation. No oath could add to the solemnity which invests the obligation of veracity in my convictions. But if it might, “I call God for a record upon my soul” that I will not intentionally misstate any thing. I however state that I have witnessed from their preachers and their people, times without number, sentiments, inuendos, implications, and significant actions, the whole scope of which was directly to

degrade the Bible ; and it is my full conviction that this is the very genius of their scheme, its native and *necessary* tendency.

There is an argument of Barclay, which I will now consider. As its topic is fundamental, so its speciousness is seraphic. It is in substance this:—*time was when to be led by the Spirit of God was thought to define the children of God ; but in our age the same characteristic becomes a reproach, and even an impeachment of christian piety.* As he uses scripture to sustain his position, he always *assumes* the very point to be proved. No christian will deny that *to be led by the Spirit of God is essentially indicative of a true christian.* Here then we are agreed. 'The only question respects *the manner in which they are led!* Of this Barclay makes no question at all ; but just *assumes*, as suits him, that it is in the very way alone of Friends !

He refers here to that memorable saying of Paul, Rom. 8 : 14. " For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." His reasoning in the connexion is very convincing, to those that follow the *inward light*, and who count it worldly logic to " prove all things and hold fast that which is good." But we will hear Barclay.

" Of old none were ever judged christians, but such *as had the Spirit of Christ*, Rom. 8 : 9. But now many do boldly call themselves *Christians*, who make no difficulty of confessing they are without it, and laugh at such as say they have it. Of old they were accounted *the sons of God, who were led by the Spirit of God.* But how many aver

themselves sons of God, who know nothing of this leader; and he that affirms himself so led, is, by the pretended orthodox of this age, presently proclaimed an heretic. The reason hereof is very manifest, *viz.* Because many in these days, under the name of *christians*, do experimentally find, that they are not actuated nor led by God's Spirit; yea, many great *doctors, divines, teachers* and *bishops* of christianity, (commonly so called,) have wholly shut their ears from hearing, and their eyes from seeing, this *inward guide*, and so are become strangers unto it; whence they are, by their own experience, brought to this strait, either to confess that they are as yet ignorant of God, and have only the shadow of *knowledge*, and not the true *knowledge* of him, or that this knowledge is acquired without immediate revelation." And this is indispensable to—piety! What *inspired* extravagance! A Friend may speak and write what he pleases. The above is a specimen of Barclay's inspiration and of his *charitableness*! If his reasoning be correct, then I see not that one soul of us can be saved that deliberately differs with him in the matter of the *inward light*! We are not christians, it seems; we are "*pretended*" orthodox, ignorant of God, not sons of God, but graceless persons, whether doctors, bishops or what not! Let no man say that I lay too much stress on this controversy. A christian may well aver that a more ruinous heresy to the souls of men could scarcely be invented, by the great sire of heresy, than Quakerism! The difference between it and christianity is so great, so

glaring, and yet so relatively *concealed*, that we must take the stand of martyrs, denouncing and abhorring it, and that practically reckless of good or evil report as the result. Those who see the difference are specially bound to be bold in confessing it; for the million see nothing but “an angel of light.”

I make a corollary here of moment—Friends mistake the nature and design of all inspiration; especially in viewing it as having for its direct object *to inspire our actions!* Now, we know that the actions of the apostles were, many of them, as men, defective, fallible, wrong;—of course, not inspired. They were to be honored as inspired only when orally or scripturally they propounded the truth for our knowledge and government. Inspired actions make—*inspired irresponsibleness*, which is the character of Quaker inspiration. Hence, a preaching Friend is always right; walks in innocency and truth alone; has nothing to confess—except that God led and inspired all his actions; and thus morally identifies his agency with the divine agency, and finds marvellous peace in confessing no sin, having no gratuitous justification, knowing nothing of the way of salvation through the death of Christ, and preaching, “another gospel,” totally and terribly *another*, all by inspiration!

Barclay in order to avail his argument, ought to have shown that there was only one conceivable way of being led by the Spirit, and that *it* was the identical way of Friends! he ought to have shown

that the Spirit does not lead "the sons of God" *by means of his own word*; or, that those who follow him in his recorded truth, are recreant to his authority, and do not follow him at all! he ought to have shown that Luther, and the noble colleagues of the Reformation, were not "sons of God," because they were led by the Spirit *only through the word of God*; and that they had the darkness to follow Christ in the matter of styling the scriptures "the word of God." He ought to have shown that the scriptures tell men to go away from their pages to find their author; and that it is not *through the instrumentality of truth revealed in scripture* that the Holy Spirit illumines, sanctifies, consoles, and perfects, the elect of God. Jesus Christ not only resolved the unbelief of the Jews into their prior disbelief of the scriptures; but he denounces them as hypocrites, because they lightly esteemed or disbelieved "the word of God." Compare John, 5 : 46, 47, with 8 : 47. "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words? He that is of God, heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." Beside, the promise of salvation is made to him *that believeth the gospel*; while christians are said to be "born of the word" and "begotten of his own will with the word of truth." To this we may subjoin, "for as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."

I here ask the reader to pause and consider the execrableness of the grand position of Friends,

who profess to walk *by the Holy Ghost!* by HIM as A RULE; *by him IMMEDIATELY, and not by his written instructions!* *by him, as "a more noble" and principal RULE in religion!* What is this but the darkness and impiety of *making God himself a rule of action, and that for all men; their superlative rule, by which it is in the highest degree SPIRITUAL to walk in all things!* They walk *by the greater* indeed! I have no words in which to express my horror at the sin and folly of the sentiment! Satan has discovered "a more excellent way," in these latter ages, of "sitting in the temple of God and showing himself that he is God," since Luther identified him in the pontificate and unmasked him to the world! His malignant majesty has always manifested a characteristic superiority to the word of God, since first he disparaged it to the mother of mankind, and "*deceived*" her with the incantation of his argument. He exhibited the same cast of character on the throne of the papacy: and now among fanatical protestants of all sorts, Quakers, Shakers, Mormonites, and what not, who desert "the law and the testimony" because "there is *no light* in them," he affects a gifted *internal* autopsy in religion, which, being superior to the Bible, renders it superfluous. This is one of his rare "devices!" To get rid of the law, he pretends to walk by the lawgiver! To supersede the word of God, he makes *God himself a rule of action!* This truly is (we hope) one of his last and rarest inventions:—it may also *safely* be pronounced one of his worst! He knows its

million-catching speciousness, and has proved its value in his modern policy. He will retain it as long as he can! It is however nothing but his most holy-looking device to prop a falling cause, and elude his tremendous enemy, *the word of God*. "Get thee hence, Satan; FOR IT IS WRITTEN, IT IS WRITTEN, IT IS WRITTEN," (thrice, said Jesus,) "thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and him only shalt thou serve!—thou shalt not tempt the Lord, thy God!—man shall not live by bread alone, but *by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God!*" This is the noblest life and the noblest food!

It is the unique and pervading and master policy of hell, and has been from the beginning, to put an extinguisher on the light of revelation; to vacate the holy scripture; to neutralise the word of God. To accomplish this is the central object; no matter by what means, if they will only reach it. The means are variable; the generalship astonishing; the resources and expedients endless. Supersede the voice of the authentic "oracles of God," and Satan can reign in state and safety. The atmosphere of night favors his domain. The most specious means are often the most apposite and the least suspected. Those which throw a verbal compliment on the Bible, and seem to reverence in order the more certainly to destroy its authority, are quite eligible. And what delusion equal to the spell of Quakerism to effectuate this end? "And Joab said to Amasa, Art thou in health, my brother? And Joab took Amasa by the

beard with the right hand to kiss him. But Amasa took no heed to the sword that was in Joab's hand : so he smote him therewith in the fifth rib, and shed out his bowels to the ground, and struck him not again ; and he died." A left-handed trick ! Many such sinister friendships have the foes of truth evinced for it. So dies the Bible with the kisses of Friends. In this country they are at this day mainly—I fear—a community of infidels—only they would have us think that they love christianity.

The only way in which Friends can elude, with *any* show of consistency, the force of this inference—that *their superior law is the lawgiver himself*, is to deny at once honestly that they are trinitarians, and to deny consequently that the "Spirit is God." Otherwise—God is their paramount rule of action ! There is no *possible* escape. I consider this dilemma as fair and as conclusive as that to which Jesus Christ reduced the Sadducees, when *they* meanly said, "We cannot tell ;" evading the premises because they dreaded the conclusion. It is this : either the Spirit, in their creed, is not God, is a mere impersonal influence or quality—and then they deny the trinity, deny their own admissions and averments, deny their 'orthodox' pretensions, deny every thing but Sabellian or Socinian heresy : or, their cardinal principle is one with the impious absurdity of making God himself a rule of action, "the saints' rule," the highest rule, and so forth ! and hence, the *only* way that even they can invent, to detrude the scriptures from their divine supremacy or to show a superior rule, is to make

their eternal Author—a rule! Let any man of sense and principle, who prefers not to swing, *gored* through life, and “his offspring with him,” on either horn of this bellowing monster, deny *him*, and take the word of God as his highest rule in religion, in this world and in that which is to come! The absurdity of the soul of the system, the putrid quality of its very heart, is such—but I leave the reader, who can, to think that it is not among impious absurdities and destructive errors the most confounding and confounded!

Monstrum horrendum! informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.
VIRG.

A monster tremendous—misshapen—forlorn—
Whose fiction of *light* is the challenge of scorn!

III. *The fact that all the real knowledge and intelligible preaching of Friends are derived from the scriptures*, demonstrates the non-entity of their inward light.

The thirty-nine books of the Old Testament had all been extant for nearly five, and some of them for nearly fifteen centuries, before the apostolic age. They had been translated into the Greek language for three centuries. Christ and his apostles often quoted them, and always in a style of commendation. “The scripture cannot be broken,” said Christ. He also said, “think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one

tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The evangelists and apostles followed the example of Christ. They ever revered and confirmed the writings of their inspired predecessors. They reasoned from the sayings of scripture as philosophers reason from facts, and mathematicians from axioms or propositions already demonstrated. "What saith the scripture? the scripture saith; for it is written; as saith the prophet;" were their accustomed forms of reference, quotation, and proof. This is manly and even sublime. It shows that all the long succession of inspired men, from Enoch to the apocalyptic angel, who said to John, "I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets," all the series of so many centuries and millenaries of time, were raised up, commissioned, and inspired, by the eternal and immutable God. It shows that they had a common cause with each other and with God; it shows "the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace."

But beside this common agreement in doctrine and subserviency in object, these two characteristic qualities of genuine inspiration are manifest in each individual writer; (1) *Each writer is perfectly INDEPENDENT of the others.* Being equally inspired, he could deliver his message for the substance of it, if none other had preceded, if none other had existed. He quotes the others indeed, and so evinces their common unity; for the cause requires it. But this he does comparatively seldom, and then obviously more for others than himself. His own resources in God are just as ample, compared

with his official exigences, as were those of the first writer. No man can think concerning one of the writers of the New Testament that *all his real knowledge and intelligible doctrine are servilely owing to his acquaintance with the writers of the Old Testament*. If this were the case, his assumed *inspiration* would be suspected or incredible. The other characteristic is (2) That *in the writers of the New Testament there is A PLAIN MORAL EQUALITY IN STYLE AND EFFICACY—to say the least of them—in those passages which are not quoted, and which are largely more abundant, compared with those which are quoted from the prophets of a preceding dispensation*. All proof of this is deemed superfluous; otherwise we could refer to the whole of the New Testament.

If this be true of the New Testament writers, why may we not expect the same in their inspired successors and equals of the Society of Friends? Proper inspiration undoubtedly equalizes for the time all its genuine subjects. Where all is truth that is spoken or written, we cannot say that what one uttered is *more true* than what another uttered by the same authority. Consequently the oracles of the Quakers are the oracles of God—or, those of the apostles are not—or, the inspiration of the Quakers is a miserable delusion.

But is it a delusion? If it have the two characteristics above considered, we should be slow to conclude against its claims. Has it then those characteristics? Is each inspired preacher, *independent*, in the sense explained, of his inspired

predecessors of the Bible? And is there EQUAL *excellence of style and strength* in what they speak at large, in distinction from what they quote from the scriptures? Would their sermons make another Bible, if they were only collected and printed and bound in one book, beginning with Fox and proceeding onward to living prophets and prophetesses? Why not? Is not God as able to inspire ignorant persons now as he was aforesaid? What a loss to mankind, that so much inspiration is not rescued from oblivion by the labors of stenography and stereotyped for the benefit of all coming ages! O Mill, Kennicott, and De Rossi, what a loss!

We must press the question. Are Friends indebted to inspiration or to the scriptures for *all* they know or intelligibly preach in religion? Would the inward light have told them of the person, mission, name, and glory, of Jesus Christ, or of a thousand other topics of truth, if the light of scripture had never directly or *indirectly* shone upon them? If, for the knowledge of these things, as far as they possess it, they are *wholly indebted* to scriptural revelation, in common with all their contemporaries, how almost impious the delusion or the disingenuousness which affects to derive it independently of the written oracles! whether they know it or not, their pretension is a monstrous fallacy! If they know it not, their ignorance is criminal and they have no right to be deceived. They have amply the means of knowledge; and God will call them to a solemn account. "They have Moses and the prophets;" they have Christ and

the apostles. "Let them hear them." Otherwise "neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." And when they descend to the dead or rise in judgment, they will find their sins and their excuses classed together, in the indictment of eternal righteousness against them.

There is a great variety in the style and copiousness of their preaching. Some of their *preachers* do not deliver twelve public speeches in as many months; and all of them together would not occupy an hour in the delivery. These perhaps never, or very seldom, make a scriptural quotation. Sometimes the recital of a passage constitutes the whole sermon. Some preachers are long to unendurable; and their elders have the office of advising them to a curtailment of their inspirations. They are all as various in the manner of making formal quotations, as they are in the time they occupy in preaching. In general, they are loose and indefinite in the citation of passages. They very often quote *what is not there*, because so said the *light within* at the time. One of their then most eminent preachers, on one occasion, in formally arguing with the writer, quoted a passage improperly. This was instantly remarked and the Bible produced. The passage was read in its connection (1 Cor. 12 : 7, to be considered hereafter) before the company of Friends, which was large. The effect was powerful. The preacher, "as he needs must," admitted his error. He was admonished to beware of depending upon misquotation for his arguments and upon the *light within* for his quotations. As he

quoted the passage, it suited his purpose ; and so have I heard it quoted in their solemn public inspirations, and that very frequently ; they quote it so, I ween, every month in the year, and found their argument on the mistake. But, as the passage is written in the text, and especially as the connection ascertains its meaning, it affords them no assistance. The crown of the matter was that a year or more afterward, and in company with that very same preacher, a professional gentleman and one who claims some scholarship in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, himself quoted that very passage in his old way to establish his old doctrine of the universality of inward light. I reminded him of the circumstance ; remarked on the power of habit and the love of theory ; and then abandoned this inspired quoter of scripture as an incorrigible victim of the inward light. He has since, however, abandoned his Quakerism for the allied mysticism of the system of correspondences. This is one of a thousand specimens that might be afforded.

One thing is remarkable :—the tenacity and boldness of Friends in quoting scripture, when they *see clearly* that the passage helps their doctrine. It seems probable that if the Bible was found seemingly to favor their views one tenth part as much as it contradicts them, they would soon adopt it as their *paramount* rule in religion. In this they resemble other enemies and corrupters of the truth ; who deal in excerpts and detached phrases, instead of studying and loving the whole connection ; in-

stead of believing and adopting the total volume : who array one part against others, a few parts against many, and individual expressions against the universal scope of the word of God ; as if it were not all one thing—all equally divine—all equally evidenced to be “ given by inspiration of God.”

I will add, that it has often been sarcastically remarked by some of their own people, that their preachers are too much indebted to the phraseology of the Bible to be supposed themselves inspired : and one very distinguished *professional* gentleman, a Friend, in the city of P—a, once affirmed to an elder of the meeting, and in the presence of many, his own dubitation of their preachers, as follows ; “ I have seen some preachers that we call ‘ hirelings,’ who, on acquaintance, appeared to me to be men of great intelligence and spirituality.” His audience seemed astounded. “ What !” exclaimed the elder, (whose son was a preacher,) “ does thee mean them that preach for hire ?” Answered the other ; “ Aye ! and to tell thee more, much that comes regularly from our gallery is sheer nonsense.” I can give names and witnesses, when necessary. Thus it is, especially with the more intelligent ; many doubt and ridicule their *inspired* communications :—many who will be angry with me for thus—in part—exposing a system of spiritual abuse which themselves certainly know to exist in the midst of them.

IV. My next argument is drawn from *the condition and practice of those nations, who, being des-*

titute of the scripture, but not (on this theory) of the inward light, have had nothing to embarrass the growth of its natural fruits or mystify their qualities.

The doctrine of the interior light was invented, in my opinion, much on the ground of its wonderful convenience. And who can deny the splendor and excellence of the scheme? What a grand spiritual equipment for tartars, hottentots, and all sorts of savages! Every man, the world over, furnished with a private supply, an individual *vade mecum* of inspired illumination, "by attending to the monitions of which" he has all necessary knowledge, and especially the riches of salvation! What could the Great Mogul desire or have in all his state, more handy or important?

The only difficulty of the scheme is that it clashes with all evidence, fact, experience, and scripture. Like a thousand other "imagnations" that the gospel unceremoniously "casts down," there is not a particle of truth in its composition. The monstrous ignorance of the pagan nations, their idolatry, polytheism, cruelty, pollution, obscenity, and perverseness, have been recorded by their own poets, orators, and historians; and the scene has been relieved by no evidence of "the principle" in its proper fruits, which can be read by eyes that have been anointed with "the eye-salve of Christ." Men think well of themselves, and of others, when they feel a common cause. Hence they are very charitable to human nature in the gross: while their "tender mercies" to individuals in the detail are

“cruel.” *Just the reverse* is true of those who think of human nature that it is *as bad* as the Supreme Inspector testifies.

In proof of the real character of the nations, to whom the light of the gospel has not shone, as a tremendous but certain matter of fact—not half so *convenient*, it may be, but abundantly more worthy of confidence than the opposite theory, I shall appeal to scripture alone. If they have this light, each of them, we are not to expect an *omission* in the total scriptures respecting it; much less the attestation of the absolute contrary. I waive what “certain of their own poets have said;” what Dr. Macknight has proved, from the best heathen authorities, of the dreadful moral degradation of the very lights of heathenism themselves, and especially of the immorality of *Socrates*, that darling of popular infidelity; I waive the assistance of facts narrated in the reports of missionaries, who were personal observers and eye-witnesses of the enormities which they rehearse; I waive the fact of the current testimony of the christian church, of all denominations since the Reformation, to the darkened and dreadful condition of the heathen nations.

These sources of proof and many others of kindred character, I waive: for, if the Bible is not express in omitting or contradicting the statement of Friends, I grant that other proofs are insufficient or illusory. My first proof is drawn from the first chapter of Romans, from the fourteenth verse to the end:—in which, if there be such a light in all men, as they aver, I am sure that Paul was ig-

norant of it. He there declares that he wishes to preach the gospel to all men, because they need it and because he feels benevolently *indebted* to them, to communicate, by *preaching or writing*, that invaluable blessing. "I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians ; both to the wise and to the unwise : so, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ : for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth ; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For **THEREIN** is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith ; [or, the righteousness of God by faith is revealed to faith ;] *as it is WRITTEN*, the just shall live by faith ;" or, the just by faith, shall live. I now ask, if this is not all folly, or at least a most superfluous office of the apostle, on supposition of this all-sufficient universal inward light ? Friends believe the gospel and this light to be identical ! Why then should Paul carry them the gospel, when each one of them had it in his own bosom ? Will Friends say they did not know what it was, and needed the presence and preaching of an apostle to give them the information ? What kind of a *light* then is it ? What good would the sun himself do to the nations, if they could not see him without the help of lesser lights, as torches, lamps, tapers, matches, fireflies, and glow-worms, to aid the vision of a man and teach him where to see the sun ? And why were not forty thousand apostles provided with forty million of evangelists to help them, in the work of going

to every man on the globe and explaining to him elaborately the important fact that he had *a light within* "by attending to" the monitions of which he should learn all he wanted and acquire all he needed for this world and the next! And what is the condition of the nations through successive ages? Do not the moderns need to be told, as well as the ancients, of the existence, offices, properties, and relations, of this interior light: what is their condition then without apostolic monitors to help them? What is their condition, even on the Quaker scheme, without preaching? But I proceed. The apostle then evinces the horribly criminal condition of the whole heathen world. He says that the light of nature, teaching what they never learn, "that which may be known of God" from his works, condemns them as sinners and leaves them "without excuse." He says; "Professing themselves to be wise," i. e. to have an *inward light* of their own, "they became fools; and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." Here are some of the rays of the inward light of the heathen nations; some of the precious fruits of heathenism! Quadrupeds, reptiles, vermin, did they and their very sages adore, instead of "the only wise God." They practised unnatural crime, he says; and that without remorse, being totally abandoned of the fear of God. He ends the picture with these words; "And *even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge*, God gave

them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient ; being filled with all unrighteousness," &c. to the end.

On the foregoing citation I remark, 1. *It contains a moral estimate of the whole world, as distinguished from the Jews* ; these he subsequently characterizes in the next chapter : and then, in the third, asks the question, "Are we better than they ?" are the Jews essentially and by nature any better than the Gentiles ? "No ; in no wise ; for we have before proved, both Jews and Gentiles, that **THEY ARE ALL UNDER SIN.**" 2. *The picture, of their degraded and guilty condition, is given in the argument, on purpose to evince their need of having the gospel preached to them.* This is obvious. 3. The apostle intimates that *all the nations once had, but voluntarily forewent and forfeited, the knowledge of God.* They were all descended from Noah. All his sons had the knowledge of the true God. But soon, hating, they corrupted and lost it. The children imitated and appropriated the iniquity of their fathers. Every generation deteriorated. "Their posterity approved their sayings." And what became of their knowledge ? The little grew less. The streams of traditionary truth were more and more vitiated ; and branching into all directions, at last presented the monstrous proportions of the common mythology, and the abominable usages of universal paganism. Thus it was true, historically, individually, philosophically, and universally, that "they did not like to retain God in their knowledge." I remark, 4. *That there is not a word said about THE INWARD LIGHT ; no*

exception in favor of its influence ; no crimination for working its extinction ; no intimation that the apostle *knew* of its existence ! 5. *There is no EXCEPTION of individuals.* Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, all the rare lights of pagan antiquity, had then shone upon the darkness : but, it was so unrelieved by their lustre, that the apostle lacked sight to see or charity to acknowledge or judgment to appreciate or inspiration to describe, the unhalloved and ungenial radiance. Whatever these sages were, the gospel, I find, makes little account of their lucubrations ; and I wish that many christian writers, to say nothing of Friends, had shown the wisdom and the modesty toward God to leave them peaceably and submissively, where they are and where the scripture leaves them, in the hands of the Eternal. I have often remembered with pleasure an anecdote which I have somewhere read and now record. A party in a stage-coach were once entertained per force with the spontaneous eloquence of a consequential blood, who chose to harangue them on the foolery of the missionary cause. At last he came to the dreadful implication of the system, that the heathen actually need the gospel, and may perish in their sins if not brought to repentance and faith in Jesus Christ. Here he vociferated, railed, declaimed, as if noise must convince where nothing else could be commanded—till he seemed exhausted.

And tamer far for so much fury shown,
As is the course of rash and fiery men,
The rude companion smiled, as if transformed.

COWPER.

His fellow passengers bore it well, though some of them felt not a little *bored* with it. At length an old gentleman in the rear, who had sat mute and unobserved, interposed, as follows: May I ask you a question, sir? Certainly. You, sir, and we all are not heathen: and worse will it be for us if we are not *christians*. The question is this—*Are you a true christian?* have you *personally* a “good hope through grace” of everlasting life? The catechumen hesitated. Proceeded the catechist—Suffer me then to *assure* you that, if you should ever be so happy as to arrive in heaven yourself, which I pray you may, you will find the heathen all there too—or, *a perfectly satisfactory reason* for their absence!

It is plain that Paul viewed the whole world as so wicked and lost, and the gospel as so *solely* competent through God to save, that therefore his inspired benevolence desired to bring them the *outward* light of the gospel, and preach to them “the unsearchable riches of Christ;” that so, through faith in the testimony and promise of God, they might be saved from sin and from the wrath to come. This view is not only devoid of the doctrine of Friends, but wholly adverse to it. Otherwise, why are not Friends *actuated* toward the heathen world as was Paul? Are they *characterized* in any way by the love of missions?

My next proof is contained in 1 Corinthians, chapter 10, verses 20 and 21. “But I say, that the things which the nations sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye

should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils." The anti-quaker phrases of "the cup of the Lord," and "the Lord's table," shall receive consideration in their place. It is worthy of note how Paul's charity disposes of the total mass of pagan worship in these verses! It is all offered to devils and not to God! He makes no exceptions, no qualifications, no apologies. How plain that either Paul was destitute of inspiration or that the nations (and I have substituted the word *nations* for *gentiles*, as a better translation of the original) are in league with the Devil and his legions—and that their very worship breathes of hell! Now where is the *inward light*? But—not to press this question: admit that it exists—it is manifestly *inefficacious*. What good does it accomplish? who is purified or enlightened or saved by it? It might as well not be, since it leaves the very religion of its subjects in the service of the Devil! Yet, O ye immortal souls, to whom Friends preach, they preach not the *gospel* to you! They recommend you to the pagan darkness of the inward light, and turn you away from "the marvelous light" of "the glorious gospel of the blessed God!" Let those of you who have no souls or (what is worse) no consciences—practically none, continue the blind followers of the blind. Those whose eyes are open see "the ditch" into which ye will all soon fall together. And O ye "forgers of lies, ye are all physicians of no value. O that

ye would altogether hold your peace ; and it should be your wisdom." The blood of souls will be found in your skirts, and that by thousands. You are not aware exactly of your heavy responsibility to God. He has condemned those rash and ignorant pretenders to a call from him, who preach "another" and an unknown gospel, "understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." I would recommend to you a *rational* and prayerful perusal of the twenty-third chapter of Jeremiah.

Another argument is drawn from the recognised former condition of those saints to whom the apostolical epistles were written. Says Paul to the Corinthians ; "Ye know that ye were gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led." He says to the Galatians ; "This only would I learn of you, received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" The Quaker answer properly is ; "O foolish Paul ! be ashamed of thy ignorance. We receive the Spirit neither by the one nor the other. Every man by nature, whether heathen, jew, or christian, receives a portion of the Spirit of God, without which God could not be just, nor man accountable. Dost thou think that God could not save his creatures without the preaching of thee or any other man ? We have nobler and more honorable views of the universal Father." Plainly Paul thought that saints receive the Spirit "by the hearing of faith." With the fact alone am I concerned. Other matters I leave to Friends. What then was their condition before they enjoyed "the hearing of faith?" Had they

“the Spirit” then? He reminds the Ephesians of their previous state in these words; “that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.” How could all this be, on the Quaker theory? In the same letter, he says; “This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as OTHER GENTILES WALK, IN THE VANITY OF THEIR MIND, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart. Who being past feeling, have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness.” He says to the Thessalonians; “Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God.” Says the beloved John, on the behalf of the church, his brethren; “And we know that we are of God; and the whole world lieth in wickedness.” A thousand other testimonies could be added; but it is useless. *Where* are the fruits of *the light universal*? Did the apostles know? They did not.

But Friends aver that in other passages their doctrine is recognised. Is this likely, after reading those passages that exclude the possibility of its existence! But I will examine one or two of their texts, which they love—mainly because they misunderstand them!

“Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons;

but, in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts, 10 : 34, 35. If this passage asserted *as a fact*—what it does not—that *in every nation* there are instances of holy men, who, without all knowledge of scriptural revelation, are accepted of God; more than this would still be necessary to sustain the theory of Friends: it would still be wanting to show that the knowledge, by which they wrought righteousness, was the result of *the universal inward light*. It might be the result of oral preaching; it might depend upon *special* disclosures of the Spirit, as that which first warned Abram to migrate from Ur of the Chaldees; it might occur as the consequence of patriarchal tradition, like that which assisted (at least) the piety of antediluvian saints. The passage has no affinity with the doctrine of Friends. *It merely asserts the characteristic largeness of the new dispensation, in distinction from the NATIONAL bigotry of the Jews.* "In short," says Dr. Scott, "where the essence of true religion is found, God will graciously accept it, without regarding names, forms or sects:—and whatever may yet be wanting in explicit knowledge of faith, will in due time be communicated." *The opposite of the text is that a man who had heard of salvation, who had long resided among the people of God, who believed the scriptures, and was sincerely devout, could NOT be accepted, because he was by nativity an uncircumcised Roman: this the Jews believed, and with a violence that was perfectly inexorable.*

The facts that circumcision was abolished and

that the nations were to be admitted "fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel," as distinguishing the new economy, were incredible to the Jews and at first even to the apostles themselves. This was the first instance, and Cornelius and his household were the first fruits, of apostolic preaching to the Gentiles. It required a miracle, a divine vision thrice repeated at Joppa, to convince Peter of the will of God, in this grand relation. Nothing less could break the spell of his Jewish prejudices; which were almost as strong as those of Friends against what they choose to call "a hireling ministry." When he journeyed, in obedience to the order of God, from Joppa to Cesarea, "certain brethren from Joppa accompanied him." These had not seen his vision, and hence "what God had cleansed, that called they common." They would doubtless report his *uncanonical* administration on their return. Peter was afterward put to trial on this very ground. When he "was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them. But Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it by order unto them." Hence it is evident that this passage respects the *Jewish*, but has no relation to the *Quaker* controversy. I remark a few particulars. 1. *Cornelius, though a native Roman, was an inhabitant of Palestine.* He lived in Cesarea, which was nearer to Jerusalem than was Nazareth, where Christ was educated. He was

doubtless acquainted with the Old Testament scriptures, with the worship of the synagogue, and the persons of the Jews. Though he held a military commission (a case where piety and soldiership combine) under the Roman Emperor, he appears so to have conducted as to win the universal approbation of the Jews; and he had been quartered at Cesarea most probably for years. Thus he was a religious man long before Peter's visit; though very imperfect in his knowledge. The historical facts of Messiah's advent he had not then learned. He "was of good report among all the nation of the Jews." 2. *That "God is no respecter of persons" is an elemental truth that refers to his JUDICIAL character alone.* His providential administration—his eternal sovereignty is not considered: it is only affirmed that *as a judge he will be IMPARTIAL*, deciding according to facts and evidence; he will not accept or condemn a man, Jew or Greek, because of national characteristics. 3. *The ministry of the gospel, and not the inward light, nor even the ministry of angels, did God employ to "preach peace by Jesus Christ" to this converted heathen and "perfect that which was lacking in his faith."* The ministry of angels was employed to *prepare the way* for the nobler or better adapted service of an apostle preaching the gospel. Cornelius "saw an angel in his house, who stood and said unto him, send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; *who shall tell thee words WHEREBY THOU AND ALL THY HOUSE SHALL BE SAVED.*" What need of all this on the principle

of Friends? 4. This *holy centurion and his family were taught, what Friends had been slow to learn.* After the sermon, said Peter, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, *who have received the Holy Ghost* as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Truly it was not the light within that predominated in the speaker or hearers: otherwise the question had been, "Why not *forbid water?* having the substance, what need of the sign? Having the Holy Ghost, what need of water?" What need? "THUS IT BECOMETH US TO FULFIL ALL RIGHTEOUSNESS." What need is there of doing the will of God! I just add, 5. That the introductory words, "then Peter opened his mouth and said," are not to be regarded as a mere pleonasm. They refer to his critical and novel situation. He had been meditating on the import of the vision. His sensations were, no doubt, indescribably strong. But he kept it all a secret till the proper opportunity. Then he boldly, as well as promptly, divulged it; he "opened his mouth" and spoke the unwonted and glorious truth.

"After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God, who sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." Rev. 7 : 9, 10. From this text, and others of which this is a specimen, Friends infer that there

are pious and holy people among all nations ; that they become such by attention to *the inward light* and not by outward means ; and consequently that their whole system is proved. But surely their inferences are too rapid to be sound. Not a word is said about *the manner* of their becoming pious ; and why then have *we* not an equal right to infer that the rule, *faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God*, was as really true in their case as in other cases ? There is at best *no proof* in such texts in favor of Friends. Beside, it occurs in a connection of prophecy. Events, then future to the writer, were predicted. These events were the conversion of hundreds to the faith of Christ, who were “sealed in their foreheads as the servants of God.” Whatever may be meant by the process of sealing, if we are to judge of this by other instances of which we are informed, we should say the gospel was preached to them ; they believed it ; they professed the religion of Christ, were baptized, and accepted, “as heirs together of the grace of life.” It is moreover a scene which occurs properly on the earth, though it respects the heavenly state ; as by the rapid associations of prophecy, the two are often exchanged and often mingled also in the description. If however it is destitute of all proof of that which it was brought to prove, we must search for other texts which bear upon the question, *How do sinners become pious ? Whatever we may allow for POSSIBILITIES in the divine administration, THERE IS NO KNOWN OR REVEALED METHOD OF SALVATION OTHER THAN THAT*

WHICH IS BY FAITH IN THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST! The gospel had been preached throughout the whole world, before the book of Revelation was written. Missionary efforts were made in after ages, especially in the next century. The book itself sublimely and often predicts the spread of the gospel as the means of salvation: and I know of no necessity or reason for the inference, from that text or any other in the Bible, that men are saved without the gospel.

The propagation of the gospel in the first ages, constitutes one of the most wonderful prodigies in human history; whether we consider the obstacles that were overcome, the victories that were accomplished, the means used, the space occupied and filled with its radiance, or its lasting and magnificent results as related to the future and the present world. Viewed with accuracy and comprehensiveness, it remains itself a demonstration of THE DIVINITY OF THE GOSPEL AND THE SUCCORS OF GOD IN ITS PROMULGATION, which infidelity can never answer or candor disallow. The passage in Colossians, 1 : 23, (compare 6,) which Barclay translates and interprets, as if it meant to teach his thesis of "universal and saving light" suffocating "*in* every creature that is under heaven," as if it meant "that little small thing" and so forth, means *demonstrably* no more than the vast and astonishing diffusion of the gospel, by preaching, even in the first thirty years after the crucifixion of its glorious Author. It were better thus rendered: "Not removed from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, which

hath been preached (*κηρυχθεντος εν παση τη κτισει τη υπο τον ουρανον*) in all creation that is under heaven; and of which I Paul am made a minister."

Another specimen this of what it seems the vocation of inward light to do! How anti-spiritual, how gross, how prevaricating, is such a light! I could easily write another treatise of corrections, rescuing the true meaning of a multitude of passages from the profane and audacious glossings of a pseudo-inspiration. We pass to consider,

V. THE MISSIONARY PRACTICE OF THE APOSTLES, *in carrying the gospel to distant nations and preaching it to all the world, as if the gospel so preached, and not any interior light, was to be the instrument of "salvation to every one that believeth."*

Actions speak louder than words, as saith the proverb of the ancients; and in reference to the meaning of the apostles, if we can ascertain their official conduct, the result should be conclusive. How then did they understand *the kingdom of heaven* in this respect? The same criterion might aid our investigation of other points. Were they Quakers? Did they think, and act, and look, and preach, like Friends? How did they act; what was their common usage in reference to the heathen world? I answer, *they viewed it as full of condemned sinners, who could be saved by the gospel through faith, and in that way alone; and they accordingly acted toward them, inculcating both by their preaching and practice the solemn duty of christendom, and especially of the church, to diffuse the light of the gospel, mainly by preaching, throughout the whole family of nations.*

If this be true, is the *light* of Friends true? If it be, why are they not *actuated* toward the nations as the apostles were? why do they oppose missions? why lend so feeble and so ambiguous an aid at best to the noble evangelical charities of the day? why not favor Bible societies and all kindred institutions, with their personal and *pecuniary* influence? I know there are a few—very few—lamentably few—exceptions! But look at the society at large. The frost of stagnation hath settled on their energies and the winter of stoicism hath frozen all its depths! If the apostles had *acted* as they do (and that not in one respect alone) christianity had NEVER been propagated among the nations!

From the commencement of the *Acts* of the Apostles to the end of the inspired canon, comprising twenty-three distinct original volumes, we have a continual history of THE MISSIONARY PRACTICE of the apostles. Not only in person did they travel and preach, but they encouraged and prepared others, evangelists and preachers, to go forth, fulfilling that ancient prophecy; “The Lord gave the word; great was the company of them that published it.” So many and so “mighty through God” were these heralds of the cross, that the propagation of christianity in the first ages remains to this day a wonder of divine achievement. It is unparalleled in the pages of universal history. The whole Roman empire felt the vital shock of the gospel, circulating, like the tide of life in the human frame, from the centre to the extremities. When Paul wrote his glorious epistle to the Ro-

mans he had indeed never visited that proud metropolis, though his pilgrim labors had filled the world, in almost every other direction, with the renown of his Master. He says to the Romans, "from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ. Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation; but as it is written," &c.—15 : 19–25. We know that many others, though less eminent, were engaged in the same identical cause. And here we see the instrumentalities which God from the beginning employed to propagate the gospel; and which, through his blessing, were astonishingly successful. "Within about thirty years after our Lord's death, the gospel was spread, not only throughout almost all parts of the Roman empire, but even to Parthia and India." Pliny to Trajan complains of the ascendant influence of the *superstition*, as he calls it, and of the consequent desolations of heathenism. Tacitus speaks of an *ingens multitudo*, a huge multitude of christians, in the city of Rome in the time of Nero. Thus onward proceeded this kingdom of the Highest, till it speedily included the whole Roman empire, with the Emperor himself, not only in its territory, but *nominally* at least in its bosom. Could Quakerism thus have moved a world? What—by inward light, passivity, and silent meetings?

That they must have thus labored to evangelize the nations is further evident *from the tenor of their commission*. "Go ye therefore," &c. Matt. 28 :

18-20, and Mark, 16: 15, 16. On these words allow a few remarks. (1) The commission was designed to be (and therefore is) of *permanent* authority in the church. This might be argued from many considerations ; we infer it here simply from the promise ; “Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world.” This could not apply to the apostles, or to the men of any one generation, exclusively. True, the apostles *as such* had no successors, no predecessors, no equals, no official similars. As preachers, however, they are comparatively common—they are at the head of a long succession of faithful ministers of the cross of an atoning Savior, from whom each derived his tantamount authority. This shows the *permanent* constitution of the gospel, and infers the *permanent* wants of men, as well as the *permanent* duty of the church. (2) The original word rendered *preach* is taken from the office of a commissioned town crier, who makes proclamation aloud with the authority of the commonwealth, and arrests the attention of all to his message. In this way is the order to *preach the gospel in all the world and to every creature*. Not a word in the commission about the light within !

The word *teach* means to instruct by oral inculcation ; and thus to *preach and teach the gospel to mankind* is the sum of this stupendous order, that remains to this day binding, directly or indirectly—binding in its spirit on every human being to whom it comes, greeting. It is an order to diffuse the truth of the gospel, to propagate christianity ; a

work of the King's commandment, in which every subject of his realm is bound to be aiding and assisting; and at least to give it his blessing and his prayers. The age in which we live is *beginning to awake* to this business. One third of the present century has gone, the brightest since the Reformation, with the light of the angel's pinions, "flying in the midst of heaven, having THE EVER-LASTING GOSPEL to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people." Here we see *the appointed means* of the conversion of the world. Luke, 10: 1, 2. The scriptures are to be translated into all the languages of the peopled earth; missionaries are to go forth by thousands; like candles unlighted, though distributed in a large house, the Jewish manuscripts of "Moses and the Prophets" (in every synagogue under heaven,) are to be touched and lighted with the torch of christianity, kindling a thousand central fires throughout the world, but shedding one sole light upon the darkness of its inhabitants. But I digress. (3) We see the *duty* of all who hear the gospel—to believe it, to learn it, to love it, and practise it to the glory of God. (4) The *sanctions* of the preached gospel are at once ultimate and tremendous: they are salvation to the believer, damnation to the infidel; and no alternative! It contains no apology for harshness, no compromise, no ceremony, no respect of persons, no double dealing, no concealment. Let the world tremble—rather let the world obey! (5) There is nothing *mystical*, or even figurative, in

all this high concern of truth and destiny. It is all intelligible. The meaning of every word is plain. It is marked with "truth and soberness." No enthusiasm, no weakness, no artifice, appears; but the signals of mercy and majesty divine! How totally unlike Quakerism! My last remark is (6) that *the gospel so propagated is ALONE recognised as the grand instrument of salvation.* As it involves no uncertainty, WE KNOW *that by this men may be saved*; for so says Jesus Christ. Can we KNOW as much of inward light? "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." He that minds the inward light—stay! is that in the commission? That instrument of God is a manifesto of duty to the world, as well as a charter of office to the ministry! Whatever we may guess, or "Friends believe" about the inward light, what divine *certificate* have we for any thing but faith in the simple gospel?

All the *history* we have in the case shows that the apostles understood this commission just as we do. *Their practice* is a commentary which verbal criticism cannot corrupt, nor any thing but infatuation resist. The light within may *clearly see* somewhat different, since covetousness and sensuality see the same thing. But genuine piety listens to declarations such as these: "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness; but unto us who are saved, it is the power of God. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the

scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." 1 Cor. 1: 18-24. Besides, we have a standing order for the recruiting of the ministry to the end of the world. 2 Tim. 2: 2.

I only ask any man of sense to tell me, *in view of all this, what are we to think of the inward light?* of that *inspired* sanctimony which denounces all this structure of God, as prosecuted "in the will of the creature" and as a system of *will worship and idolatry?* "Wo unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter. Wo unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight." Is. 5: 20, 21.

A correct view of the commission, work, importance, and ends, of the evangelical ministry, might revolution the mind of any Friend, in respect to the distinctness and dignity of the ministerial order: and he who reads the scripture with an eye critically awake to the subject, will see how the total scope of the book of God differs from the

total scope of Quakerism : what I have given under this head, or indeed elsewhere, is more an exhibition of principles and specimens than a full synopsis of the subject.

VI. THE CHARACTER OF APOSTOLIC PREACHING, AND ALSO OF HIS WHO COMMISSIONED AND PRECEDED THE APOSTLES, *is wonderfully destitute of all force and propriety, in respect to the doctrine of inward light, if that doctrine be true.*

That these all preached the doctrine of *the person and office-work of the Holy Ghost, as vital to all saving knowledge of God*, is a momentous and indisputable fact. No man believes this fact perhaps *more really* than I do. It is the catholic faith of protestants : and he is no christian who doubts or denies it. Let not Friends assume that I am opposed to *the scripture doctrine of that important article of the creed of all saints* ; because I distinguish it from *their doctrine* which I consider not scriptural at all :—for, I believe the Quaker spirit to be another spirit, the Quaker influence another influence, and the Quaker doctrine another doctrine.

It seems necessary, as I wish neither to deal in negatives nor to become voluminous with positives in this treatise, to give a statement of what *I consider* the catholic doctrine on this subject—the importance of which can scarcely be exceeded. Here also I wish to commit no individual or denomination for *my views* of the catholic doctrine. If I show a very different doctrine from that of Friends, then the reader has only to “search the scriptures ;” and

if he finds it there *in substance* as here represented, he will be at no loss to account for the zeal manifested in these pages against its placid counterfeit. Perhaps also some scriptural evidence accompanying the statement may aid his conviction of the truth. It will be impossible, however, within the allotted space, to adduce the full proof of every position; nor will an approximation to this be attempted.

That the Spirit of God has a mighty and uncomputed agency in preparing the church for glory and eternally sustaining them in that sublime fruition; and that this agency is substantially the same in all ages of the world—from Abel to the last ransomed soul before “the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat;” are positions of sacred and evincible truth. But the Spirit has done many things without us, as well as in us; and many preliminary, as well as consummate; and circumstantial, as well as vital, in effectuating the salvation of men. All his influences, however, are necessary in their place; nor does it accord with his perfect wisdom to do any thing in vain or any thing superfluous. By *his influences* I mean *all that he does, in whatever aspect, in accomplishing the salvation of the saved*: a correct view of which affords at once the theory and the vindication of those blessings of salvation, called, somewhat technically, REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

These influences I distinguish into two great

classes as ORDINARY and MIRACULOUS ; of which inversely :

First, MIRACULOUS influences. Under this head I comprehend all *extraordinary* influences, whether *formally* miraculous or not ; as his agency in creation, in providence and in the ancient church ; his plenary REVEALING influence, in all the “ holy men of God ” by whom the scriptures were written for the benefit of the world ; his influences strictly miraculous in the first ages of the Jewish and the christian church ; particularly of the latter, when the preachers of the gospel, *introducing* christianity and *planting* it, in a world of ignorance and hostility unallayed with better qualities, “ went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following—God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will ; ” and his *suggestive* influences, in many merely oral communications of his prophets and apostles, occasional or regular, public or personal, brief or extended, for purposes more partial and temporary than what was ordered to be written for coming generations. Of *these* influences, called MIRACULOUS, I would observe (1) that *they are all gifts and not graces, all helps and not parts, all auxiliaries and not constituents, of vital religion.* A man may have inspiration and work miracles, and be “ a devil,” as were Judas and others : because he may know and experience all these things, and never love God or forsake sin, or have one good motive. Piety does

not consist in being inspired or working a miracle ; but in obeying the gospel, departing from iniquity, and practising the will of God.⁵¹ How would the opposite, or the doctrine of Friends, affect us, reduced to the simple proposition ; *Except a man becomes inspired, as the prophets and apostles were, he cannot be saved!* This however is the doctrine of Barclay, as I shall hereafter show. More to evince the absurdity of the position, let us alter it, thus ; *Except a man have the gift of miracles and of languages, as the apostles had on the day of pentecost, he cannot be saved.* I observe (2) that *all the MIRACULOUS influences, as they are distinct, so are they all SUBSERVIENT to the ORDINARY influences, and of ultimate worth ONLY as related to the triumphs of truth and holiness.* Miracles and inspiration are to piety just what scaffolding is to a building or husks to growing corn :—of no utility after their end is accomplished. Miracles however are still of use to us ; established by testimony and vindicated by rational evidence, all ages, since the last one was performed, may be certified of their verity ; may infer the truth of the system which they were given to authenticate ; and enjoy in thought and feeling (not in sense) all the moral advantage of the whole series from the beginning ; this their noblest benefit and end. If they were thus *subsidiary* to the more noiseless, less ostentatious, untransitory influences, called *ordinary*, then (3) *we ought to value and expect the ORDINARY influences, as at once attainable by all, and INFINITELY MORE PROFITABLE TO THEIR POSSESSORS, than the extraordinary and mi-*

raculous influences. These one might have and—perish; those to have, is to be saved—if the *degrece* involve holiness of heart! I observe (4) that *whatever tends to error in this relation, by leading men to substitute the latter for the former, to prefer gifts to graces, and miracles to mercies, and inspiration to a moral change of the affections, tends equally to deceive and ruin the soul; tends to make zealots and fools instead of saints and christians; tends to fascinate the immortal mind with nonsense and to plunge it into death.* Once more (5) *there is no evidence either of the necessity or the reality of miraculous influences since the apostle's day, nor of one instance of proper inspiration since the death of the beloved John.* Where is there any utility of such influences? *Cessante causa, cessat res,* the effect ceases with its cause. The power of miracles continued and permanent, is at once the claim and the stigma of antichrist. 2 Thes. 2 : 9, 10. And why is there not *just as much* evidence of miracles, as of inspiration, continued? Friends strangely separate, what God has generally joined; and are—of late—quite as remarkable for declining to work miracles as for professing to be inspired. O that they would learn to “refuse profane and old wives’ fables, and exercise themselves rather unto godliness!” Otherwise, it will be their doom, as it is their history, to “turn away their ears from the truth, and be turned unto fables.” “And we know that all things work together for good, to *them that love God*, [whether inspired or not,] *to them who are the called accord-*

ing to his purpose:" and these are identified with them that love God.

SECONDLY, I come now to speak of the *ordinary* influences of the Holy Spirit. By these I mean *all those influences by which the mind is enlightened, convinced, converted, sanctified, comforted, sustained, actuated in obedience, edified in faith, expanded with benevolence, martialled in duty, and matured for heaven; as also those that ETERNALLY glorify the being of saints, and make their everlasting conservation in blessedness to be infallible.* These I suppose are substantially the same in every age, vitally and totally necessary to salvation. I however subdivide them into *objective* and *subjective*.

OBJECTIVE ordinary influences. By these I mean *those influences of the Spirit in which THE OBJECTS OF RELIGION are afforded to the mind as the occasions and moral causes of devout affection and the stamina of usefulness in the world.* Of these I shall make some observations at the commencement of successive paragraphs.

(1) *These influences are all exerted THROUGH THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF TRUTH ALONE, from whatever medium accepted by the mind;—*whether that medium be at the time the volume of God's blessed and luminous word; or the mighty works of his hand; or the senses in any way conveying it to the thoughts; as preaching heard, or the sacraments seen, or pious example witnessed, or the appeal of providential events of joy or grief considered, or—to one who knows the general truth—

“night visions *may* befriend” and dreams help us awake. 2 Cor. 3 : 8, 11, 12, 18. In a word, God may use *almost any means* to bring the truth into living contact with the mind.

(2) *All truth, that savingly influences, is derived, since the first ages of christianity, from the volume of scripture alone ; and that directly or indirectly, immediately or remotely, formally or virtually : so that but for the scriptures, we should be sunk in the profane barbarism and stupid idolatry of the heathen nations.* Rom. 15 : 4. Prov. 29 : 18. John, 17 : 17, 19, 20. Eph. 6 : 17. James, 1 : 18, 21, 22. 1 Pet. 1 : 22-25. Rom. 3 : 1, 2. 1 Thes. 4 : 5. There are other passages innumerable to to the same point. These however may suffice.

(3) *The grand MANNER in ordinary of truth's access savingly to the mind, is THROUGH PREACHING ; when the Spirit speeds the progress of his own truth to the latent “ springs and principles ” of the mind ; not by altering the truth ; but by so presenting it to the mind as to give the truth “ free course ” and efficacy through all its faculties.* The truth, being right, needs not the Spirit to convert or improve it ; or to give it life, being itself “ quick and powerful ; ” but the mind needs to be arrested, awakened, transformed, through the truth, to perceive and love and pursue the glorious objects of religion, the fixed stars of the eternal firmament. 1 Thes. 1 : 5-7 ; 2 : 13. 2 Thes. 2 : 11-14. Whence we pass to treat,

2. *Of SUBJECTIVE ordinary influences.* By these I mean *all the influences of the Spirit on the subjects or men whom he affects, bringing them to con-*

sider, seek religion, repent, obey, worship, believe, practise holiness, and persevere to life everlasting; including awakening, conviction, regeneration, sanctification, consolation, universal piety, and ultimate salvation.

I call these *subjective*, because men are the subjects of them, and because they are considered distinctly with respect to the subjects themselves. I call them *the influences of the Spirit*, because they are virtually so denominated in the word of God; and because he is *the Grand Agent* who produces them and is immediately glorified in them; since all these belong to his revealed office-work. Of these I remark,

(1) *That the true order in our consideration of them is, that OBJECTIVE precede SUBJECTIVE influences; and not the contrary.* Give to *subjective* influences the precedency, and you have made an inlet to all the enthusiasm, spiritual pride, and specious sin, that ever spurned the scriptures, hated order, violated purity, misrepresented truth, degraded religion, glorified blundering ignorance, and scandalized the souls of men. In such an inversion knowledge is despised as infamous and Satan enthroned in his celestial disguises. This is, no doubt, the philosophy of all religious wild-fire and spiritual extravagance, and *pious* ill manners, and spurious illumination. Thus men learn to worship their own experiences, to deify their feelings, and to follow every imagination as the voice of God. I am sorry to record that real christians, and even christian ministers, are *sometimes* carried away—in

degree—with this lawless influence. The weakness of the human mind, the infinite themes of religion, the infirmity of faith, opinionated ignorance, silly credulity, the arts of false teachers, the stimulus of a solemn occasion, spiritual pride, the deceitfulness of the heart, officious and erring counsellors, and the devices of the devil, are the proper *causes*, as the scriptures are only the innocent *occasions* of all these scandals: which however may be resolved into a principle which is in fact digested into the creed of Friends and made the focal point of all their religion; that principle is *the precedency of subjective influences!* I believe that this was the precise inspiration of that lustrous son of moonshine, George Fox. Whether he had piety or not beside, is *another question*—and I leave it to him who knows. Thus I do of all Friends, wishing their salvation. I attack their tenets, not *them*. To be sure, *they* are very much identified with their tenets; but this is not my fault:—I wish they were more than the moon's distance apart! But to return. Give to *objective* influences the precedency; and then *subjective* follow in their place, and all is order, symmetry and wisdom: the feelings are made to honor their proper sphere in subordination to truth; the intellect is “exercised to discern both good and evil;” the whole moral manhood is subjected to “the glorious gospel of the blessed God;” and the subject learns to “be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh him *a reason of the hope that is in him*, with meekness and fear.” 1 Peter, 3 : 15. I observe further—

(2) *SUBJECTIVE influences are never to be considered genuine but as they may be seen to correspond with OBJECTIVE.* This result need not be always immediate, formal or known, in order to be real. We cannot conceive of gospel holiness but as the counterpart of truth. Holiness is the image of God; and divine truth is the royal stamp on which that image is cut, and which the Spirit uses as the universal instrument of all his own impressions. However he may melt or soften or prepare the mass, before he coins it into heavenly currency, it never gets the king's "image and superscription," till that unrivaled signet imparts it by the power of the Spirit of God. I venture to translate Rom. 6 : 17, more as it ought to be, in favor of this view. "But God be thanked that ye are not, though ye were, the servants of sin; seeing ye have obeyed from the heart that mould of doctrine into which ye were cast." It is elsewhere said; "so we preach, and so ye believed." And again we read of others "that perish, because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." Says John, "We are of God. He that knoweth God, heareth us; and he that is not of God, heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error."

(3) *THE MODE of subjective operation, ESSENTIALLY considered, is equally inscrutable and unimportant.* "How can these things be?" *How* does the Spirit reach, open, impress, and actuate the mind, so that now the same things engross and enrapture it which once were insipid and even re-

pulsive? What wheel has he touched, what cord relaxed, what veil removed? We only know the fact *that he does*, not the mode *how he does*, the glorious wonder. A wise man, who knows the rational horizon of the mind, and can see to the boundaries of human intelligence, *in rebus—certi denique fines*, confesses his total ignorance, where fools luxuriate in the pride of knowledge. Acts, 16 : 14. John, 3 : 8. Col. 2 : 18. This difficulty, though *practically* it has no existence, resolves itself ultimately into the inscrutable mode of a most palpable fact—the necessary and absolute dependence of a created moral agent.

(4) *The all-important matter is THE RESULT of these influences.* The process is valuable only for the sake of the result. This is the grand *desideratum* in self-examination. Whatever influence, otherwise definable or not, brings its subject to evangelical results, in thought, motive, conduct; that influence is to be ascribed to the Spirit of God. Hence the criteria of discrimination that abound in the sacred volume. Hence the *results* described in such passages as the following; “the *fruit* of the Spirit is love, joy, peace,” &c. Gal. 5 : 22-24. Eph. 5 : 9. 1 Cor. 12 : 3. Observe, how totally devoid of all extravagance are these texts! There are thousands more in the Bible of the same kind. It is plain then if a man *love* God, if he *really* love him, if it be *a fact that he loves God*, that man is a christian and will be saved, whether he can give the history of the affection or not. “Believest thou this,” O reader! “Lovest thou me?”

(5) *The subjects are conscious ALONE of the objective influence; while, by faith only, and not by feeling, they ascribe it to the Spirit.* I mean by this that a man is conscious of the agent, only through the instrument; or, he is solely conscious of the action of truth on his powers and of his own mental exercises and acts in view of truth; and is in no other way *conscious* (or "*sensible*," as Friends say) of the influence of the Spirit. Psalm 55 : 5. Acts, 9 : 5. Heb. 4 : 12. Psalm 19 : 7. John, 14 : 22, 23. The fancy of an immediate consciousness of the Spirit evades every rational criterion, and is most probably all delusion and materialism:—beside, its result is generally mystical or corrupt or ambiguous.

(6) *The forms, reasons, circumstances, and degrees of influences, perpetually vary, not only in different subjects, but at different times in the same subject; nor may any form or style be prescribed as a standard of genuineness, since nothing must supersede the rule of judging by the result.* "By their fruits" alone, may the children of God be discriminated; and this according to the rule of the written word. The history therefore of the *mode and order* of their experiences is at best of very subordinate importance. 1 Cor. 12 : 6. Phil. 3 : 13. Heb. 10 : 32.

(7) *The whole economy of these influences, as of any others, depends supremely on the sovereign pleasure of "the only wise God."* I mean by this not to exclude human agency or accountability from their proper place and mediate influence in

the event ; nor to favor any notion of fatality, or destiny independent of the voluntary conduct of men ; but I do mean to deny the existence of absolute chance, and to put the event, in common with all other events, in the sovereign arbitration of God. I mean to deny the *Arminian* view which enthrones eternal chance and exalts the autocracy of the creature “above all that is called God, or that is worshipped ;” and puts the Creator in a posture of waiting ignorance or sincere discomfiture, rather than of dominion “over all, blessed for ever.” All this as a fact, and as a doctrine both of reason and scripture, I believe. It is *an article of faith*, properly such ; not *a rule of action*. It is one of the “things that we are to *believe* concerning God ;” not otherwise one of the “duties that God requires of man.” Our duty is one thing : the government of God is another. It is also of immense importance to *ourselves*, and of most auspicious bearing upon our own salvation, to know the truth, and especially to *love* the truth, in this sublime relation. No Friend however can, I think, “receive the love of the truth” in respect to the proper dominion of the Eternal—intelligently receive it, without ceasing to be a Friend. Though Barclay makes some exceptions in favor of singular individuals, such as David, Paul, and others, yet the *system* which he strenuously upholds is *diametrically opposite* to the position at the head of this paragraph : in this he is true to the doctrine of the society, but false to the oracles of God. “Let God be true, but every man a liar, as

it is written." Without this enthronement of the divine sovereignty in our faith, we shall worship a being, as God, who is not the true and "only wise God," who has not all and especially the grandest events in his hand, and whom any freak of chances may occur to frustrate and confound. Besides, we shall be in perpetual collision with our own eternal interests and with the God of the Bible. 2 Tim. 1 : 9. 2 Thes. 2 : 13, 14. 1 Thes. 1 : 4, 5. 1 Cor. 3 : 5-7. Rom. 8 : 28-30. 9 : 16, 18. 11 : 5-7. I just add that the doctrine of sovereignty *in no aspect* excludes those whom the doctrine of regeneration or faith would not equally exclude. Properly understood it militates not against any other doctrine of scripture; nor will it ever debar from the kingdom of heaven one who does not also debar himself by pride, prejudice, obstinacy, and love of the world.

What is *adventitious* in the experiences of a converted sinner; that is, what results from his temperament, his history and circumstances, and not from the nature of religion, being neither essential nor proper to its possession; and what is thus the fruit *of the subject* and not "the fruit of the Spirit," to whatever degree it may extend, and however it may modify those experiences, in time, form, or intensity, I both distinguish from religion (confused as they generally appear) and also omit at present to consider. It is of importance however to remark that *what the Spirit produces we at the same time subordinately perform*; since his influence succeeds only to bring us to deeds and courses of evangelical obedience. Holiness is not

an abstraction, nor a dormant principle, nor the offspring of physical influence—except possibly in a subsidiary way. Holiness is an abstract word; but the *thing* is nothing other than a cordial self-consecration to God, in a way of obedience, not to our own imagination or devices, but to his rational and excellent will revealed in the gospel. The word *holiness* is applicable, with all its cognates, *sanctify*, *sanctification*, *saints*, *holy*, and others, to persons and things equally; being so used abundantly in the scriptures: their common import being—*set apart from a common to a sacred use; set apart for God*. Thus, the temple with all its premises, furniture, and service, was holy; and *holiness to the Lord* is the motto of his universal worship. Here then, is the clue to its *personal* meaning; those persons are holy who, being enlightened to know and regenerated to love the gospel, are willingly consecrated or set apart for God. To produce and sustain this result is the design of the *Spirit's* influence and of the means of grace. When any one finds himself thus serving Christ, he is a saint, and the Spirit of God hath hallowed him as a living temple of his influence. In conversion itself the subject is brought to adopt other views, feelings, motives, and ends of conduct, than he previously ever knew. He is changed *in his estimate of objects and in his volitions concerning them and in his relations to them*. Before, the world, in some form, was his idol, his pleasure, his all; and to it he sacrificed his conscience, his reason, his salvation; while God and religion were

objects of practical neglect and steady dislike. Now, he sees that such an estimate was false, criminal, ruinous; and that to choose the world for his portion is to choose hell for his destiny: it is the estimate corrected that revolutions the choice. Now, he resolutely resigns the world and "chooses that good part which shall not be taken away from him." The estimate may exist imperfectly, without the choice; and so the subject revert from mere conviction to a worse apostacy: but it is not conceivable that the definitive choice should occur but as the result of the estimate. Such a volition was never his before, whom its occurrence defines "a new creature." Thus the Spirit accords in his operations with the laws of mind, of which himself is the creative author. He operates on moral agents; who are not the less such because previous transgressors and enemies; and they are not the less such for what he does in reforming them, either in the process or the result. Those who would see a perfect picture of his influences in conversion, *sketched in their results alone*, may consult the parable of the prodigal son. After his voluntary desertion of his father, after his riotous and profligate courses, we see a pause, a consideration of his state; we see his rectified estimate of things, his definitive and voluntary resolution, his practical consistency, his humiliating and ingenuous confession, his gracious reception, his final restoration, and the elevated rapture of his father and household at the event.

Having thus given an outline of this most impor-

tant doctrine, according to the scope of scripture, I wish to characterize *the views of Friends* as contra-distinguished from it.

(1) *They hold to continued miraculous influences*, or—what is much the same—to the PRECEDENCY of *subjective* impressions, or immediate “objective manifestations” in the mind. Their whole system is *subjective* mainly. Saith Barclay, “which revelations of God by the Spirit, whether by outward voices and appearances, dreams, or inward objective manifestations in the heart, were of old the formal object of their faith, and remain yet so to be; since *the object of the saint’s faith is the same in all ages, though held forth under divers administrations*. And what was the object of their faith, but inward and immediate revelation, as we have before proved. But further; if the object of faith were not one and the same both to us and to them, then it would follow that we were to know God some other way than by the Spirit.” Sophistical as ever! as if the *medium* of knowing were the same with the *object* known!

(2) *They hold to the NECESSITY of those, and to that faith which is founded on them as their “formal object,” in order to salvation*. “The true and effectual knowledge, which brings life eternal with it,—is no otherwise attained; and none have any true ground to believe they have attained it, who have it not by this revelation of God’s Spirit.” What is this but *eternally* unchurching all who disbelieve his doctrine!

(3) *They hold that this is UNIVERSAL, all men*

participating it in all ages of the world. "This light enlighteneth the hearts of all in a day, in order to salvation, if not resisted : nor is it less universal than the seed of sin."

(4) *They hold that, as it is by consenting to this internal light that one man "differs from another" unto salvation, so it rests absolutely and ultimately and wholly and only with his will to consent or not, and so to self-arbitrate the event of salvation ; yet, they maintain, that, as it is by consenting to the influence that IT saves us, so we ought not to SAY that we save ourselves, but that IT saves us.* It might be proper to inquire how *happened* Barclay to consent, when others refused ? There was either a cause for it or there was not : if the former, *what* was that cause ? "WHO maketh thee to differ from another ? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive ? Now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it ?" 1 Cor. 4 : 7, and 2 Cor. 5 : 5. But if it was a mere hap, for which there was no cause at all, then the following absurdities result : (1) *God himself could not foreknow it ; for, that which had no cause was a mere fortuity.* It might have come to pass and it might not ; how then could God have *certainly* foreknown that it would come to pass, as now the event has taught us all that it did ? If we say he foreknew *uncertainly*, what is this but affirming his ignorance, since we all do the same with respect to future events—of which we are all totally ignorant ! It follows that God never foreknew that any one

would consent, or knew at all until he happened to find out that he had consented! This is next door to horrid impiety. (2) *There is no certainty of the continuance of the church on the earth.* It is only by consenting to follow the Spirit that any man becomes a member of the church invisible, as we all agree. If then it be an absolute contingency, a matter of perfect chance, whether any one consents or not, it is at best a chance whether one more will ever be converted! The consequence is plain. Again, (3) It is foolish to talk of *God's raising up ministers* to prosecute his work, since if chance dont happen (without any cause) *to cause the will to submit to be willing to consent* to the impotent wishes of God, he can never *raise up another!* What a wonderful felicity of chances it was in the first ages, that God happened to succeed to procure so many apostles *just when he happened to want them; ESPECIALLY PAUL!* And when Friends think of *Barclay*, what a philosopher he was, how grateful ought they to be to chance, by whom he was converted, by his happening to consent to the light within! Yea! and if Fox had not so happened to consent, what would have become of the whole society? It is plain that Quakerism altogether, with its wonderful light, is the mere result of chance! But let us hear *Barclay* expound the matter. "I say—that as the grace and light in all is sufficient to save all, and of its own nature would save all; so it shines and wrestles with all in order to save them; he that resists its striving, is the cause of his own

condemnation; he that resists it not, it becomes his salvation: so that in him that is saved, the working is of the *grace*, and not of the *man*; and it is a passiveness [e. g. sitting still and placid in silent meetings] rather than an act; though afterward, as man is wrought upon, there is a will raised in him, by which he comes to be a co-worker with the grace." This is rare inspiration and most sublime philosophy! Quakerism needs something more than an *apology*!

I now infer that *the views of Friends concerning the Spirit; are not the views of the Bible*; ⁵² and remark that Barclay continually assumes their identity and rashly reasons on that false assumption: particularly (1) when he quotes the sayings of scripture in reference to the Spirit; and (2) when he quotes from Calvin, Luther, and the early Fathers, on the same topic. This is a very common and most unfair practice of Friends.

It is plain that neither the scriptures nor the christian Fathers yield *his doctrine* any support, unless it be true that *their doctrine of the Spirit* is itself identical with *his*! As well might Friends quote me, when I speak of the necessity of the influence and maintain that all means will be ultimately vain without it; and because I say this, might they affirm that I held *their* doctrine! and this, though I abominate their doctrine, and believe it to be a mortal delusion, and am convinced that the blood of souls by thousands is chargeable to its *ignis-fatuus* coruscations! The assurance of Barclay and of Friends generally on this article is truly wonderful! After

affirming, *he* says “truly,” that “*this* revelation of God’s spirit” is that without which there is no saving knowledge, he avers, as follows; “the certainty of which truth is such, that it hath been acknowledged by some of the most refined and famous of all sorts of professors of christianity in all ages.” He then tries, awkwardly enough, to reconcile his theory with their piety and salvation—whom he intends to adduce as witnesses; and in a sort succeeds. But mark! they were all hireling priests, doctors, and schoolmen, whom he *elsewhere* abundantly denounces; “justly divests of the noble title of *christians* ;” and holds up to popular execration as the corrupters of christianity! *Now* he needs their aid; and as they have all spoken of the excellency of the Spirit’s influences, yea, of their necessity too, he first canonizes—how safe they are—and then quotes them! Reader, take their names; *Augustine, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Hierom, Athanasius, Gregory the Great, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Bernard, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Dr. Smith of Cambridge, Plotinus, and Origen.* All these, with the exception of Plotinus, (a heathen platonic philosopher of the third century, who much more probably held the doctrine of Barclay than the others,) believed in the *paramount* authority of scripture; in the *subserviency* of the influences of the Spirit to the progress of revealed truth; in the pestilent enthusiasm of all pretension to “inward objective manifestations” of the Spirit; and in the total darkness of every human mind that is not converted through the gospel, to “the marvellous light”

of God. Quakerism indeed did not arise till more than a century after the Reformation ; still, we can judge from no uncertain premises, that the Fathers of that age of glorious memory would (more than any other men perhaps whose piety is admitted by Barclay) have denounced his doctrine in no measured terms. He has culled some of their loose and hortatory notices of the excellency of the Spirit's influence, *has translated them*—I think—*with some accommodation*, and then strung them together as witnesses for *his doctrine!* The zealots, Stork, Stubner, Cellary, Munzer, and others, whose seraphic enthusiasm clouded the Reformation and seems for a time to have confounded Melancthon and the Elector of Saxony, were in their pretensions the similars of Friends ; hence the judgment of Luther in their case is in point, as it condemned them for impostors, and that on the sole authority of scripture ; a test to which they were sublimely unanxious to be subjected.

The same may be said of the scripture authorities quoted in Barclay. *Unmystically* interpreted, they are loved, as well as understood, by his protestant opponents. And what in sound argument do they yield him, till he has shown *a perfect agreement in nature* between his view of the Spirit and the scripture view of the Spirit ? To me (and I have studied the subject with full conviction for more than twenty years) the two doctrines appear just as different, and just as much hostile and mutual rivals, as are a piece of gold coined by the government and legitimated among the people and

a brazen counterfeit that claims an equal, nay, a much superior currency.

Before I leave this point I would solemnly warn the *christian* community against a specious deception. It has been very successfully and very extensively practised already. Friends will probably say of the author, Why! he criminales all other denominations, as much as he does us. For the church of England, the Baptists, [and just as much the *Presbyterians*,] and others, hold to the influences of the Spirit also. I reply 1. This is only deception and evasion. The view of Friends is their own *foxian* view, and not ours at all! There is **UTTER CONTRARIETY IN NATURE**, as well as difference, between the catholic view and that of Friends. Does the former inculcate *immediate* inspiration, as *indispensable* to a preacher, and to "the building up of true faith," so that without it, all is vain? or that the scriptures are "a secondary rule" merely, and to be so "esteemed?" or that their *paramount* is, by the Spirit, inserted, as a seed, light, and so forth, *in every man* that ever was born? or that this non-entity is itself the very vital influence of the Spirit? or that **OUR GREAT DUTY** is, to "retire inwardly" and let it "expand and take the government?" Does the catholic view admit that *all other ways* of concurrence with the influence of the Spirit, except that of "silent waiting" on "the immediate drawing and moving of the Spirit" and his influences necessarily "*sensible*," "are to be denied, rejected, and separated from, in this day of his spiritual aris-

ing?" does it deny the scriptures to be "the word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?" Does it make the Spirit, i. e. God himself—a rule of action and the highest rule? Does it find out a way of salvation for Turks, Jews, and Heathen of all sorts, WITHOUT THE GOSPEL, and by "inward objective manifestations in the heart?" I reply 2. That I know of no more palpable *dishonesty* of argument than theirs, (unless their inspired ignorance may *palliate* the crime—as it can no more—for their ignorance is itself a transcendent crime in the eyes of God,) when they *dare* to identify *their view* of the Spirit's influences, with that of "the common faith!" It is just as much like, as—folly is like wisdom; or "Lucifer fallen" resembles "the son of the morning," when he shone among the stars of God! The things are two, not one; they are contrary, not identical; they are as different as *inspired* presumption and most ignorant 'sincerity' are *different* from the "truth and soberness" of christianity.

There is one class of texts, by which Friends defend their tenets; such as this, for example, that Christ has promised "to be to them mouth and wisdom, tongue and utterance," (see orthodox TESTIMONY, 1830,) whenever they preach; which class it is exceedingly difficult for me, as an *uninspired* biblical student, to expound. I will promise to do it, however, on one condition—that they will lend me a *concordance* that contains them! the one above cited, is *very often* quoted, "with indubitable clearness and infallible certainty," by their inspired

holders forth; and hence it convinces all mightily, that each one, when speaking, is an example of its truth. Now, *I* can account for all they say, *much better, on any other supposition*, than that of *divine* inspiration! Let them cease to injure others so much, as to aver that *their view* of the Spirit's influence, is at one with the view of protestant christians generally. I know of no two sentiments, held by different religionists on the same subject, more radically hostile and utterly diverse, than theirs and ours on that grand article! Theirs too pervades and characterizes, as THE GRAND ERROR of the system, its total volume. It absorbs every thing *within*, as the great sepulchre where all is buried "in silence!" What is not *within*? Is it the Lord's supper, or Baptism, or justification, or *light*, or the great "Teacher that cannot be removed in a corner," or the strivings of the Spirit, or the ministry of condemnation and righteousness, or the seed, life, power, grace, principle, inspiration, and so forth—to the end of the *inspired* vocabulary? Friends often speak of sins to be "winked at;" as if God winked at them; and as if they did not *wholly pervert the sense* of Acts, 17: 30, which they assume to use and explain. It means only that in former times God did not, as now notably he does, send out *an official protest and a demonstration of the preached gospel*, against all the wickedness of men! and not that he *ever connived absolutely* at sin, though he can *pardon* it through the sacrifice of his own Son. It means that in other times he practically *overlooked* (ὑπερι-

δων, see Doddridge; note *in loco*) the sins of men, or seemed to care nothing about them: "but *now* commandeth all men every where to repent."

Now let us briefly try the question, *Did the apostles, with Christ at their head, actually preach on the principle of the inward light as laid down in the Apology?* This question I have had in my eye and in my heart, ever since by the grace of God I came to know him in truth: for, "when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me that I might preach him among" my countrymen; as the revelation and the vocation came only through the OUTWARD "objective manifestations" of his written word and ordinances, so "immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood;" but set myself to the devout and prayerful perusal of his own incomparable oracles; saying, "Deal bountifully with thy servant, that I may live and keep thy word. *Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.* I am a stranger in the earth: hide not thy commandments from me. My soul breaketh for the longing that it hath unto thy judgments at all times. Thou hast rebuked the proud that are cursed, who do err from thy commandments. Remove from me reproach and contempt; for I have kept thy testimonies. Princes also did sit and speak against me: but thy servant did meditate in thy statutes. Thy testimonies also are my delight and my counsellors." Psalm 119: 17-24.

All men are not, from whatever cause, qualified

to discriminate truth, and judge principles: but to those whose intelligence is mature and who love the God of scripture—and to none others—do I make the present appeal, to judge in this matter the pretensions of Quakerism! For one, my own conviction has steadily increased; while my anguish is also increased that *so many gifted and socially lovely characters* should be careering to eternity in the confidence of *the light within!* The excellent late Dr. Waugh of London felt the same; when called to preach in a certain sea-port village where many Friends reside, he used the following pertinent figure, in a benevolent *lament* at their infatuation in superseding the true gospel of Christ. For the truth of the anecdote, I can vouch; having received the account from a respected brother in the ministry, who enjoyed the friendship, and was acquainted with the person, of the good Doctor; whom George III. is said greatly to have revered, going sometimes *incognito* to hear him and calling him the King of Dissenters. The words are my own: “I am told, my friends, that your harbor is dangerous; that it abounds in shoals, rocks, and breakers, which many a skilful mariner has braved in vain; that there have been numerous dismal shipwrecks on your immediate coast; but that of late there are proportionately few! Do you know the reason? Doubtless you do. The authorities of the country have at great expense humanely erected a large light-house, towering to the sky and shedding without change its faithful radiance far and wide

on the ocean. Now, the pilots can bring a vessel into moorings almost with no inconvenience ; and simply by steering according to that fixed and friendly light. This you know. But what would you think of a proud East Indiaman, with a rich freight on board, who, getting a strange aversion to that light, should light a taper in the cabin and steer by *the light within* ? Would you not remonstrate, if you could ? But suppose you had remonstrated in vain, what would you apprehend from such hardihood ? What, but shivered timbers and a dismal wreck, since all experience is in favor of the light-house as the only safe mark to steer by ? And I, my friends, am afraid of some of you in this village ; afraid that your hopes and souls will perish on the rocks of error. Instead of steering for the haven of eternity by the light-house of the Bible, which the Eternal King has provided to that very end ; you are, I hear, many of you who reside in this place, abandoning your course to the uncertain and insufficient guidance of *a light within* ! Alas ! for the freight, the precious freight !”

But to the trial of the question. I first ask, *what, on the Friends' theory, ought we to expect of consistent men who were inspired to preach the truth* ? Undoubtedly, their preaching ought all to point, like so many concentric rays, to the focus of the inward light ; they ought to apprise men of its existence, explain its nature, and exhort them to follow its suggestions. Thus *Barclay*, in his address to Charles II. notwithstanding the known profligacy of that wicked prince, tells him of that light that

“shineth in his conscience :” terms it the *Light of Christ* ; exhorts him to “apply himself to it,” and follow it as an unflattering and all-sufficient guide. So did *not* the apostles. So did not their Lord ! They did indeed *say to the visible church that Christ was in them, EXCEPT they were reprobates ; BUT NEVER THAT CHRIST WAS IN REPROBATES !* The distinction of Barclay here between the inbeing and *inhabitation* of Christ is a piece of learned fustian, a miserable evasion ; and reminds one of his *Je-suitical* education ! See his words after *vehiculum Dei* below.

The apostles preached that “God *now* commands all men every where to repent ;” no notice of the *light*. Christ testified that they should “all perish,” except they repented. Their common doctrine of *regeneration* is very adverse to the idea of Friends. Instead of telling men that *the seed is in them*, and must be cherished and made to grow ; they told them that they were all sinners, “dead in trespasses and sins,” and must be *totally changed* in their moral nature, or perish ; without one glance at any such thing as *the seed* ! The order of God, which they every where resounded, was, REPENT AND BELIEVE THE GOSPEL. Paul indeed told the Athenians that God is “not far from every one of us ;” and here what a fine opening he had for *the seed* doctrine ! how he *might* have added, in Barclay’s words, by way of explanation, for “a divine *spiritual, and supernatural light is in all men ; which light or seed is vehiculum Dei ; as God and Christ dwelleth in it, and is never separated from*

it ; and as it is received and closed with in the heart, Christ comes to be formed and brought forth." Instead of this, his explanation is merely of the natural presence and ubiquity of God ; "for in him we live, and move, and have our being : " Mark ! we as creatures are in God, not God in us : "for we are all his offspring." The apostles preached that "the whole world lieth in wickedness ; that every mouth shall be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God ; that the *friendship* of the world is enmity with God ; that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth in him* might not perish, but have everlasting life ; that the stone which was set at naught of the builders, is become the head of the corner ; NEITHER IS THERE SALVATION IN ANY OTHER : for THERE IS NONE OTHER NAME UNDER HEAVEN given among men, whereby we must be saved ; that this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life ; and this life is in his Son : he that hath the Son, hath life ; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life ; that he that believeth not the gospel, shall be damned ; and that the wicked shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when he comes to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in them that believe ;" and that *to reject or sophisticate the gospel* is the criterion of eminent wickedness.

In all these specimens of genuine inspiration, as taken from the preaching of Christ and the Apostles, it is observable that not only is nothing said about

this *seed* or *light* of Friends, either in a way of reprehension or explication or allusion, but the propositions themselves exclude the possibility of its existence. They preached an OUTWARD CHRIST to a world *inwardly dark and lost*; even "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness;" they directed men to look *out of themselves* for salvation, to "Jesus Christ and him crucified," whom they preached as the only hope of the world; they called upon men to exercise "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;" and they fully warned the impenitent and the unbelieving not only of the terrible guilt of their courses, but of eternal damnation as the certain consequence of remaining in them. I will add, if there was any sin that induced the more dreadful denunciations of these missionaries of heaven, it was undoubtedly *the sin of corrupting the doctrines of religion*. How tremendous are the rebukes of Jesus Christ against the Scribes and Pharisees for neglecting, superseding, or misinterpreting, the holy scriptures! Read the seventh of Mark, and the twenty-third of Matthew, and ponder their meaning, ye who doubt it. Again, take one example of the preaching of Paul, which is applicable too, to all modern corrupters, and tremble for them that vitiate the gospel. Acts, 13; 10. "O full of all subtlety, and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, WILT THOU NOT CEASE TO PERVERT THE RIGHT WAYS OF THE LORD!" He then smote him with blindness by miraculous agency; and all this because he "withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from

the faith." If it be such sin to "turn away" one soul "from the faith," what kind of responsibility is theirs who actually divert thousands from the same? I come now to show.

VII. THE FALLACY OF ALL THE EVIDENCE *upon which the doctrine affects to be supported by scripture.*

This proposition might imply or seem to require that I must follow them in the examination of *all the evidence* which they adduce, in order to evince its fallacy. But this were perhaps impossible; since there is plainly no end to the perversion of the sense of scripture, by the application to its pages of some fond and false principles of interpretation. There never was a book more susceptible of specious perversion than the Bible. Not that it is waxen and flexible in its own native structure. Just the reverse. But there are many causes which enable a wrong-headed fanciful expounder to wrest its meaning with plausibility and verisimilitude. The ancientness of the style; the peculiarities of the Jewish nation to whom it was first communicated; the facts and usages of oriental antiquity; the dependence of its parts on each other; the truth-fraught boldness of its phraseology; the latitude and strength of its figures; the fulness of its mercy; and other characteristics not to be numbered; so appear on the face of its pages, as to give ample scope to the action of a lawless, theory-loving, imaginative mind, and seem (and only seem) to yield to an influence upon them, all plastic and coercive, which the graceless interpreter ingeniously emits. But let it be remembered that if probation is here, retribution is hereafter. Every thing in the

divine constitution, and the Bible more especially, is purposely designed to *try the reins and heart*; and while God gives all needed scope to the exercise of our moral powers, and preserves perfect our proper freedom, he proportionately augments our personal responsibility! Wo be to the sinner whose rashness or whose malevolence trifles with the truth of Jehovah and vitiates the meaning of his written oracles! The Bible is capable of the most clear, full, and satisfactory exposition. Holy ingenuousness of heart, and a well disciplined mind, are the grand qualifications of an interpreter. Learning, patience, collateral helps, a knowledge of the hermeneutic art founded as it is on the soundest principles of science, a correct philosophy, and especially a thorough and critical knowledge of the original languages; these are subordinate, but most desirable; and for a *public teacher of religion* they are to a certain degree *indispensable qualifications*. May the church be ever saved from the interpretation of 'sincere' and blundering ignorance!

To say this, is consistent for us, who profess an utter indebtedness to the scriptures for all we have of *divine revelation*. But—Friends—their relation is widely different every way to that Book of Books. One would be likely to inquire why they value scripture supports, conjectured or real, even as much as they appear to do, seeing they are so sublimely furnished, every man "under his own vine and his own fig-tree," with a private supply of *paramount* authority and excellence! But they do indeed affirm that the scripture teaches their very

doctrine. They name the texts that contain a *testimony* to their creed of a universal inward light, and refer us to them with as much confidence as if *any such doctrine* was soberly taught in the word of God ; or as if *now* they believed the Bible to be of supreme authority. I commence by flatly denying their assertion : and am bold to pledge myself that *there is not one text in the whole Bible* that, in its native and proper import, contains any such doctrine. Nay, more ; I aver that *any other heresy* that ever darkened the air, is just as able to support itself on the basis of the Bible, as the awful, good-looking, pestilential heresy of Quakerism. The result is that the text must first be *perverted in its meaning* (and that may be done in many ways) before it favors the doctrine of Friends.

Barclay's sixth proposition, after blaming his *Arminian* allies, the *Remonstrants of Holland*, for that in which they had been *chiefly wanting*, in that, though they had said so many good things that suited him, they have erred in affirming "the absolute necessity of the outward knowledge" of the gospel ; (where they were manifestly *evangelical and right* ;) concludes with a censure of them "and many other assertors of *Universal Redemption*, in that they have not placed the extent of this salvation in that divine and evangelical principle of light and life, wherewith Christ hath enlightened every man that comes into the world ; which is excellently and evidently held forth in these scriptures ; Gen. 6 : 3. Deut. 30 : 14. John 1 : 7, 8, 9. Rom. 10 : 8. Tit. 2 : 11."

In this passage of the *Apology*, and in a very formal part of it, (in a *proposition*, not the discussion of it, in the conclusion of one of his *theses theologicae*,) we have some six or seven verses selected from the whole Bible, which—*he says*—contain the proof that outward knowledge of the gospel is not necessary; that the extent of Christ's salvation is placed in the *inward-light* principle which is in every man; and all this "is excellently and evidently held forth" in the passages he has cited. To these then let us go, much in the order propounded, to see this blazing and excellent evidence, which, we believe, was all in his own *enlightened* imagination. After considering these, we shall notice a few other of their vaunted proof-texts. Why should any man be allowed to vend such ruinous imposture, without animadversion?

1. We begin with Gen. 6 : 3. "And the Lord said, my Spirit shall not always strive with man; for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." Barclay's comment, in discussing his proposition, is simply this, so far as *interpretation* extends; "*my Spirit shall not always strive in man*; for so it ought to be translated." Why did he not condescend to give us some proof of this? He makes an assertion, bold, new, contrary to received opinion, based on philological criticism or the *implication* of it, a most important assertion and one *fundamental* to his *internal* scheme; and yet, never offers a single particle of proof of his version! This might answer, if he was really *inspired* to say so: but then he ought

to work a miracle to prove his inspiration. Otherwise we must just treat him like another man. Mark! the point of difference here is NOT *whether the Spirit strives with men!* This is admitted. But it is *whether he strives IN every man and without outward means*, according to the scheme of the inward light! So says Barclay:—he *asserts* that he does. We call for proof:—*there is none!* Why then does not his assertion fall by its own sluggishness, having nothing to support it? O—Because he is *inspired!* We call again for proof:—THERE IS NONE! Why then must we believe him? Is it because he was so learned? We answer, whatever his general learning might have been, it was all nothing unless he was *specially well versed in Hebrew philology and criticism*; and even then his *assertion* is insufficient. When a man tells how a text *ought* to be translated, a most important text and a most cardinal alteration, and yet gives us not one syllable of evidence on which to found his assertion, we ought to be wont to defer *very much indeed, censurably much*, to his lore and correctness as a *Hebrean*, or more to his *inspiration*, in order to give any confidence at all to his opinion! Barclay's *Hebrew* knowledge however is very questionable. It is my opinion that he knew little or nothing of the language.

Our translation of the original word בְּיָדָיו , rendered in our Bible *with man*, may safely be pronounced a correct one. If there be a question in the case, it all turns on the first letter of the word. The prepositional prefix בְּ , is rendered *with* by

our translators and *in* by Barclay. He says *it ought* to be *in*. But how does he know this? Is it because the letter \beth , means *in* and only *in*, according to general grammatical usage, when so prefixed to nouns? *If this were a fact*, it would seem to justify his assertion and greatly assist him. But the misfortune of his predicament is that the fact is otherwise. To mention one case of a thousand, it is rendered *with* six times in one verse; Exod. 10 : 9. \beth means *almost any thing*, as it is situated. It is a preposition of notoriously large and generic signification. One must always look at the nature of the case to know how to render it. Our Lexicons give a numerous retinue of meanings in its definition. *Parkhurst* has *numerically* thirteen! For the sake of general readers we will state them and others. *In, within, among, when, because, to, against, with, together with, concerning, of, into, by, by means of, after, for, on account of, according to, upon, above*, are all given as forms of its meaning in different circumstances. Now look at the assertion! He takes one meaning out of twenty, and decides *without any reason offered* that such is what it *ought* there to have! The Lexicon of *Gesenius* by *Gibbs* contains the following remarks, on \beth as a prefix preposition; it is one "occurring in various connections and significations, which in other languages must be expressed by many different particles." It then proceeds to give the different meanings and formally enumerates *nineteen* with references and proofs. At best it can determine nothing in the case. On the score of philo-

logy therefore the assertion of Barclay is good for nothing. The error is the more reprehensible that the matter is so important! It is *all* in the controversy, if it decides the point in favor of his doctrine of the light within.

I allege further that it is an awkward and unnatural rendering, which it *ought not* to have; that there is no necessity of supposing any *immediate* objective manifestation to the antediluvians either within or without them, since *we know* of the existence of *mediate ones*, quite adequate to answer the demands of the case; and that there is nothing in the condition of the church or of mankind, before the scriptures began to be written, that requires or warrants the theory of Friends. A word on each of these, superfluous indeed for the critic, but perhaps needful for others.

(1) *The passage ought not to be rendered as Barclay decides, because his way is awkward and unnatural.* We have seen that there exists no *grammatical* necessity for his version. I now assert that it is destitute of all intrinsic propriety. The sense of the verse is liberally this: *My Spirit shall not be striving WITH man forever or for an indefinite period; for he is mortal, carnal, rebellious: I will bring the matter to some end and issue, and thence appoint him 120 years of further trial; at the expiration of which period I will drown all the world with a flood.* As if he had said *I will not always and to no result be dealing WITH man, and bearing WITH him. My Spirit of truth and mercy shall not always be treating, and*

striving, and forbearing, WITH him to no purpose; I will take measures to cut it short in judgment: the controversy shall be settled. The longevity of the antediluvians made such a procedure aptly proper; and 120 years was to them but a short respite, so long was their life. It was but a brief appendix to the age of one of them who was old; but when it was for all, young and old together, it was solemn, it was terrible! The reason was, and this is the *natural* rendering, that *God would not be always, and to no result, treating and contesting WITH man.* In common negociations between contending parties, it is common, it is natural, for one of them to say, *you know my terms; I will not waste time or dally WITH you, as if this treating WITH you were to continue for ever. I will limit a time, say one month, within which you must decide.* This will better appear, when we consider,

(2) That *there is no necessity of supposing any "IMMEDIATE objective manifestation" to the antediluvians, either within or without them, since WE KNOW of the existence of MEDIATE ones, quite adequate to answer the demands of the case.* We are informed of the preaching of Noah to them; of the vast operations, constantly advancing through the whole period, in the building of the ark, which solemnly warned them of the approaching deluge; and of other means which they enjoyed in wonderful advantage and perfection:—by all which means the Spirit of Jehovah strove with that evil generation.

The facilities of tradition, connected with the fact

of genuine and decided piety, down to the period to which the text refers, and even after it, demonstrate the plenitude of outward means. Our positions here are that outward means are necessary; that the word of God is the grand instrument for ever; and that, *whether this word be written or spoken*, delivered by oral prophecy or oral tradition, it is the outwardly ministered *word of God*, and not any internal objective manifestation apart from it, by which his Spirit strives with men in all ages. We believe indeed in the *inward objective manifestation* occasionally and extraordinarily made to his prophets by the Spirit: but then we also hold that these were most generally made to be written or spoken for the sake of others, and so were peculiar to the prophet as such; of course they were not, *as such*, a universal inward light; and when communicated, though they were *objective*, they were not *immediate*; since holy men spake, preached, taught, worshipped, and labored for the souls of men: and thus God strove with them, *in kind*, not *in degree, and form*, exactly as he does with us. Our knowledge of those ancient ages is indeed very general and limited. But it is not *therefore* indefinite; we know enough to authorise the inference that they well knew the will of God by ordinary outward means and the occasional inspiration of a prophet; either (and much more both) of which ways shows the non-necessity of the theory of Friends to account for the whole matter; for it is obvious that Barclay and others suppose (wild as is the sentiment) that the *mere fact* that God strove with men, and communed with them by his Spirit, *before the scrip-*

tures were written, is proof positive of their doctrine ! This might be probable, if we could think of no alternative much more rational, adapted to accountable agency, and like the known and common administration of the reigning Jehovah. But suppose that generation had all been cotemporary with Adam, Seth, Enoch, and perhaps thousands of others, who were truly pious, benevolent, and enlightened in the ways of God ; was there any necessity that the inward light should *then*, more than *now*, be afforded to make them completely accountable, and vindicate the moral empire of God, whose Spirit strove with them by these instruments ? But *their common longevity made them almost all cotemporary with each other, and facilitated the traditional progress of knowledge to a degree of which we can scarcely form an adequate conception !* The fifth chapter of Genesis warrants me in saying the following things, according to the strict calculations of simple arithmetic. Noah was 480 years old when the period of awful probation commenced. He was born only 126 years after the death of Adam. He was cotemporary with Enos, the third from Adam, 84 years ; and with *all* his other ancestors, after Seth, till their exit from the world : Seth only and Adam had he not seen, and Seth died only 14 years previous to his birth. Enoch however, who was translated at the early age of 365, is an exception to the above, as he is to almost every other statement. The venerable Methuselah survived his son Lamech about five years ; and was cotemporary with Adam 243 years and with his

grandson, Noah, 600 : as he died the very year of the deluge ; and most *probably* many other, possibly thousands, of pious persons, shortly before the terrible desolation of the flood. Let us remember that these were all our ancestors, as well as of Noah and of Christ ; let us consider that they were men like ourselves, only that their prodigious vigor of body and mind made them all *giants in those days*, of whose prowess we can scarcely form a fitting conception : let us recollect that God has always had a church on the earth, “ a seed to serve him ” that is “ accounted to the Lord for a generation ;” Psalm 22 : 30, and then let us inquire, is it probable that their *need* of the Bible was as great as is ours ? had they not traditional helps and facilities altogether peculiar and wonderful for the preservation of the oral word of God ? and if any special want or waning of knowledge existed, could not God inspire a prophet, as Enoch, Noah, or others, to speak to them and communicate his will ? Is there no solution in reason or probability, without that wild one of Friends ? *Must we* suppose internal objective manifestations in every man—a universal inward light, in order to understand their case ? Is there no way in which the Spirit could strive *with man*, unless he strove *in man*, and in every man of that age ? How then does the passage in question so “ excellently and evidently hold forth ” the doctrine of Friends ? I solemnly declare that I cannot see, and do not at all believe, that *it teaches or favors in the least* any such doctrine as that which Barclay’s sanguine assertion declares it

so *excellently and evidently* to inculcate! The Holy Ghost is said to be *resisted* or striven against when a prophet of God delivers his message to a rebellious auditory or nation. "They rebelled, and vexed his Holy Spirit: therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them." Is. 63:10. "Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day I have even sent unto you all my servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them: yet they hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their ear, but hardened their neck: they did worse than their fathers." Jer. 7:25, 26. This same principle is proved in the concluding words of Stephen before the council. After a long sermon, made up *almost wholly* of scripture references, in which he *proved* that Jesus was the Messiah and confounded and even exasperated (he did it *innocently*) his auditors; he perceived their perturbation and their malice, and thus in the conclusion of his discourse *applied* the subject: "Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, YE DO ALWAYS RESIST THE HOLY GHOST: AS YOUR FATHERS DID, SO DO YE. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them that showed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers; who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it." Acts, 7:51-53. On this *excellent and evident* passage, I remark, (1) that the hearers of Stephen *resisted* the Holy Ghost, not as *inserted* IN THEM, but as

striving from without; they resisted him in his truth, quoted from "the lively oracles," as Stephen calls them, (not *the dead letter*, as *Friends* [alone call them,) and ministered by a living preacher to their rebellious "heart and ears." (2) Stephen says that *this was just the way of their fathers!* Hence we conclude that their fathers resisted the Holy Ghost speaking in his prophets or in his written lively oracles. He adds in proof, "*which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted?*" This is "evidently and excellently" apparent as *the way* of the Spirit's striving, and *the way* of resisting his influences, in all ages of the world. But where now is the mystical, interior, materializing thing, called *universal inward light?*

Let us return to "the years beyond the flood." If it be demanded, why were not alphabetical writing and the scriptures introduced sooner in the ages of the world? I answer, THE RELATIONS OF TRUTH WERE FEWER AND SIMPLER, in those early periods of time; the facts that make up the *substrate* (if I may so speak) of scripture history had not many of them then occurred; it was suitable to the known wisdom of the divine economy gradually to increase revelation's light, and multiply its relations, to the times of MESSIAH; as well as to converge its radiations to their focus on Mount Calvary, and to perpetuate its reflections thence, through the medium of the written oracles, the ministry of the word, and the christian sacraments, to the end of time: while the singular facility of communicating knowledge, by the common longevity

of those ancient patriarchs, completes the solution.

The building of the ark was a slow, prodigious, and portentous operation. First and last, we have reason to think, it filled the awful interval of the period, 120 years, in which the world was plainly and *externally* warned of the approaching inundation. The matter was doubtless understood, and most probably derided and scorned by them to the last. "They did eat, they drank; they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark; and the flood came and destroyed them all." Luke, 17 : 27. While it evinces, among other proofs, the advance of those "awful fathers of mankind," in civilization and the arts, that such a structure as the ark could be reared and completed at all, as it would have been in any age a wonder greater than the tomb of Mausolus; the number of men directly and indirectly engaged in its fabrication must have been prodigious! The difficulty stated in *Calmet*, (see article *Ark*,) against this view of the long period of its building, is imaginary; and will vanish (though you admit, as I do not, his premises) simply by reading Gen. 6 : 18 *prospectively* with respect to his sons, as the sense and the words plainly require: so that it neither concludes nor militates against the general idea of expositors, that the probationary interval of 120 years was occupied in the monitory preparation of the ark. And what was the intelligible motto of this enterprise? What the *meaning* of Noah's conduct in its prosecution? What the speaking portent of it all? The answer is at hand.

“By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house, by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.” Heb. 11 : 7. Noah also explained himself, unquestionably : for he was a minister of religion, a man of resources and influence, a character of probity and renown, and as such well known by the whole world. “God spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, A PREACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly.” 2 Pet. 2 : 5. Thus it appears that the whole world, by outward means, and mainly through the preaching of Noah, were warned ; were rebellious to the known will of God ; and so perished for ever. This seems to be, without doubt, the purport of the passage in 1 Pet. 3 : 19, 20, which affirms that those spirits, *once* rebellious “while the ark was preparing,” are *now* “in prison,” no more reached with the ministrations of mercy and the offers of salvation. See Macknight *in loco*. It affirms that Christ *preached* to them ; just as Paul affirms that, after his ascension, Christ “came and preached peace” to the Ephesians : he preached to these by the apostles and their colleagues ; and to the antediluvians by Noah and others. Thus the adage, *Quod facit per alium, facit per se* : what one does by another, he does by himself.

From all this, I infer that those ancients had a correct knowledge of the creation of the world ; of the temptation and fall of man ; of the promised

Messiah ; of the worship and murder of Abel ; of the holy Sabbath ; (compare Gen. 2 : 2, 3. 8 : 10, 12, and other places where the *number seven* was eminent as a symbol of perfection ;) of the character, prophecy, and translation of Enoch ; of the divine institution and typical import of sacrifices ; of the influences of the Spirit ; of the perfections and ways of Jehovah ; of the nature of religion ; of God's anger with them ; of the second advent of Christ and eternal judgment ; (see Jude, 14, 15 ;) and of innumerable other things, to a degree far surpassing *in some respects* our outward privileges ; and all this without any implication or sanction of the fancy of an *internal objective light* whose *manifestations* were given to every man on the globe.

(3) *There is nothing in the condition of the church or of mankind, before the scriptures began to be written, that requires or warrants the theory of Friends.*

I am thus extensive on this point, because it is one in which the genius of Quakerism triumphs, as if all its rash assumptions were infallible truths. This paper need not be loaded with quotations from *all their works* in which they speak of periods before the scriptures *began to be written*, as those in which *their views of the light within* must be admitted. Who spake to Abraham, or Noah, or Enoch, and others, say they, before there was any Bible ? And how did those patriarchs manage who had no Bible and yet walked with God ? They make these bold appeals just as if their questions could be answered *only* by admitting *their*

answers! only by adopting their doctrine! only by rejoicing in “the sparks that *they* have kindled!” This absurd exultation looks so much like *evidence, argument, demonstration*, in the eyes of those who admit their *inspiration* while they thus exult, that millions are captivated, convinced, converted, and it may be also *inspired*, when they witness its imaginings.

The apostle says that all these ancients were actuated *by faith*; and with *Barclay*, I admit that the great object of faith then and since is “*Deus loquens*,” God speaking. But cannot God speak *to us*, unless he speaks *in us*, and *in each one of us*? This is the question: and until they actually prove the *negative*, Friends have proved nothing to the purpose. *Barclay* himself admits that God, in all that long tract of time, 2500 years, before the Bible or the Pentateuch was given, and before alphabetical writing was known, (or revealed, as some think it was of inspired original and *first* made known to Moses,) often spake to men by the ministry of angels, by “outward voices, appearances, and dreams,” and by the agency of human preachers: and any one of *these five modes* will account for the knowledge and piety of the ancients, without all influence or agency of the light within! Hence their own *admissions* answer their appeals: while all their arguments are *wholly destitute of proof* that such a *universal internal light*, or seed, or *vehiculum dei*, or divine emanation, or paramount rule of action, has any existence.

Let it be remembered too that “Noah lived *after*

the flood 350 years ;” and that Abraham was born *two years* after Noah’s death, and lived the cotemporary of *Shem* 150 years. These facts might be extended : but enough is written to evince that *tradition* must have been a great help from the beginning of the world to the time of Moses. In his time, it is thought, (see Psalm 90,) human life was reduced to nearly its present span. The tradition of theological truth could come, through *faithful* channels, from Adam to Moses by six or seven steps ! and none can doubt the interest of those ancient Fathers of the church in handing down, from sire to son, a pure account of those wonders and truths of God which themselves superlatively loved, defended, and diffused. Friends at least ought to admit the value of tradition, since, to the exclusion of better lights in our day, it makes so forceful a part of their own system of education. Besides, in the period (427 years) after the flood till the calling of Abraham, the tradition, the credit, and the monuments, of that terrific chapter of the divine judgments, were yet recent and unquestionable. The deluge was then of modern memory. The fact that *such a lesson was by many soon forgot*, must indeed be admitted : it is equally criminal, wonderful, lamentable ! But this infers nothing against the sufficiency of the means for “retaining” it in their knowledge. “For this they *willingly* are ignorant of, that—the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished.” God is not answerable for the perverse inconsiderateness of men. Where the evidence

is sufficient and the creature accountable, God is vindicated, whatever may be the result. The light of nature every where teaches more than men *anywhere* learn from it; more than theologians have generally admitted; and quite sufficient to conclude against all the excuses of idolaters, "all the nations that forget God," pre-eminently all the enemies of revelation. This light does not interfere with that of *traditional*, any more than with that of *scriptural* truth. And here it requires, methinks, only a little comprehension of the facts of the case and a little ingenuousness of heart toward God, to perceive the irrelevancy of the theory of Friends, the non-necessity of their universal inward light. I have bestowed thus much to the consideration of the subject, which is so plain and rational as represented in the total scope of scripture that the theory of Friends is necessary to make rather than solve its difficulties; because with them it is a capital subject, and one in their view *quite conclusive* against the *paramount* claims of "the oracles of God."

I pass to the next passage, in which Barclay affirms that the inward light is so "excellently and evidently" taught.

2. This occurs in Deut. 30 : 14. "But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it." As Rom. 10 : 8 is virtually the same text, or rather a quotation and amplification of the first, they may be considered together; though by Barclay separately noted, yet simply in the order of priority in scripture. With

regard to either or both these passages, I affirm that *they neither teach nor contain the doctrine of Barclay*. Let us examine them; and first that in Romans.

In examining this passage, it would be preferable to view it *in extenso* from the first verse of the chapter to the tenth. The eighth verse, however, is the hobby of Barclay. "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart." Quere, Is the inward light in a man's mouth? Is it also in his heart? And at the same time? What walking temples of phosphorescence must we be, especially *some* of us? For aught one knows to the contrary we may be saturated with it, as men on glass with electricity. There is hardly as much humor as soberness, to a reader for example of Fox's journal, in the thought that *he* must have seemed to himself, as he walked about on the dark earth, like a charged conductor of ethereal light, with scintillations of glory streaming from him in all directions. But why is it called "the word?" Why not his own talismanic name of "inward light?" The charm is gone, however, as soon as you allow the apostle to explain his own words; "that is, THE WORD OF FAITH WHICH WE PREACH." He proceeds farther to explain it thus, "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart it is believed unto justification, and with the mouth it is confessed unto salvation." The liberty I have taken with the tenth verse, is one to

which no honest scholar will object ; since it literalizes more strictly, as well as better renders the sense of the original. How the word came “nigh,” is told us by the implication or rather the very words of the passage ; since it is “the word of faith which we *preach*.” See verse 15 also. It is *in the heart*, when it is there “believed ;” it is *in the mouth*, when it is there “confessed.” It is originally then in neither. Thus says God to Moses ; Deut. 31 : 19. “Now therefore write ye this song for you, and teach it [to] the children of Israel : PUT IT IN THEIR MOUTHS, that this song may be a witness for me against the children of Israel.” Says David ; “Thy word HAVE I HID IN MY HEART, that I might not sin against thee.” Ps. 119 : 11. This is the genuine idea of “phylacteries” (preservatives or defenders) and the proper style of wearing them about with us ! And again ; “Take not the word of truth UTTERLY OUT OF MY MOUTH ; for I have hoped in thy judgments.” 43. It were well if Friends should *ponder* that Psalm, with its 176 verses. It is a devotional panegyric (with eight stanzas for every letter of the Hebrew alphabet—an acrostic in the original) on the written word of God, as *essentially* subsidiary to vital piety in the soul ; and as showing the way of the Spirit in its production there ; and proving illustriously how *a truly spiritual worshipper* values “the word, the testimonies, the statutes, the judgments, the precepts, the laws, the sayings,” of God ! How “excellently and evidently” then is their doctrine “held forth” by Barclay’s vaporeing quotation !

What a deception to the unwary, to the ignorant and unstable! What a sin so to “wrest the scriptures;” and to do it under the *forged claim* of inspiration, the more to blind the mythic visionaries that see with him! The enemies of God may see no sin in the perversion, as they see comparatively none in themselves: but will the friends of God sympathize or symbolize with them?

There is another proof to the same end. It is taken from the etymology and scriptural usage of the expression, here rendered in the chapter four times, “the word.” The original is *ρημα*, not *λογος*. The difference is that the former means specifically what is spoken, enunciated with the organs of the voice; and occurs in the New Testament (I have counted and examined them) about 70 times. The latter is more generic and extensive: it means doctrine or discourse, a word collective (as speech) or individual, written or spoken, heard or remembered or imagined; and it means also, by a grand and most appropriate personification, the Son of God in his prophetic office, as the instructor of mankind and “the light of the world.” In this last sense it is used by John in his gospel, 1: 1, and in his Revelation, 19: 13. Here permit a digression in place.

The Friends, Orthodox and Hicksites, the whole of them, refuse to call the scripture the word of God. One reason assigned is—that the title is appropriated personally to Jesus Christ. But this reason is most weak and sophistical. John so appropriates it indeed, in the *two* instances above cited; and in

these alone does it certainly or prominently occur. He so applies it in a secondary and figurative sense, and very rarely, i. e. but twice. But be it remembered that as the expressions in the original are different, so *ῥημα του Θεου* is NEVER applied personally; never once; though for the uttered or spoken, or subsequently written *word of God*, it occurs so *very frequently* in scripture. What reason then is there for their refusal? especially when we consider, (1) that the inspired message of God, whether written or spoken, contains identically his words, and in the nature of things, could not have an appellation more proper than "his word" for its collective record; (2) that Fox says he declared "the word of the Lord" to the people; and *if* he did, and records what he said identically, is not so much of it "the word of the Lord" still? (3) that the scriptures call themselves "the word of God." Paul after quoting with explanations from the Old Testament, justifies the spirituality of the sense and its application, thus: "for the word of God is quick (alive) and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, &c." Heb. 4: 12. Mark, *he* does not say it is "a *dead* letter," and not to be understood but by *inspired* catechumens! They are called "the lively oracles" once; Acts 7: 38; and "the oracles of God," three times; Rom. 3: 2; Heb. 5: 12; 1 Pet. 4: 11. The word spoken and heard is called "the word of God" very frequently. Hundreds of passages might be collected—but *quantity* is not our aim. (4) That Jesus Christ expressly calls the scripture the word of God. See Mark, 7: 13; where he refers, having just quoted it, to Exod.

20 : 12 ; and John, 10 : 35, where he refers, having just quoted it, to Psalm 82 : 6. I could easily command more proof ; but suppose that man to be uncandid whom the evidence already adduced fails to conciliate to the truth of the position that Friends act without reason and against it, in refusing to call, what God inspired to be “the law of his mouth” to us, the holy scriptures, the word of God. (5) That the word of God is properly and absolutely, (whether written or spoken or in whatever way conveyed,) the highest or the paramount rule of action. It is not true in this world *peculiarly*, that it holds supreme pre-eminence. It is the highest rule everywhere ; throughout the universe ; “in all places of his dominion.” It is the highest with “angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, HEARKENING TO THE VOICE OF HIS WORD.” It is thus that all the illustrious hierarchies of heaven obey him, walking by no higher rule, or rather *flying* by it alone. Thus are they “all his hosts ;” sentient of his will as indicated in his word ; “ministers of his, that do his pleasure.” And what know we of God in a way of worship, or as it respects his ascertained will concerning us, except from his written word ? “whereunto *we do well* that we take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in our hearts.” What know Friends without that glorious and plenary informer ? Nothing at all in religion ! Nothing that is true or distinguishingly Christian ! Why then refuse they to call it what it is, the word of God ? O how much do they lose by their error here ! Where-

fore, consider (6) That the reason they allege is not credibly the one that influences their refusal. I do not say they know the fallacy and practise it contrary to what they know to be right. Sin is deceitful ; is deceit itself. Millions that are posting to hell, according to the testimony of scripture, are full of vain and presumptuous hopes ; mistaking themselves for the servants of Christ, it may be, when he knows them to be the servants of the devil. But there is little use here in proving this. I only allege that the real reason of refusal with the Friends is the enmity of the seed of the serpent against the seed of the kingdom. It is sin itself ; opposition cloaked from sight, yet mortally set against “ the truth as it is.” If the Bible was a *friend* to Friends, they would insist on its meaning more and commend it to the universal reception of mankind. The word of God is that tremendous panoply in which “ the sacramental host of God’s elect ” are clothed, and the etherial point of which is intolerable to the spirits of rebellion, human and infernal. It disposes of them too summarily. Like its Author, it respects no man’s person. It fears nothing, conceals nothing, disguises nothing ; but makes manifest the character and the doom of the wicked, in light of the eternal throne and the Sovereign that reigns on it. I believe it is the policy and the temper of sin, and nothing better, no matter in whom, that resolutely and knowingly refuses to recognise the word of God, as such : and while they continue so to do, I for one can *recognise* them only as those who, I fear, are the disguised enemies of Jesus Christ, and “ wolves in sheep’s

clothing," notwithstanding their smooth and oily arts of seeming goodness, by which they are wont to ingratiate themselves with strangers, the simple or the ignorant. I return to the passage in Romans.

It is fortunate or otherwise as we think, I pronounce it, however, fearlessly, to be a fact, that in all the prime quotations of the Friends, their champions and smaller heralds, a cool analysis of the passage not only dissipates the evidence on which they rely, but converts it into a damper of their flame—and an extinguisher of their light. With astonishing infelicity, equalled only by the impious presumption of his inspired arrogance, does Barclay refer to the passage in question. He touches a spring, and fires a train, and ignites a mine, of explosion and ruin to his total Quakerism. It is the doctrine of justification.

Of this glorious cardinal point of christianity, the whole epistle to the Romans may be entitled an inspired elucidation. To understand it as it is revealed, and to have hope toward God in that incomparable way, will always, in a mind of comprehension and consistency, induce substantially the following results: It will endear the scripture to all that is human in him, to all his faculties and affections, to his influence and his praise, in a degree transcendent and supreme; it will give him such hope in God through Jesus Christ as never was without it; it will make holiness the passion of his life and the element of his motion, mental and corporeal—it will facilitate universal duty and familiarize it to the practice; it will demonstrate that in-

stead of leading to licentiousness, as infidels and sciolists pretend to be conscientious in alleging, it is the best and the only way of prosecuting "true holiness;" it will give a clearness and fixity of vision in the things of God, a clew of interpretation to the whole volume of revelation, and inspire an immutability of character, while it communicates to the mind that unequaled excellence which Sir Humphrey Davy justly pronounces the grand *desideratum* of human nature, *a sound and established religious faith*; it will impart a clear perception of the attributes of God, of his law, of human accountability and depravity and ill-desert, of the glorious atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ on the accursed tree, of the principles of the divine moral government, of the nature and laws of the mediatorial system, of the duties and dangers of men as "prisoners of hope," of the offers and promises, of the threatenings and denunciations of the word of God, and of the diverse eternal destinies of the TWO GREAT MORAL CLASSES into which the species are divided here and hereafter; it will commend the way of acceptance and justification through the Mediator, to the unalterable convictions of the soul, as the only possible way in which a sinner can be saved; it will demonstrate immutably the divine origin of the gospel, as a thing not to be rationally referred to an architect inferior to Him who arched the firmament, and stored immensity with innumerable worlds in solemn order perfectly arranged; and it will every way accomplish and confirm him as a christian, as never was there one on earth without it:

making moral courage "hard as adamant" against prevaricating error, and tender as the gentlest offices of love toward penitence or candor ingeniously seeking for the truth.

The scriptural doctrine of justification is one which, I am bold to say at least, is not understood by Friends. It is perverted by them sadly; and here, speaking experimentally as a witness, my whole soul adores the God of all grace about equally for my own conversion from old Adam and George Fox! Through the one, condemnation reigns over all his depraved posterity; through the other, I feel, as well as think, that it becomes well nigh eternized on all his perverted votaries. It is impossible for a Quaker consistently to learn and love the scripture doctrine of justification; for, accepting it, he would in all consistency renounce Quakerism.

Without delivering a dissertation on the subject, I shall advert to some of its important principles.

1. It is founded on the distinction between the person and the character of an individual. Paul, for example, is the same person that he ever was, and so continues immutably and eternally. But his character is not the same that it was. Conversion was its first incipient change; sanctification progressively advanced it in the divine similitude; glorification hath consummately expanded it in the perfection of heaven. He who now emulates a cherub in clearness of vision and a seraph in purity of zeal, was once the dark and bloody persecuter of Jesus Christ and his church; "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of

the Lord ;" verily thinking " that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." But, remember, he is the same person ; the sinner that did all those things ! His person is unchangeable and identical ; and so is that of every other individual.

2. The moral account of every human being is retrospective, as well as present, and includes the charge of every sin, with its legislated curse against the person by whom it was committed. How enormous and tremendous the account ! Like the manifesto of a correct creditor, to whom we have been plunging deeper and deeper in debt for a long course of years, the items are there that we had forgotten and each one contributes to the appalling sum total : while the claim demonstrates our bankruptcy, and holds our person justly a prisoner to its power. " The strength of sin is the law." Our insolvency—is a disagreeable thing to look at.

Hence men of *inward* light are wont
To turn their optics *in* upon 't.—BUTLER.

Hence the doctrine of justification is so meanly and universally detested by the men of the world. The felons of the curse can ill endure a settlement, even by grace in Christ Jesus, if it honors law and requires them to confess the utter and terrible ruin of their circumstances.

Hence all that is in man, pride, passion, art,
Powers of the mind, and feelings of the heart ;

Insensible of truth's almighty charms,
 Starts at her first approach, and sounds, to arms!
 While bigotry, with well-dissembled fears,
 His eyes shut fast, his fingers in his ears,
 Mighty to parry and push by God's word,
 With senseless noise, his argument the sword,
 Pretends a zeal for godliness and grace,
 And spits abhorrence in the christian's face.—COWPER.

3. Justification, as such, strictly taken, respects *the person alone*, and not the character; while to commix these in the view, is the very chaos of all confusion to a subject worthy of the most correct discrimination of which the intellectual powers are capable. It consists in the release of the person, on account of Jesus Christ alone, from all his penal responsibilities; remitting all his sins for that dear sake; and accepting the party as righteous, and so engaging faithfully to treat him, through the Mediator, to the glory of God. It is a forensic or judicial declaration of indemnity forever, in their behalf who believe; and a consequent public treatment of them as if they were in no sense deserving of the executed penalty of law.

4. It were easy in thought to separate, what is in fact inseparable, the person and the character, in respect to justification; that its glorious theory might become more clearly discernible. The arch-fiend of pandemonium, for example: his character is totally bad, and his person under eternal sentence. Suppose this were reversed, without reversing or altering that: he would be personally free and uncondemned, and yet as bad as ever. Or, suppose his character was reversed and melio-

rated into perfect holiness, his person would still be holden for the sins that are past: and he would then be sanctified but not justified, not absolved. This anomaly often occurs in the jurisprudence of human society. A person of perfect innocence is convicted of crime, is not justified but condemned; while the villain escapes, in the eye of law, justified. To absolve a person of all his sins, to release him, is the justifying act by which a sinner becomes accepted in the sight of God: and is specifically the proper idea of *redemption* ἀπολυτρωσις—which Friends define to be a cleansing of the interior from sin! It contemplates us as captives, slaves to the curse, sold to punishment, and justly exposed to “everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord.” Hence Christ dies for us; “in whom we have redemption THROUGH HIS BLOOD, (that is—HIS DEATH,) the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.” Eph. 1: 7. Rom. 3: 24. 8: 1, 30. When our moral relations are adjusted, and we are accepted as righteous in the sight of God, righteousness is said to be “imputed” to us, or reckoned or counted or accounted: for the original word is the same or a cognate, wherever those various forms occur in our translation. Yet this subject of “imputed righteousness” is the perfect horror of Friends, all of them! And they must all—as they *know* that they do—degrade it; for their inspired patriarchs all did it. And why? Because it is unscriptural? Was the epistle to the Galatians, and Luther’s immortal commentary thereon, written for any other end than to disabuse

it of what its enemies had said of it, and vindicate it as the only way of hope? How will a Friend be justified without imputation? O, he will repent and mind the inward teachings hereafter. Will he? and how is this to repair his former obliquity and defalcation? Will present repentance atone for past sins? Just as much as for future and no more. Suppose he was truly to repent, that is, not merely be sorry, dress plain, and "get still;" but turn from all sin like a man, with full purpose of heart to practise universal righteousness: suppose he were "renewed up" to the perfect sanctimony of Fox; still is he the same person that committed those former sins; and is *he* righteous? But God will pardon! Will he? Yes, for Christ's sake alone; and he will impute righteousness also where he pardons; or, every sinner of the species would be lost forever, all his pharisaism and all his holiness and all his "sincerity" to the contrary notwithstanding! See Rom. 4: 1-8. Gal. 3: 6-14. Read, understand, believe, and love—or, reader, lay your account with eternal condemnation!

5. The evangelical system, however rejects with just indignation the hypocritical inuendo of infidelity and heresy conjoined, for their cause is one, against the only method of possible justification for men, that it tends to licentiousness; and lays, in the very centre of the fabric, the basis of holiness, by defining the nature of faith, and making its requisition absolute and universal, and giving the very means of its production and nutrition in the grace of the Spirit. "This only would I learn of you, received

ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" Gal. 3: 2. Faith generally means—confidence in testimony. Evangelically it means this and more; namely, A CORDIAL CONFIDENCE in the testimony of God as contained in the scriptures, especially in respect to the way of justification. It is "with the heart" indispensably that we believe unto life eternal. We trust affectionately, and love what we trust; and thus assimilate, and are "sanctified by faith that is in Christ." Acts, 26: 18. Now hope becomes the lovely inspirer of holiness—for "every man that hath this hope in HIM"—that is, in CHRIST, and not IN himself, as Friends misinterpret it; see the original—"purifieth himself, even as HE is pure." 1 John, 3: 3. "The devils also believe and tremble." Yes, but they never love and "go on their way rejoicing." A man must have a religion better in kind, as well as greater in degree, than devils, in order to escape their prison. What shall we say then of some who have not so much religion as they? Who do not even believe! A christian however knows what it is to love God, as well as fear him; and his very fear is "clean, enduring for ever." Says Paul, "For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." 2 Tim. 1: 7.

It is a great proof of the stupidity of the human mind in the things of God, and proper to infidelity alone, to insinuate that the apostles were at variance on this article, especially Paul and James. The latter more insists on the holy nature of justifying faith; the former more assumes it. Paul never

meant to say that a "dead" antinomian faith could save us; nor James that "the righteousness of God" should be superseded or mended by our own doings, in order to perfect the way. James inveighs against the faith that produces no good works, which "is dead, being alone." Paul shows that justification is gratuitous to the person, who believes "with his heart." Our present piety and our future, even if it were perfect—as it never is in this world, could only answer the preceptive claims of the law for the time being: in respect to time past, it could not cancel sin, or atone for it, or excuse it, or reverse the facts of its history, or annul the moments of time in which it was perpetrated, or diminish the ill-desert of the person for having committed it; and in respect to the future, in two words, what could it do to counterpoise the sins already perpetrated, or—more impious imagining!—to *DESERVE*, as its proper "wages," that "exceeding and eternal weight of glory" which constitutes splendidly "THE GIFT OF GOD IN CHRIST JESUS?" How excellent is the enlightening and sanctifying virtue of this doctrine of "the eternal Spirit!" How does it discriminate a true hope from a false one! How reveal the upstart impudence of those human spirits whose latent pride were otherwise unsuspected and asleep! How excellent must their service be, who *never* obey the gospel; who in their unbelief never please God or do a single thing in pure obedience to his will; and who for all this so estimate service by them done or to be done, in fact or in abeyance, especially and pre-eminently the

latter, as to think eternal glory but a fair and righteous compensation for it all! Give me and mine that better hope of the gospel; “being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus!” There is no other hope that deserves the name. To be justified possibly in any other way is—*always to be and to have been without sin in the sight of God!* Every mortal is a sinner: and must be justified imputatively and for Christ’s sake alone, by an act of pure and infinite grace; or condemned distributively and for his own sake alone, by an act of simple and sovereign justice forever.

6. The conditions of justification and salvation, respectively and inseparably, as here propounded to us, are worthy of special observation; namely, to BELIEVE WITH THE HEART, and to CONFESS WITH THE MOUTH. These are plainly THE TERMS OF LIFE ETERNAL!

To “believe with the heart,” is the precise way in which the things of religion are felt or realized, spiritually and practically, by christians. It is a better way than all the acts and orgies of fanaticism, than all the dreams of delusion, or the inspirations of sorcery, or the imaginations of credulity, or the artifices of impenitent remorse, or the *got up* sensations of animal zeal, can ever substitute or furnish. It is sober; principled; rational without neology; fervent with no extravagance; and happy without affectation. It is also useful; delighting in evidence; capable of conviction; firm in its positions; noiseless and immutable. This is the kind

of christians we desire to see. "The Father seeketh such to worship him."

To "confess with the mouth" is to honor Christ before men; to own the blessed Redeemer in public; to join his standing army and espouse his cause; and to furnish, by his command, such proper indications and signals to his officers and others, as are made justly requisite to a recognition of us on their part. **WITHOUT A SOUND CONFESSION THERE IS NO RECOGNITION AUTHORIZED.** Besides, confession is said to be "unto salvation." This is a terrible impeachment of their hopes who shun to confess the Savior, or whose confession is so vitiated that it were difficult to know what is to be inferred from it. Is it Christ that they confess? or Mohammed? or Confucius? or Zoroaster? or Swedenburgh? or George Fox? or some new impostor? Is their confession enlightened or ignorant, is it sound or heretical, is it intelligible or steeped in stupid mysticism?

But the things are connected. If we believe aright, we so confess also. The faith governs the confession, as good or bad. When both are right, the party is diaphanous, clear as crystal, in religion; and God is "glorified in him." Then the heart and the mouth respond to each other and to truth, in happy concert. The mind and the manners, the feelings and the words, what is within and what is without, the soul and the body, in a word, the total man, is Christ's, consistently, practically, influentially, joyfully, and for ever! This is religion. Would to God that I could think, for then would

I cheerfully “confess,” that such is the appropriate religion of a Friend!

“Therefore, if ANY MAN be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.” 2 Cor. 5:17. Wo, wo, wo, to the misery-making delusion of inward light!

7. There are but two ways possibly of justification before God: the first is to demonstrate that we are and always have been perfect in holiness, according to the requisitions of the law of God; that is, to demonstrate here and hereafter that we have never sinned; for, if we have, we fall under the curse of eternal justice. The other is—the way of grace and righteousness by imputation in Christ Jesus. Thus in the passage Rom. 10:1–10, the apostle declares two ways only; and resolves the self-righteousness of the Jews into their *ignorance* of the divine method of justification, while he weeps over them without hope, notwithstanding the “zeal of God” which he bears witness that they had. “For they, being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.” The word “righteousness” in all this connection respects the person rather than the character; and were better rendered “justification” in every instance. Thus; “the righteousness of God,” of which a whole nation was “ignorant” and remains so to this day, means—not the intrinsic equity of his nature, nor the rectitude of his moral administration, nor any general aspect

of his justice; though it implies them all; but it means the method which God has invented, adopted, revealed, and provided in Christ Jesus, and from which HE will never depart; the evangelical method of justifying sinners. "For Christ is the end of the law" (as good as legal justification could be, to all intents and purposes—to say the *least* of it) "for justification, to every one that believeth." The disclosure of THIS GLORY OF THE GOSPEL is expressly assigned by the apostle, Rom. 1:13-17, as one of his chief reasons for wishing to preach it at Rome. By the light of nature and the sagacity of men, it never could be known. It was *in the gospel alone* that it was revealed. "For therein is the righteousness of God," that is, his method of justification, "revealed to faith to be by faith: as it is written, The just by faith (or the man who is justified by faith) shall live;" or be accepted, and saved in Christ. The liberties I have taken with our translation, only exhibit the sense of the original more plainly, as the scholar will see, and as many learned commentators have shown. But what do Friends know of this glory of the gospel of Christ? I answer, nothing, or next to nothing and worse than nothing. Their system precludes it. Their ignorance is organized in its alienation. They confound it with sanctification, through their tradition and their educated lack of competent instruction.

"I wot that through ignorance they did it, as did also their rulers." And I would fairly warn a Friend not to learn the doctrine of scripture on this fundamental article—if he means to keep his cast:

for the two things are utterly incompatible. Believe the true doctrine of justification according to the word of God, and it will give you a solid anchorage. By it both pharisaism and fanaticism will together die. Its influence is steadily the same: "that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the slight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, who is the Head, even Christ."

Barclay has written between 40 and 50 pages of his "Apology" under the head of "Justification;" in which he proves mainly this—that he never understood the subject!

It is with a perpetual mixture of pity and grief and indignation that I plod through the desert of his dreary and jesuitical lucubrations on this important theme—to which pilgrimage I have condemned myself several times. I pronounce it mystical, confused, fallacious, arrogant, heretical, and of no solid perspicacity in the things of God. But he must keep up the dignity of the inward light; and by pretending to know every thing, vindicate the honor of inspiration, his own and theirs. Hence this quondam jesuit, trained as his noble mind had been to a sophistry which ceased not to be the besetting sin of his life, blunders and flounders and splashes along, like Bucephalus in a quagmire at midnight. He reminds me constantly of honest Considius, one of the lieutenants of Cæsar in his Gallic wars, who reported to him an interesting

matter of fact, respecting the position of the enemy ; which he had just observed “with indubitable clearness,” and therefore “testified to” all in a hurry : upon which report, a military movement of some consequence was immediately ordered ; the whole army was set on march ; a lofty hill-top eminence was stoutly gained ; and the victorious troops exulted without a battle—for no enemy was there ! the lieutenant, in the *inspiration* of his zeal, having reported an unreal spectacle ; “quod non vidisset, pro viso, sibi renunciasset ;” but with all the certainty of a man who misleads a multitude, and even trepanns a great commander, because he moves too fast in his observations to possess himself of the truth as it is, or to understand the subject of his sanguine communications.

Not unwisely therefore does the saying of Luther receive the homage of succeeding ages in reference to this grand fundamental of christianity—“ARTICULUS STANTIS VEL CADENTIS ECCLESIAE ;” THE DOCTRINE BY WHICH THE CHURCH OR STANDS OR FALLS :—a sentiment of which I scarce know whether more to admire the solemnity, the poetry, the validity, the utility, or the piety ! It deserves the respect of the universe, as it conciliates the testimony of the wise. To understand the doctrine of justification ; to master the science of its relations to the law and to the gospel, with correct and profound discrimination ; to adjust it in the revealed system, as it respects the atonement and the righteousness of Christ, the moral government of God, the duty of sinners, and the hopes of men ; that

same great and wise Reformer also justly made his criterion of a qualified theologian and an accomplished minister. O how justly! No man is fit to preach who does not understand it; who does not aggrandize it to the perceptions of his hearers; who does not glory in it surpassingly himself! But when was Quaker preacher SUCH? I never knew or read of an instance, even by approximation! To be such, is to be a Quaker no more. They do not understand the subject. Barclay does not—*probatum sit*.

☞ “*It is by this inward birth of Christ in man that man is made just, and therefore so accounted by God: wherefore, to be plain, [who has a better right?] we are thereby, and not till that be brought forth in us, formally, if we must use that word, justified in the sight of God; because justification is both more properly and frequently in scripture taken in its proper signification for making one just, and not reputed one merely such, and is all one with sanctification.*” The italicising is his own. I however will capitalize this sentiment—JUSTIFICATION IS ALL ONE WITH SANCTIFICATION! And sanctification, it seems, is all one with the mystic “seed” *in us* set a growing! What shall I say? Is this the way to expound the word of God; to sustain the protestant cause; and to diffuse christianity in the world?

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget.

VIRG.

Not such defenders can sustain the cause ;
 Or vindicate the truth's eternal laws ;
 Or suit the age, or claim our just applause.

Reader, the whole dissertation is "a continent of mud," resolvable into the substance of the precious *morceau* I have quoted. It is a specimen of the whole territory. It is the seminal nucleus whereof all the total *quantity* is but the homogeneous expansion.

On the above, I would remark,

1. That he evidently dislikes the word *justified*. "If we *must* use that word." Indeed! How reluctant to use one of the "words which the Holy Ghost teacheth!" one of the richest in the vocabulary of Jesus Christ! one of the most glorious to authentic hope! I know the reason—neither the word, nor the thing, suits the system he advocates. It explodes that system with mutual repugnance. The matter is in his way; and yet he vaunts as if it were an exact fit. If the word be "all one with sanctification," how great the infelicity of its use! Why say any thing in the Bible about justification? why not use one word only? and why does *he* write so much to tell us that both are one and the same? "As many as resist not this *light*, but receive the same, it becomes in them an holy, pure, and spiritual birth—by which—as we are sanctified, so are we justified in the sight of God." Thus his seventh proposition, "concerning justification," proceeds, as the thesis of his essay: in which there are twenty-one lines of mythologic wisdom, without even the

word *faith* in all his formal statement. The doctrine of evangelical faith is another enemy of their system.

To believe in that *light*—is all they know of faith ; and what they steal from the word of God to confirm their error, they pervert to the same end. The faith of the gospel is intelligent ; is rational ; is steady ; is above the feelings, as their balance and their guide ; is just as devoid of fanaticism as of infidelity ; is happy and peaceful ; “ full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy.” But how terrible is the delusion of sin ! The maniac maintains his sanity in the first place, and construes his friends as his foes. The spirit of false religion rejoices in the sparks of its own kindling, and refuses to see itself as it is, in the light of truth ! But its sentence will soon be executed !

2. It is plain that Barclay confounds the distinction between person and character, between sanctification and justification ; and is either ignorant of the truth or worse—such a vender of “ another gospel ” that if he were also “ an angel from heaven ” he ought not to be countenanced in his darkness and delusion ; in the destructive *malaria* of the influence he emits ! On one occasion this doctrine of justification was disguised and incidentally vitiated, by the apostle Peter himself, at Antioch in Syria. It occurred in a way of practical “ dissimulation ” and temporizing. But Paul would not endure it. “ To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour ; that the truth of the gospel might continue

with you." Hence, says Paul, "I said unto Peter before them all," &c. He "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." He set him right too, in a way magnanimous and *paulian* indeed: and Peter seems to have received the correction with a "meekness of wisdom" which no one of his pseudo-successors is known to have exemplified. Gal. 2. The inference is—the cardinal importance of the incorrupt doctrine of justification, and the necessity of resisting its corruption and its obscuration too wherever they occur, no matter in whom and however incidentally. What then are we to think of a whole system that is destitute of the true doctrine; that wretchedly sophisticates it; that supersedes and virtually denies it; and that, in its whole compagination of principles and its wordy ambages of explanatory labor, does nothing but annihilate its character and its glory? Let any enlightened christian, ask Quakerism, where is my hope, where my indemnity, where my Redeemer? But blindness is contented—for it sees not what it loses: ignorance has no conception of what is to be known; and where the soul is removed from the knowledge of the true gospel, and is habituated (for the devil's greater pastime) to be amused with "another," it is awfully probable that the siren will continue to sing, and the song will not cease to enchant, and the enchantment will prevail till 'outer darkness' ends the career. "O my soul! come not thou into their secrets: unto their assembly, mine honor, be thou not united!" I bless God that I am no more one

of them. Let no man rashly censure me for repeating this declaration!

3. "Because"—says he, "justification is both more properly and frequently in scripture taken in its proper signification for making one just and not reputed one merely such, and IS ALL ONE WITH SANCTIFICATION"—wonderful! "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." How much meekness does it require to deal with spiritual sorcery and corruption! "Justification is all one with sanctification;" that is "its proper signification;" it is "more frequently in scripture taken" for sanctification; it does not mean "merely reputed one" to be just; and "because" of this—

—————cui lumen ademptum!

The monster roars tremendous in his pain
Without an eye, and strives to see in vain!
Light is extinguished and he gropes insane.

Think, reader, how profanely he caricatures the doctrine of God; as if justification, as he would vilify it, means to "repute merely" that one is just! as if he were *not* justified by an act of God! as if it consisted in giving currency to a false report! a fact without existence! This is inspiration, I have no doubt; but not *divine* inspiration. It is a fact, and a glorious one, that every christian IS JUSTIFIED in Christ Jesus, and that this is the only way. It is a fact that "God justifieth—and whom he justified, them he also glorified."

But justification is taken for sanctification "both

more properly and frequently in scripture "than—what? where is the other subject of comparison? It is at once implied, by necessity; and slighted into oblivion, by design. What then is *that sense* of justification which Barclay teaches is *both infrequently and less properly* connected with the word in scripture? It is the sense which he dislikes, obscures, and supersedes, with the darkness of his foxian scheme of *light*. It is the sense of LUTHER'S ALL; the foundation of the church; and the glorious constitution of Jehovah! I have "searched the scriptures" often with this very idea in my eye; and now I feel perfectly authorized to contradict his assertion, and assert the contrary. The personal and forensic sense of the word, *justification*, as opposed to condemnation, is the primary and pervading sense of the word in scripture. The obscuration of this truth is like an eclipse of "the sun of righteousness." But such obscuration is—Quakerism! Take an induction by the way—They know next to nothing of atonement, whatever they *say* of it, using the word and referring to the death of Christ; as little know they of the law of God, of the nature of human accountability, of the perfection of the divine moral government, of the ill-desert of sin, of the immutable principles of the gospel, and the method of acceptance with God:—or they *could not* be so dark, vacant, and erroneous, on that capital and central doctrine of "Jesus Christ and him crucified!" I summon the world to look at this and examine it for themselves. Those who *understand* the gospel, and love it, as the thrice excellent truth

of God ; and who give themselves the trouble to understand Quakerism and “judge righteous judgment” concerning it, and such only, can appreciate what I aver. As for others—I pity them! Prov. 18 : 12, 13, 17. 20 : 25. 21 : 2, 3, 30. 26 : 12. Error is often very good-looking and sometimes elegant in manners. It has the face of an angel, the voice of a siren, and the heart of a fiend. The truth of God is our only safety against its specious and captivating arts. There is but one way of being right, and many of being wrong. Rectitude is one thing ; deviation is manifold. One way to be straight ; many to be crooked ; one way only to heaven—but how many millions make up the labyrinth of ways that lead to hell !

The word *justification* occurs thrice only in the total volume of God : Rom. 4 : 25. 5 : 16, 18. and there it means *not* sanctification in any instance ; but the act of imputing righteousness to the person of a believer. Its cognates, justify, just, righteousness, righteous, and so forth, refer very often as they occur, generally to the character indeed ; but perhaps *never* to the exclusion of that justifying “righteousness of God” as the primary idea, which it was the hope of Abel and the zeal of Paul to attain in consummation at “the resurrection of the dead ;” saying, “that I may win Christ, AND BE FOUND IN HIM, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.” Phil. 3 : 9. and the whole chapter ! “Even as David also describeth the blessedness of

the man unto whom GOD IMPUTETH RIGHTEOUSNESS WITHOUT WORKS; saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Rom. 4 : 6-8. What is this but the beatitude of the man whose person is imputatively righteous ? who is accepted as righteous, nay "the righteousness of God" in Christ!—in THE ONLY WAY in which it is possible for a human being to be justified in his sight ! But we need not quote the whole Bible to convince a man of sense and candor that Quakerism *here at least* is not christianity. In this central matter it is perverse and ignorant, presuming and empty, deceptive and false.

There are two more cardinal proof-texts of Barclay yet to be examined : and I premise that they are quite considerable ones, in which their doctrine is about as "excellently and evidently held forth" as in any other passages in the total scripture ; where the imperfection or plain mistake of our venerable and learned but NOT inspired translators (more than two hundred years ago) may have given unwittingly to Friends, just then soon about to rise with their light, the specious appearance of a vindication and a sanction. I take them in order. The first is John, 1 : 9. "That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

Respecting the true sense of this passage, I observe, in opposition to their view ;

1. The text literally and strictly interpreted as Friends are wont to have it, is entirely solitary and without a parallel, I think, in the whole Bible. The

analogy or "proportion of faith" then, is against it. Rom. 12 : 6.

2. It utterly fails them in respect to *internal* location ; inasmuch as it does not say an *inward* light, a light whose site is the soul's interior : and this it ought to be shown to assert, before it can be legitimately accounted to prove their hasty inference. It tells of no *such* light. 3. There is *positive* evidence to the contrary ; or, that it is an *external* light, as one that casts its radiance UPON *an object*, rather than one that shines WITHIN *a subject*. This evidence I draw from the meaning and use of the original word φωτιζει, which had been rendered with stricter accuracy, *shines upon*, than *enlighteneth* or "lighteth ;" and so, being an *external light*, it cannot favor the theory of Friends or be properly called a *divine emanation in the soul*, or *spiritual instinct within us*, or any such mystical foolishness.

The scholar will observe that the word is a *derivative* and *diminutive* formation from φως, *light* ; and so means to throw some of its beams on a darkened surface, as a candle in a large room *enlightens* it, but is itself a *light* and much brighter than the effulgence it emits. This view accords very well with our *unmystical* theory of gospel light, but not with their position.

I propose here to refer in order to *all the other places* where the word occurs, that we may have the usage of the sacred writers to show its meaning : these places are ten only ; as Luke, 11 : 36. 1 Cor. 4 : 5. Eph. 1 : 18. 3 : 9. 2 Tim. 1 : 10. Heb. 6 : 4. 10 : 32. Rev. 18 : 1. 21 ; 23, 22 : 5.

There are besides two substantive formations from the verb; 2 Cor. 4 : 4, 6. or rather one that occurs twice, and which it may be well to examine. How does "the bright shining of a candle give us light?"

4. There is no necessity of any sort that we should so interpret the passage, as Friends, in their rapid *à priori* presumptions or inspiration-way, are wont with singular audacity to affirm its meaning: this however is their way; a perfectly homogeneous one; like their first error and whole system.

(1) It may be differently rendered, without any outrage to the laws of language, to read thus; "which coming into the world, lighteth every man;" where the participle *coming* is construed to agree with light and not with man. This version has had the sanction of many respectable names, and especially of Dr. Campbell, that prince of philological learning.

(2) It may simply refer to the *catholic largeness* of the new dispensation, whose jurisdiction is properly "all the world," and whose formal object is "every creature;" without all distinction of nation, sect, or party; it *thus* "enlightens" or *shines upon or toward* "every man that cometh into the world."

(3) It may signify merely that *every one that ever was truly enlightened* obtained from "the word" all his light; which is plainly true. This appears probable when we reflect on *the obvious scope* of the passage. The design of John, in the sublime introduction of his gospel, is evidently to describe and signalize THE ETERNAL WORD. He tells us one thing and then another, all tending to evince

his divine eminence and the consequent inferiority of all other lights as dependent on him. On this hypothesis, it may be thus paraphrased; "never a man entered the world, who was truly informed in the things of God, but as the result of light communicated by Jesus Christ." This view makes the sentence elliptical, and requires us to understand after it, "who ever was truly enlightened." It also accords with the known style of John. He abounds with ellipses and bold expressions; and his style ought to be studied and understood, before a detached passage is hastily interpreted against the general scope of all his and all the other sacred writings. Take one instance. "All that ever came before me, are thieves and robbers." John, 10 : 8. This is a plain and a bold ellipsis. Supply the words, "professing to be the Messiah," after the first clause; and you have the meaning. These words the writer expects the reader to supply. Otherwise, Moses, David, and Elijah, to speak of no others, were "thieves and robbers." Friends sometimes *literalize* extravagantly.

That one, or possibly all (for they are related) of these three renderings are the truth, I am confident. The style is dense; the meaning manifestly general and comprehensive. With respect to the first version, it may be remarked that our translation (*that cometh*) is unauthorized by the original. Instead of the relative and the verb there ought to have appeared simply the *participle active* of the verb *come*; thus, "every man coming into the world." Then, if *coming* agrees with *man* instead

of *light*, it proves too much—it proves that the man is enlightened *in the act or moment of entering the world!* If this be admitted, it may be inquired what possible good can it do him? and also, what becomes of him afterward? Is he enlightened *just then*, once for all? Is it a natal inserted light? But if *coming* agrees with *light*, (and grammatical law does in no way reclaim at the supposition,) then the first rendering seems valid. Also, the next verse favors the view. There the light becomes *personal*, changing the neuter to the masculine; thus, “*He* was in the world, and the world was made by *him*, and the world knew him not.”

5. If the interpretation of Friends be correct, then it was *antecedently* the design of the Apostle and of the Holy Ghost to express their view; but, supposing such design, is not the text an evident failure? or at best a very imperfect expression? I think it might be materially improved, especially by Barclay, who, when he wishes to express the same thing, uses such language as the following; “the saving and spiritual light, wherewith every man is enlightened—there is an evangelical and saving light and grace in all—the universality of the love and mercy of God toward mankind (both in the death of his beloved son, the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the manifestation of the light in the heart) is established and confirmed against all the objections of such as deny it.” I think, if I had been about to express the doctrine of Friends just there, that I should have used language, on such an immensely important article, like to this: *Every hu-*

man being since the fall, that enters the world, has an internal seed or principle of divinity in his heart, by attending to whose "OBJECTIVE MANIFESTATIONS" he comes to the saving knowledge of God; either with or without the assistance of outward means. This is surely their doctrine. It is also *very different* from that taught in the text. I consider it a "damnable heresy." 2 Pet. 2:1.

This remark may be extended to the whole scriptures. Why were they written at all, since a paramount rule, a superior light, *pre-existed* universally? why was so MUCH written, when ten sentences or none might have sufficed to put men upon their *internal* resources? and why was SUCH A BOOK written, when the only possible use of any book could be to inform men of a superior light, which they could not see by its own beams, nor feel by its own fire? Those best acquainted with the sober contents of the whole Bible, are best qualified to answer these questions—especially if (which is a rare thing) they happen also to understand Quakerism.

6. But suppose it proves the reality of a universal *inward* light, shining constantly and yet near to suffocation, somewhere above or below the diaphragm—not to be too nice on questions that tend to researches topical and physiological, I discern another difficulty. I could not descend into their mine, without a better safety-lamp than Sir Humphrey Davy could invent, against the detonation of subterranean gases! I have no "faith in the effectual operation" of the non-descript glimmer within.

Why? Plainly, because an old man might believe in the existence of "a reed shaken with the wind," without making a walking-cane of it. Even if the light within exists, and if this text proves it, the very same connection proves that—it is not a rule at all or a totally *insufficient* one, and in either case disproves the doctrine of Friends. For (1) it is not discernible by its own light. "The light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not." Hence the ministry is necessary, by the word of God to teach men; as John "was sent to bear witness of that light," else undiscoverable. But (2) John did not point out *that light*; the idea of such a splendor or spark *within*, seems never to have entered his mind. He testifies of Jesus Christ, points to "the Lamb of God," and tells the people to "behold" him. v. 15–36. Hence (3) the word of God is the rule, and this light, whatever else it is, is plainly no rule at all; but that word is, led by which, we see the light and walk in it. I am *here* not explaining the text, so much as confuting *their* view of it. (4) The light, construed by admission as that of Friends, is plainly *inefficacious*. Not one in fifty millions of its subjects ever knew of any *such* thing in them, or even thought they did. Hence it is insufficient and ineffectual. It is not "able to make us wise unto salvation," without being 'outwardly' taught by Friends what to do with it! Hence it cannot be so superior to the "holy scriptures" as to take precedency of them and reduce them to the rank of "a secondary rule." (5) Soberly, *we* allege that there exists no supernatural

light in men ; and consequently, as the word of God is the supreme law, the action of the living ministry commending that word to our cordial and practical regards, is reasonable and requisite. But plainly the whole connection including the text, “excellently and evidently” shows no inward light in men or *inward* light at all. Least of all does it support the heretical madness of a rule in men superior to the inspired scriptures : and on the whole, it is certain that there is not a particle of distinctive Quakerism in that noble chapter—which some have dared to defame by calling it “the chapter of Quaker light !”

It may seem strange to all but Friends, or those who *know* them, that I have spent so much time in correcting their interpretation. But a few words of error, especially when widely circulated and devoutly believed, require many words to refute them. What an encyclopedia of voluminous toil would it properly require to follow Barclay through the almost 600 octavo pages (densely printed—as *this* is not) of his elaborate work, and refute all the specious theological nonsense and error with which an unprejudiced christian reader can see that it abounds !

The only remaining passage to which Barclay refers for “excellent and evident” proof, of a UNIVERSAL INWARD LIGHT in depraved sinners, “dead in trespasses and sins” as they walk on the footstool of God, which is cursed for their sake, Gen. 3 : 17. 6 : 5, 11, 12, is found in Titus, 2 : 11. “For

the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us," &c.

I know exactly how they use this text, and how much they fondle it, and how often their inspiration starts from its list to run the race of folly, fiction, forgery and—devotional SIN! Often have I heard, and seen, and wondered, and been mightily convinced and moved, as many another deluded ignoramus was, while some spiritual sooth-sayer, male or female, "borne sublime upon the cherub wings of ecstasy" and soaring beyond all truth and evidence, was inspired to convey to us its true import exegetical. Often, as I well recollect, have I been solemnly duped, as well as others, with the fallacy. Does any one say, Well! forgive them. We are all liable to make mistakes. We must bear with one another. Answer, I bear them any thing but personal ill-will; God is witness: and in this sense, I pardon them with all my heart, for deluding my infancy, infatuating my education, and jeoparding my soul—and for doing more mischief to some of my own flesh and blood yet steeped profound in the spell of their delirium! I can compassionate and would kindly repair the mistake of a fellow mortal, black or white. But when he DARES to charge his errors and his moral agency identified upon his Maker; make HIM alone accountable for them; and claim the impunity of assumed, and most falsely assumed, INSPIRATION; and this is, in cool and unexaggerated fact, THEIR UNIVERSAL CLAIM WHENEVER THEY PREACH; I feel as if a calm reprehension merely of their fault were criminal in me, es-

pecially as the error is of a kind at once so deleterious to the interests of souls, so dishonoring to the great God, so impalpable to the populace and even to the more intelligent of the general community.

Their argument now to be examined is much on this wise: Here it hath "appeared to all men;" that is, "the grace of God that bringeth salvation" hath: but how hath it so appeared? Have "all men" the scriptures and other outward means? not so! but all men have the witness of the Spirit in their hearts; and in that temple of the heart has this grace appeared, &c. Then they appeal to their hearers and apply their version, by confounding the mere actings of conscience (armed it may be with some remembered passages of "the word of God") with the agency of the Spirit IN all men: and say, Hast thou never felt something that reprov'd thee in doing wrong, that commended thee in doing right, and that could not be bribed or "removed into a corner?" And so forth to the end; while listening hundreds are convinced, refreshed, and—deluded. They often make episodes at such a time, when a lucid interpretation moves that way their bowels, in praise of the scriptures: as "given forth" by that light; as an outward testimony to be sure; but still, one in which the doctrine and views of "ancient Friends" are "excellently and evidently" manifested; and as being, on the whole, "a secondary rule" of considerable respectability.

But it is time to explode their fallacy. It may be premised that the text truly yields them not the least particle of support. The abstract proposition, that

such "grace hath appeared to all men," I fearlessly pronounce to be as flat and certain AN IMPOSSIBILITY IN POINT OF FACT as is the monstrosity of transubstantiation. But still I should not so assert its fallacy were it not for this cardinal fact—that **THE PASSAGE IS FALSELY TRANSLATED**. There is no such proposition in the original. Genuine inspiration **NEVER** taught such a sentiment, since the birth of time or before. Does the reader say, How are Friends to blame for that? I answer, they are not to blame for that. It was done before they were born; or George Fox either, eleven years before the important epoch of his birth. But—what is inspiration that is **NOT TO BLAME** for blundering most egregiously, where a little honesty with the school-taught "gift of tongues" perusing the original, exclaims, why no such proposition is there!

It is perhaps an error, though comparatively of no importance, to render the adjective, one word, σωτηριος, "that bringeth salvation." It seems rather too strong. Still, its strict English synonyme, *salutary*, is not strong enough. It means "tending to salvation;" and perhaps "salvation-bearing," as a compound epithet or qualifier, were nearly the sense of the original.

In grammar, theology, and fact, I have now a graver error to expose. Why is the word, "appeared," made to govern (as if it did in the Greek) the phrase, "to all men?" It does not; and it cannot be so construed legitimately. The Greek does **NOT** say that it "hath appeared to all men;" but it says that it is "salutary or salvation-bearing to all

men," wherever it comes, or (like the rising splendors of the sun) wherever it appears.

Admit a digression here, (such an oasis is grateful to the christian traveller in the sandy desert of controversy,) to ask, What if men should respond to the gospel appositely and heartily wherever it appears? Is it not what God cordially desires them to do? It would bear salvation into their bosoms universally! It would roll its volume of blessedness gloriously round the globe! It would emparadise us all in its large enclosures, as primeval Eden could not our first progenitors! And whose is the fault that it fails of this splendid result? Rom. 9: 32, 33. The gospel is in no sense at fault. Still, how glorious, and in grace how pre-eminent, is that discriminating sovereignty, supervening just here, "according to the election of grace!" Rom. 11: 5.

I will render it, as nearly as our idiom will admit, (and that is very near, in this instance,) precisely as the words occur in the original, though necessarily with diminished force and certainty; thus: "For hath appeared the grace of God, which is salvation-bearing to all men, teaching us," &c. In the Greek the word *hath appeared* (Ἐπέφανη) occurs first of all in the sentence; and cannot in any right way affect the syntax or the sense of "all men;" which occurs at the end, in the dative, plainly governed by the adjective which I have rendered "salvation-bearing." If there is any defect in this evidence, it is wholly relative. It respects simply the fact that ordinary readers cannot appreciate an argument drawn from the Greek language. Still, or-

dinary readers may believe the facts which I allege ; and no scholar, tyro though he be *in literis graecis*, can help seeing the truths of the facts, if he will open his Testament at the place. But if the facts are true, so are the inferences : this any common mind of common honesty can well discern ; and all that is ‘excellently and evidently’ proved, by the passage of Barclay’s inspired and confident quotation, is—that the inspiration of the Quakers is sorry imposture, and that the word of God yields them no support. Quakerism is NOT christianity.

The apostle had been mentioning relative duties, and enjoining their performance on different classes and conditions of men, in the previous context. He had specified “aged men, and women, young women, young men, servants, masters,” and others : then the text is introduced which declares that “the grace of God hath appeared ;” that it brings salvation “to all men ;” and that it “teaches us,” &c. Mind, reader, it is one thing for salvation to be brought to you ; and another for you to accept it. Tendency is one thing ; effect another. Yet both are necessary to a realized salvation. Again, what a dreadful error it is, which the gloss of Friends, from the mere surface of a mistaken and unskilful rendering, maintains ! Farewell, all missionary hopes and efforts ! “The grace of God which bringeth salvation HATH APPEARED TO ALL MEN !” This proposition, as such, is absolutely and eminently false ! In the previous chapter, verse 3, it is said that God hath “manifested his word THROUGH PREACHING ;” but this is doubtful or

superfluous, if it is manifested in every heart; if it hath actually "appeared to all men" in their minds; if it hath a universal location in that dark interior! I cannot help censuring the error; and blaming, in the name of Jesus Christ, the people that propagate it. It is a dreadful forgery against the life of souls. Its central point, its fulcrum, and its rest, that saving grace HAS "appeared to all men," is A MOST PALPABLE FALSITY; and deserves to be displayed, that it may be known by those who are now "ignorant of his devices" and blindly accessory to his homicidal reign, who "was a murderer from the beginning." And yet I know that if the evidence *takes hold* of a Friend, it will draw blood! How can he give up his faith in the "effectual operation," and the "objective manifestations," of a "universal inward light?" How admit the serene delusion of "early Friends?" How withdraw his confidence from Barclay, whose performance in his esteem has been such a masterpiece as to non-plus forever the whole "CLERGY, of what sort soever, unto whose hands his volume may come; but more particularly, the DOCTORS, PROFESSORS, and STUDENTS of divinity in the universities and schools of *Great Britain*, whether prelatical, presbyterian, or any other;" to whom it is thus pompously addressed, with all the holy defiance of a man whose inward light renders *him at least* infallible!

Having gone through the examination of the illustrious proof-texts to which he refers us, in the end of his "sixth proposition," as if they were not

all witnesses against him only, I shall conclude this chapter with the inspection of some others; *almost* as illustrious and as powerfully in their favor, as those we have just considered. Some stars are so brilliant and beautiful that it requires a practised astronomic eye to see it, if they do not belong to the first-magnitude class. I here claim again to speak as a witness; and shall mention some that occur indeed in their books, but which I have more *felt* in their public ministrations, and which now I know to be nothing but stupefactions of the truth—as *they* inspire and enunciate them. O what a spectacle for angels to weep at, is—a large Quaker meeting of deluded souls, believing in things that have no existence! and disbelieving, as priest-craft, the demonstrable realities of God! and trepanned, the whole of them, with the conceit of immediate inspiration, as the infallible light of their miserable dreams and devout hallucinations! Will George Fox defend them in the day of judgment? Will *he* be their “advocate with the Father?” “But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant.” 1 Cor. 14 : 38.

“A portion of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal;” as I have *often* heard them say, and then dilate on the imagination. It is so quoted frequently by Fox, Penn, and others. Some however quote the passage as it is, 1 Cor. 12 : 7. “But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.” *Their* meaning is plain. It is that every one of us is distributively furnished with a *quantum sufficit* of inward light, as a starting capital for spiritual augmentation and “profit” to our-

selves ; that this is a gift of the Spirit in us all universally, not only “every *man*,” but every one of the species, of whatever age, sex, or description ; and that the grand business of life is—to walk by that internal light as our “more excellent way,” our chief and paramount rule in religion ; the word of God being sublimely postponed to it. So say Martha Rowth, Sarah Grubb, Job Scott, Robert Barclay, and ancient Friends. Hence Quakerism makes its regards chiefly concentrate every way toward the very *penetralia* of the soul, the blazing focus of the light within ! And why not ? This is consistency.

Quam Juno fertur terris magis omnibus unam
 Posthabita coluisse Samo : hic illius arma,
 Hic currus fuit : hoc regnum Dea gentibus esse,
 Si qua fata sinant, jam tum tenditque fovetque.—VIRG.

The goddess this is said to have preferred
 Above all lands alone ; and to have cared
 Less for deserted Samos : here her arms,
 Her chariot here, her treasures, and her charms.
 This for the nations she designed the port ;
 The world’s chief glory and its loved resort.
 Would but the fates permit ! and hence she tends
 And cherishes its interests and defends !

Excuse the bathos of the application. It is like falling from the chariot of the sun, into the inward light (to say nothing of the fire) of the crater of Vesuvius. I am not sure but a little of the ridiculous may be of service. And if so, no thanks to me ! No invention of mine has the right to be credited. I can say with Young as pompously,

I find my inspiration in my theme :
The grandeur of my subject is my muse.

Soberly, however, *I* am not inspired at all ; and shall proceed in a common sense way, as Friends do not—why should they ?—to show them, or others as the case may be, that the passage in question belongs all to “ the steeple-houses and the world’s people and hireling priests ;” at least that it is none of theirs. It is not felonious to reclaim one’s own from pillagers ; however “ sincere ” they were in finding what was not lost, or in making mistakes systematically in the way of their vocation. But who can forgive *inspiration* for making mistakes ? Had I that plenipotentary gift of God, I would care nothing for critics of any sort, nor stoop to ask clemency of the intellect, the feelings, or the conscience of the reader.

Take a few specimens of high pretension from the fountain head. Only a few, where hundreds similar, with disgusting repetition, are seen. It is not generally believed how high their claims rise.

“ I saw,” says Fox—meaning by plenary inspiration, “ that the grace of God, which brings salvation, had appeared to all men, and that the manifestation of the Spirit of God was given to every man to profit withal. These things I did not see by the help of man, nor by the letter, though they were written in the letter : But I saw them in the light of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his immediate Spirit and power, as did the holy men of God by whom the holy scriptures were written.” On the

same page he says, "When the Lord God and his Son Jesus Christ sent me forth into the world to preach his everlasting gospel and kingdom, I was glad that I was commanded to turn people to that inward light, spirit, and grace, by which all might know their salvation and their way to God; even that Divine Spirit which would lead them into all truth, and which I infallibly knew would never deceive any." Here is inspiration, infallibility, and full equality with apostles and prophets "by whom the holy scriptures were written!" Again, "The Lord God opened to me by his invisible power, how, 'every man was enlightened by the divine light of Christ.' I saw it shine through all, &c. This I saw in the pure openings of the light without the help of any man; neither did I then know where to find it in the scriptures; though afterward, searching the scriptures, I found it." Is this the kind and degree of inspiration that must be excused and compassionated for mistakes, blunders, lying, and sorcery? for vending "damnable heresies" in the name of God? for deluding thousands of silly and credulous persons, the unstable and the ignorant, and sometimes the educated and the respectable? Is it no sin to poison the waters of the sanctuary? None—but I forbear! I write for sober and unprejudiced readers; and am willing to rest the appeal with them whether one can have too much zeal in the exposure and extirpation of such a system? It is not "an iniquity to be punished by the judges;" but it is an iniquity of aspects and relations infinitely terrible. ☞ To expose their *inspiration*, as the

centre of their system, is one chief design of this publication. I view it as spiritual falsehood, sorcery, and delusion—almost without an equal in the world. Modern cheats and inventions are quite inferior. Mormonism is more gross and revolting. St. Simonism, with its “family,” is palpably ridiculous and false. But Quakerism is more specious, more seraphic, more impalpable every way, more refined, a better counterfeit, more imposing: but in some respects more criminal, more destructive and subverting than either!

In respect to the true sense of the passage, I remark,

1. That “every man” in that place, does NOT mean every human being; but every one of those only, concerning whom demonstrably the apostle speaks: every christian, or every member, and especially every officer, of the church of God. Read the context and take the drift of his homily. He speaks to the church and of the church collectively, as “the body of Christ” with its many “members;” and each member, as appointed to a peculiar office; and each office, as differing in form and in magnitude, in honor and in importance, from the others; and all the offices, as having a common scope, a common spirit, and a common glory in Christ.

2. Besides, “the manifestation” given is *not a passive one*; not an objective revelation made to us: but AN ACTIVE manifestation made *by us*; “the manifestation of the Spirit” to others. It were better rendered or paraphrased thus; “The duty and office of manifesting the mind of the Spirit to others,

and so of diffusing his homogeneous light in this dark world, is confided responsibly to every one of you, to every member of the body of Christ, in this and all coming ages. True, all have not the same office, nor each an office of honor equal to that of others; still, all are honored, all are obligated, all are called and qualified for some appropriate service in the church; each is "necessary" to the others: and by all in different ways, the Spirit is 'manifested,' and his influence diffused." The original word, rendered "the manifestation," ἡ φανερωσις, occurs only in one other place; where the sense is quite parallel and perfectly clear: 1 Cor. 4: 2. "by manifestation of the truth," i. e. ACTIVELY MANIFESTING IT, "commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." A preacher has a noble office of "manifesting the Spirit," confided to him; and a poor, sequestered, pious old woman, such as my eye at this moment mentally sees, on her couch of debility, or in her chamber of privation, a prisoner, (I mean a *real* individual—and many others there are,) has an honorable office also; manifesting the Spirit in a way of holy exemplification, of cheerful and lucid faith in Christ, of patience and pain, of resignation, constancy, prayer, and words of grace, "seasoned with salt, that minister grace to the hearers," and that are "good to the use of edifying." Eph. 4: 29. Col. 4: 6.

3. The end of this distribution is declared, προς το συμφερον, "for the common benefit;" or, as Dr. Macknight has it, "to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit, for the advantage of all." This

is very diverse from the view of Friends. According to them, it is, as I said, a private capital at starting, to be improved for the individual behoof of its possessor in every case; it is that without which we should scarce be accountable, and with which our grand business in life is—

“To turn our optics *in* upon’t.

* * * * *

“Strange too that men of inward light

“Dont draw bonds and mortgages by’t!”

If this is ridiculous, I cannot help it; it is the folly of Quakerism, a monstrous spiritual hoax, that more injures thousands than telling them of it can injure any. Clear is my own conviction that the good of souls and of society requires its exposure; and that *I* am “manifesting the Spirit,” according to the office given me, in some humble degree, when I hold it up to the scorn of conscience and the abhorrence of mankind. I do it “for the advantage of all;” or, the common benefit.

We may here see the causes that freeze the feelings of Friends in respect to the christian charities of the day. They believe that “the grace of God,” the very grace “that bringeth salvation,” hath actually “appeared to all men;” and that every human being has an inserted quantum or “manifestation of the Spirit:” and if we or the apostles believed so—why, what silly dotards, to “go into all the world and preach (audibly proclaim and orally communicate) the gospel to every creature,” at such hazard, pain, and cost of every sort! Hence their

equivocal love, (with VERY FEW exceptions,) rather their ill disguised antipathy, to Bible societies and all such institutions of *purely spiritual* charity! Hence I endeavor to show the real or more potent moral causes of their armed neutrality. All however ought to concur with me and do the same. Christians are one. I might anglicise the original word, rendered "to profit withal," and say that christians are A SYMPHERIAN SOCIETY; a spiritual corporation, for mutual aid and mutual action, against a common foe, and with a common motive, bond, and ultimate reward. Glorious community! Blessed commonwealth! "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob; thy tabernacles, O Israel! Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob, neither is there any divination against Israel: according to this time it shall be said of Jacob and of Israel, WHAT HATH GOD WROUGHT! Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee!" One reason that Friends adduce or feel, why they are so sparsely and so seldom seen in the operations of the Bible cause, is—the *peculiar* testimonies given them to maintain! A better version of the matter is—their abandoned sectarianism; the misrepresentation (not "the manifestation) of the Spirit" in their characteristic way; the important duty of sustaining their clanish singularities! And pray, do they think it the best way to fight—to keep out of the way! can they best "maintain" their *singular* way of speech, behavior, and attire, and other *important* testimonies, by withdrawing from their presence whom such *lucid* examples and protests as theirs were

given on purpose to instruct or improve or warn? What martyrs of a *peculiar* order, these modern ones, for the sake of "weighty testimonies!" The fact is, they have ordinarily too much good sense or morbid sensitiveness, not to be *ashamed*—as they certainly are, and in this I praise them—of their own testimonies, in good and intelligent society! They have a great many ingenious circuities and evasions, by which to slip along with their "testimonies," without collision, and without manifesting a single ray or particle of light from the illuminated interior, that might as well be "under a bushel" at once, for all the demonstration it makes! "For whatsoever doth make manifest is light."

Truth is properly the monopoly of no man. I have no private creed in religion; nor do I suppose that any man ought to have. Truth is the testimony of the Spirit, given for "manifestation" universally; and when purely manifested, "the Spirit" is manifested too, just as much and identically. With the light of the Spirit of God I identify myself morally; the whole of me; to live and to die, for this world and the next. O for grace to be thus purely and perfectly devoted! The man that counteracts that light, is no ally of mine, whoever he may be; I am his moral enemy, because I oppose him as such, *toto caelo, toto orco*⁵³; and "go the whole" in the argument. "What concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" 2 Cor. 6 : 15. And we may add emphatically; "what communion hath LIGHT with darkness?" or legitimacy with usurpa-

tion and imposture? Let the insipidity of a semi-christian answer.

This text of "manifesting the Spirit," as referring to the duties of "every man" in the church, is one of immense practical concern; rich in its moral treasures; a grand theme for a sermon apposite to the present state of the churches; and worthy of large and thorough application: but I forbear, having other ends that now invite me to their pursuit.

The passages of scripture which Friends pervert are very many. Their leaders do it, "and hold themselves not guilty; and they that slay them say, 'Blessed be the Lord; for I am rich:' and their own shepherds pity them not." It were easy for me to write another book, of texts disabused of their corrupting glosses and shameful sophistry. To sophisticate however is "not a vain thing" for them; it is their "life." Quakerism must die the moment it understands the subject and learns to reason fairly. I will select a few passages, say three; of whose gross perversion I have been experimentally connusant; and the last in the series of which is worthy of distinguished consideration—since it seems to me, as certain as any mathematical proposition that can be named, to explode the foundations of Quakerism, and to demonstrate the supremacy of the scriptures forever.

"He that believeth, maketh not haste." That is, he sits "still" in Friends' meeting. A kind old Friend, a preacheress, for whom indeed I feel a reciprocal kindness, (for she is very "sincere" in her

errors,) once quoted it to me with great tenderness, just before I left the society. It meant, pause, "get still," and show the temper of him "that believeth," by—holy inaction, serene stagnation, a do-nothing kind of piety; avoiding "the activity of the creature" and the learning of the colleges! Ah! this *tenderness* of a refined and elegant, a really kind and clever Quaker lady! It is very persuasive. It is a charm often of sovereign fascination and success. It is much more potent than argument. I bear them record that their ladies are, some of them, characteristically refined, chaste, and stainless in purity of behavior; possessed of qualities that adorn private life, gild the social circle with a lustre of comparatively innocent delight, improve the manners and sentiments of youth, and constitute about as fine a substitute for the religion of the gospel as one will find any where! But—to the text. It occurs in Isaiah, 28 : 16. Compare it with Rom. 10 : 11. 1 Pet. 2 : 6. Its true sense is plain, as quoted in the New Testament. Friends quote it wrong in form, as well as substance. It is, "He that believeth, *shall not* make haste." It is future, not present; and it means, he shall not retreat, run away in clandestine "haste," "be ashamed," or "confounded," in the day of judgment: that is, HE shall not, who "believeth on Him" that is the foundation-stone of Zion, laid there as the basis of the church by the Eternal Master Builder. It has no affinity with the softness and the insipidity of what they chiefly value and inspire.

There is another, which they quote as it is not, in favor of their light, with very great unction and

frequent enlargement. It respects "the great inward Teacher" of their faith; as one that CANNOT "be removed into a corner," they say. Paul was once put into "a basket" and "through a window" "let down by the wall; and in that way escaped the hands" of "the governor under Aretas the king." This was as bad to the poor Damascenes or the christians of that city, as "removing their teacher into a corner."

Quere, Is the cavity interior, where the elegant little light is inserted, and where it burns almost suffocated sometimes by "the activity of the creature," is it triangular, quadrangular, oval, spherical, cylindrical, or of some other and better proportions? It gets into "a corner," it seems, only by removal. But we will not press the inquiry. We have a promise to consider. "Thine eyes shall see thy Teacher;" i. e. the eyes that see the flame of the inward light. "And thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left." Isaiah, 30 : 20, 21. To cut short the riddle, and some treasured anecdotes of curious fact that I could pleasantly rehearse in its solution, the word *teacher* happens to be plural in the text! and the original more evidently demonstrates that OUTWARD HUMAN TEACHERS are meant, in both places where the word occurs in the 20th verse. Thus מוֹרֵיךְ and אֶת־מוֹרֵיךְ. How they dislike the plural! In view of the denounced invasion and calamity of the Jewish nation, and especially of the metropolis, the prophet consoles the church with

this assurance: "Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy TEACHERS be removed into a corner any more, but thine eyes shall see thy TEACHERS: and thine ears shall hear," &c. How unfortunate in proof-texts are ancient Friends and modern ones too! We may infer from this passage the following things: that competent religious teachers are meant; that it is a great and precious gift of God to have them; and that it were better to lose all temporal riches than the privilege of their ministrations, which are to be esteemed an appropriate compensation in times of worst calamity. Jer. 3: 12-15. It puts out the light that is in every man, superior to the scripture as a rule! At least it takes no note of that inserted *little focus* that "boasteth great things." How confounded I once saw a really esteemed and honored Friend, by producing the passage in a parlor and reading it coolly to the eye and ear! Confounded, sorry, frightened;—but "of the same opinion still!"

I now come to the last text to be considered here; and to which I have already alluded. It is found in 2 Pet. 1: 19. After quoting it, I shall remark on its history as connected with Friends; and then on its meaning, as subverting their system. The translation is in the main good; but I will change it a little, by way of expressing more truly the sense of the original. "We have also the prophetic word made more firm: to which word ye do well taking heed, as to a light that shineth in a dark

(and dreary) place, until the day dawn, and the star of morning rise in your hearts."

That Friends do not feel quite certain that they know what this means, is evident in one instance at least! and yet it is an awkward position for them to take, on more accounts than one. In an edition of Dr. Maclaine's *Mosheim*, published in "New-York, 1821," I find near the end about 45 pages of "VINDICATION OF THE QUAKERS," smuggled⁵⁴ into the fourth volume; where, among other documents, is one of "Joseph Gurney Bevan," of London, in which he alludes to this text, in connection with George Fox's career, and makes in the margin the following note: "It seems by the way, not easy, in our translation, to find what constitutes the comparison, in this passage." Poor man, "not easy"—had he been trying hard to find it, preacher as I suppose he was! A very little sane contemplation of the context, I should judge, would relieve his difficulties, even if he could search only "in our translation." But his mighty master Fox was in the same predicament or a worse one. Bevan is commenting, in connection with the note above cited, on Fox's exemplary and singular trials in reference to this noted text. In the journal of Fox, he records his own exploits in his own incomparable way; and I ask leave to transcribe the total paragraph. The importance of the principles involved will warrant it.

"As I went toward Nottingham on a first-day in the morning, with friends to a meeting there, when I came on the top of a hill in sight of the town, I

espied the great steeple-house ; and the Lord said unto me, ‘Thou must go cry against yonder great idol, and against the worshippers therein.’ I said nothing of this to the friends, but went with them to the meeting, where the mighty power of the Lord God was amongst us ; in which I left friends sitting in the meeting, and went to the steeple-house. When I came there, all the people looked like fallow ground, and the priest, like a great lump of earth, stood in his pulpit above : he took for his text these words of Peter, ‘We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts.’ He told the people this was the scriptures, by which they were to try all doctrines, religions and opinions. Now the Lord’s power was so mighty upon me, and so strong in me, that I could not hold ; but was made to cry out, ‘Oh ! no ; it is not the scriptures ;’ and told them it was the holy Spirit, by which the holy men of God gave forth the scriptures, whereby opinions, religions, and judgments were to be tried ; for it led into all truth, and so gave the knowledge of all truth. The Jews had the scriptures, yet resisted the Holy Ghost, and rejected Christ, the bright morning-star. They persecuted him and his apostles, and took upon them to try their doctrines by the scriptures, but erred in judgment, and did not try them right ; because they tried without the Holy Ghost. As I spoke thus amongst them, the officers came, took me away, and put me into a nasty stink-

ing prison; the smell whereof got so into my nose and throat that it very much annoyed me." Thus far George.

We may now observe certain things that explain the text; that demonstrate THE PERFECT CORRECTNESS of the preacher, called by his invader and reviler "a great lump of earth," in the position he advanced; that conclude absolutely against the inspiration of Fox and show of consequence his wicked fanaticism; and that make the passage before us a luminous protest of heaven against their whole system, and in favor of the scriptures as the only book of inspiration in our world and the HIGHEST rule of action in religion. If these things appear, one may ask the nature of that morality that disturbs worshipping assemblies of christians in the very time and action of divine service; that pronounces the service "not divine;" that raises riot and confusion in the house of God; that molests (and this it did in numerous instances at first, and as long as it could conveniently or with impunity, and would now do *with the worst kind of persecution* if it dared) others in their conscientious public devotions; and that, after having *provoked* the interference of the civil authorities, complains of severity, and uses its ostentatious sufferings to elicit the sympathies of the ignorant, to practise on the weak, and to facilitate the imposture of its own delusion!

I do not say that Friends never suffered wrongfully; or that justice was not often perverted in their punishment; or that they were not cruelly persecuted in many instances: but I do say that

they were too often the aggressors, and the *conscientious* spiritual persecutors of the first part; and that such persecution as theirs, characteristically *theirs*, is perhaps the most intolerable in the world, as themselves would now evince, I fear, if theirs were the power and the ascendancy in the state—for we may hardly trust the “tender mercies” of men irresponsibly any where! I say also that in either hemisphere they were punished by the civil arm less for their doctrines as religionists, than for their practices as religionists, against the rights of others and the laws and order of civil society, going “naked for a sign,”⁵⁵ disturbing the worship of others, religious railing and abuse, calumniating all modes and ministers of religion except their own, and denouncing others in the coarsest and most offensive style. What could be worthier of censure from “the officers,” and of their power interfering in the case, than the conduct of Fox in the occasion himself describes? But that occasion was only one of hundreds; in all which *he* was inspired; the *inspirer* only was accountable; *he* was identified with God; and to animadvert on his ways and doings were sacrilege!

“We have also the prophetic word made more firm” or permanent: *βεβαιότερον τον προφητικον λογον*. “More firm”—than what? What is the other subject of comparison, which is disparaged in the argument? Friend Bevan, we remember, thought it “not easy to find.” A *fox* hunter of this sort, is often at fault when the game is near him, and quite visible to those who prefer the light

of heaven to inward darkness. Read the previous verses, where it is as plain as day; and as "easy to find" as it is to *attend* to what "the Spirit saith to the churches," even "in our translation." Alas! how hard for some *illuminees* "to find" the sense of *revealed* truth! The reason is plain. The recipe of their darkness and mistake, the amulet of their preservation from its influence, is that forgery and folly—"the light within!" well may they take up the lamentation; "Therefore is judgment far from us, neither doth justice overtake us; we wait for light, but behold obscurity; for brightness, but we walk in darkness. We grope for the wall like the blind, and we grope as if we had no eyes: we stumble at noon-day as in the night; we are in desolate places as dead men." I have no words in which to express my grief, shame, pain, and indignation, at a system of delusion so deceitful and so fixed with its talons in the blood of its prey!

In the previous verses of the chapter, 16-18, Peter refers to the glorious scene of the transfiguration, which himself and James and John were the privileged triumvirate to witness. See Matt. 18: 1-9. Mark, 9: 2-10. Luke, 9: 28-36. These three were several times selected to witness scenes of privacy and wonder, which they were especially to attest afterward to others, for the confirmation of their faith. Matt. 26: 37. Mark, 5: 37. So here. The noble apostle tells what they saw and what they heard; "when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' And this voice which

came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." O privileged place; distinguished hour; exalted and glorious converse! What would we give to share such transcendent favor! So near to heaven; "eye-witnesses of his majesty;" hearing the very attestation of the voice of God!

While his readers might so indulge or frame their sentiments, the apostle interposes, as if to say; "The pageant was indeed gorgeous and astounding. I almost swooned at the glare of its radiance; and knew not what to do or where I was. But let none envy us; none especially who have the Bible! There "the prophetic word is" made "more firm," more permanent, more complete for every desirable purpose. Jesus Christ is its all pervading theme: and instead of a voice so transient, so secluded, so dense and brief in its comprehensive import, commending HIM to your confidence; you have a volume of accomplished and accomplishing truth, equally divine, equally from heaven, equally intelligible. Peruse it, meditate it, follow it forever."

The prophetic word as spoken on mount Tabor, and the prophetic word made "more firm" in the scriptures; these are plainly the subjects of comparison: as Friend Bevan himself might have seen; or any other ignorant man that could look at the context, and take the scope or simply the continuity of the argument. Does any man doubt that the Bible is meant, by the "light that shineth in a dark place?" The *immediately* following verses make it obvious: "knowing this first, that no prophecy of

the scripture is of any private interpretation ; [or origin, as some prefer ;] for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man ; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." verses 20, 21. This we ought to "KNOW FIRST" or chief!

I have said that the true and plain sense of this text is ruinous to the pretensions of Quakerism. For—

1. It shows the superiority of the scriptures as a rule. The voice miraculous that he had just panegyricized to our wonder and our faith, is less firm, less permanent, less full, less satisfactory, less every way to be desired, than the prophetic word of scripture. Will any one now say that his own 'inward light' is superior? But grant for a moment that it is—how it demonstrates the ignorance or mental weakness of the apostle, who in commending his readers to a superior light to that on the mount, never mentioned the glorious rule of Friends, which makes the scriptures "secondary" by its own nobler effulgence! He surely knew nothing of it.

2. It shows the practice of primitive christians ; "whereunto—ye take heed;" in walking by the rule of scripture. It shows also the commendation of God for that cause. "Ye do well," says the apostle ; encouraging their adherence and piety. But he does more. He puts an *imprimatur* upon the excellence of the scripture, and its spiritual utility in the scheme of salvation, its subserviency in the constitution of God throughout the whole process of piety in the soul, that seals its value as supreme ; that

shows it, from the very nature of its office and its use, the paramount rule in religion ; and that shows as well the nature of religion, vital, genuine, sober, enlightened, and true religion, as distinguished from all counterfeits ; for we “do well taking heed to its light” as long as we sojourn in this “dark place ;” and “till the day dawn and the star of morning arise in our hearts.” The morning-star, “sure pledge of day, that crowns the smiling morn,” is used in scripture as the sparkling image of hope. Rev. 2 : 28. 22 : 16. Col. 1 : 27. 1 Tim. 1 : 1. It rises here “in the heart ;” implying delighted and purified affections in religion, as connected with the influence of hope in Jesus Christ. 1 John, 3 : 3. It is plain that this experience is consequent upon rightly “taking heed” to the light of scripture. “The dawning of the day” is much cotemporaneous in nature with the rise of the star of morning ; that beauteous phosphor (*φωσφορος*) of the dappled orient, that glittering harbinger of splendid day, that bright precursor of the sun, shining in his glory ! I care not to analyze poetically or rhetorically the force and finish of the figures, picturesque and glowing and apposite as they are : but would say in brief, they evidently refer to the whole of experimental religion ; they claim the instrumental cause of scripture truth for all that is genuine in our experience ; they require us to elevate and honor that “light” as paramount ; and there is no reasonable fear of dishonoring the agency and office-work of “the eternal Spirit,” by following “what he saith unto the churches,” respecting the end for which he

furnished us with his own thrice blessed word! It appears evident that the figures, of the "day dawning" and "the star of morning arising in our hearts," are in apposition; the latter being an explication of the former, and both referring to piety in this world, as viewed in connection with its consequent and certain glorification in the next. Here at best it is but the progress or the perfecting of authentic hope; it is comparative night or the *dawning* only, of the day of everlasting holiness and glory. "The way of the wicked is as darkness: they know not at what they stumble. But the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Reader, do you hope on a death-bed to say, "I have fought a good fight," unless you can also say, "I HAVE KEPT THE FAITH?" If not, then 'TAKE HEED to the light that shineth in a dark place;' and beware of false lights, *inward* lights, and blind guides—however smooth and affectionate they seem!

Errors not soon corrected :
 Though few learn not in riper years
 That man when smoothest he appears,
 Is most to be suspected.—ALTERED FROM COWPER.

Give me a man of wisdom, of principle and moral courage, of honesty and steadiness.

3. It represents the scripture as a most precious treasure, invaluable and solitary; and the ruin of the world without it: "A LIGHT THAT SHINETH:" It shines steadily, purely, benignly, certainly, superlatively. And it is one, not many; a unit, not a plurality; its light is all homogenous, unique, di-

vine. Besides, It shineth "in a dark place;" a place of darkness and pollution: *εν αυχμηρω τοπω*. Such is our world. So God views all the inward light of men. Reader, suppose you were traversing, for instance, the tunnel of the Thames, or some hideous mine or cavern of the earth, or rather the catacombs of Paris; were marching with one lighted flambeau only, along the well described but narrow path of that awful subterranean receptacle of "dead men's bones" if not of "all uncleanness;" and had advanced some one or two miles of your way from the aperture of your *facilis descensus*, and were beginning to think of the returning process; *revocare gradum*; would you not look at the precious light in your hand with a high and hearty estimate, "midst upper, nether, and surrounding darkness?" How dependent you would feel on its friendly beams! Now, suppose two strangers should appear, or two voices greet you in the dark; one would assure you of a superior light to be seen by just shutting your eyes and looking at the interior of yourself; the other would commend you to value that in your hand, as "a light that shineth in a dark place," to "take heed" to it, and trust no other medium of vision or of conduct, till you arrived at open day, or saw clearly the peering light of the aperture above: would you not require to be made VERY SURE INDEED of the comparative inferiority of the light in your hand, before you would either throw it away or trust the other, in such "a dark place?" There truly some visitors are said to have lost their way and left their own bones in

pledge to the ghastly populace around them. But what of that? To lose one's way as a pilgrim to the world of spirits! to be guided wrong in our blindness by one as blind! to be deluded of the path of life, and to forfeit our hope and our soul as the price of reckless credulity, "believing a lie!" This is terrible.—Often is it—history too.

4. The preacher who took the text, and whom Fox so abused, interrupted, contradicted, while peaceably officiating in his own desk and to his own people, and according to his own and their conscience of duty, WAS MOST CERTAINLY RIGHT IN HIS POSITION; he was telling the truth, the pure and proper sense of his text to his hearers; and more truth than Fox ever told; when that foolish and rash zealot commenced his offensive insolence, as "the Lord said unto" him! This is evident from the showing of Fox himself. Whence, I would demand, with feelings of tenderness to them,

5. What degree of silliness or sinfulness does it require to accredit his inspiration! If here deluded; if here demonstrated infallibly to have been a mere mountebank of spiritual fanaticism at large, and furious in annoying others and all others that would not follow him; if here his certain converse with "the Lord" turns out to be an abominable deception, a pre-eminently stupid falsehood: who knows that on other occasions, where he manifested the same temper, manners, principles, he was any more inspired? Where is the proof of his inspiration at all? Shall we go to his "miracles" to find it? *His* "prophecy" certainly came "by the will of

man." That of "the Holy Ghost" is of a kind every way different, superior, accompanied with complete rational evidence.

The general assembly of the presbyterian church, at their annual sessions, A. D. 1804, passed the following declaration of their sober views on this subject: and if it had been legislated on purpose, it could not more aptly condemn the principles of Quakerism, as exemplified in this and like outrages of Fox and his similars of the society. "We strongly bear our testimony against those persons who pretend to immediate impulses and revelations from heaven, those divine communications which were given only to the prophets and apostles, who were appointed by God to reveal to mankind the way of eternal life. When men presume that the Holy Spirit, contrary to the established order of Providence, interferes, by particular impulse, to direct them in all the common affairs of life; when they deem themselves to be impelled by him, to particular acts, or particular religious exercises, contrary to the established order of the gospel and the obvious duties of the moment; when finally, they pretend to miraculous powers or prophetic influences and the foretelling of future events: all these are evidences of a wild enthusiastic spirit, and tend, eventually, to destroy the authority of the word of God, as the sole rule of faith and practice." I bless God that such remains to be the *unanimous* averment and testimony of that large denomination, whose divisions are all on smaller and comparatively inconsiderable points, for the most part:—and

whose very dissidence not more evinces the imperfection of christians and even christian ministers in this world, than it demonstrates also, in respect to presbyterians, their common freedom of thought, their *principled* tenacity of right, their high common estimate of the value of truth, and their characteristic purpose, by the grace of God, to “strive together”—and may it ever be “standing fast in one spirit, with one mind!—for the faith of the gospel: and IN NOTHING terrified by their adversaries; which [fact of opposition for the sake of the truth] is to them an evident token of perdition, but to us of salvation, and that of God.” I bless God, not only that I am converted, as I trust, from Quakerism to christianity, but that I belong to this very denomination of the church of Jesus Christ! And my soul’s most *unsectarian* prayer for all my brethren and fathers of the presbyterian church, is—that they may kindly and charitably appreciate each other; that they may know and honor their high obligations to their Great Head; and that divine prosperity may attend, preserve, and bless them all, forever.⁵⁶

There may be some implication or confusion of the truth, in respect to what Fox avers in his speech about the Jews, and even the great men of their nation, rejecting the Messiah. But the sentiment that this resulted from their fondness for the oracles of God, is not merely gratuitous; it is impiously false. “Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?”

Again, Abraham said unto him, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." They were so occupied in "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" and in propagating their "own traditions," that they neglected "the word of God" and were (as they are to this day) as ignorant of the real sense of the Old as of the New Testament.

But "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." True; but what has this to do with "a universal inward light!" a light "in every man!" It refers to saints alone, whom the Spirit of Christ hath marked and sealed for his own eternal kingdom. It discriminates saints from "the whole world" that "lieth in wickedness." It respects not the influence miraculous or extraordinary; but that which is through the truth, common to all saints in every age, producing "the fruit of the Spirit" in the living character; according to Gal. 5: 22-26. and Eph. 5: 9. It is the Spirit influential, not the Spirit personal; it is not conscious converse, but moral purity produced; it is not inspiration, but holiness; not revealing new truth fresh to the mind, but bringing one to *see* and love the truth already "written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." This is true of the subserviency of the whole Bible. The Spirit uses his written truth as the medium of all his illumining and sanctifying influence. "FOR WHATSOEVER THINGS were written aforetime," have a common relation to the

people of God. John, 17 : 17. Rom. 15 : 4. Now, if in *this* sense, Fox had avered that the rejectors of Christ had the scriptures insufficiently, not having also his Spirit ; and that if men had his Spirit they would not reject him ; his position were true : and after this truth possibly the moral instinct of Friends may be often blindly groping, when they know “ neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.” This grace in the heart is piety. It is often called “ the fruit of the Spirit ;” often by the name of some one of its multifarious branches ; often by the name of “ the Spirit ;” because the Spirit of God produces and sustains it all. This grace is an indispensable in religion—universally. It is a qualification and a *sine-qua-non* of office not only, but of standing also in the church invisible. The Jews that rejected Christ were destitute of this qualification. But see how Fox confounds things ! With him the qualification of a judge, is a rule of judging ! As if the competency of Hale as chief justice, were the supreme law of the realm ; the statute-book being nothing to it ! “ They took upon them to try their doctrines by the scriptures.” Were it not then *more presumptuous* for them or others to “ take upon them ” to try Christ and his apostles by a still more holy and superior rule ? For Fox makes the *Lawgiver* every where his superior *rule* ; to which the scripture, that was “ given forth ” from that, is “ a secondary rule !” Truly, it was no part of their sin or of ours to pay too much court to “ the word of God, the sword of the Spirit ;” the universal instrument of his saving opera-

tions. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." 1 Cor. 12 : 3. Certainly—and yet this text is just as much in favor of Friends as the others we have considered. The fact is incontestable—no man can so say approvingly, wisely, knowing what he says, but by the Holy Ghost. The only question is—*How* does HE induce the result? With or without his written word? Without it, says Fox. So *he* came by his knowledge, he tells us; and we in part credit him. With it only, and in no other way, says the consistent christian. A man who knows the testimony of the Spirit, "understandeth it," (Matt. 12 : 23,) loves it, trusts it with his heart, and gives his life cordially to its influence, is the one and THE ONLY ONE who can say "by the Holy Ghost" that "Jesus is Lord." He is a true christian. He walks by "the word of God," the scriptures, as his highest rule in religion. He owns the Lawgiver, as greater than the law; but not as a greater law! not as a law at all! He has "the Spirit of Christ." He belongs to the glory of the species, the noble company "of whom the world was not worthy," the ransomed of the Lamb, the saved "in Christ Jesus," *the legion of honor devoted forever to the glory of the King of kings.*

It now occurs to consider, in relation to the 'luciferous aura' of Friends,

8. THE POWERFUL DECISION OF MANY PASSAGES OF THE WORD OF GOD AGAINST IT.

After treating this branch of the subject, it would remain to despatch two others; namely, according to original announcement,

9. THE INNUMERABLE CONTRADICTIONS OF THAT LIGHT AS IT SHINES FROM FRIENDS ; and,

10. THE PARAMOUNT OFFICE OF SCRIPTURE, ACCORDING TO ITS OWN CLAIMS, AS OUR RULE IN RELIGION.

Willing to condense, rather than amplify, the topics of discussion, I refer the *ninth* article mainly to the pervading exhibitions of this volume for some evidence of its truth : subjoining, that while the details of that evidence would be sometimes *in minimis*, concerning things of small moment if not of frivolous import ; while I have letters on file received from their inspired preachers, and have heard oral predictions from “the fountain-head” uttered concerning myself, which I have been spared to contradict and by the grace of God have lived to confound : I forbear for the present to pursue a path of illustration which is very far from grateful to my own feelings and may be irritating to theirs. This premised, I shall consider the *eighth* and *tenth* articles as one in substance ; treat them together ; and endeavor to vindicate their common truth and related sentiment, by an array, apt though brief, of scriptural declarations inconsistent with the arch heresy in which all Friends are agreed ; and in which, as such, they must *necessarily* remain ; and which is of itself sufficient to *require* our non-recognition of their claims, whatever else they say, as professing *christians* :—the arch heresy that denies the paramount relation of the scriptures as our rule in religion.

“Christianity and the scriptures are essentially

associated. Without the latter, we should not have received the former.—In examining into the degree of authority to be attached to the scriptures, we are favored with a very direct appeal. We may go to the scriptures themselves.” In these sentiments of an excellent cotemporary,⁵⁷ I need scarce record my own most hearty concurrence. It is more to the point to say, they suit our purpose admirably; they are just such as the sacred volume, intelligently and devoutly and thoroughly perused, never fails to inspire. What then is that “degree?”

It is often said loosely by excellent writers, that the scriptures are our *only* rule in religion. This is not accurate; it is incorrect. We have other rules; as reason, experience, observation, history, the general facts of life, philosophy, the love of happiness, the light of nature, the moral sense, the maxims of wisdom, the law of the land, the precepts of morality; and those innumerable laws, collateral and subordinate, which flow from these in endless ramifications and forms. But among many, among myriads or millions, ONE ONLY can be SUPREME or PARAMOUNT. I use the word PARAMOUNT, because it is definite and apposite exactly to the grand idea to be conveyed—SUPERIOR TO ALL OTHERS. This is the sense in which the word is used; attributing SUPREMACY UNRIVALLED to the authority of the inspired scriptures, in the position, THE BIBLE IS TO BE REGARDED AS OUR PARAMOUNT RULE IN RELIGION.

Not only do I view the position as sound and demonstrable; but as FUNDAMENTALLY IMPORTANT. The only hope I can have for the salvation of a

Friend—I speak my own conviction as it is—reposes in this one qualifier; for ought I know he may be better in his feelings than his philosophy or the ordinary symbols of his creed. This I often fondly hope. Hence I think deliberately, and by moral necessity, that if his feelings ultimately put any other rule above “the word of God,” and if he is as bad in his real principles as in his doctrinal statements, he is also “in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity; his heart not right in the sight of God, and himself with no lot or part—as yet—in the matter” of salvation by Jesus Christ. Besides, if “the oracles of God” are not paramount, then some other rule is “above them;” and what is that? “The scriptures cannot be the rule of faith, because they cannot give faith; for faith is the gift of God, which overcomes the world.” The rule of faith then is—God himself, because He *can* give faith! Hence the Bible can be the rule “neither of practice, because it cannot distinguish of itself, in all cases, what ought to be practised, and what not, since it contains as well what ought not to be practised, as what ought.” The Bible then “cannot be the rule of faith or practice!” This is ‘orthodox’ Quakerism: for, so says that inspired mystic, William Penn!! Again; “George Whitehead says, That which was spoken from the Spirit of truth in any, is of as great authority as the scriptures or chapters are, AND GREATER, as proceeding immediately from that Spirit; as Christ’s words were of greater authority when he spoke, than the Pharisees reading the letter.” Penn here quotes

approvingly what Whitehead says. Hence Quaker inspiration "in any," is of GREATER AUTHORITY than the Bible; especially as it is fresher!!! Hubberthorn, another piece of inspired heresy, says, "The Spirit of God is the saint's rule, and that is *greater* than the *scriptures*; and the *rule* of the Spirit of God is *above* the *scriptures*." An opponent had objected to him that, "The scripture was given by the Spirit for a rule:" to which Hubberthorn replies; "This we desire a proof of, by plain scripture, and *till then we deny it*." Humphrey Smith says, "God changeth not; and where doth the scripture say, that the scripture is to be a rule to walk or be led by?" Edward Burroughs says; "that we own to be the rule of our conversation, which they [Abel, Moses, and others] walked by, *the immediate Spirit of God* which was before the scripture was written. And all you who profess the scripture to be your rule, your own rule shall testify against you when the eternal judge judges you; and they *who witness that to be their rule which gave forth the scripture*, walk up in the life of the scripture more than you all; and you are proved to be but the *Jew* outward, who boasts of the ordinances from the letter, but persecutes them by slanders and false reproaches, who witness the substance." Another says, "This I witness to all the sons of men, that the knowledge of eternal life I came not to by the letter of the scripture, nor hearing men speak of the name of God." Dewsbury. I quote once more, from Fox; "the scriptures—will not give the knowledge of Christ. That which comes

from him and shines in the heart, doth give the knowledge of Christ the light; the Jews had the scriptures, but had not the knowledge of Christ. Nothing gives nor makes manifest the knowledge of the Savior, but the light which doth enlighten every man that cometh into the world. And none can know Christ by the scriptures; they testify of him; but none can know Christ but by revelation;” that is, immediate revelation in one’s own soul! What could be more subversive of Christianity?

When I read such mysticising sophistry and prevaricating infidelity, as the specimens above, I feel as if Quakerism was entitled to the horror of the whole community; to the public execration of mankind! The scriptures “a secondary rule”—and then no rule at all, neither of faith, nor of practice, according to Penn—and then incapable of imparting the knowledge of Christ—and then adverse to (not homogeneous with) their higher rule—and opposed in influence to the light within—and reduced to nothing by immediate revelation—and this made indispensable universally to faith and salvation—and the Spirit of God himself a rule of action and “the saints’ rule”—and the fresh inspirations of these “deceitful workers” declared by Whitehead and Penn to be **GREATER IN AUTHORITY** than the scriptures themselves—and the knowledge of eternal life “witnessed” to be acquired independently both of scriptural revelation and the preaching of the gospel! and these are the prophets of the devil who claim our charity and scorn our communion, and who vaunt themselves *chris-*

tians of utmost purity and genuineness, as well as preachers of soundness infallible and of furniture inspired! Here a christian may well stand for his life. I cannot conceive what heresy is cardinal and infinitely pestiferous, if Quakerism is not such! and only wonder that christendom has cared so little for it! or endured so courteously a satanic delusion of the sort for scores of years! The more I examine it, the worse it shows. It is a system of sinuous sophistry; a philter of deception, a chalice of sweetened poison. I should be unwilling to die till I had stood up as a witness against it, and written MY SOLEMN PROTEST AND WARNING for the preservation of others from its murderous snares! If there happens to be a state eternal, a thorough and consistent mere Quaker may well wish that he had never been born! In that world "Moses and the prophets" are more respected. There his arguing can no longer deceive others or himself. His profane sophistry will be eternally overruled; and his refined sorcery reduced to common-sense conviction. He may there too late discover—if he fails to do it here—that Jesus Christ MEANT SOMETHING, by "hell-fire, where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched!" Mark, 9 : 43-50.

It will aid our conviction of the just supremacy of the scriptures as our rule in religion, if we can ascertain, simply as an auxiliary fact, the estimate of the Jewish nation respecting them at the time of the appearing of Christ. "How firmly we have given credit," says Josephus, "to these books of our own nation, is evident from what we do; for during so

many ages as have already passed, no one hath been so bold as either to add any thing to them, to take any thing from them, or to make any change in them; but it is become natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem those books to contain divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and if occasion be, willingly to die for them." Thus, Josephus, Philo, and others, speak of them, with ultimate reverence; as "the scripture," or "holy scriptures," and "the divine scriptures." Thus Paul speaks of them to Timothy, who was educated by his pious mother in "the holy scriptures" of the Old Testament; for then the books of the new were not written. Other proof to the same effect is at once abundant and not necessary. These sentiments were common to the nation. It was the universal public sentiment of the country. They knew of no superior rule to the word of God; nor had such a refinement of error then appeared.

Let it here be observed that this ecumenical persuasion of his countrymen, Jesus Christ did nothing to reprove; but, on the contrary, every thing to enlighten, confirm, and establish. If this is so, the conclusion is inevitable. Let us examine the premises. In his sermon on the mount in the very outset and opening of his public ministry, Matt. 5: 17, 18, he thus addresses a Jewish auditory; "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." I ask—does this import "the secondary rule;" or indicate any rule paramount to the scriptures, for us to honor in religion? He immediately adds

“For verily, I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” Hence, the whole of the Old Testament, which comprehended all that was then written, is confirmed as a document of truth eternal, which is to be punctiliously accomplished; and this necessarily, as being more firm than the physical fixtures of “heaven and earth.” This too the Savior teaches explicitly in the very commencement of his ministry, and to an immense congregation, “multitudes” from all parts of the land; “from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Jerusalem, and from Judea, and from beyond Jordan.” But why did he not reprove them for overvaluing “the oracles of God?” a sin of which no evidence convicts them. For though their rulers and scholars sinned plentifully against “the oracles of God,” yet it was in other ways than in the sentiment of their paramount authority or the sacrilege of textual mutilation. They practically neglected and transgressed them; they vacated their meaning by glosses, superficial and erroneous; and they superseded them by their manifold “traditions,” which in effect were criminally promoted to the priority or the primacy of all. But they were a paragon and an example to mankind, in preserving pure the integrity of the text and in sentimentally regarding their inspired books as the highest rule in religion. Christ himself adverts, not reprehensively, to their almost doating scrupulosity, in numbering the letters and the points, as well as the lines and larger divisions of the scriptures; in what he


says about "one jot or one tittle" not passing "from the law till all be fulfilled." He alludes evidently to the *Yod*, the smallest letter of their alphabet; and to any smaller mark or apparently inconsiderable point, originally connected with the sense of inspiration: and he alludes as well and approvingly to the accurate pains-taking of their learned men, in the preservation of every particle of the authentic scriptures. But he goes farther. In the very next verse he makes a practical application of the doctrine. "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do, and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." He here speaks mainly of evangelical teachers, his own true ministers; and declares of them that each shall be graduated in his kingdom according to the respect he pays to the sacred writings, even the most inconsiderable portions or enactments of their code: he shall be exalted as "great" or degraded as "least," according to the respect he shows them, even the comparatively minor parts. What then are we to think of those who put them down *en masse*, exalting a certain interior light, said to be *universal*, "above" them? and at the same time professing to be incomparably the best *friends* of the scriptures in the world! I would say of them; so did not Christ. He plainly had no such view as theirs cardinally is. His views are totally incompatible with it. The air and the savor and the scope of his doctrine is far different from

theirs. When they pretend that Christ came to introduce a dispensation more spiritual than the scriptures, and far enough above them, according to their own most erring notions of the Spirit, they show him as coming to dissolve, annul, “destroy, the law and the prophets;” so that not “a jot or a tittle” remains what it was, in majesty pre-eminent, as the immovable legislation of Jehovah. I add; he here inculcates the grand idea, sublime in its simplicity, of the unity of revelation—the unity of the scriptures—“the unity of the Spirit.” Though the portions are different, and the parts multifarious, they all constitute collectively one revealed system; the code of inspiration; the written infallibility of heaven. Hence, they were then complete as constituting the Old Testament: but consummate as a whole, only in that connection with the New, which makes both to be ONE VOLUME OF PERFECT AND PARAMOUNT LAW IN THE MATTERS OF RELIGION. This evinces the cumulative majesty of the doctrine of Christ, when applied to the whole volume, the Greek and Hebrew scriptures combined! Jesus Christ familiarly called the scriptures, as such, “the word of God;” and one of his apophthegms it was that “the scripture cannot be broken.” But a higher rule he NO WHERE inculcates or implies or recognises; neither did his Jewish countrymen, whose sentiments on that point it was the spirit of his total ministry to sanction and diffuse.

In this sermon he elsewhere utters a monition, which ought to be commended to the serious *intelligence* of Friends: “If therefore THE LIGHT THAT IS

IN THEE be darkness, how great will the darkness be!"⁵⁸ chap. 6: 23. The context shows that this is *moral* darkness only, resulting from pride, prejudice, and the obliquity of the feelings in religion. Wrong motives often obtain the ascendancy of right ones, and doubly darken the mind. The worst perversion that error accomplishes is when it procures darkness to be mistaken for light, and so to be religiously maintained to the very last. This is, I verily believe, the precise condition to which the whole system of Friends most efficaciously tends to reduce its votaries. "There is a way that SEEMETH RIGHT unto a man," according to his own inward illumination at the time; if it seemed wrong to him, wrong as it absolutely is, he would not follow it; "but the end thereof"—and every way has an end, though all travelers do not think of it; and thoughtlessness or presumption is no proof of safety: "the end thereof are the ways of death." This is death eternal—"the end of them that obey not the gospel of God!" Friends often assume that the way is right, because it "seemeth" to be; and hence they trust their own wisdom, and "the light that is in" them leads them speciously to ruin. It is right, according to *their* paramount rule! and it is the way of "death" in the end, according to the law of God! Here is contrariety.

Let us recur to one of "the prophets," all whose words must be "fulfilled," according to the preacher on the mount. Isai. 8: 19-22. The twentieth verse is itself, notwithstanding the impertinent salvos and palliatives of Barclay, a record of ruin to the *light*

of Quakerism: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to THIS WORD, it is BECAUSE there is no light in them."  The law means plainly, not the mystic law of Friends that is "within" us; but in general the written scriptures, the "word" and "the testimony" of "the oracles of God." Thus says Christ to the lawyer; "What is *written* in the law? how *readest* thou?" Luke, 10: 26. See also Hosea, 8: 11, 12. The law more generally indeed referred in strictness to the pentateuch alone; when joined with "the testimony" however, the whole scripture is plainly meant. Now, mark the appeal, to which the Holy Ghost directs the faithful of the nation; that they should promptly and perpetually make it! *From what* is it to be made? I answer, from mysticising pretenders who had found out "a more noble and excellent rule"—very much like if not identical with that of Friends. "And when they shall say unto you, 'Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter:' should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY." The appeal then is *from* these sorcerers; whom the Spirit of God denominates "wizards," &c. not as though they *owned* or *anticipated* the title. When they thus practise, the appeal is to be instantly made: and to make it, observe, is described as "seeking to God!" and this in contradistinction to the course of listening to these spiritual mummers and impostors! Should a people resort to such upstarts? nay, on the contrary, "should not a people seek unto their God?" well!

granting that they should ; how is this to be done ? Answer, by resorting “to the law and to the testimony !” by carrying the immediate and the ultimate appeal to the written law of the kingdom ! Besides ; how contrary this to the common gloss of Friends, that calls the scripture “a dead letter,” and their own light, a living oracle ! The question was, shall we seek to these spiritual sages ? The Spirit of God answers in effect ; no ! you shall seek to God ; as he speaks to you in the scriptures. Would not any nation seek to their own God ? And should you go “for the living to the dead ;” from the lively oracles to the stupid gastronomy (see Septuagint) or inward light, of men “dead” to wisdom and deceitfully counteracting God ? Bring them and their muttered mysticisms to the divine criterion, and it will ruin them.

“Yes ! but if they had only attended to the clear ‘inshining’ of the light in their own hearts”—! To be sure : but Isaiah was not informed on that subject. He had not been “renewed up” to the sublimities of George Fox in his day ! True : And, what is worse, Dr. Scott seems to be very little before him, if not precisely in the same leading-strings of the spiritual nursery ; for he says, “Philosophical illuminators and enthusiastical pretenders to new revelations, which are not to be judged by ‘the law and the testimony,’ are alike concerned in this decision.” To be plain ; this is just what I solemnly think that every mere Quaker will “believe and tremble,” when he stands at “the judgment-seat of Christ ;” if his light be not sooner renounced ! “They shall

iret themselves, and curse their king and their God, and look upward. And they shall look unto the earth; and behold trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish; and they shall be driven to darkness." vs. 21, 22.

"He that despised Moses, law, died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy," who disobeys the completed canon of inspiration! see Luke, 16:29-31, where Christ declares that he who has the former, or the Old Testament alone, and refuses to "hear them," would not "be persuaded, though one rose from the dead!" Alas! it was not "inward light" that ultimately convinced the wretch, who said, "I am tormented in this flame!" and who is pictured before us, by the great master of moral painting, as a neglecter merely of "Moses and the prophets," before he was conveyed to the eternal world, where he "lifted up his eyes, being in torments!"

Man is an accountable being, prior to the extension or the relations of grace in Christ Jesus. Grace is given to save a sinner; *not* to make a man accountable! he was accountable before; in the very structure of his being; in the very organization of his mind; in the faculties and endowments of his mental constitution. Accountable he is to all eternity: he remains such forever in hell or forever in heaven! and forever on principles of absolute law. Now, the oppugnation of the whole rebel species, against this absolute accountability, is the soul of all the heresy in the world! Friends re-

gard grace as necessary to accountableness; and hence they take special pains to provide "every man" with a precious little inserted *viaticum* or *modicum* of gracious influence; "by attending to the inward teachings of which light" he comes to "see clearly" all the mysteries in the universe! Hence, whenever they search the scriptures, it is, as Fox confesses, having made these discoveries antecedently, and without knowing that they were to be found in them! Is it any wonder then that their light should enable them to see marvellous things in the Bible, which its author never meant to put there? things that really unprejudiced learners could never find? and that profound scholars in "the law of their God" *know* it no where contains? In the first chapter of Romans the apostle assigns, as the reason for his strong desire "to preach the gospel" in that imperial city, the fact that *in it alone* is revealed the doctrine of justification by faith: averring that the light of nature indeed was luminous, in respect to the being and perfections of the "God-head;" the accountability and depravity of man; and the justice of God, as his moral governor and righteous condemner for sin. In the second chapter he proceeds to show, at large, the absolute accountability of all men, jews and gentiles, as they shall be seen "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." verse 16. This he does by showing that each man believes it in reference to every other one; witness his censures, his criticisms, his criminations: and these common, mutual, universal! He says al-

so that these demonstrate (what philosophers call *the law of nature*) the accountable constitution and moral organization of every individual of the species, whether heathen, christian, or jew. He says that hence those without law "are a law unto themselves; who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another." But Friends "see clearly" that *this* means the workings of "the good principle" in them; namely, their own interior taper burning all beauteously, and darting its radiations "through all!" I only remark, by the way, that their light is evidently cursed with the spirit of perversion and error; "conclusion retrograde and mad mistake!" In the second of first Corinthians the apostle is showing mainly THE NECESSITY EVERY WAY OF A REVELATION FROM GOD, such as the apostles and prophets were empowered to produce: but Friends stupify the sense of the whole argument with the mysticism of their light! In the third of Romans, having shown the accountability and criminality of all men, he inquires; "What advantage then hath the jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? much every way: CHIEFLY, BECAUSE THAT UNTO THEM WERE COMMITTED THE ORACLES OF GOD." Here, I ask, if the inward light be a paramount rule, where after all is the demonstrated advantage, as "much every way?" He proceeds; "For what if some did not believe?" believe what? "the effectual operation of the light that is in every man?" no! but "the oracles of God." Well;

“shall their unbelief make the faith (faithfulness) of God without effect? God forbid! yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged;” or, when thou judgest. Here we see that men are accountable absolutely; that they perish when they have the signal “advantage” of the scriptures, because they do not “believe” them; that the veracity of God does not depend for its honor on their piety that credits it; that unbelief is really a sin and a damning one; and that the “advantage” of the means of grace is intrinsical and absolute, even when it is not improved, or when, through perversion of unbelief, it becomes an occasion of augmented guilt and ruin, “a savor of death unto death!” If Friends hate this, it only identifies them with that very class to whom said Jesus Christ; “And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life!” Ye have “both seen, and hated, both me and my Father.” Let them beware of “the way of Cain”—and of Paine!

“Making THE WORD OF GOD of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered; and many such like things do ye.” Mark, 7: 13. Jesus Christ here calls the scripture “the word of God;” which Friends are too pious and too wise to do, “through their tradition, which they have delivered; and many such like things do they!” Besides, to “make it of none effect” in any way, is here branded as distinguished crime! The jews did it by false interpretation: Friends do it more

effectually and by a wholesale process, by defaming its superlative dignity, denuding it of its proper title, and recommending men to "sit still" and listen to the informations of "a more noble and excellent rule" within them! Again, I say an anathema, in the name of the Lord, upon their arch and horrible heresy! I can scarcely conceive a more foolish or a worse one.

"But CONTINUE THOU in the things which THOU HAST LEARNED AND HAST BEEN ASSURED OF, KNOWING OF WHOM [OF GOD] thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, WHICH ARE ABLE TO MAKE THEE WISE UNTO SALVATION THROUGH FAITH WHICH IS IN CHRIST JESUS." 2 Tim. 3 : 14, 15-17. I should want the competency of the inward light divinely endorsed, in language BETTER THAN THIS, before I would desert "the holy scriptures" for its profane and wildering elucidations! I should wish to see it written, by inspiration as certain, in language tantamount to this: "but still there is 'a more noble and excellent rule,' greatly superior to the holy scriptures, 'a light in every man,' that is 'above them' and far more useful and certain in the direction of souls to salvation and to God." Instead of any such diabolical folly and falsehood, either here or elsewhere to be found in "the holy scriptures," they are elevated above all proper competition and equality; they are declared to be "able to make us wise," and that the best kind of wisdom and the best degree of it too; "WISE UNTO SALVATION;" and this, in the simple and rational way

of *believing them heartily*; “through faith;” and this faith is said to be “in Christ Jesus,” for he is the pervading theme of them all! Besides, Timothy is congratulated on this “chief advantage” of a Jew, the possession of “the oracles of God;” and that he had *known* them “from a child.”

It is not the style of inspiration to conform to our technicalities of thought. It exhibits great truths, facts, realities; and leaves every man, accountably and at the peril of his soul, to make his own inferences: yet so, that a spirit really unprejudiced and ductile to the divine instructions, will be led, substantially, progressively, infallibly, to the knowledge of the truth. “Good and upright is the Lord: therefore will he teach sinners in the way. **THE MEEK WILL HE GUIDE IN JUDGMENT: AND THE MEEK WILL HE TEACH HIS WAY.** All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth, unto such as keep his covenant and his testimonies. For thy name’s sake, O Lord, pardon mine iniquity; for it is great. What man is he that feareth the Lord? him shall he teach in the way that he shall choose. His soul shall dwell at ease; and his seed shall inherit the earth;” or the land, i. e. the land of promise; typically, heaven. “The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and he will show them his covenant.” Ps. 25: 8-14. I now ask if the passage in Timothy is not perfectly decisive? I think it is. What want we more? What other rule, what “more noble and excellent” one do we need, who have one divinely commended to us, as “**THE HOLY SCRIPTURES THAT ARE ABLE TO MAKE**

US WISE UNTO SALVATION, THROUGH FAITH THAT IS IN CHRIST JESUS!" It is impossible to conceive of A RULE SUPERIOR, either in its competency or its evidence! And how do Friends contrive a superior one? I answer, by profanely substituting the legislator for the law; making the Spirit of God a rule of action; and so honoring the greater, as to supersede the less—to detrude it from its proper dignity as if it was NOT "able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus!" I also wish to ask the reader, especially if he happens to belong to the rare company that value their souls, the following questions: (1) Are you sure that AS MUCH CAN BE SAID of the interior light of Friends? is IT "able to make us wise to salvation"—'by faith in its effectual operation?' (2) By what evidence CAN YOU be rationally convinced of it? or will you believe it on the naked *dixit* of a Quaker? (3) Ought you not to have MORE AND GREATER EVIDENCE in favor of the "light," than you now have so amply in favor of "the holy scriptures," *before* you venture so to desert them for it, as to call them "a secondary rule" and give to it the desired pre-eminence? (4) Have you not A DUTY TO DO FOR OTHERS, as well as yourself, in resisting a "damnable heresy" that would degrade and in effect annul forever "the holy scriptures," in behalf of a moon-struck non-entity imagined to reside "in every man" and fabled to be vastly superior to them! (5) Have you well considered THE GREATER CONFIRMATION of the excellency of "the holy scriptures," as our paramount

rule in religion, in that the apostle proceeds immediately to state, vs. 16 and 17, that THE WHOLE SCRIPTURE IS DIVINELY INSPIRED; and is PROFITABLE FOR ALL THE ENDS which the chief rule in religion could be desired to answer? "PROFITABLE," not injurious or useless or of small utility, to those noble ends! "profitable for instruction, for conviction, for correction, for education in righteousness; that the man of God might be complete, accomplished perfectly for every good work."

If he is so accomplished by "the holy scriptures," what OTHER AND SUPERIOR RULE does he at all require? Quakerism is here "weighed in the balances, and found wanting." Its proper epitome, and its future epitaph, is TEKEL. But Friends are afraid of *the man's hand* that writes their doom upon the wall—afraid calmly and closely to see the evidence, that the scriptures themselves furnish, in contrariety and in extinction to their light! Barclay refers indeed to the verses just quoted; but in what way? I answer, jesuitically and shamefully alone! He glides by the noble and the glorious passage, as if it had little or no relevancy to the argument: he translates it wrong, and omits the first two uses specified, for which "the holy scriptures" are declared to be "profitable." Thus; "All scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable—for correction, for instruction in righteousness," &c. And pray, is it not profitable for "doctrine?" and also for conviction, "reproof," or perhaps more correctly *προς ελεγχον* for polemical authority and decision: since the word is properly forensic, referring to arguments

used in a court of judicature for the demonstration of points contested? The scripture is thus the arbiter of controversy. But mark the serpent coiled in the "silence" of his lillies! He perverts the sense and alters the proposition; reasoning in a circle, and making the premises uncertain, and changing two powerful propositions into one dilute and quakerized; to the utter ruin of the sense! In his hands it informs us simply that "all scripture [that is] given by inspiration of God, is profitable" for a thing or two! instead of the true proposition, that refers, as a solemn *imprimatur* of the Spirit to the canonical perfection of his own work, to "the holy scriptures," and pronounces THEM *de facto*, first, to be "given by inspiration of God;" and second, to be "profitable" for all the ends requisite and competent to a paramount rule in religion! But, it may be said to me; Did *you* not make a translation for yourself? and if so, why not he also? and if he might, why not omit the *is* where it first occurs, since it is not in the original? I answer, why insert it in the second place, "*is* profitable," since neither there is it found in the original? Why not omit it till after the whole, thus elongating and qualifying the subject of the proposition, and postponing the predicate—forever! The fact is that the propositions are two; in the original distinctly marked, and in our version correctly given. The grammar of the Greek obviously *requires* two; and the conjunction *καὶ* and demonstrates it, though Barclay, in his "sincerity," ventures wholly to *omit* that word, and so, designedly or otherwise, emasculates

the sentence and palms upon his reader a most sleepy and silly forgery! One of his ends in this can be seen, yea two of them, and perhaps more. As he has serenely changed the sense; (1) It has no particular applicability to "the holy scriptures," as the received volume of God, known and honored by the whole church, then and since, as well as before. (2) It is a proposition of total insipidity, ascertaining practically nothing; as if he had said, light is light, and good to see by; whatever is divinely inspired is divinely inspired, and furthermore of considerable utility on one or two accounts; "all scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable"—Is it? what a discovery! I should rather doubt it, in some instances at least, if I could judge *only* from the influence allowed to its truth by certain luminous characters! (3) As he has widened the circumference of the passage, and set it to spinning in the air round an uncertain centre, it becomes rather "profitable" than otherwise to Friends! for now *all* their illumined writings, that were "given forth by that that made the scriptures," are equally within its sanction and enclosure! "All scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable:" hence the writings of George Fox, Robert Barclay, William Penn, Job Scott, and others, men and women, more than we can number, become canonical at once! Quere—Would Friends have any special objection to the whole world walking by *Barclay's Apology*, as their paramount rule in religion? What a fine time indeed, if all the world would thus come to the '*light!*' And would it make a fine *eternity* too?

(4) While I truly leave it with God what were his motives in this perversion and imposture, I charge him in effect with the ends alleged, and suppose that in this I only show, as it is, the prevaricating nature of Quakerism. It is not evidence that makes the system, that constitutes, upholds, or diffuses it. I could fill a volume of commentary with similar criticisms on similar perversions of its own; perversions belonging to the *light*, as children to a parent, in its other exhibitions of "darkness visible."

It were easy to multiply instances of scriptural declaration, utterly at variance with the huge heresy here opposed: but I will conclude this last division of the subject with the consideration of one that seems apposite to the place as well as suitable to the argument. I allude to those solemn words with which the sacred volume concludes; Rev. 22: 18-21, especially the former verses of the four. On these, without caring to quote them in order, I submit the following observations. 1. They exhibit A SOLEMN SEALING OF THE SACRED CANON. (1) I assume here that the Apocalypse was written *last* of the books of the New Testament; and though I know that biblical antiquarians have differed on the point, I do not know that the opposite arguments have any solid respectability. (2) The sanction respects the sin of changing or mutilating the sacred text, so as to corrupt christianity, and pass off a forgery against heaven on the credulity of men; and this either by adding or subtracting, or in any other way vitiating its divine integrity. Hence, as it respects the quantum of the sin and its nature, no reason can be

given why it should be interpreted restrictively to this particular book; since the sin is much the same, to whatever portion it refers of the sacred canon. It is like forging or erasing the signature of God. The inference is that at all events it extends morally to the whole Bible. (3) It imports that more inspiration is neither necessary, nor probable, nor at all to be expected. (4) It requires us to take heed to what it thus seals, as sufficient for its end and of infinite utility to us. "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand." 2. The four concluding verses, taken in connection, prospectively refer to the end of time, to THE SECOND COMING of our Lord. The sealing of the canon evidently contemplates the intermediate ages: it is sealed finally, as the finishing of inspired prophecy; "always, even unto the end of the world." This I take to be both evident and important. Other scriptures also, and I may say the total tenor and scope of prophecy, declare the same thing. It is precisely analogous to the manner and the certain truth of its import, in which the Old Testament scriptures were sealed by the concluding verses of Malachi. Chap. 4: 4-6. Those words sealed the prophetic disclosures for more than four hundred years; and plainly till the first coming of Messiah, or especially till the times of his precursor and cotemporary, John the Baptist; who was personally the predicted "Elijah the prophet," of that eventful period. Till then, the church was distinctly apprized that the prophetic gift would retire and its

oracles no more be communicated ; consequently they were referred to those already copious scriptures for their paramount rule in the portentous interval. "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb FOR ALL ISRAEL, WITH THE STATUTES AND JUDGMENTS. Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." Consequently, we have the best reason to believe historically, that the fact corresponded with the prediction. Many pseudo-sacred books were indeed written ; but they were utterly rejected from the canon of the church. The books that constitute what we call the *Apocrypha*, were all written in this interval ; and are on that account alone, if other cardinal proofs were not demonstrative and abundant, condemned as spurious ; notwithstanding their canonized validity according to the council of Trent. So is sealed the New Testament canon, and with it the total volume of inspiration, till the second coming of Christ in the end of the world : an event which he declares shall occur "quickly," or with as much rapidity as infinite providence, rolling on the events of things, can well and wisely order in their course. The church also responds with kindred rapture, as the bride beloved salutes the appointed hour of her bridegroom's return ; "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." And TILL HE COME, according to his own engagement, THE CANON OF PROPHECY IS PLAINLY SEALED BY HIMSELF ; nor is it HIS BRIDE that will encourage a forgery in his name. What then are we to expect in the mean-

time ? I answer, our anticipation ought to be two-fold ; (1) *That* SPURIOUS *prophecy will abound.* This is the fact. In every age since, we have seen the sibyl leaves of sorcery scattered on the winds of heaven for the ruin of the nations : so that the *Apocryphal* writings of the new dispensation are more numerous and more execrable, and some of them more specious, than those of the old.⁵⁹ I place *the writings of the Quakers*, with their voluminous simulation and their virulence of error, among the most successful counterfeitings of Satan in these latter ages. They are plainly spurious pretenders to an equal, nay “greater,” because fresher, authority, than “the holy scriptures.” They are specious and plausible, as the “angel of light” apparent, by whom they were inspired. They intoxicate with their potations all by whom they are imbibed ; introducing “another Jesus, another Spirit, another gospel,” and not those of the scriptures of truth. The Quakers, the Mormonites, THE PROFOUNDLY STUPID TONGUES of the British metropolis, and others, thousands such, have since appeared with their very authentic inspirations ! nor is this the end. “False Christs” and every kind of false prophets and false doctrines, will crowd the procession of the future, till the millennium. (2) *That we ought to expect* NO MORE GENUINE PROPHECY ; no, not till the end of time. The *spurious* has been easily identified hitherto, even summarily, by internal evidence. It seems almost obvious absolutely, that no more of the true is needed, nor will ever be given. I do not say that “knowledge” will not

“be increased,” both by the improvement and the diffusion of light: but both shall proceed from the perfect volume that God hath “sealed till the time of the end!” The Bible will be more and more perfectly understood; more and more purely and faithfully interpreted; more and more extensively pondered and known; more and more translated into different languages; more and more communicated to the nations, and universalized in its glorious benefits. We live in the last dispensation, most certainly: and though the most eventful and the best of its portentous series is probably to come, yet the “paradised ages” before us will constitute not a new dispensation, but only the more “blessed and holy” consummation of the present. I expect such a consummation; and by such means induced—together with intermingled judgments, some or many of which will electrify the world! and things more terrible, in executing summary wrath on the multitudes of the post-millennial apostacy; just as time and eternity meet, and “the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him;” shall raise the mighty congregation of the dead; and “shall sit upon the throne of his glory.” Matt. 25: 19, 31. Acts 1: 9–11. 1 Cor. 15: 24–28. Phil. 3: 20, 21. 1. Thess. 2: 19. 3: 13. 4: 13–18. 2 Thess. 2: 1, 2–5. 1 Tim. 6: 13–16. 2 Tim. 4: 1. Tit. 2: 12, 13. Heb. 9: 28. 2 Pet. 3: 7–14. Rev. 1: 7, 8. Then indeed will come that MOST “GREAT AND TERRIBLE DAY OF THE LORD,” to which all similar days had been typical and tributary. 3. We ought to trem-

ble indeed at THE SIN AND DANGER OF MUTILATING "THE ORACLES OF GOD!" This may be done in many ways: but in two principally, which are specified distinctly in the obsignation. (1) By ADDITION. "If any man shall *add* unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." If "any man" will examine these "plagues" in detail, he will soon find them to transcend all ordinary damnation; yet they shall be added to him who adds to the inspired canon the forgeries of his own imagining: and WHO shall add them? ☞ "GOD SHALL ADD unto him the plagues that are written in this book!" Is it any venture here to infer the distinguished wickedness, beyond all powers of language or of thought to express, of such profanation! such felony against heaven! such forgery of the seal royal of "the only wise God!" Whose cause is subserved by such systematic sorcery! the cause of truth or error, of salvation or perdition, of Jesus Christ or of that chieftain "of the bottomless pit, whose name in the Hebrew tongue, is ABADDON; but in the Greek tongue, hath his name APOLLYON;" in the English, whose name is DESTROYER. But are Friends obnoxious to this awful commination? I answer, promptly, ☞ NO—IF THEIR CLAIMS TO INSPIRATION ARE VALID AND CORRECT! BUT, IF THEY ARE NOT, THEY ARE MORE PERFECTLY ENTITLED TO ITS VOLLIES OF WRATH DISCHARGED UPON THEM THAN ANY OTHER RELIGIONISTS KNOWN TO ME IN THIS AGE. It is undeniable, and it were monstrous to deny, that *their claims* are as high as any claims

ever were. The only difference is, that, as all false pretension overacts and becomes *more such* in appearance than that which is true, Quakerism claims more, and that much more importunately, than real inspiration does! George Fox has almost every sentence first or last fenced with the averment, "The Lord said to me; the Lord told me; the Lord showed me;" and such like claims to an inspiration of the highest kind, that of direct suggestion, plenary, constant, perfect, reaching to all his INSPIRED ACTIONS as well as all his words; and (as Barclay claims) becoming alone competent as the rule of universal practice. This then is "adding" with a witness! On supposition that their claims are delusive and false, they are in a condition at once most guilty and horrible—none the less because they "*say*, peace and safety." I press the power of this dilemma; for it is no fiction, or invention, or artifice, but the solemn truth of the matter. If their preachers and authors are inspired, their communications are, as Penn declares, confirming the oracles of another spiritual ventriloquist, of equal, yea, "greater authority;" because more 'immediately' or recently given: if not inspired, they are entitled to all the plagues written in this book! Reader, on which horn do you prefer to swing? I know with what lubricity *they* can manage to slip away from the conclusion—but I know too that there are others who care for the truth. But the scriptures may be mutilated, and the sin and peril incurred, (2) *By subtracting* from their finished code. For "if any man shall *take away* from the words of the book

of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." This is plainly a threat of equal awe. I ask; Are Friends exposed to it? Is there any sense in which they "take away from" the canonical scriptures? I answer, There are several; *first*, They *supersede* them with their own spurious inspiration, in whole or in part, in principle or in effect, by pre-occupying the minds of the people and bewitching them with their ephemeral and fresh supplies of inspiration! *Second*, They give the people such an idea of THE NATURE OF INSPIRATION, against its true dignity and perfection, by intruding their miserable specimens continually on their notice, that the conclusion is natural, and even necessary, that all inspiration is equally childish, moonstruck, insipid! and this is "taking away" from the true "oracles of God" their proper excellency and use. *Third*, It comes to pass by the whole influence of their notions and their scheme that "the holy scriptures" are VERY MUCH REDUCED in value and in efficacy, in the practical estimate of their people, especially their youth; who, with some rare exceptions, are proverbially ignorant and almost paganized in respect to the contents of that book of God! They have no catechisms or creeds; no bible-classes of parochial exercise and insight in the treasures of the truth; no Sunday-schools (unless quite recently "provoked" to that good work—though quakerized) in which to teach their children; and no pastoral care, instruction, and sound indoctrination on "the Lord's

day." The scriptures are NOT READ AT ALL in their public meetings: nor have they any such thing as the domestic altar or regular family religion, or social worship of any kind in their domestic scenes—except some equally few and fitful visitations of travelling *inspirati*, now and then, to teach them comparatively nothing. To "take away" from "the holy scriptures" their admirable use, is richly to deserve the curse written for the deed! It is to entail curses by wholesale on the souls of sinners around us! It is to marshal the way of the unreconciled, in everlasting deviation from God! And it is to satisfy and to secure them with a piece of hateful treachery *within* them, by which they are to walk, as "a more noble and excellent rule!" Hence, in effect, in ways other than I have here mentioned, (that I *know*,) in the common sentiments and conversation of many of them, they take away from "the word of God" all its proper virtue, all its best results, all its glorious hopes! Is this no sin? "FOR I TESTIFY," says Jesus Christ, "unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book!" HE testifies the sin of mutilation, and the doom of its perpetrator!

Very well do I know, here and elsewhere, what Friends allege against these charges. They say; Why, we do verily esteem the scriptures as the noblest writings in the world; we read them frequently, and exhort our youth to do the same, as they all can witness: so that it is rank calumny thus to blaze us abroad as contemners of the scriptures. This is perhaps the substance of their an-

swer, as I have often “witnessed” it. Well, grant that this is all to some extent—possibly—true: I will tell you, Friends, what else ye do, abrogating all the good. You tell them (1) That they are only “a secondary rule;” a good book, but not “the word of God.” (2) That each of them has their paramount in his own heart, “by attending to whose clear manifestations”——than which a worse error could scarcely be told to them, or believed by them! (3) That inspiration has not ceased at all; but that the writings of inspired Friends are very ‘profitable,’ being fresher “given forth” by the same Spirit, and worthy to be pondered by all Friends. (4) That Friends value the scriptures, not as the priests and hirelings and world’s people do; since the Bible is not the gospel, but only a record of the things of previous ages and dispensations in relation to the living principle, “a measure of which is given to all to profit with.” Penn. And, (5) You DO NOT TELL THEM, for this is contrary to your principles, of THE INFINITE IMPORTANCE of becoming acquainted with their contents! the guilt and sin of their condition, till converted heartily to God! the certain perdition of their “dying in their sins!” the necessity of loving that truth identically, which is there revealed, in order to the existence of piety in the soul! the fact that God uses his written truth as the universal instrument, directly or indirectly, of all the ascertained piety in the world! the evil of ignorance, error, indifference, and unbelief; and the utter hopelessness of continuing in impenitence! the necessity of application, without prejudice, indolence,

or intermission; and the equal necessity of prayer, *heartily believing* prayer, to "the Father of lights" and the Maker of mind, without *impiously* waiting for "a special impulse" to pray, in order to proficiency in the knowledge of the truth. And (6) you give them no adequate helps, motives, and really learned instruction, calculated to interest their minds and affect their thoughts and attach their feelings with practical intensity. How could you give, what you do not possess; or adequately recommend what you never experienced? Hence there is next to none of sound biblical instruction enjoyed by your children; while they are *conscientious against trusting all it says*, lest they should fall into the snare of preferring it to the inward light; which is "a more noble and excellent rule!" This *I know* is fact!

The conclusion is that the charge of mutilation of the scriptures is good against you! and now I increase it perhaps, by adding my own conviction that no other heresy does this more effectually; and that the good things, that you say in praise of the Bible and compound with your poisonous heresy, only enhance the evil! for no one then suspects you of any injurious influence. "Art thou in health, my brother?" You kiss while you betray the Son of man! You smile when you stab him to the heart! You very sincerely "crucify him afresh and put him to an open shame!" While doing the work of an enemy, you claim to be pre-eminently a friend! You prevent, in your own incomparable way, that just estimate of "the oracles of God," without

which not one man in a thousand IS EVER ACTUATED in devoutly reading them to the benefit of his soul ; and then say many fine things about such fine writings ! In this way too you deceive yourselves : and you as well deceive others. The superficial beholder thinks better of you than the truth. Many an *infidel* Friend, and I have known such members of meeting and “plain” ones too, passes for a believer and a christian, because of his dress and his address alone ; just as wretched brass often passes for gold, because of an exterior stamp, at making which counterfeiters are expert, but which does not change its nature. So may an enlightened christian say of the theatre, when one of its fanatical votaries blames him for his censure of it : thus—That there are many good things in it, I do not deny or doubt. Its sentiment is often as good identically as the gospel of God, which it correctly quotes ; often as refined and poetical as Milton or Watts ; often full of manly and generous incitement ; often delightfully rhetorical, displaying some of the finest examples of true eloquence ; often mentally improving and rationally entertaining ; and sometimes possibly affording a less censurable way of spending or rather mis-spending a whole evening—than some others that could be named. What then ? Is the theatrical system good ? I answer, far from it. It is a school of vice ; a system of ruin ; as Tillotson said, ‘ the chapel of the devil ;’ the antechamber of hell ; as bad as gambling and swindling and methodized impurity can make it ; the royal exchange of universal profligacy ; the place

where all young men almost, who go to perdition before they die as well as afterward, in our large cities, commence their dissolute courses and enter their novitiate of vice ; a system which, stern statistics and matter-of-fact experience have demonstrated, could not exist a year, but for that thorough alliance with sensual iniquity and other abominations, which has always characterized it in both hemispheres. If this account be correct, I ask any sober reader, if the virtues of the stage are not as helpful to the system as the opposite parts of it ! if the system is not worse (because at once sustained and disguised by them) on account of the incidental excellencies involved ! if the very courtezans that haunt it, as their devoted temple, are any more necessary to it as a whole, than are those cunningly intermingled excellencies ?

I say the same of Quakerism. As a system, it is a cheat, a spiritual hallucination. It is not christianity. It takes away salvation ; and teaches you to be smooth and soft ! It robs you of the only hope of a sinner ; and gives you "inward light" for your "more noble and excellent" compensation. It supersedes the Redeemer and his offices ; and requites the felony with—a plain and peaceful garb ! It does this—and says and does a great number of other things which are quite good and worthy of *immense* commendation ! And because of these other things, it requires all men to approve the system, and fellowship its votaries, and have a perfect fraternal charity toward all "the blind leaders of the blind," that mean no harm, are very sincere, and see no

danger in that way! I confess that it nauseates my soul to read or hear a Friend praising the scriptures. To betray Christ was hardly as great a sin as that affectionate kiss the traitor gave him! Nor can I dispassionately believe that my present decision results from any greater or worse cause than a peculiar acquaintance with the reality of the case, and with both sides of the unappreciated argument. So far am I from any personal exasperation, that it is love for their souls—God is witness—that induces me both to abhor their errors and to give “voice and utterance” to that abhorrence. But they will not credit this averment; far otherwise!—a sentiment which it more grieves than surprises me to discern the necessity of entertaining. “The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord! If they have called the master of the house Beëlzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household!” Jesus Christ never found out the way of speaking the truth faithfully to unconverted men without displeasing them.

I conclude with the remark, that now for more than twenty years, have I been strongly and increasingly convinced that the errors in which I was nurtured and which (though I neither did my duty nor thought myself a christian) I sincerely believed, identifying them with all the christianity I knew, are radical and destructive; worse for their specious appearances, their interesting and conciliating accompaniments, and the things truly good embraced

in the system as a whole : and that the experience I have *really* had of them and of christianity in competition, and the spiritual perils I have necessarily encountered in consequence, authorize me at least to speak and publish my own solemn conviction respecting them. If in doing this, I have appeared to use more severity and rigor than were properly allowable, I can only say I will repent of what I have written, the matter of it, as soon as I am convinced of its impropriety ; while the motive of it, I refer to the Judge eternal—and the manner, to those who choose to criticise it : since well I know that no man is competent to condemn this performance, who is not a sound and practical christian ; and who, to a correct knowledge of the doctrine of the scriptures, does not unite such an acquaintance with the contrasted errors of Friends, as to be thence qualified impartially to estimate and incorruptly to pronounce on their high pretensions. “Fear them not therefore : for there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed ; and hid, that shall not be known. What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light ; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house-tops. And fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul : but rather fear him, who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.”

PART THIRD.



THE SACRAMENTS: THE MINISTRY.

THE LOVE OF CHRIST CONSTRAINETH US. 2 Cor. 5 : 14.

THY WILL BE DONE IN EARTH AS IT IS IN HEAVEN. Matt. 6 : 10.

THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS IS THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY. Rev. 19 : 10.

NOW I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and KEEP THE ORDINANCES AS I DELIVERED THEM TO YOU. 1 Cor. 11 : 2.

This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. 1 John, 5 : 6.

Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Acts, 2 : 38.

And he took bread, and gave thanks, and break it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament [covenant] in my blood which is shed for you. Luke, 22 : 19, 20.

But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation [judgment] to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. 1 Corinthians, 11 : 28, 29.

Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends, IF YE DO WHATSOEVER I command you. John, 15 : 13, 14.

For thus IT BECOMETH US to fulfil all righteousness. Matt. 3 : 15.

And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they who are called to the marriage-supper of the Lamb. And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God. Rev. 19 : 9.

And thou hast tried those WHO SAY THEY ARE APOSTLES, AND ARE NOT; AND HAST FOUND THEM LIARS. Rev. 2 : 2.

Even from the days of your fathers ye are gone away from mine ordinances, and have not kept them. Return unto me, and I will return unto you, saith the Lord of hosts. But ye said, Wherein shall we return? Mal. : 37.

Wo unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight! Therefore is the anger of the Lord kindled against his people, and he hath stretched forth his hand against them, and hath smitten them. Therefore as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust: because THEY HAVE CAST AWAY THE LAW OF THE LORD OF HOSTS, AND DESPISED THE WORD OF THE HOLY ONE OF ISRAEL. Isai. 5 : 21, 24, 25.

Now as Janes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as theirs also was. 2 Tim. 3 : 8, 9.

PART THIRD.

THE SACRAMENTS.

THE high spiritual pretensions of *Friendism* and its instinctive absorbing tendency to the interior, which may be termed (for we may make a word in such a case of singularity) its INTERIORIZING characteristic, its pervading fondness for the invisible *penetralia* of the human tabernacle, where best its indefinite and mysticising orgies can be performed, to mention *just here* no other and possibly more potent causes, may well account for its unsuffering antipathy to the christian sacraments. Few however, to whom Friends and their writings are not *both* known, can imagine *how great* their devout aversion is towards these abrogated shadows, as they love to regard them;—these DIVINE INSTITUTIONS, as they are fully demonstrated and justly termed.

The *importance* of the christian sacraments may be inferred absolutely from the fact, when proved, of their divine origination and authority. It may be subordinately shown from their proper nature, their true significancy, their instructive implications, the experience of communicants, the history and character of *some* who have rejected them, and the testimony of the most learned and excellent writers in the church; as well as from their catholic preva-

lence and certain antiquity as adjuncts of the christian religion. But—we repeat it—if the bare fact of *the pleasure of God in the matter* will not commend them to the mind of the reader when duly vindicated as divine ordinances, we may almost despair of lower considerations, and leave the incorrigible to the judgment of God. Their importance in relation to Friends, however, is peculiar. To affirm or deny their claims affects a system of doctrine. The Friend could not be convinced of their divinity, without supposing that spiritual duty had some (and *possibly* more) exterior and formal relations. It would then induce him to consult external evidence. It would obligate his conscience to some outward religious performances. It would explode his total system. It would teach him not to call that common, which God had called holy. He would hence desire instruction; he would consult scripture, become candid, value exposition and all proper helps to the just and full investigation of the sense of scripture, and feel bound by any outward lights which God has evidently lighted and sustained for direction in the way of his will. One great proof with me (*è plurimis unum*) that Quakerism is not christianity, is derived from the sacraments. I am sure that these are divine ordinances; and that the evidence that they are such is perfectly conclusive. Quakerism rejects that evidence; and I reject Quakerism.

By a sacrament, I mean, *a divinely appointed form of worship in the church of Jesus Christ, with respect to the covenant of grace, in which, by sensible signals mutually approved, either party is*

plighted to the other according to the tenor of the promises ; God to the believer for his salvation, and the believer to God as the object of his choice, his joy, his worship, his praise, and his inheritance.

Protestants justly affirm that there are two sacraments, and only two, under the gospel. There are many other matters, which, though divine ordinances, (as magistracy, marriage, divorce in certain cases, and others,) are still not sacraments : because they refer rather to human society and secular order than to the covenant of grace ; or, the spiritual stipulations of the parties and the immediate interests of the soul. The names of those, as sacrament, eucharist, baptism, washing, the Lord's supper, sealing ordinances, and the like, are *comparatively* of small concern. We write of *things*. If the fact can be proved, according to the definition given above, our main purpose is gained. I believe in the *things*, and can assign competent reasons for the *names* by which they are distinguished. If Friends could be brought to see the divine wisdom of the things themselves, they could also be brought, and that with ease, to own the propriety of the names. The matters themselves are their aversion—to such a degree that demonstration is often found powerless to remove it.

My great object here is to evince the *reality* of these sacraments in general ; that they are important adjuncts of the christian *religion*, as it came from God, as it still is, and as it shall be to the end of time or the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ to judge the world.

Friends regard them as vanities of no warrant or profit ; as traditionary relics of Romanism or Judaism or both, which it becomes all christians to disesteem and deny. They often speak of those who are *better instructed*, compassionating the *earthliness* of others—who obey God in the sacraments : these are thought to be mere children and dotards in comparison of their own enlightened superiority to such obsolete or barbarian usages : and they often speak of the wars and bloodshed which the sacraments may have *occasioned*, as proofs of their evil tendency and empty character. Many speak of them with levity and insult, as if *no proof* could establish their claim to divine authority ; so evident is their absurdity in the *à priori* radiance of the inward light ! *Our grand position is, God is their author, as the scriptures perfectly aver* : if we can prove this, let the reader judge *what kind* of modern inspiration it is that contradicts, and that with fanatical self-complacency, the written orders of the Spirit of God ! Wretched delusion ! Presumptuous and guilty sanctimony !

I begin with christian baptism. This sacrament may be defined to be, *a typical washing of the body with water*, (I suppose neither the quantity, nor the mode of application, to be at all essential ; the divine and human *intention* being the main concern,) *as an act of appointed worship, devoting the subject to “ the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost :” into the visible profession, worship, and inheritance, of which “ name,” the party is thus formally introduced ; while its IMPLICATION is—the moral*

impurity of the subject that requires ablution; its SIGNIFICANCY—the salvation of God in Christ Jesus, especially that moiety of it which is termed sanctification.

On this, and its twin companion, much has been and might be written. My present aim however is to evince their reality as divine institutions, or to show why I thus esteem them; and in doing this, to oppose the sentiment of Friends that spiritualizes and refines away the plain import of scripture respecting them.

I argue the reality of baptism, as a divine institution, from its high antiquity and general prevalence in the church; from the apostolic and ministerial commission; and from the certain practice of the apostles and primitive preachers of the gospel.

1. *From its high antiquity and general prevalence in the church.* Long before the corruptions of the papacy *began* to add its heathen honors to the simple vesture of Christ, acting always (as is the immemorial course of superstition,) on the principle of *increase*, baptism was notoriously universal in the church, and received as an apostolical tradition of the pure institute of God. The *fact* none will deny. I therefore omit proofs: or refer for them to the unanimous voice of ancient ecclesiastical history.

Now, as this was all in the first three centuries of the christian era, so was it *anterior* to the hierarchy and establishment of papal Rome. It could not therefore have been a degenerate innovation after the apostles “fell as'leep,” but must have been known and approved by themselves. Or, if it were a cor-

rupt innovation, where is the *proof* of this? How came the corruption to be immediately so universal? what trace of its introduction? who introduced it? where? who opposed, or did none oppose, such childish degeneracy? These questions are of more force, when we consider the evidence which is furnished in the New Testament in favour of the inspired apostolical origin of baptism. Whence, 2. *The commission, given by Jesus Christ to his apostles and to their successors in the ministry of the gospel to the end of time, authorizes it as a divine institution.* Matt. 28: 19, 20. Mark, 16: 15, 16. It is hard to prove what is palpable and self-evident. It is so plain from the compared and concurrent testimonies of these two Evangelists, and that in the important respect of the ministerial commission, that it seems certain that no unprejudiced person, who understands especially the original, and is of mental force sufficient to appreciate evidence, could read and study both passages without acknowledging their conclusiveness. "Go ye therefore and teach [disciple, μαθητευσατε] all nations, baptizing them in [into] the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.—And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth AND IS BAPTIZED, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." On these passages I remark,

(1) That, though they were originally given to

apostles, they were evidently designed for all succeeding ages, "even unto the end of the world." They therefore comprise the only true preachers' commission through the whole dispensation. Its power to bind *us* has lost nothing, it has rather gained, by age.

(2) That baptism is formally included (in the latter passage by necessary implication, in the former by express order,) in both and either of them. The promise of salvation is *not* made to him *that believeth* merely; the words *and is baptized* are added: though it is hard to see *how* a true believer, having the opportunity, *could* refuse baptism.

(3) That in such a formal instrument as the commission of the Christian ministry, we have reason to think that nothing of *small* moment would be inserted: but baptism is inserted; while the general order to inculcate *whatsoever I have commanded you* covers *all* the minor matters of christianity, and at the same time more palpably includes baptism. *Whatsoever* Christ has 'commanded' must be for that reason enforced by *his* ministers. It is the best reason in the universe. What matter is it what Friends and others choose to think or speak? a true minister is mainly concerned to know and vindicate the will of Christ. How any person, considering the solemnity and perspicuity of this instrument, can disparage baptism and deny its *purely* divine authority, appears only to those who have some acquaintance with the facts of religious frenzy and with the darkness and infidelity of the human mind! The fancy of one's own *inspiredness* marvellously

disqualifies its subject for all sober thought. The illusions of religious vision shed their powerful pictures on all the objects of contact; and instantaneously the total system of written truth assumes a correspondent hue. But the spirit of sound and rational investigation is *very different* from a visionary inspiration.

But how do Friends *interpret* or evade this order of the Highest? Answer—by *spiritualizing* in spite of evidence. They say it means *spiritual* baptism alone! But is it not claimed as the prerogative of Jesus Christ alone to “baptize with the Holy Ghost?” To talk of *delegating* this power, is about as wise as the conceit of some who, to rationalize away the divinity of Jesus Christ, suppose that the work of creation was delegated to a creature. But what is this fancy other than a begging of the question? That there is such a thing as spiritual baptism is granted—for otherwise the rite could have no meaning or use; that it is greater than that which is merely *its instituted sign* is also foreign to the controversy; and that God is wont to baptize with his grace the spirits of men, through the co-agency of his ministers, is equally admitted: but the question is, *Has he appointed a visible sign of this and “commanded” our obedience to it?* We affirm; they deny. Observe, (1) He orders *them* to do it; “baptizing,” as preaching, teaching, &c. (2) Spiritual baptism is always identified in substance or effect with the exercise of that faith which is “the fruit of the Spirit” and to which the promise of *salvation* is made: why then the tautology of saying

he that believeth AND is baptized shall be saved? On our view, its meaning is plain and fair: *he that believeth and submits to the administration of baptism, as the seal and sign of the covenant of grace, thus witnessing a good confession, shall be saved.*

But hear Friends. "There is no baptism to continue now, but the *one baptism* of Christ. Therefore *water baptism* is not to continue now, because it is not the one baptism of Christ." Barclay. Was it not in the *christian* commission of the ministry, and *for the new dispensation*, that *they* were to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, *baptizing* them," &c.? Or was this NOT *christian baptism*? or could *they* baptize with the Holy Ghost? or if both they and Christ were to baptize, where then is the "one baptism," about which Barclay reasons so *jesuitically*? jesuitism itself!

But the true meaning is plain,

3. *From the practice of the apostles and primitive preachers of christianity under that same commission.* None but an infidel can doubt that the inspired apostles understood this fundamental matter—their commission! How then did they *act*? Look at Peter in the house of Cornelius, urging the administration of the sign *on the express ground* that his hearers *had received* the substance! "Can any man forbid *water*, that these should not be baptized, who *have received the Holy Ghost* as well as we?" He does not say *who always had a light within*; but "who *have received the Holy Ghost* as well as we!" The whole phraseology of the New Testament is plainly *at war* with that prime error of Friends. If

the apostles had believed Friends' doctrine, they would have expressed themselves in different language—*foxian*, for example. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts, 10:47, 48. Is there any need of comment or could proof be more conclusive? Is Quakerism christianity? Look at the case of the thousands of Pentecost; Acts, 2:41, of the converts at Samaria; 8:12, of the Ethiopian eunuch; 33, of Paul; 9:18, of Lydia and the jailer; 16:15, 33. and others recorded in the book of the *practice* of the apostles, and recorded to this very end, that we might compare *actions* with *words*, and so *ascertain* the mind of the Holy Ghost! How much inward light and inspiration must be requisite to convince a man that water baptism is *not* a divine institution!

If it be said *Peter misunderstood the ministerial commission*, in thinking that the gentiles were not included; I reply, (1) Peter was not *all the apostles*; and his prejudice as a jew on the article of communion with the uncircumcised, though common to his nation, is a mere *exception* to the rule, but one that was not lasting. At first he thought as a jew. It was his personal infirmity, his private imperfection. God wrought a miracle indeed to correct it; but his views of baptism were not corrected, for he *baptized* the household of Cornelius immediately *after* the miracle. (2) Paul was miraculously converted, *was baptized* and never misunderstood his commission in any thing on record. He also practised baptism; and though his colleagues, Silas, Timothy, Titus, Barnabas, and others, most probably *officiated*

oftener than himself in the rite of baptism, yet was it done in his presence and with his authority. No miracle was ever wrought to correct the administration of baptism: and if the exception (a transient one) confirms the rule, it is true that the apostles did understand their commission. Their public practice too is without exception, uniform, decisive. This was especially true after the gospel began to be preached to the nations by universal consent.

Besides, the position, to which we now refer, respects the *inspiration* of the apostles in their public administration. This indeed is the only proper idea of their inspiration. The private actions and words of the apostles were not *inspired*. Inspired actions, that abortion of moral agency, is one of the inventions of *the religious society*. They were inspired only when they *professed* inspiration; only when authoritatively delivering, by word or writing, the will of God to others, or when they received it for their own *official* government. Inspiration did not remove or impair their personal accountability or consecrate all their individual conduct; but where they spake or wrote *professedly* the will of God to bind the consciences of others, where they all concurred in the measures and duties of his worship, and where their *recorded practice* under the high seal of heaven proposes to illustrate the duties of men, there the position is in its place—plainly none but an infidel can doubt that the inspired apostles understood this fundamental matter, their commission!

Three of their objections I will here consider; premising that I have often heard them urged by

their leaders ; that they are the strongest with which I am acquainted ; and that properly expounded they are totally against themselves. They are all texts of scripture.

Objection 1. "The like figure," &c. 1 Pet. 3 : 21. From this they infer that water baptism is not meant ; that "a good conscience" is all ; and that this they can have in perfection while they entirely omit the "figure."

Without circumlocution I will give what *I am sure* is the plain and proper meaning of this passage, in a paraphrase ; adverting to its connection with the preceding verses : As eight persons were saved in the ark, when the whole world perished by the just judgment of God ; so now, those who duly submit to the ordinance of baptism find that to be *figuratively* an ark of safety to them : not that the mere mechanical action which removes "the filth of the flesh," or mere symbolical washing, comprehends the important matter ; the substance must ever accompany or rather precede the sign, in order to its salvation : but how could we feel safe were we to neglect it ? how could we possess "the answer of a good conscience toward God" if we were to omit what HE hath commanded ? In order to be assured of *his* favor, we are ever to *walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless* : Luke, 1 : 6, for "a good conscience *toward God*" is always the concomitant and consequence of universal obedience.

This "figure" gives a terrible *implication* against the hopes of those who neglect baptism. It is the

“ark” in which the church is saved ; while a worse deluge than that of the days of Noah awaits the souls of them that contemn God, and who yet boast of their “good conscience” while they deny HIS ordinances ! Many a poor dupe of the light within has vaunted his mistake (and now continues to do it) as if it were his piety : and boasted or believed in “a good conscience” as his own, while he refused *the very thing* to which the passage refers as constituting it.

In proof of the validity of the exposition, let it be remembered (1) generally, that christianity and truth are always self-consistent ; (2) that this Peter is the same who officiated in the house of Cornelius, and who thus called to the thousands on the day of Pentecost ; “Repent and *be baptized* EVERY ONE OF YOU in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Besides, the drift of the context obviously requires this interpretation.

Objection 2. “I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius ; lest any should say that I had baptized in (into) mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas ; besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize ; but to preach the gospel.” 1 Cor. 1 : 14-17. From this they gather that baptism is at best a small affair ; that it was no part of Paul’s proper office to perform it ; and that it can be no very culpable matter for them wholly to dispense with it. To which I reply—

(1) That this is wholly *changing* their ground ;

it is a fair concession of the *fact* that the rite was practised by the apostles of God: for if spiritual baptism be all, then *this* is meant; and if so, are *Friends* to be seen *disparaging* its importance! Paul *must* have meant the rite, and not that signified by it—or, he regretted the *salvation* of men!

(2) There is no such thing in the passage as any *disparagement* of the rite. Paul does not say that it was not his proper business; for then why did he baptize at all? Did he perform what was improper and wrong? If his had been the notion of Friends, would he have baptized Crispus, and Gaius, and Stephanas and his household? He does indeed say that it was not *his* principal business or the duty most appropriate to his office as the Apostle of the nations. But is this depreciating or impeaching baptism as a divine ordinance? Far from it. See him at Ephesus, Acts, 19: 1–7, imposing christian baptism upon twelve of John's disciples:—who had been before baptized by the Baptist; as I must believe, notwithstanding the show of venerable *names*, (and nothing else,) in favor of a different view. But the church was divided into parties; and some (we may guess who) piqued themselves not a little on their conversion under the ministry of Paul, and especially that they had received their baptism at his hands. By the way, *they valued* baptism and associated it with their conversion to God! Paul then rejoiced in the circumstance that he had baptized very few of *them*, “lest any should say that he” was accessory to *their* partizanships. But did he assert or imply that *the others* were not baptized? or that

God was about to abolish the ordinance ! or that he had not baptized thousands of other persons, in different places, with his own hand, or caused still greater numbers to be baptized by his associates in the ministry ? O the darkness of a certain *light* !

That baptism ought to be performed only by a regular minister of Christ, and not by any other person, we infer from the obvious propriety of the case ; from immemorial usage ; from the evils and disorders incident to an opposite practice ; from the fact that it is contained in the *ministerial* commission ; and from the total absence of all example or authority in the New Testament for its administration but by a public minister of Christ. We therefore deny totally the validity of lay baptism. This is a troublesome consideration to *Friendism* ! Those whose characteristic it is to deny the distinct order of the evangelical ministry, would be slow to accredit a divine ordinance (not to speak of many others) which ministers, and *men* only, can competently perform ! This is the fountain of their *inspiration* on several articles. Their dislike of the clergy is unfeigned, conscientious, pervading : their *phobia* on this topic (I might say—hydrophobia) is wonderful ! Hence a total retrenchment of *whatever* seems to sanction or require them. Their reforming was radical and their revolutionizing entire ! They have retrenched the commission itself, as antiquated and lifeless ; always taking out a new one for every special piece of service they perform : I think however it is just as vain and sanctionless as any other “sparks which they have kindled.”

3. I come now to another argument or *Objection* of theirs, taken, very confidently, from Matt. 3 : 13-15. "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me ! And Jesus, answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now : for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him." They say in substance this : Christ suffered it *then*, because of the ignorance and blindness of the people, who were addicted to the ceremonial of the Jews and the impositions of the rabbins, and who could not have brooked the introduction all at once of a system of total spirituality. It was *then* a merciful compliance with their weakness ; but *now* it is no longer to be "suffered." The substance has come ; the shadows and symbols retire. I answer,

(1) It was not *divine* inspiration that dictated such a miserable gloss. Hear it from their prince of the *Apology*, a very chandelier of illuminations for the whole church to see by :

"It will not thence follow that *christians* ought to do so now ; and therefore Christ, Matt. 3 : 15, gives *John* this reason of his being baptized, desiring him to *suffer it to be so now* ; whereby he sufficiently intimates that he intended not thereby to perpetuate it as an ordinance to his disciples." *Inspired!* I deny that it "sufficiently" or *at all* intimates any such thing. Wo be to him "that loveth or *maketh* a lie !" This is only another instance—one of millions, where *a certain light* perverts evidence and

sanctions mistake! It is another *demonstration* against Quakerism: for inspiration is their basis; but inspiration, when genuine, is infallible; a mistake therefore subverts the basis, by evincing that it is not of God, but an illusion of men. Whatever clemency is due to the mistakes of men, who acknowledge their fallibility and profess their subjection to the ordinary laws of mind, *none* ought to be granted or claimed in the case of those who boast of plenary inspiration from God, just such as that of the apostles: for, if their main position be true, they *need* no clemency—it is insolence to offer it! This sing-song of Barclay is often re-echoed in their meetings. I well remember to have witnessed, and often to have felt, the incantation, thus: Jesus suffered it to be so then. And even now, my dearly beloved, must we forbear with those who are in the outward and who practise it in this day when the true light shineth. Alas! they are in shadows indeed. They see not where is the life, the liberty, the power! But blessed are your eyes for they see, and your ears for they hear!

Need I characterize the perversion! Blessed be the ears that hear such *cheap* inspiration, and rare spirituality.

They have totally mistaken the facts of the case. When Christ says, “Suffer *it* to be so now,” he does not by *it* mean the ordinance itself, for that was no part of the noble dispute; but he means the anomaly of the master being baptized by the servant! A grammatical conscience ought more shrewdly to have scanned the antecedent of “it;”

which is palpably *not* baptism; but the totally unparalleled relative incongruity of its administration in that wonderful instance. "Without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better;" and the implication is the same in the action of baptism. John was too humble and too sensible to bear the implication, without a proper confession of his inferiority. Hence "John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" But afterward "he suffered him," and Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan. Thus the whole view of Friends is fundamentally false. It is founded on a total perversion of the monosyllable *it* in the sentence. They assume that *it* means *the ordinance itself*; and not the passing paradox of its administration, that never before or since had its counterpart, of a sinful man administering a religious and official qualification to the sinless and only-begotten Son of God! How great the humility of John; how much greater the humiliation of his Lord, "the latchet of whose shoes he was not worthy to unloose!"

O thou glorious Mediator!
 Who thy pattern would desert?
 Who is purer, better, greater,
 Or in wisdom more expert?
 I will follow thee, my Leader!
 Glorifying only in thy cross;
 Thou my all-sufficient Pleader,
 Having thee I feel no loss!

(2) The reason which the Savior assigns silenced

the scruples of the Baptist, and ought FOREVER to silence the reasoning of Friends ; “ Suffer it to be SO NOW ; FOR THUS IT BECOMETH US TO FULFIL ALL RIGHTEOUSNESS.” This sentence is worthy to be printed on the heavens in capitals of gold ! Its applicability is illimitable. It applies to all persons, at all times, and for all duties. It includes all the objects and subjects of religion. It comes from the lips of our glorious Lord, and enforced by his own illustrious example in the most expressive circumstances. Observe, *first*, his *motive* in the transaction. It was to fulfil a branch of “righteousness.” Baptism was a *divine* ordinance ; and as such obligatory on every worshipper of God, on every man. Jesus Christ was a man. He had been “made of a woman, made under the law,” and as such was absolutely obligated to obey it, as he did, in perfection. It would have been a dreadful defect in his character to have omitted that (as he omitted no other) branch of righteousness. He could have had no other motive than to honor his Father in *all* the ways of his appointment. He had no sin to wash away ; no personal fitness to the rite as to its implication—the impurity of the subject : but he had duties to perform, and a perfect example to complete for his followers. He speaks of *them*, in delightful association with himself, when he says, “thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness ;” to do any thing and every thing WHATSOEVER God has appointed ! Hence the prodigies of divine approbation that followed his baptism. “And lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of

God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him : and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Observe, *second*, that he had not then commenced, but was soon to commence, his *public* career as a preacher and minister of religion. He was just then emerging into publicity, being "about thirty years of age." Hence the scene of his baptism has been styled that of his *inauguration* or formal introduction to office. Still, he was a private character *when* he was baptized—as all others are. Observe, *third*, how sedulous he was to receive baptism. He came *incognito* from Galilee to John, a distance of nearly 100 miles, to receive it; and then *insisted* on its performance. Observe, *fourth*, that the principle was old, though its application was then peculiar, in his practice. He was circumcised; he attended the passover; obeyed his parents; wrought at an humble trade; inhabited an obscure and disreputable village; waited patiently and unknown till the *lawful* age; celebrated the passover, and instituted its counterpart, the very night before he suffered; and in all "left us an example that we should follow his steps; who did no sin." Observe, *fifth*, the force of the sentiment that thus "it BECOMES us" to do! It is proper, obligatory, honorable, necessary! It every way *becomes* us! How *unbecoming* then for us to keep an *inward light* that contradicts both his example and his commandment! We may do *other things* innumerable. We may do them scrupulously and in vain. It is no part of "all righteousness" unless divinely commanded. It is dire-

ful to have our wisdom in collision with the wisdom of God. We never can compensate for neglect or violation of positive duties by a multitudinous observance of *other* matters. Poor King Saul tried this sort of piety to his sorrow on more than one occasion. "And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft; and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king." Again, "not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but HE THAT DOETH THE WILL OF MY FATHER who is in heaven. Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you."

Other objections of Friends to the ordinances of God, I am little careful to answer. But, in relation to the *subjects* and the *mode* of baptism, I have only to say that it will be time enough to discuss them when they cease to deny the rite itself. It were frivolous to investigate *how* or *to whom* a service is to be performed, while we doubt or deny that it is to be performed at all. Let Friends acknowledge *the fact*; and then we will attend to their subordinate queries. The same may be said in regard to the *uses* of baptism. "What good does it do thee?" is a very common question with them. It is very much like the question often put in respect to "the forbidden fruit," *What harm*

could it do for Eve to eat an apple? The divine sanction is every thing. To honor it has a vital connection with good, and to dishonor it, with harm. I sincerely pity the men who must wait for eternity to convince them of this! I add, the utility of any measure or observance in religion is not, as such, our first question respecting it; but this, *Is it the pleasure of God?* To question the excellency of a divine enactment is absurdity, equalled only by its impiety. Suppose Abraham had doubted and hesitated when ordered to forsake his country, his paternal mansions, and all the peerless charities of home, because the *utility* of the mandate did not appear to him! Suppose he had preferred his own eye-sight in the matter of sacrificing Isaac, and had plausibly and naturally enough questioned its expediency and uses! Would he ever have been called "the Father of the faithful and the Friend of God?" To be *such a Friend*, is worthy the ambition of immortals and the competition of mankind.

"By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only-begotten son, of whom it was said, that in Isaac shall thy seed be called: accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure." The utilities of baptism however are not inscrutable, not paradoxical or severely trying to our faith; though it is no part of my present pur-

pose to discuss them. To be publicly devoted to God according to his own appointment; to have "the answer of a good conscience toward God" by duly respecting his own appointed signals of alliance with himself; to feel that we have been typically washed according to his own order, and at the same time sensibly admonished of our natural defilement—of the purity of God—of his purifying grace—of "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," which is the great archetype of baptism—of the conservative "ark" into which baptism symbolically places us—and of the obligations and solemn commitment to holiness of life which baptism implies; and to understand and appreciate the import of being baptismally allied "to the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," in duty, profession, worship, covenant and hope, are a few of the intelligible advantages of this branch of "righteousness:" and however baptism, in common with every other item of christianity, may be or has been abused, perverted, mistaken, dishonored, prostituted, or ignorantly observed, by professors of religion, its utilities, like its authority, are wholly independent of the actions of men and entirely resolvable into the constitution of God. If it be demanded whether grace is *conferred* or only *signified* by this sacrament; I answer, both! not indeed that grace is necessarily conferred by the sign or always accompanies it; because, as in the case of Simon Magus, it is not always sincerely received. But this is true of *every other* conceivable institution of God! What is *prayer*,

when not sincerely used? Shall we then say that grace is not conferred and received by prayer? or reading the scriptures? or performing any other duty? In *all* these cases, grace is not necessarily connected with the service; it is not mechanically connected; it is not found *ex opere operato*⁶⁰ with the mere performance. Shall we then, through an ultra spirituality, renounce the total service of God? We must do this, or remain inconsistent and wrong in the rejection of divine ordinances in general, or that solemnly commissioned one of baptism in particular. FOR THUS IT BECOMETH US TO FULFIL ALL RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Barclay devotes nearly 40 pages to the treatment of baptism; and it would require 400 fully to notice all the sophistry of his argument. When I read him on the sacraments, I confess that I am led to doubt whether he himself believed what he wrote; though upon reflection, I am unwilling to deny his sincerity. If the positive evidence already adduced will not convince the reader of his perversion, I leave him to his responsibility; only observing that positive evidence has not been exhausted. I have only given a few items of proof, despairing of conviction where these fail to produce it; and remembering that truth is independent of the stupidity of men.

One argument of Barclay deserves some separate notice. It is fundamental in his reasoning, and very plausibly treated. The text of Ephesians, 4 : 5, "There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism," suggests his position that there is *only* "one baptism;"

hence he would hang us all on some horn of a dilemma which he constructs for the purpose. He would have us admit from our view—as he states it—that water baptism is that *only* “one,” and that hence there is no such thing as spiritual influence or the baptism of the Holy Ghost: that is, if we hold to the instituted sign we *must* mistake it for the thing signified; or if we hold to the signal, divinely appointed, we must *necessarily* forego or deny the substance. This is strange reasoning; and (if I can understand the drift apart from the drapery or the disguise of his argument) it is just that which he employs. He *assumes* that there is no connection between the sign and the substance, but rather a contrariety; so that both cannot *by possibility* co-exist and mutually aid each other; and so that, the things being mortally *repugnant and opposite*, as well as *distinct*, he who “holds to the one” must of necessity “despise the other:” he assumes virtually that “God and mammon” might as easily and compatibly be both at once pursued by men, as water baptism and spiritual baptism be both at once believed by them; and hence we are called to take sides with *Friends* against the ordinance, or against God with the *inimical* sign. Any one that wishes to see and feel the force of his argument is advised to commence with believing that all signs are marvellously at war with all their corresponding substances, all types with their archetypes, and all words with the sense conveyed by them. They will then believe, by parity or consequence, that if a man hangs out on his vesture the signals *cap-a-pie*

of honesty, soberness, and religion ; he must be the certain enemy of all these excellencies : and also that all the divine hieroglyphics of preceding ages were direfully inimical to “Jesus Christ and him crucified,” whom they were all designed to adumbrate and in whom their rays all converged for their accomplishment. Hear Barclay. “As for the first, viz. *That there is but one baptism*, there needs no other proof than the words of the text, *Eph. 4 : 5. One Lord, one faith, one baptism* : where the apostle positively and plainly affirms, that as there is but *one body, one spirit, one faith, one God, &c.* so there is but *one baptism.*” I answer, the apostle “affirms” no such thing ; he does not say *but one*. He only asserts its unity. But what is unity ? Almost every subject is one in some respects, and *not* in others. A man is an animal and a spirit, *one* in person, *more than one* in nature and composition. Jesus Christ is one person and only one : but he has two EQUALLY appropriate natures, as “the man Christ Jesus,” and as “God over all blessed forever.” 1 Tim. 2 : 5. Rom. 9. Thus, we have “one Lord,” who is both human and divine. Suppose I should follow Barclay’s reasoning in respect to this article, which the apostle affirms in the same place, thus : Jesus Christ is Lord and we have *but* “one Lord,” therefore the Lord Jesus Christ is *but* one ; but if he is man proper and God proper he is not *but* one, and hence not *the Lord* : therefore he is God only and not man, and those who hold his humanity *oppose* his deity ! Thus, in reference to baptism, it is “one”—and hence there is no such

thing as water baptism ; and “ there needs no other proof,” as “ the apostle positively and plainly affirms ” the premises, “ one baptism ! ”

The apostle in the connection is enforcing union among the christians of Ephesus : “ endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” To this end, he tells them of the oneness of their baptism and of other unities, which all inspire oneness of sentiment and feeling : by which I understand that as they were baptized into one INCOMMUNICABLE NAME, and not into different names of worship, they were hence baptismally obligated to union in all things, universally honoring “ the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Baptism is evidently *characterized* from *the name* into which we are introduced by it ; “ were ye baptized *into* the name of Paul ?—Lest any should say that I had baptized *into* mine own name. When they heard this, they were baptized *into* the name of the Lord Jesus.” Acts, 19 : 5. As baptism introduced converts, as it respects its proper import, their own profession, their worship, and obligations, into *one* name ; so it was one cause that it subserved and owned, and so the apostle here refers PRIMARILY *to the rite of baptism as connected with the name of “ the only wise God ”* and the obligations of all true worshippers. Here is moral unity ; one household, one brotherhood !—a community to which “ Friends ” do not visibly belong !

Barclay and other Friends generally beg and push the question by reason of their *assumptions* at starting. Hence they bring the incautious into

their dogmas with marvellous plausibility and with a great display of logical fairness. One instance of this is the assumption that *the PRIMARY meaning of a word is always one with its MOST IMPORTANT meaning*. But it often happens that the *secondary* meaning of a word, as baptism, is at once its most important and its least frequent sense in scripture. Like circumcision, its primary meaning is *the sign only*; its more important is its *secondary* sense, and refers to the heart and its purification. The phrase "The sure mercies of David" is also an example. Its secondary sense, referring to Christ, is *the important one*! Thus, the *primary* sense of baptism respects the rite only; it is used however for its archetype by a very fair metonymy, without merging its existence or its distinctness in its greater. But Friends begin with the *secondary* meaning, and hence try to do away with the primary; they think they seize the substance, and then they deny the *entity* of the sign. Let the candid judge! Because they see us contending for the sign, they often infer that we oppose the substance; they often say, 'if they had the experience of the matter, they would care less for externals:—which *might* be true, and yet externals be of divine authority. We say, they *are* of divine authority; and therefore mainly do we, from conscience toward God, maintain them.

There is a meaning in the rite baptismal, in its relations and implications, which is justly dear to the enlightened sensibilities of the christian. It is peculiar too—and little, it may be, understood even

by the church and the ministry. God has a visible family in the world, in which he regards his people "and their offspring with them," as "the seed of the blessed of the Lord." Is. 59 : 20, 21. Their relation to Him, and correlatively his to them, is most wonderful, gracious, and full of moment. Baptism does not make it. It pre-exists in the economy of gracious administration. Baptism finds it, owns it, illustrates, seals it. It is instituted in the order and offices of the church visible of Jesus Christ by his own most gracious appointment, in subserviency to the triumph of his mercy and "the fruit of the Spirit." It exists "that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the gentiles UPON WHOM MY NAME IS CALLED ; saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." Acts, 15 : 17. It is in baptism appropriately that "this glorious and fearful name THE LORD THY GOD," is *called upon* the members of his visible family. This recognises the family relation. He who adopts them, as their Father, communicates his own name of glory and supersedes their former names of shame. Is. 44 : 1-5.

Hence the proper form of the action should be, "Baptizing them INTO the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The reasons of this, as contra-distinguished from the method of our translation and of current usage, I will briefly state.

1. The common phrase *in the name of* means merely *by authority of*. There is not so evident a propriety in expressing and repeating this in every instance of the performance, which is sufficiently

implied and proved without it. It is plainly done by divine authority.

2. Where the sense of the phrase *in the name of* is found, there the original *εν τῷ ὀνοματι* is different. Acts, 3 : 6. 1 Cor. 5 : 4.

3. In this sense something ultimate, not mediate, is meant. If baptism wrought salvation, as infallibly as a miracle accomplished a cure, it would be ultimate ; and the propriety of saying, I do this effectual thing *in the name of Jesus Christ* would be sensible. But baptism is not ultimate. It is mediate, initiatory, symbolical alone. The phrase in question then is not pertinent. It is calculated to misrepresent the purport of the ordinance. It implies that the rite is ultimate and virtual. Again,

4. The proper grammar of the original *εις το ονομα* requires a different phrase ; as, *to, unto, or into*. It refers to the family designation. When one is adopted into the household of another, the name of the family is assumed. The adopting act confers it ; the adopting ceremony signifies or declares it. Hence we are adopted and baptized *into* the family of God. We become visibly his children ; he, our Father. We are called by his name. Baptism enunciates this. Hence Paul dreaded even the impeachment of baptizing “into *εις το εμου ονομα* his own name ;” as if he were about erecting a private concern, a separate and rival interest of his own ! a church of Paul, not of Christ.

5. The meaning of the proper phrase is comprehensive and excellent. The name of Jehovah is that by which he is known. It includes whatever

manifests him. Thus is it the object of worship and of praise, of conformity and aspiration, as well as of knowledge and profession. The party is henceforth to be educated to Christ. He has symbolically "put on Christ." He has been publicly *devoted* "to the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." To the same high and holy name, assumed as his, he is now to live. It becomes the obligation of his life to honor that name. Not to do it, is sacrilege. It is desecrating what is relatively holy. It is robbery of God. It is manifest and awful sin. And yet—it not so much makes the obligation, as recognises it. It is the obligation which rests equally in fact on all men. I do not say that there is not a special degree and form of obligation resulting from the solemnity—as an increase of light and privilege always enhances obligation, and as vows enhance it.

By the way, we may see in what sense *the naming of the subject* is connected with baptism. Christening, as the rite is very improperly called, means with many only giving a name. If so, I say, it is not its human name, (which is strictly no part of the rite,) but its divine one alone. Acts, 15: 17. How very superior are the implications!

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Other denominations are accused by Friends, in reference to the sacraments, not only of general darkness, but of a *judaizing* and *romanizing* propensity. In this they assume, not prove, that

christianity has no appropriate symbolical institutions. But this is exactly the question in dispute! Whatever is properly jewish or mosaic must indeed depart with the abrogated economy to which it belongs. But may they not be too hasty in cashiering every thing on the assumption that it is jewish, and as such annulled? Not indeed if they are *inspired*; for when was any one ever too hasty in obeying God? If I could grant their inspiration, there would be at once an end of the argument. But as I sincerely believe them mistaken in that grand particular, it will be at least consistent to argue the matter. If they say how shall we know what is abrogated and what is perpetual? I answer, 1. This is just such a question as Friends are fond of asking, simply because they cannot answer it themselves. They have no "pastors and teachers" among them, who learn and hence are qualified to teach; they are all inspired, and thence study and investigation are at war with the duty of waiting for the responses of the internal oracle. Thus they "have taken away the key of knowledge." This is the real cause of the doctrinal ignorance of the society; and it is the inglorious occasion of thousands of questions, which they would be ashamed to ask if the inward light had not paralysed their powers and suspended with them the sources of instruction, which God hath ordained and blessed as ordinarily indispensable to doctrinal proficiency. How shall we know? they often ask; how shall we discriminate? Answer, how can you help knowing, how can you fail to discriminate, if you have this *omniscient* light within

you? If you wish to know how we uninspired people come by our knowledge, we answer, *by studious and honest and prayerful application of mind to the inspired scriptures, and in no other way.* This way you have never tried, and never can try, while you believe in your own inspiration. But 2, the scriptures fully enable us to discriminate; though this is not vital to our present argument, which is to prove that christianity hath its own symbolical institutions, and that the holy eucharist is one of them. Many things were imposed on the jews "till the time of reformation;" but when that "time" occurred, it brought with it baptism and the Lord's supper, too easy, significant, unbloody observances; which in no wise encumber, and in many ways assist, the spirituality itself of the worshippers. This I can heartily and experimentally, I hope, attest.

I define the Lord's supper thus; *A solemn ceremonial observance in which, by the distribution and participation of bread broken and wine poured, the church obey God in "showing forth the Lord's death" as the only and the ample atonement for the sins of men; commemorating the expiatory death of Jesus Christ as the only medium of the remission of sins; confessing their ill-desert as transgressors of the law of God, and their grander sins as having been neglecters of his glorious gospel; professing their faith in his doctrine, and their hope in his grace and advocacy; devoting themselves to his service forever; expressing their love for each other, their benevolence to all men; and expecting*

from his infinite fulness, as exalted to the throne of the universe, a full supply of all that they need for time and for eternity, according to his promises.

That this is a sacrament of the New Testament according to the will of God, and as such incumbent on all men, I prove, by the worthiness of the event commemorated; by its manifest tendency to sanctify and console the spirits of his worshippers; by direct evidence from scripture.

1. I begin with considering *the worthiness of the event* commemorated in the Lord's supper.

Whoever understands and accredits the nature of the atonement, and sees its immense importance in all our moral relations, will admit not only that it deserves to be commemorated or that no event ever did or ever can deserve such honor; but also that an institution, such as that now under consideration, is most worthy at once of the wisdom of God and the universal approbation of man. I trace the disaffection of Friends, therefore, to their real ignorance of the nature and glory of the atonement. But here it will be replied that Friends do believe this article of the catholic creed. To this I answer, 1. That this is not true of all or of a very numerous portion of them. Many with whom I have conversed are pure infidels on this prime topic. One of their most notable preachers in my own vicinity has publicly vilified the doctrine, and said in the eye of day, (the letter that contains it has been printed in our public journals,) that he would prefer to receive the punishment due to his iniquity, rather than accept of pardon on the terms of a suffering

substitute. He was no doubt *in earnest* in this declaration, and as much *inspired* as he is on any other article. I sincerely pray that his preference may not be his perdition! What kind of a *christian* community is that with whom such a vaunted preacher of Christ is still suffered to exercise an uncensured ministry?⁶¹ But 2, I am scarcely convinced that one of them, with whom I have ever conversed, or whose writings⁶² I have ever read, either clearly understands or properly believes the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ. Barclay, Fox, and others do indeed *say*, now and then, that Christ died for us and was our sacrifice; but this is so infrequent, so general, so transient, so opaque a confession, that it serves little other purpose than to prove how deeply they disparaged, and how superficially they comprehended, that glorious transaction. A writer on astronomy, if he intelligently received the copernican system, would not merely glance at the cardinal fact of the central position of the sun and the tributary movements of surrounding orbs; he would signalize the illustrious truth, and make it as renowned in his treatise as it is in the economy of the firmament. What that fact is to the solar system, such is the doctrine of atonement to "the truth as it is in Jesus." To deny it, to omit it, to obscure it, to disparage it, is to quench the glory of the gospel and the hopes of the world. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." In the sententious language of the beloved apostle, *life* and *light* are his accustomed tropes for *salvation* and *knowledge*. Thus, in Christ was salva-

tion through his atonement on the cross ; and this salvation properly understood, so illumines the mind that one knows, understands, sees, the things of duty and of God with correctness and unto salvation. "In him was life and the life was the light of men." The sentence is dense, but not mystical ; it ever was and ever will be true. *Observation* perpetually confirms it ; they understand duty who have learned salvation. The cross is itself the key and the torch of all sound philosophy in universal ethics. It is "the light of men," because it is "the life" likewise : for Christ becomes "our life," because he died for us, as an expiatory sacrifice to the glorious justice of God. Hence, when we hear of a religious teacher who transiently adverts to the death of Christ, but sees no attraction there to detain his thoughts, we know at least that he is so uninstructed in the central glories of the kingdom that he is incompetent to the work of the ministry, as one of those who "understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." To this I can affix the seal of my own experience—and of my perfect conviction. I once sincerely compassionated the emptiness of the communion-service and the *superstition* of those who revered it : but then I knew not the Father or Christ, and was deplorably ignorant of the atonement. When my mind was revolutioned by the truth on that excellent doctrine, I repented of my *compassion* "in dust and ashes," and sincerely "abhorred" my arrogance before God : having no hope except in "Jesus Christ and him crucified" as "an offering for sin," and having posi-

tively a sweet and glorious hope of "redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace."

As to the *importance* of the atonement, it can easily be proved from the scriptures that *not a sin* could be remitted without it; that all the remissions ever granted *previous* to the advent of Christ, from Abel downward, were "for Christ's sake," who was to appear and suffer in behalf of sinners; and that all that have been *since* granted were equally for his sake, who *has* appeared, and has "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" that he is the Savior and the only Savior of men; that his principal design in coming into the world was "to save sinners" by dying for them; for though he "left us an example," this was not the principal end of his manifestation. His example was not his atonement; and "without shedding of blood is no remission." All the appointed hundreds of millions of symbolical sacrifices that bled for 4000 years on the altars of God, were *prefigurative* of Christ and derived *all* their efficacy from their relation to him. They were all *prospectively* typical of "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world;" even as "the Lord's Supper" is commemorative and retrospectively typical of the same self-offered victim.

The philosophy of the atonement is—I must think—intelligible; and, when understood, the most stupendous spectacle of moral grandeur of which in all our knowledge there is any example. The ineffable glory of God is no where apparent to our perceptions as it shines reflected from the cross.

His unsuffering justice, his unspotted purity, his infinite benevolence, his wonderful philanthropy, his eternal faithfulness, his unfathomable mercy and grace to guilty men, his consummate wisdom, his absolute supremacy, his perfect unchangableness, his inconceivable power, his matchless condescension, his greatness and his glory; all his perfections, natural, moral, communicable, incommunicable, there harmonize, and blend, and blaze, with an effulgence which nothing else can illustrate. That God is a most perfect moral governor; that his law is not to be broken with impunity; that his administration is at once infinitely authoritative and infinitely benign; that he punishes, not for the sake of punishing, but for the sake of preserving the moral order of the universe; that the whole human race is sinful and so exposed to punishment; that sin deserves the awful curse which the law of God denounces against it; that his kindness to sinners shall never be exercised at variance with his kindness to the universe, nor mercy triumph at the expense of justice; that mercy is that to which a sinner has no claim, no right, no title, from the law-giver; that God is under no obligation to provide a Savior for the guilty, and that it was therefore grace, not debt, that one is provided; that the law of God is "holy, just, and good," and that its preceptive claims are never repealable; that men must hence be brought to love the law in order to approve of the gospel; that the gospel is not merciful and gracious, if the law is not just and excellent; that it is hypocrisy to profess love for the gospel

while we secretly dislike the perfection of the law; that God pities whom he punishes, and “delighteth not in the death of him that dieth;” that when God can answer, by an expedient of his own adoption, all the ends of punishment, through atonement and properly without punishment, he is then ready to pardon with eternal and infinite and generous benignity; that the atonement did not make him essentially placable, since this was his character from everlasting, but that it qualified his administration to show the mercy of his nature in the salvation of sinners; that he procured the atonement at an infinite expense, and will not suffer it to be made in vain; that his providence is higher, and deeper, and larger, and stronger, than all the skill of his adversaries, and that his pleasure shall be accomplished in their overthrow, except they repent and become his friends; that he is an infinitely glorious and all-perfect being, a God of unfathomable wisdom and illimitable intelligence, “over all and blessed forever:” these are some, and only a few, of the living truths which radiate from the cross as from their proper focus, and impress the image of their own loveliness on the spirits of christians. They give us a glimpse of that glory which will enlighten the perceptions of the church triumphant forever. Many other truths are taught most impressively in connection with the cross; many of a speculative, experimental, and practical character, which are all excellent, but which we cannot now enumerate. Suffice it that a genuine estimate of the moral glory of the atone-

ment and of the salvation of the gospel, will always lead us to exclaim *intelligently* with Paul ; “ But God forbid that I should glory, save in THE CROSS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.”

An atonement has actually been made for sin, “ that God might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus :” and it is important that the fact with all its instructive accompaniments should be universally *remembered*. Christ has accordingly instituted that significant festival of faith, called “ the Lord’s Supper,” saying ; “ Do this in remembrance of me.” The commemoration of the love of Christ in the atonement is the commemoration of the sum total of religion. Not a duty, a privilege, a relation, but connects itself with that glorious affair ; and derives from it light, consolation, and encouragement. Can any man degrade or doubt the symbol, who duly estimates the reality ? Friends often demand why we do not practise the papal pediluvium or feet-washing, since this is *equally* enjoined by Christ ? I answer, because it is *not* equally enjoined, nor enjoined at all as a positive observance ; because it was *merely* a symbolical or exemplary action of Christ, enjoining, as its whole moral force, kindness and service toward each other among all his disciples ; and enjoining this in the most affecting circumstances. John, 13 : 13–16. What then is the wisdom of that man, Barclay or any other, who can liken the atonement to the pediluvium, and calmly ask, if one is to be commemorated, why not the other ? I adduce this as a proof

that none of them see the infinite worthiness of the atonement, that none of them properly understand or appreciate the vicarious death of the Son of God! Or, if any of them do see its glory, their vision is fitful and faint. Their atmosphere is so misty and hazy that the very sun looks like the moon eclipsed through such a medium. I scarce ever saw or heard or read a man or woman of them, whose knowledge of the matter was not shallow and puerile; even when comparatively most sound. How could it be otherwise? Those who never learn, can never teach: and *their* inspiration does not vacate the sentiment. The orthodox of them, so called, as to the real science of the subject, the intellection of the things, the knowledge of the atonement with its relations and implications and glorious excellencies, are weak as water, shallow as the surface, almost as empty as mere verbiage can make them. Just so long as their preachers refuse to study theology, count it as a sin, get no knowledge but what they steal from better sources and then credit it to the honor of the light within; so long will their spiritual pedantry and religious quackery and doctrinal sottishness continue!

If Friends had obeyed Christ in this observance; if they had "often" and every where commemorated his dying love, at the communion-table; if they had followed the wisdom of scripture, instead of their own illusory *light*; if this ordinance had been duly observed, explained, estimated among them from the beginning, they would not now

have—preachers who denounce the doctrine of atonement, *the only foundation of hope*, and so “deny the Lord that bought them!” It may be safely affirmed that to slight the distinguishing truths contained in that observance, is a uniform and certain symptom of fatal degeneracy; and that it can no where be duly understood and honored where those truths are not ascendant and believed. It preaches the gospel to the very senses of men. In the bread that is broken, representing his mangled body, and the wine that is poured, representing his blood shed for our sins, are contained the hieroglyphics of redemption. It signifies the very vitals of *evangelical* religion. It has the same revelation to the scripture doctrine of justification which baptism sustains to that of sanctification; and both these united are the religion of the Bible in epitome. “O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?” Gal. 3: 1. It *could* have been manifested to their “eyes,” only symbolically, in the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper.

2. The manifest tendency of commemorating the death of Christ at the communion-table, is an argument for its divine authority.

If its tendency is good and not evil, then certainly nothing contrary to goodness is contained in it. But if that good is positive, great, favorable to the purest celebration of divine worship, this is of itself no mean argument in vindication of its divine

origin; and, in connection with other and greater evidence, it is most veritable proof. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

The actual tendency of a divine enactment is answerable to the design of God in its legislation. What then was the design of the communion service? I answer—to *diffuse and perpetuate the devout knowledge of Jesus Christ to the end of time.*

"THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. 11 : 24-26.

"O foolish Galatians," &c. Gal. 3 : 1. 1 Cor. 10 : 16-21. The tendency of this service then is seen in its nature and design. It tends to define, establish, and promulgate christianity. It tends to the vindication of true religion in the earth. It tends in the same precise ratio to save the souls of men; to promote all their real temporal interests; to console the hopes and edify the faith of christians; to designate the church; to instruct all beholders in the cardinal things of the gospel; to maintain gratitude in the bosoms of men for the love of Christ; to aid the just interpretation of the scriptures; to symbolize salvation; to impress the mind with the very essentials of revelation; to preserve the distinguishing features of EVANGELICAL worship; to show the nature of *that one hope* (founded on the only medium of salvation) which alone the truth of God authenticates; to rebuke all heretical innovations in doctrine, experience, or practice; to strengthen the trust of the believer; to bind in one the body of the faithful; to afford a most affecting,

appropriate, sanctioned way of professing, and re-professing, the faith of Christ ; to afford a visible, a universal, and a frequent discrimination between the church and the world, between “ the sacramental host of God’s elect ” and the bewildered tribes of the ungodly ; to induce humility, self-examination, prayer, praise, and joy in God ; to habituate christians to *remember* Christ and their infinite obligations to his love ; to remind them continually, “ as often ” as they so commune, of all their spiritual relations and prospects ; constantly to revive in their feelings the grand object of apostolic toils and cares, “ Jesus Christ and him crucified ; ” to make them think of others, imitate the love of Christ, and communicate the gospel to the destitute ; to deepen all their devout impressions ; to affect them with the expectation of their own death ; to mature them for the heavenly state ; to deaden them to the world and its evanescent glory ; to perpetuate all the moral lessons of the cross ; to testify the glorious fact of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead ; to endear his name to his people ; and to promote the conversion of sinners.

In short, what good end does religion sanction that the ordinance we are considering does *not* tend to produce ? It symbolizes the atonement of our crucified Lord : and what the atonement was in fact, such symbolically is the Lord’s Supper. To this view I will anticipate two objections, which however have been often urged. How, it is said, if the atonement was such in itself, such toward God, does

it hence follow that we should commemorate it in the symbol, since, what it was, it is and remains to be ; and since its nature would be just the same if the event was not so commemorated ! To this I rejoin, that in addition to its influence upon the moral administration of God and in the ultimate blessedness of the faithful, it is adapted and designed indispensably to have *a moral influence* (of illumination, sanctification, consolation, and worship) upon the church and the world, which influence cannot be exerted or felt but by the due celebration of the Lord's Supper : so that while we have no idea (as have the Romanists) that there is *any expiatory* virtue in the symbol or the service, and none that our actions can at all alter or affect the intrinsic nature of the atonement, we do believe that our characters are altered in relation to the atonement, and the atonement *changed in its relations* to us, by our celebration of the Lord's Supper according to his appointment. Besides, in devout subserviency to Christ in his own ordinances, we receive "the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him." Acts, 5 : 32. Hence, as it is the will of God that such commemoration should be perpetual in the church, he blesses its due administration, and produces, through the sanctifying virtue of his own most holy Spirit, that moral influence (which also the ordinance itself tends to exert) in the bosoms of the pious, under which they make a juster and clearer estimate of religion, and are progressively transformed into the divine similitude. 2 Cor. 3 : 18. The objection rests on a total and

a very common mistake as to the nature of the atonement ; which is not that measure of licentiousness which some seem *fatedly* to suppose. The atonement was not intended to accomplish the salvation of men *in*, but "*from*, their sins." Hence there is space intentionally left, after the atonement as such is consummated, for the action of moral influence and the scope of moral agency. Hence a man must still repent of his sins, and believe with his heart, notwithstanding the atonement ; or "Christ shall profit him nothing." The only way to be savingly interested in the atonement, or in Him who made it, is to—"repent and believe the gospel." A moral effect then must still be produced on the spirits of men, and no less than that which the Holy Ghost denominates regeneration, or there can be no salvation *even through the atonement*. How worthy of the wisdom of God to make the doctrine of the atonement and the frequent symbolizing of its truth to the senses of men, to become the very means and the objective causes of producing that moral effect on their spirits ; by bringing them to consider, believe, approve, resemble, enjoy, inherit, and communicate, "the glorious gospel of the blessed God !" Here we see two extremes of error (and which is more hurtful I do not take on me to decide) to which men have been alternately propense, and that in every age. Some must have *all* atonement, and nothing else : others, all internal subjective practical holiness, and nothing else ; no atonement. The former depreciate "the fruit of the Spirit," the necessity of per-

sonal obedience, the lasting obligation of righteousness, and the perfection of the law of God: the latter dishonor the law in another way, see not the necessity of the perfect moral government of God, substitute their own doings for the atonement, array mercy against justice, or make mercy in Jehovah such an attribute of weakness and variableness as would disgrace a man; and so put the extinguisher of their own ignorance and effrontery on the glory of the gospel. Both extremes are wrong.

Incidit in Scyllam qui vult vitare Charybdim.

He sinks in Scylla, who would more avoid
Charybdis' whirlpool, equally destroyed.

They constitute the Scylla and Charybdis of the subject:—not so however as desperately to endanger the bark of faith, of which God is the pilot, truth the guiding star, and safety the course equidistant from either of the ruinous alternatives. John, 3: 17, 18. 1 Tim. 1: 15. Our Palinurus never sleeps, and when waking never errs.

The other objection is one in which Friends peculiarly delight. It is this—of what avail is it to speak all these good things about the *tendency* of the ordinance, if it is still wanting in *efficacy*? if thousands who observe it have never realized those excellencies to which the ordinance is said to *tend*? if millions even who have regularly eaten of that bread and drunk of that cup, have been bloody, persecuting, impure, incorrigible sinners, perpetrat-

ing, as occasion served, all manner of sin, and being at once a nuisance to society and a degradation to human nature? Version—if a good thing is abused, it ought to be disused; if a divine institution is not duly honored, it ought to be abrogated. Let us then abrogate marriage and every other divine institution.

In order to make the objection available, or give it *any* efficacy, it ought to be shown (1) that such miscreants were *intelligent* and *devout* communicants; and not merely that they did the material thing: for no ordinance of Christianity, nor even of Quakerism, professes any efficacy but by faith in its divine authority. Christianity *tends* manifestly, tends pre-eminently, to sanctify and save the world: but still it has *efficacy to save* only where it is clearly and cordially accredited. Now, is it any proof against the ordinance that hypocrites have celebrated it, that apostates have dishonored it, that infidels have remained unblest by it? And it ought to be shown (2) that a divine ordinance is not to be estimated according to its own evidence, nature, and tendency; but depends for its character upon the treatment it receives in a world of dark and ignoble traitors against heaven! What, upon this principle, should we think of Christ himself? Was he as bad as the treatment he received? Thus the tendency of the Lord's supper is excellent, and remains an everlasting argument for its worth. We are not advocating its abuse or apologizing for its abusers. To say, as some have done, that there is no distinction or difference be-

tween tendency and efficacy, and that there is in any subject just as much of the former as of the latter, and no more, is just saying of every divine ordinance that it has no intrinsic character—that the Bible itself has none—and that its adorable Author himself, unless where his name commands its due efficacy—but, I forbear! In the tendency of the ordinance, which to faith becomes its efficacy too, thousands and millions of God's elect have rejoiced before him, whose lives have evinced the proper fruits of worship and the reality of genuine faith in the atonement, which they were wont to commemorate. With ineffable delight have they approached that sacred festival, and repeated “often” the privileged obedience. *I* never come to it but with an estimate which *recollection* deepens and exalts. “Herein is love: not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another.” 1 John, 4: 10, 11. 2 Cor. 5: 14, 15. Gal. 2: 20. I proceed further to evince the fact of the divine authority of the observance,

3. *From direct scripture evidence.* Here allow me to pause, and wonder at the infinitely foolish anomaly of Quakerism. I do it too not without humiliation mingled with curious inspection; for I was a Quaker and am a man. Poor human nature! philosophy, by which I mean religion, requires me to look at thee by engrossment, as well as in detail; and whenever thou art visible in the back-ground of the mirror of truth, to say—it reflects a picture

of which I am generically the original. Ought we not all to be humble?

And what man, seeing this,
And having human feelings, does not blush,
And hang his head to think himself a man!—COWPER.

Sunt lacrymae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.—VIRG.

No fictions these, but stern realities!
We weep at things—who would not that is wise?
Our kind is suffering; and we sympathize.

Homo sum! humani nil á me alienum puto.—TER.

I am a man! a common tie
Unites me to humanity.

We may well question whether men ever saw the exact parallel of Quaker presumption and folly, error and pretension, all confounded in one *religious* system,

“ Since Abel worshipped or the world began !”

Fox, who pioneered the way, was a spiritual nonesuch. He boasts the highest kind of inspiration—God and he talking together with infinite familiarity on every subject. One would think that all heaven was bent upon making his acquaintance, and crowding into his company. I would not here insinuate that he was not a curiosity in sober fact, even to angels. What wonderful “openings” he had! and these not in theology alone; but also in law, metaphysics, languages, arts, and sciences; and especially in botany, chemistry, materia-medica, and astronomy; so that he once seriously

thought of becoming a practitioner of physic! What a prize would such a Galen prove in these days of cholera! Is it any wonder now that his skill, (which was not original at all in Barclay, Penn, and Sarah Grubb, for they learned the most of what they knew about *the light within*—they learned it all from George,) is it, I say, to be wondered at that he should have skill, quite as extraordinary at least, in biblical antiquities, sacred hermeneutics, and theological criticism? or that the demonstration of these (inspired furniture though they be) should be constituted in part—and no very inconsiderable part either—by the result, ascertained to his own satisfaction and that of divers others equally or homogeneously wise, that the scriptures of the New Testament contain no such divine institution as the sacrament or religious observance of the Lord's supper? Soberly—if nothing else existed in my knowledge as a criterion by which to stamp fallacy and stupidity on their claim of inspiration, I should not hesitate, as a man and a christian and a minister of christianity, to denounce the pretension of Fox and all his retinue, as equally preposterous in reason, monstrous in history, and deleterious in practice! Among other ill effects of the abominable whim of the society is this—to degrade all inspiration in their thoughts. I never saw a Quaker who could be held with a text of scripture, against the current of his prejudices. Tell them of what is declared in “the oracles of God” against a female ministry, and they will sometimes say—“O that was only the opinion of

Paul!" Was it? How convenient for garrulous dames and spinsters of the society, that *George* could furnish them with a counter inspiration! And what if Paul was inspired to deliver to the church of God the glorious and most affecting eucharist, the Lord's supper? The answer is at hand. Since the new dispensation of the weaver's son, George the cordwainer, of Drayton in the Clay, Leicestershire, the spirituality of matters hath been so astonishingly improved, so "clearly seen and testified to," that now no more are such "outward things of the letter" availing or obligatory. This George plainly testifieth. "And behold," saith William Penn, "behold the blessed man and men that were sent of God in this excellent work and service!" Truly ordinary reformers and iconoclasts were cyphers to them. Luther was not inspired; Melancthon was his pupil and the neophyte of his instructions; and as for Calvin and Cranmer, down to Baxter, Howe, and Jeremy Taylor, they confessed their knowledge to be mainly derived from the devout application of their powerful minds and ponderous scholarship to the pages of a book, which, after all, they knew no better than to denominate, with religious and complacential awe, THE WORD OF GOD! Hence all the celebrated chieftains of the church, and lights of former ages, FROM WHOM THE GLORIOUS REFORMATION UNDER GOD RESULTED AND ADVANCED, with all our peerless protestant immunities, retire aghast; their fame collapses and their brightness dies, in contrast with the inspired oracles of Quakerism—oracles that throw

their collective splendor into dim obscurity, before that lucid welkin of day which has shone upon us so ravishingly, since the luminaries of *the inward light* have favored all christendom with their inspired discoveries! It is a demonstrable fact, however disgraceful to the spirituality of all the worthies above named and thousands of others it may possibly appear, it is nevertheless a fact that all of them, each to the day of his death, remained undelivered from the serious faith of the divine institution of the supper! Is it any wonder then that such lights of science,

Sagacious readers of the works of God,
And in his word sagacious,

as Bacon, Lock, Boyle, Milton, Newton, and their cotemporaries; not to mention the more modern ones of Edwards, Dwight, Scott, Hall, Jay, Chalmers, and others, equally splendid in the world of letters and in the firmament of piety; is it any wonder that they should have been held in the same persuasion? I suspect, however, that if the veil could be lifted that secretes the ineffable glory, there might be witnessed, in the recollections and the praises of the entire celestial host of ransomed men, some manifest resemblance to the eternal celebration, even there, of the same ceremonial! They have all "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. THEREFORE are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple;" while "worthy is the Lamb that was slain," is their song.

If any Friend may chance to read this book as far as this, and cares candidly to examine the scriptural evidence in the case; though I must confess to him that it is rather "outward" after all; I do most kindly intreat him, notwithstanding the sport I have designedly made with that delirious enthusiast whom he so religiously reveres, I entreat him candidly to consult and compare the following scriptures—remarking, that they are only a few of many that might be advanced; and that the whole Bible, taken as one complete system of revealed truth, teems with the subject from beginning to end; as eternity also does! Matt. 26:26-30. Mark, 14:22-26. Luke, 22:14-20. Acts, 20:7. 1 Cor. 5:7, 8. 10:15-22. 11:17-34. Gal. 3:1. Rev. 3:20. 19:9. 22:12-15.

Friends ordinarily say, in regard to the alleged proof of scripture; (1) that we do not understand it; (2) that it is "not in the letter" or "outward act" that the festival is to be celebrated; (3) that it is not "the physical blood" [what other kind of *blood* is there?] of Christ that we are to drink; (4) that it is all spiritual, and in the heart to be seen and done; (5) that possibly the apostles might, in tenderness to the prejudices of the Jewish converts, have allowed or even for a time performed it; (6) that in this age, however, it is of no necessity or use; (7) that they enjoy sweet communion with God apart from all such gross and visible forms, and withal such cumbrous and expensive observances; (8) that symbols and outward signs are childish under the gospel, and impede rather than aid pure

spiritual enjoyment, which delights in freedom and abstraction; (9) that there is real elevation and sublimity in *their spiritual way* of keeping the feast; (10) that one can scarcely imagine what horrid persecutions, malignant superstitions, and bloody wars, have been OCCASIONED by those “outward” things; (11) that they know by happy experience every way the superiority of the manner of Friends; (12) that it was only the Jewish passover that the Savior attended “the same night in which he was betrayed;” (13) that there he spoke only incidentally, as it were, and hence only one of the evangelists records it, the order which modern professors so superstitiously over-rate, DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME; (14) that we ought to celebrate the pediluvium or feet-washing, to take young children in our arms and put our hands on them and bless them, or to mimic any other public action of the Savior in a religious way and “in remembrance of him,” as well and as much as to celebrate “often” the festival of “the Lord’s supper;” and (15) that there can be no conceivable sense or religious profit in eating a crumb of bread and sipping a few drops of wine, now and then, and calling the superstitious custom an act of piety and worship, well pleasing and acceptable to God; which all that are *enlightened in their way* know much better how to appreciate as it deserves.

O lux Dardaniae! spes o fidissima Teucrûm!—VIRG.

O light most trusty, excellent, and wise;
How happy they who see it with their eyes!

O light transcendent, most benignant light—
 No wonder learned sages grope in night!

Once I actually believed in precise coincidence with their views: and I know that many, or perhaps all, of them, “verily think” the synopsis, substantially as I have given it above, is truth. God forbid that I should charge them with duplicity and hypocrisy, as if they were practising for wordly ends a *known* system of imposture! God is my witness that I love their persons and their souls; and that in the spirit of love I have written the severest things, if such there are, in this treatise. But I have deliberately ridiculed their fundamental fancies—because it seems as if sober argument would less affect or expose their follies. This is my motive—and nothing which they can say will deepen, I assure them, the sense I now have of accountability at “the judgment-seat of Christ.” My reasons are already given for thinking irony and even sarcasm sometimes proper and in place, even in sacred matters. *Aeternitate pingo*: my interests in time are few, and fast receding.

What I have yet to offer, as it respects scripture evidence of the divine institution of “the Lord’s supper,” shall be confined mainly to a passage already referred to, 1 Cor. 11 : 17-34. All the postulate that I here propose is—1. That this passage contains truth, and that it is contradicted consequently by no other truth in the Bible or the universe; 2. That if it puts down, contradicts, utterly refutes the whole synopsis aforesaid, the

views of Friends are equally nullified, and the folly of their assumed inspiration proved. It was this very passage that first killed my own stupid dotage on the subject: and it would do the same service for any other educated and sincerely believing Friend, if he would only *dare* to “come to the light” of its plain and certain sense, soundly and yet palpably interpreted. With as much confidence as ever Friend possessed, and infinitely better evidence than they ordinarily command, I declare that this simple passage ruins their whole system; and that it is false, as by consequence christianity is false too and all inspiration false, if their system is true. Unless a Friend will admit, for example, the *possibility* that this passage may condemn his views, he is NOT a candid inquirer; if he will, let him candidly inquire—and the result will ensue. To pre-judge may be *inward light*; but it is not honesty. “He that doeth truth, cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.” Or, let Friends beware of “the light,” if they wish—to remain Friends! I know of no better way. It is simply a mode of that way—to fix their orbs of vision wholly *within!*

I submit the following observations on it.

1. *It was no impalpable spirituality*, such as Friends arrogate. There were sensible elements in the feast, called “bread” and the “cup of the Lord;” and these connected with the actions of “taking and eating and drinking,” what is called by the Holy Ghost, “the Lord’s supper,” and symbolically “the body and blood of the Lord.”

2. It was instituted, however, *not to satisfy the appetites*; but for religious ends. "What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?"

3. It was *abused by the Corinthians*, for which they are sharply rebuked, though the institution itself is not revoked on account of it. 20-22.

4. The abuse itself *demonstrates the fallacy of the ethereal view*. "For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper: and ONE IS HUNGRY, AND ANOTHER IS DRUNKEN." Did this abuse ever occur at a Friend's communion-table—in the heart? Were spirituality and abstraction ever capable of an abuse of the sort? If there had been no bread to eat, and no wine to drink, and no *bona fide* table spread, and no service palpable to the senses performed, how could the perversion occur? a perversion so great that the apostle declares it was "the Lord's table" no longer, to such an one, but "his own supper! One is hungry and another is drunken." Why? Because they "sat still," and considered, and enjoyed "inward" communion? What scandalous impudence does it require, in the nineteenth century, to assert any such thing! What mental sottishness or romanizing servility to believe it!

5. *Does the apostle annul the observance* or drop one disparaging inuendo against it, because of the evils it had already OCCASIONED? Just the contrary. He assures them of its sanctity; exhorts them to prepare for it; 27, 28, threatens them with "judgment" for their abuses; surrounds it with the highest sanctions in the universe; 29, and declares its

perpetuity to the end of time. 26. He declares also the propriety of its frequent observance. In all grave discourse, the comparative implies the positive. "As often" as ye do it, implies that it is "often" to be done; and other evidence of the word of God proves that it was ordinarily observed every week, on "the Lord's day," by primitive believers. Besides; it characterized the acts of assembling. The church "came together to eat;" 33, "to break bread," &c. Acts, 20:7.

6. Their abuse of it *had brought down on them already the divine judgments* of sickness and premature death, in many instances. "FOR THIS CAUSE many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." Christians were cut off judicially, as Moses was, for an example to others; although it was well with them in the end or rather after it. There was an epidemic at Corinth, on account of this abuse of the Lord's supper, and "many" were afflicted with it, even unto death. I have no doubt at all that modern pestilences, and remarkable instances of waning health and sudden or untimely death, may often have a relation to a similar abuse, which ought to make us all "examine ourselves." To contemn the death of Christ is to defy our own. "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged." Our health and life are held absolutely in the hand of God.

Friends will here probably smile. And why? Because they *spiritualize* the words "sickly, weak, sleep," and so forth. I only say, smile on. I did not undertake this treatise, to pursue the serpent of

error through every sinuosity of his labyrinth ; or the soaring genius of presumption through all the sublimities of its flight. By literalizing or spiritualizing one or the other, as suits them, they often succeed, with great sincerity and some speciousness, in evading the truth.

7. *The great end* for which "the Lord's Supper" was instituted is here declared: TO "SHOW THE LORD'S DEATH TILL HE COME." HIS SECOND COMING in the end of time is here referred to demonstrably. The interval then is to be occupied in his church by commemorating his death and anticipating his last advent. If the death of Christ be a matter of infinite importance and glory ; if God and man are both incalculably interested in it ; if it was expected in prophecy, prefigured in rites and types and sacrifices, desired and respected in the worship of the ancients since infant time ; if from everlasting it entered into the all-wise scheme of God that his Son should thus "die, the just for the unjust;" if he "verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for us," as "a lamb without blemish and without spot," that "with the precious blood of Christ" we might be "redeemed;" if these things are true ; if the crucified Savior is the centre and the sun of the redemption system, around whom all other lustres revolve dependent and tributary ; I can see a little of "the manifold wisdom," and the manifest condescension of God, in the enactment of "the supper of the Lamb."

“ Glory be to God who gave us,
 “ Freely gave his Son to save us ;
 “ Glory to the Son who came !”

Suppose Friends had always understood, professed, and honored “ the Lord’s Supper,” as we maintain that God here requires them to do ; would it ever have become questionable—to use no sterner word—whether they were infidels or not ? Whether their preachers knew the simplest characteristic elements of christianity or not ? Would such a schism *on cardinal points*, as now exists among them, ever have probably occurred ? Still, *possibly* it might ; as we have reason to know.

Look at 2 Cor. 5 : 18–21, and see what a centre it occupies, and what a circumference it fills, in the high diplomacy of the ambassadors of Jesus Christ. “ God was in Christ reconciling (or atoning) the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.” This is the grand fact of christianity. The proposition refers to the crucifixion. What a scene ! How dark, inscrutable, portentous ! All nature sympathizes and sickens. The heavens are bathed in darkness. A night, terrific and unnatural, hangs on the firmament. The sun suffers an unwonted eclipse or retires in deepest shades ; and day dies too. And “ Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom ; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent ; and the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints that slept,

arose." Who can interpret a scene like this? Is the universe confounded? Are the dead and the living changing places? But greater are the moral wonders than the natural. Behold that sufferer on the cross, midmost of the three! There is innocence, perfect, stainless, unparalleled innocence! See that form! The hands and feet stream blood. The head is bowed in death. Why was it so? Was heaven conscious of the mutiny that bore him off? Why did not God prevent it? Why did not "ten legions of angels," the armed soldiery of the heavens, Luke, 2: 13, *πληθος στρατιας ουρανου*, interpose for his rescue? Is it a crisis beyond the reach of providence, a dilemma too terrible for the wisdom of God? Is it the unmanageable uproar of hell; and is all creation flying off from the Creator? Is there no virtue, no power in the universe, equal to the exigency? Or, is sin culminating above the throne of God, and menacing the catastrophe of all things? Hark! a voice, and an inspired one, solves the mystery forever. "GOD WAS IN CHRIST RECONCILING THE WORLD UNTO HIMSELF, NOT IMPUTING THEIR TRESPASSES UNTO THEM." The plot is now developed; the tragedy performed. Surely we ought to "be reconciled to God," who gives such demonstration that he is cordially willing to be reconciled to us. "Only acknowledge thine iniquity, that thou hast transgressed against the Lord thy God:" saith the prophet. Truly he will "not impute iniquity" to us who believe in his name, since he has imputed it to one who died for us. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew

no sin ; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.”

All was willing, love inspired it ;
 Jesus chose it ; God required it ;
 Love the prompter, love the spring :
 Who was injured by the measure ?
 He whose love esteemed it pleasure ?
 He who chose the suffering ?

I should like to see the christian who thinks such benefit as this deserves *not* to be commemorated appropriately, and in all its affecting and glorious implications, to the end of time. “The Lord’s death”—what an expression ! “FOR AS OFTEN AS YE EAT THIS BREAD, AND DRINK THIS CUP, YE DO SHOW THE LORD’S DEATH TILL HE COME.” Consequently,

8. *Paul instituted it at Corinth originally*, when he there first “planted” the gospel. Corinth was from Jerusalem about one thousand miles. When Paul entered that voluptuous metropolis of idolatry and heathenism, his future converts were “gentiles carried away after dumb idols even as they were led.” Here he built on no other man’s foundation ; but “as a wise master-builder he laid the foundation” himself. What a fair field for the ethereal spirituality of Quakerism ! He could now have instituted “silent meetings,” a female ministry, and a most impalpable worship ; without sacraments, ordinances, instruction, or forms of any kind. He could have told them of “the seed, the life, the principle, the fund of the soul, the silence of all

flesh," and all that heathen nonsense—if his inspiration had only been identical with that of Fox. Instead of all this counterfeit imposture, he preached to them "the unsearchable riches of Christ;" taught them to render "thanks to God for his unspeakable gift"—by which *he* meant (not the inward light, but) the gift of his Son to die for us; instituted baptism and "the Lord's supper," and adverts to the circumstance that he had so done, when he blames them for the sin of abusing so sacred and precious a favor. This he asserts, and at the same time,

9. *He solemnly testifies the divine authenticity of the ordinance.* "FOR I HAVE RECEIVED OF THE LORD, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread," &c. Not only did Paul enact it at Corinth, but this he did as the result of special revelation before received from the Lord. Paul never saw Christ in the days of his flesh. He saw him indeed by miraculous apparition after the Lord was glorified. The Savior appeared to him on purpose; told him of this institution; and ordered him to erect, honor, explain it, in his church. Is this true? Then what a fiction is Quakerism! What a synopsis of errors do their reasonings furnish! How wild and jaundiced are their "views" in religion!

10. The order, "THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME," is here amplified and confirmed. It is REPEATED TWICE by Paul; once after either element. Of what avail is it for infidelity in drab now to insinuate, that it was spoken incidentally?

that it occurs in Luke alone, and that we estimate its importance extravagantly? Is not the inspiration of Paul as good as that of Luke? Neither of them was present at the scene; but were they both inspired? Then is their testimony one, and that the testimony not of man but of God. Has God then changed his mind since Quakerism arose to arrogate its oraculous interpretation? Has HE ascertained by experience, that his original plan of perpetuating these blessed memorials till the end of the world, and the second coming of our glorious Redeemer, was too defective and short-sighted to be sustained? O Quakerism! "how long wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun!"

I call heaven and earth to witness that **QUAKERISM IS NOT CHRISTIANITY**: and while as a witness I testify against them, in the name of my own glorious Master, I ask all men to tell what are their protestations worth of respect for the scriptures? The Bible is the word of God, and it will be highest or—under foot! It is paramount or nothing.

Through faith he [Moses] kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the first-born should touch them. Heb. 11 : 28. Ye are come—to the blood of sprinkling. Heb. 12 : 24. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast. 1 Cor. 5 : 7, 8.

Do Friends object, that *the use* of such observances after all does not appear? I answer, That is not the question. It is simply—are they divinely

instituted? If they are, then their obligation instantly results; and that whether we can see the wisdom of them or not. But perhaps a number of uses may be discerned, even by us. They are divinely appointed badges of subjection to the gospel; and as such they discriminate appropriately the visible disciples and family of Christ, methinks that one of their uses appears just now: they serve to detect a certain spurious christianity that would pass current for divine! they expose a *sui generis* style of piety that pretends a more perfect intimacy with God, while it despises them! they demonstrate the temper of Quakerism.

The sacraments are a plain and divinely instituted test of our obedience. They are like "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil;" that is, the tree that gives knowledge, or makes known, or indicates, or stands as a test, "in the midst of the garden." God has employed such outward and easy *indices* of piety from the beginning. Only, the primitive tree condemned them that touched it, and ordered men away: these condemn them that neglect it, and order men to approach "with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." I knew one comparatively eminent preacher of the society, who used to say, in his public communications, something of this sort; showing that his convictions were at least lamed and limping with an half-perception of the sense of scripture on the article; "However, Friends, let every man be fully persuaded in his

own mind. Some that go to these outward sacraments are, I doubt not, sincere. It is as far as they see; and I would not condemn them. But for one, and for me, I can say that it appears not required! Alas! more inspiration! Is it then "required" of others? and not of him? Where has God issued a dispensation for rebels of the society? God does not require it of some! Does he then require it of others? What! and license some to disobey his own ordinances; that is, license some to sin against his authority, to depose the Lawgiver of the universe, and erect George Fox in his place? "It is not required of me!" What a discovery! He is to be excused from the family-table of the children of God! absolved from the duties, and yet instated in the privileges of salvation! Nay, privileged sublime to ride in the car of his own lucid imaginings, "above all that is called God, or that is worshipped." And why is *he* so privileged? Plainly because of his attainments. Paul was a dwarf, a pigmy, a babe, to him! What a pity he had not lived about eighteen centuries earlier; the whole college of apostles and evangelists might have gone to school to him! Seriously—I knew the man, and respected him. He used to say in my hearing many sound and good things. I am as far from being his foe, or his personal contemner, as I am from believing his system. My heart pities his memory! He knows better now. Eternity has taught him the truth—I even hope in Christ to his exceeding and eternal joy, as well as to his wonderful correction and reform! I so hope, however, not on account of his

Quakerism, but in spite of it ; and submit the question to God.

Say the apostles of the Lamb, “ We are of God. He that knoweth God, heareth us ; he that is not of God, heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.” By the christian sacraments, I think, the spirit of Quakerism may be *known*. In their crucible, its gold comes out dross. It is “ the spirit of error.” And if “ error ” betokens a congenial “ spirit,” it is not innocent.

But while Friends retrench all the ordinances of christianity, they perpetuate their own. Plain language, plain dress, and plain address, are their *three* sacraments. The pope has *seven* : christianity only *two*. Theirs are the badges, however, not of christianity, but of Quakerism. They indicate only—a Friend. I believe they are absolutely anti-christian. Who ever commanded such things ? “ Neither shall they wear a rough garment to deceive.” See Zechariah, 13. ¶ with Dr. Scott’s notes. The subject is almost too low and disgusting to treat seriously. I will, however, briefly examine some of their positions, in a style free, perhaps colloquial.

As to plain language, they say, that it is grammatical, as ours is not ; that it is scriptural ; that ours originated in pride, and therefore ought not to be upheld ; that if Friends do not maintain singularity in these things, they will be more in danger of losing their distinctive character and mingling with the world ; that their plainness restrains, in a salutary way, their youth and others ; and that the Master wore a seamless coat.

The pretence of a grammatical conscience, is rather ridiculous ; especially when all their correctness regards the *number* only ; for notoriously they abuse the *case* and *person* more than others—*How does thee do ?* Let us parse it at our leisure ; remembering that it is a sample of their address to one individual, in the second person ; a specimen of their common mode of conversation. *Does* is not second person at all ! *thee* is in the objective, not nominative case—what governs it ? and there is no nominative in the sentence for the verb *does do !* Instead of *How doest thou ?* which they almost never say ; and instead of *How are you ?* which the world's people say : they conscientiously say, all for the sake of grammar, *How does thee do ? Is thee going out to-day ? Will thee ride ?*

With Friends it seems a good saying for polemical effect, to allege its *scriptural* character. But is this valid in their service ? (1) There is nothing analogous in the fact. When the Bible was written, the comparatively modern usage, that makes the singular and plural one in addressing an individual, or rather substitutes the latter for the former, was unknown to all languages : at least no *such* use obtained on earth as that now almost universal. Consequently, there was only one way. If the same state of things had then existed, which now exists touching the matter, and the scripture had then employed the singular alone, and laid great stress on the observance, where all the world used the plural ; and if the scripture had so made itself *singular* on the point, the case would have been,

as now it is not, worthy of citation. (2) An argument from their "secondary rule" always seems like condescension in them; a conformity to our way. If we only had an *inspired* sentence in the affair, as Fox said he had when his conscience and his preaching stickled on the article so pertinaciously, it might be vastly convenient; for then we should *know*. But (3) if Friends go to the scripture, let them honor the whole precedent. "And Abraham bowed himself to the people of the land, even to the children of Heth. And he lifted up his eyes and looked, and lo, three men stood by him: and when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the tent-door, and bowed himself toward the ground." Abraham was a gentleman; a man of good manners, who thought it right, by customary indications, to express *outwardly* his inward regard for others. So was Paul; so were all the saints of scripture. "Most excellent Theophilus. I am not mad, most noble Festus:" which last was spoken to a heathen and a profligate magistrate, out of respect to his station and office in society. "Be courteous: in honor preferring one another; honor all men; honor the king; pay ye tribute also," a *military* tax or impost to a military and heathen emperor!! "Render to all their dues: honor to whom honor." But citations endless might be made to show that ill manners, rudeness, voluntary awkwardness, a studious plainness of demeanor, gratuitous singularity, refusing all sensible expressions of respect for others, the utmost *formality* in opposing all forms, and the like notions, are entirely

unlike the scriptural way. Acts, 16: 30. 27: 10, 21, 25. 1 Pet. 3: 6. I believe they are often the mere cloak of elements as unlovely as spite, envy, sordid feeling, pride, ignorance, bigotry, and very much of bad habits and ill breeding: and that all these things are *precisely contrary* to the temper and manners of the gospel.

Now suppose I grant, what Penn especially so much asserts, that the plural form originated in pride—what of it? Is not usage the arbiter of language, and has it now any such affinity?

———usus

Quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi.—HOR.

With usage is the dynasty of speech;
Its power and right, its rule and sense, to teach.

Besides, it is wretched casuistry, passing over the nature and utility of a thing, to reject it, because, by burrowing into antiquity, it may appear that somebody introduced it in connection with a matter of mischief, or from an evil motive. The position proves too much. It proves that the word *solemn*⁶³ and a thousand others ought never to be used in christian worship. It proves that one ought conscientiously to differ from universal usage in any thing, whose origin appears, on thorough and learned inquest, to have been connected with evil, or which was introduced from a bad motive. This would retrench for us a multitude of innocent usages. On a more enlightened principle have Friends acted in one instance at least—in adopting the title of *Quaker*.

Its good origin is more than questionable. Gervas Bennet, Esq. the Derbyshire justice, (none the better he for the good origin, *Benedict*, blessed, which his surname certainly had,) gave it to them in 1650, from motives which Friends would have to take leave of their inspiration before they could refer to a good origin. Well, let us see. The inquisition is evil; indulgences are no better; the crusades were not very good; the institution of cardinals is bad enough: and all these papal evils, from no good motive, were introduced within about a century of each other, some six or seven hundred years ago, in the midnight of the dark ages. We have all heard of the dignity and "eminence" indicated by a cardinal's hat, and of the farcical ceremony of its presentation. It is a large umbrageous broad-brim, whose associations of venerableness, since first introduced into England, have bordered *broadly* upon *sacred*, in the estimate of our ancestors. Hence the almost instinctive awe which some of us have for such a religious covering of the head masculine. It is questionable if any other cope or canopy of the kind indicates as much piety and wisdom and venerableness. Antiquarians tell us that previously there were no hats in England, Scotland, or Ireland, of that expressive, right reverend, and most patriarchal cut and fashion. Besides, they have another advantage—the instinctive associations of infallibility! It is all owing to a proud origin that such hats appear even in our own days. But will Friends insist that they are intrinsically wicked; and call every man a CARDINAL that appears abroad so

qualified ; and suspect an inoffensive citizen possibly, of a treasonable league with the tyrant of Rome, either prospective as a candidate or consummate as an ally, should he be seen in the street perambulating, under the dignified circumference of such a worthy conservatory ? Broad-brims, for aught I know, are as innocent as umbrellas ; if not of the same species. They are very innoxious things ; and for the life of me, I cannot see the malignity intrinsic, resulting simply from the evil origin they unquestionably had ! I confess that I always think of a cardinal astrut, when I meet a specimen of very large dimensions ; although it differs in color entirely from the canonical one, and although its owner may be too *solemn* in his contemplations to think or mean any such thing. But I pass to another illustration. Shaving the beard certainly originated in pride. It is a comparatively modern custom, wholly unscriptural—so far as general precedent extends ; 2 Sam. 10, and was invented notoriously by the exquisites and petit-maitres of a by-gone age. When first introduced, it was scouted as fantastical, effeminate and unnatural, degrading and unmanly ; and to this day some of us know, by our conformity to the degenerate custom, that it is expensive, time-consuming, troublesome, and often painful. Still, Friends themselves are all in that ‘outward’ observance. On their own principle, it is very unspiritual, to say the least of it ! Is it not a useless conformity too to “the way of the world’s people ?” What an evil

origin it had! With how many is it *a toilet business* of pride and vanity and wasted time!

That we ought to be singular gratuitously, singular for its own sake, is a sentiment fit for the creed of misanthropy alone. I consider it an evil to differ from any man on any subject. Plainly I do it only because on some points it is a greater evil not to differ. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is the rule. "And who is my neighbor?" Answer—any one whom you can benefit or injure; any man who is related to you in any proximate way: a Jew, if you are a Samaritan; a Samaritan, if you are a Jew; and any human being, black or white, swarthy or florid, if you are a christian. A christian is the only genuine friend of the species on the foot-stool of God. He loves them not less, but more, because he tries to frustrate their errors, to convince, correct, and reform them. And shall he advertise an opposite creed in his manners or his dress? If he dresses conscientiously, as unquestionably he ought, his conscience is open to evidence, and ready to be rectified "by manifestation of the truth."

Not that he peevishly rejects a mode
Because the world adopts it. If it bear
The stamp and clear impression of good sense,
And be not costly more than of true worth,
He puts it on, and for decorum sake
Can wear it e'en as gracefully as she.

Some friends, I well know, allege that we err, in what we here aver of them, in point of fact; that

they do not lay stress upon the fashion of the raiment ; that they leave every one to himself in the matter. This I beg leave to doubt. I *remember* too much to believe it. Why have Friends *written such a quantity* about it, if it were a thing comparatively indifferent with them ? Does *inspiration* treat of trifles so voluminously ? Do they wish to provoke me to tell and to quote all I know on the subject ? I hope not. Meanwhile, ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS ; as saith the proverb. I propose a test—Show me “ a public Friend,” approved and eminent in labors, with clothes decently and moderately similar to those of other gentlemen—not quakerized notoriously ! Show me such an one with a comfortable double-breasted surtout, or with coat and under-dress of blue, or——black ! Produce me such a sample, and I will believe that you state the subject authentically ! Till then, I must really believe that such a *rara avis in terris* is a bird of Utopia only ; and that, should such an one actually appear, and exercise his “ openings ” among you, it would mystify the *light*, and grieve the bowels, and incur the rebuke, of a whole society. To be plainer—it is all frivolous to aver that you care nothing for “ plain ” conformities ; and you know it ! Have I forgotten one of your periodical “ queries,” about “ plainness of speech, behavior, and apparel ? ” and the “ careful ” observance of the same which it solemnly enjoins ?

But, you say, our reasons are religious. Are they ? Why then are they not *christian* too ? Has the Captain of salvation appointed a *religious uni-*

form for his soldiers? If not, how dare others do it in his name? How dare they misrepresent his mind and will on the point? How dare they caricature his religion along the streets? How dare they make their youth ridiculous in dress and address, distress their feelings, and subject them to wanton jeering, insult, outrage, from the brute mob? "Ah! how the cross is slighted! Is it? What cross? One of your own making, your own will-worship, and not at all the cross of redemption or of the Redeemer! "Why! did not he wear a garment without a seam?" Indeed he did:—but it differed as much from broad-skirts and buttonless drab, as reason differs from fanatical ignorance. He wore, beside his under-dress which the soldiers parted among them, John, 19:23, 24, a large flowing robe or over-garment, called by Dr. Campbell "a mantle:" this the soldiers would not rend, obviously because of its texture of excellence, curiously woven. They cast lots for it whose it should be. It was too valuable to be torn. It had probably been presented to him as an expression of esteem and reverence, or as an offering of pious gratitude. Its seamless character proves not its plainness, but rather its tastefulness, its worth and splendor. In short, we have no reason to think the Savior or his disciples were ordinarily distinguished by their costume. The fine rule of Dr. Watts, *Dress so as to escape observation, avoiding singularity and extremes*, seems to have been theirs. I would add—Dress moderately, modestly, comfortably, honestly. Peter was known by his speech as a Galilean; and perhaps the others.

I know of none but the Pharisees whose dress distinguished them. Matt. 23 : 5. These put much of their religion in the shape and possibly the color and size of their clothes. It is a cheap mechanical sanctity, very ostentatious and rather spurious, to advertise one's religion in the appearance of his hat, coat, and equipage. There may be such a non-descript as a spiritual *dandy!* and such a quality as holy finesse. If a man *has* religion, and cares to have it, it will ordinarily appear in a proper way and at a proper time. And much more should we care for appearances in the sight of God than in the sight of men. We should take care of our reputation—in heaven! But how great, and “outward” truly, how over done and spiritually fantastical, is the pains-taking of men and women Friends to dress—precisely so!

Truth is truth, whoever says it : and on this principle I advert to the saying of a very worthless man ; conceding its bad origin, while I commend the sentiment it contains. “If the Maker of all had been a Friend, what a drab-colored creation we should have had!” Instead of this, the eternal architect and original of all things, has implanted the principles of taste, and the sense of beauty, as well as of universal harmony and elegance, in every human being : and stored the world with an exuberance of well-adapted objects to attract and gratify so pure and innocent an endowment. God hath thus made man ; and thus made all nature “beauty to his eye and music to his ear.” How inimitable, how rich, how variegated, the hues of a flower-garden ; an autum-

nal forest ! or the tints of glory that adorn the occident on a fine summer's evening. How grand and imposing a spectacle is old ocean, rolling in its own expanse. How ravishing and splendid the scene of the firmament, glowing with innumerable stars ; " with living sapphires," as Milton calls them—at (as Barbauld gives it) " the dead of midnight and the noon of thought !" how gorgeous the counterpart of all these glories, peering as from an equal subterranean vault, seen thousands of leagues below the reflecting surface of some sylvan lake ! How inspiring and symphonious the songsters of the wood ! They praise the Creator, while man is mute and inconsiderate of him. But we speak of clothing, not minstrelsey. " Consider the lilies how they grow—Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. If then God so clothe the grass, which is to-day in the field, and to-morrow is cast in the oven ; how much more will he clothe you, O ye of little faith." Thus all his works concur and speak his praise.

And all are under One. One spirit—His,
 Who wore the platted thorns with bleeding brows,
 Rules universal nature. Not a flower
 But shows some touch, in freckle, streak, or stain
 Of his unrivalled pencil. He inspires
 Their balmy odours, and imparts their hues,
 And bathes their eyes with nectar, and includes,
 In grains as countless as the seaside sands,
 The forms with which he sprinkles all the earth.
 Happy who walks with him ! whom what he finds
 Of flavor or of scent in fruit or flower,
 Or what he views of beautiful or grand

In nature, from the broad majestic oak
 To the green blade that twinkles in the sun,
 Prompts with remembrance of a present God.
 His presence, who made all so fair, perceived,
 Makes all still fairer.

COWPER.

The senses are not sin ; nor is their regular and temperate gratification wrong. Is any man so stochically philosophical in his pseudo-christianity as to profess that he eats, for example, *merely* from a consideration of ulterior results, as the health and strength of his physical system ; and counts it sin to *relish his food* in the process of mastication ? It is the inordinate indulgence of the bodily appetites, or their irregular and iniquitous gratification, that constitutes sin in the sight of God. Christianity is intended to suit and discipline, to tutor and perfect our total manhood, in the best possible manner and to ends equally and superlatively good. We are to “ use the world as not abusing it ; ” to enjoy without excess or waste or *ingratitude*, his bounties who so munificently furnishes us with good of every sort. “ For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving. For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer : ” that is, the authority of “ the word of God ” hath set it apart for our use, and “ prayer ” concurring receives his blessing with the gift ; and both constitute the appropriate “ sanctifying ” of these donations to their legitimate end—the use of man. Hence we are not to *invent* crosses that we may carry them, as if they were divinely commanded ! especially to invent them for others ;

and dogmatize them on mankind, proscribing or legitimating what we will—as if will was law! Others are as free as we are; we as obligated to subjection as others. Legislation in such things belongs underived to the prerogative of the Great King of consciences; and belongs to him alone. Besides, there are two other reasons against the usurpation of our legislating in the case: first, we never engage in making or doing such laws, without so neglecting, as practically to unmake and undo, the really obligatory laws of God: the *commanded* sacraments, for example! The attention we give to uncommanded forms, always subduces proportionately from our obedience to what is commanded. Second, As it is wrong in principle for any man to POPIFY himself as a lawgiver, in the church especially, so, as Paul avers and as experience shows, it ought to be resisted in its beginnings and crushed in the quickening; or it will increase, mature, and become at last a living monster of mischief and impiety. So prolific is the progeny of *abuses*, when allowed; superseding christianity as God gave it to us, in its completeness and adaptation, in his word.

But the plainness of the society often operates as a salutary restraint. I question this altogether. Besides, restraint is not virtue. A tiger may be restrained, till in effect he becomes as inoffensive as a lamb: but still he is a tiger. How much virtue is there in a restrained Quaker? as much as there is of sanity in a maniac dressed in strait vesture. Such restraint is not salutary, except possibly for the repose of the community. It cramps the mind;

makes servile the temper; irritates the feelings; contradicts the wishes, without at all convincing the judgment or enlightening the conscience; generates cowardice; acts as a constant mentor of degradation; exposes its subjects to the cruelty and sport of the foolish, without at all commending them to the confidence of the wise; and is calculated to foster self-deceit, contractedness of thought, latent malice, envy, and sly duplicity. I solemnly believe that Quakerism tends to degrade the human mind; to strengthen its vulgar and low propensities, to alienate mental manhood and the honest love of moral evidence; to inspire cant, religious whining, holy moping, artificial distortions of the countenance, perversion of doctrine, solemn vacuity, and even desperation, insanity, and suicide! Of the insanity of its tendencies—I can only record that I have long believed it from actual observation. I could give names—a number—now at my command and of my acquaintance, of Friends, who, under the influence of their most reasonless and proofless scheme of mysticism, have gone lunatic and died maniacs—some, and these their preachers, by self-violence. The reasons are, I think, mainly such as these: it stimulates the mind, when spiritually exercised, to the intensity of fanaticism; puts it upon the quest of things impracticable; deprives it of the strength and satisfaction of rational evidence; shows it not at all, for it does not know, THE GLORIOUS DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH IN JESUS CHRIST, or THE SCRIPTURAL WAY OF WARRANTED ACCESS TO GOD; fills it with a host of

morbid prejudices ; perverts its sober thought, and *inspires* a feeling that rational investigation is inimical to spirituality and offensive to the grace of the Spirit ; destroys, as I believe, the proper and glorious use of scriptural and evangelical guidance, by telling them—and let no Friend deny this—that the scriptures are “ a secondary rule ! ” and the Spirit *speaking in them* “ the primary rule ” in religion ; yea, that the Spirit, i. e. God himself, is a rule of action, and infinitely the highest and best rule of action ! I speak as a witness and *know* that I speak truth—though well I know also how their serpentine sophistry will declaim, and throw dust in the air, to darken the vision of others ! The best restraint in the world is—pure christianity.

But one of their *esoteric*⁶⁴ arguments is—that if they do not maintain the characteristic plainness of the society, they will lose *cast* and come to nothing ! Will they ? Well, I think this must be admitted. It is my own opinion. Hence we see the importance of “ working out their own ” Quakerism, with punctilious conformity ; for, otherwise, they may stand a chance to find out the truth and get converted to christianity ! But—I would tell them, 1. That they will come to nothing, at all events, so far as Quakerism is concerned. They are now so much altered, from a thorough-going Quaker of the seventeenth century, that if the two kinds should coexist in Philadelphia next year, or even in London, they could not mutually endure each other. Which of them is sufficiently “ faithful ” in these days, to enter *Christ church* “ steeple-house ” in

that city and interdict the worship there, in the name of the Lord? I do not believe that if George Fox were to enter Arch-street meeting, in the city aforesaid, he would be either welcome or endured; i. e. if he should be just what he formerly was. There is no persecution in this free and happy land, to elevate them into sectarian prosperity. Nor is any man more glad of this every way than myself. But mark my word, and remember it when I am in the other world—IN THIS COUNTRY OF LIGHT AND CIVIL FREEDOM THEY WILL CONTINUALLY WANE, ASSIMILATE TO BETTER MODELS, AND ULTIMATELY COME TO NOTHING AS A SECT.

Every generation will probably improve in mental freedom and the temper to examine. The circumambient light, made by reflections and refractions from the word of God, will compel them progressively to see things as they are. They will then begin to reason; and I hope, to pray—without waiting profanely for a motion of their sluggish internal prompter. It will then be enough for them to know what is the will of God on the subject. And if they can possibly ascertain from his living oracles, by studious searching and a little common sense, that Jesus Christ once “spake a parable to this end, that men ought always to pray and not to faint,” they may at last come to see that the invitation, the order, the promise, of God, to prayer, constitute THE IDENTICAL ALL-SUFFICIENT WARRANT “to every one that believeth.” This will instantly break up the waiting system; it will make their silent meetings seem to

them as empty and heathenish as they are ; and learning to follow the Spirit where he truly leads, they will obey the written word of inspiration, as their highest rule of action, and come experimentally to know, much better than Barclay ever did, the meaning of that grand aphorism which he mystically abuses—**AS MANY AS ARE LED BY THE SPIRIT OF GOD, THEY ARE THE SONS OF GOD.** Rom. 8 : 14. Heb. 4 : 14-16. Many an old man probably will hug his prejudices “inwardly” to the grave ; but his posterity may not always “approve his sayings.” The signs of the times indicate the progress of things and their improvement too. Their educated young men will think and speak and influence others. Friends have altered since I can remember. They are shaken, the whole of them—except the mere mental and moral sediment of the society, the ignorant and the dull proverbially. They begin to see that there is no sin in classical education and mental discipline ; that Latin and Greek may be learned from good motives, and without contamination ; that there is more temptation in ignorance than in sound learning ; and that all correct knowledge may be acquired in subserviency to piety. Let real light advance. It never had such a fair field as in this land. God is the Great Patron of all true knowledge ; and christianity is a system of rational evidence, as well as of “grace and truth.”

I must add, 2. That they ought to repent of their **SECTARIANISM.** It is a shame to any people, especially in this age and in this unique and happy land ;

and especially as they have more of sect and less of christianity. It is the very mind of anti-christ. And, Friends, allow me to ask, why will you labor, and metamorphose your humanity, and exhort or assist each other in upholding that excrescence of a darkling and troubled period, not half-reclaimed from the traditional popery of ages ; why will you toil to uphold a system which can never uphold you ? Let it alone ; give it up. Take the religion of Jesus Christ just as HE has given it to us, and made it for us, in the holy scriptures. Conform to it ; it is greater than you : and it will make you happy ; it will save you. This, my dear fellow creatures and friends, I know by experience. I have proved it ; I commend it to you. Will you *not* conform to christianity ? Well ! take the consequences then ! This is all—and surely it is enough. There is no indecision in God. The alternative is before you. Christianity will never conform to you, not a jot or a tittle of it. Again, I say, IT NEVER WILL CONFORM TO YOU OR TO ANY MAN. Conform to it ; to the whole of it ; just as it is ; cordially ; confidentially ; constantly ; and you will be saved long enough before you get to glory ! The salvation of Jesus Christ is a PRESENT salvation, as well as an ETERNAL one. “ He that hath the Son, hath life ; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life.” Reader, is this possession yours ? Take care of your title. Many will be disappointed for the want of a good one. Nothing but truth is indisputable.

This chapter shall conclude with the consideration of a passage, Col. 2 : 20–23, on which the so-

ciety are wont to lay much emphasis ; as they do, most tenaciously, on any and every one that seems, in their light, to vindicate their views : so that I think it a good inference that they would adhere as closely to the whole volume, if they only liked it all, as well and as much as they seem to like some special passages, which they misunderstand and plausibly pervert. This real reason, for the selectness and delicacy of their scriptural taste, may possibly not be known to themselves. It is not in money-getting or the principles of arithmetic, but in *religion* pre-eminently, that “the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked.”

Every one can see the use to which Friends put it—to denounce the sacraments ; warn and encourage themselves in the *holy* disobedience of rejecting them ; and fix on consistent worshippers the charge of judaizing and formality. And truly they can throw over their version of it a cloud of speciosity in favor of their usages, as if it was written on purpose to sanction them.

Intending now to attempt its disabuse from their glosses and their mistakes, their ignorance and their inspiration, by showing its proper meaning ; I observe,

1. That the passage is comparatively of difficult solution. Often have I witnessed its mistaken use in the pulpit, in religious publications, and in the noble speeches even of *senatorial* eloquence, engaged in the cause of TEMPERANCE and thundering in the capitol. On this account Friends ought to be treated with special lenience, just here, were it

not for their notorious inspiration when they preach ! Inspiration deserves no quarters ; needs none ; and were more injured by the offer than the want. Still, of mere grace I will award it to them—thinking it a good instance in illustration of the nature of grace, as favor to the ill-deserving ! for they always affect to know all about it, and all about every thing else almost, as inspiration might.

2. Much of the darkness and mistake which generally accompanies the passage may be traced to a demonstrable infelicity of our translation. I will render it, as seems just and necessary, thus : “ If then ye have died with Christ from the elements of the world, why, as those that live with the world, do you subject yourselves to the arbitrary enactments of men ? *Thou shalt not eat, thou shalt not taste, thou shalt not handle* ; which things are all corrupting by abuse ; according to human authority and inclination ; which things have indeed the appearance of wisdom, by will-worship, and formal humiliation, and unsparing severity to the body, (though with no real profit) for the satisfaction of the flesh.” That I have rendered the above perfectly as it should be, I do not affirm ; but that the general sense is correctly given, I am confident. The learned reader may consult the original at his leisure. He may also ponder Dr. Macknight, Parkhurst, Robinson’s Wahl, Schleusner and others, with advantage. The original is so densely written ; so idiomatically, in the free style of Paul ; that one may well confess in details its intrinsic difficulty, after all.

To be inspired sometimes, would be vastly convenient; it would at least save many an honest student from the incessant toil and occasional headache of patient investigation.

3. The passage, so far from favoring Friends, is entirely opposed to them. It forbids christians to allow any human authority to speak to them with its own dogmas. *δογματιζεσθε*. It will not allow them to be *Pythagoreans*, bowing to mere authority. It absolves them, as the subjects of Christ, from all the orders of men in religion. Col. 3: 23-25. It respects "ordinances" such possibly as these; "Thou shalt use the plain language; thou shalt wear clothes of a precisely given description; thou shalt go to Friends' meetings only; thou shalt vilify all other ministers as "hirelings," and not learn even the truth from them; thou shalt believe, without any evidence, that there is, in thee and in all men, a certain inward 'light, seed, life, principle, fountain, power, grace, and portion of the divinity,' which is 'above all' and 'hath dominion over all,' by attending to the voice of which, thou mayest come to the full knowledge of salvation." Those obey it who refuse utterly to be "subject to ordinances" such as the above; and who continue to deny all the fleshly wisdom and presumptuous legislation of creatures in the church, of which JESUS CHRIST ALONE is the all-sufficient HEAD.

4. Suppose for a moment it did refer to "the ordinances" of baptism and the Lord's Supper, (1 Cor. 11: 2,) I beg leave to observe, doubt it who may, and I shall only observe, that *then* the scrip-

tures would contradict themselves flatly and demonstrably—a consequence which in point of fact (not of words) seems to affect *Friends* very little.

5. The passage refers, from the previous context, it is thought, to all the desired innovations of heathen schoolmen and Jewish corrupters; while its principle is of universal application, exalting the authority of Jesus Christ alone and exclusively in the church “which he purchased with his own blood.” It will not admit the philosophy of Pythagoras or Plato to domineer; or the enactments of Jewish impostors to deform. It allows no distinction of meats; it favors no will-worship, no maceration of the body, no *strait* vesture of religious singularity or clanship, no self-inflicted austerities, no profitless and mechanical observance. It pronounces all these to be human fabrications, fleshly wisdom, injurious, and tending to destruction in many ways. It will be perceived too that the inhibitory clause, rendered in our translation, “Touch not, taste not, handle not,” is not plural, as if the apostle commanded it; is itself no integral part of the inspired scriptures, but a mere quotation by the apostle of a judaical mandate for the purpose of annulling it; and that it is often improperly used in the cause of TEMPERANCE—a cause too glorious and too affluent in resources to need any perversion for its assistance, since perversion alone sustains the arguments that oppose it. It is a cause too, I am happy to add, in which *Friends* have been nearly right from the beginning; and in which their example, taking precedence of others, has been comparatively excellent

and of praiseworthy consistency. Still, it is not a *perfect* example in several respects. None of their members are allowed to vend the intoxicating poison—in *small* quantities! But some of them “feel easy,” or uneasy, while *they trade in it by wholesale!* And why, knowing this, in a YEARLY MEETING, full of inspiration and other wonderful qualities, do they every year groan over the matter, or squint at it, with a half resolved menace of action, and then do—nothing? Is it that in *such* an assemblage “there is not strength enough in the body” to act in that business? or will they always adjourn it till next year? Or, is it better “to get still,” and hold *silent meetings* only, on that subject? reaching it galvanically or otherwise, “without words?”

On the sacraments, Barclay has written nearly 80 octavo pages. To follow him, especially in his *parade of sanctions* from the word of God by *references that are all against him*, would be vexatious and useless. I only aver that I have stated the strongest of his seeming arguments that I can find—though I solemnly believe, and for reasons already given, that his whole dissertation on the subject is a tissue of sophistry, a flying from the point, a mystification of evidence, and a disingenuousness of procedure throughout! It oftentimes induces the indignation that would—almost—denounce him as a wanton perverter and libeller of the truth! I boldly write my thoughts, just as they are; and know that I must answer for it to God. It is out of my power to think that he was not a wilful sophist or a deluded errorist, considered as a

religious teacher. In no other aspect would I dispose of him. As one of my relations is that of a witness, I record it for those whom it may concern that what he writes induces in my mind only a deeper sense of his perversion, and of the anti-evangelical and even infidel tendencies of Quakerism ! I believe *Hicksism* belongs to its substance, and is one of its common and proper fruits. Let men scout it, if they will ; let them treat it as empty assertion, *after* all the scriptural decision of the Holy Ghost that has been adduced, and that the genius of Quakerism systematically neglects or instinctively disguises ; still, it shall be recorded—I am sincere too—that the whole scheme, here and elsewhere, is “ another gospel ;” is homogeneously hostile to the doctrine of justification, of atonement, of salvation by faith, and of eternal and manifest perdition as the sure result of obeying *not* the gospel : and these are the fundamentals of christianity, which the Bible continually brings into view ; which Quakerism continually puts out of view ; which it is the policy of hell forever to supersede and obscure ; and equally the duty of the church and the ministry to maintain, pure and inviolate. “ Ephraim compasseth me about with lies.—I have WRITTEN TO HIM the great things of MY LAW, but they were counted as a strange thing.—Ephraim is smitten, their root is dried up, they shall bear no fruit.—Ephraim also is like a silly dove, without heart.—They return, but not to the Most High : they are like a deceitful bow : their princes shall fall by the sword for the rage of their tongue. This shall be their derision in the land of Egypt.

They call to Egypt, they go to Assyria. When they shall go, I will spread my net upon them; I will bring them down as the fowls of the heaven; I will chastise them, as their congregation hath heard. Wo unto them! for they have fled from me: destruction unto them! because they have transgressed against me: **THOUGH I HAVE REDEEMED THEM, YET THEY HAVE SPOKEN LIES AGAINST ME.**—I will go and return to my place, till they acknowledge their offence, and seek my face: in their affliction they will seek me early.”

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

The infidel has shot his bolts away,
Till, his exhausted quiver yielding none,
He gleans the blunted shafts that have recoiled,
And aims them at the shield of Truth again.

* * * * * *

The world takes little thought. Who will may preach,
And what they will. All pastors are alike
To wandering sheep, resolved to follow none. COWPER.

How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things.

So then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.—Rom. 10 : 15-17.

But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.—2 Cor. 4 : 1-7.

My words shall be of the uprightness of my heart: and my lips shall utter knowledge clearly. The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life. If thou canst answer me, set thy words in order before me, stand up. Behold, I am according to thy wish in God's stead; I also am formed out of the clay. Behold, my terror shall not make thee afraid, neither shall my hand be heavy upon thee.—Job, 33 : 3-7.

Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. Moreover, it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful.—1 Cor. 4 : 1-5.

And THE THINGS THAT THOU HAST HEARD OF ME among many witnesses, the same COMMIT thou to FAITHFUL MEN, who shall be ABLE TO TEACH OTHERS ALSO!—2 Tim. 2 : 2.

Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.—2 Cor. 5 : 20.

If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.—1 Pet. 4 : 11.

That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive: but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, who is the HEAD, even CHRIST.—Eph. 4 : 14, 15.

As for my people, children are their oppressors, and WOMEN RULE OVER THEM. O my people, they who lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths.—Isai. 3 : 12.

On the subject of the christian ministry, Friends are very peculiar in many respects, and wrong in

about as many. The theme is inviting, fertile, and important; but it is so well understood comparatively in this country, that I thought at first wholly to omit its treatment. Its connection with Quakerism, however, has determined me to the present course; in which I shall attempt little more than to expose the anti-scriptural perversion of their scheme: and this generally as it respects the nature of the office; its importance as a means of grace; a competent temporal support; the right of females to officiate; and the probable salvation of their present and proper ministrations. Their views and usages here are so well known, as not to require many quotations from their authors: indeed the way to put down error is to establish truth; and not to waste time and strength in chasing a serpent through all the windings of his flexile and lubricated path. Speaking however as a christian witness, and knowing my account in the eternal world, I record my hearty protest against their peculiar views; as false, specious, purely fanatical, and eminently ruinous to those whom they avail to influence!

I. THE NATURE OF THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE occurs to be considered. Its nature as God has made it, and as the scriptures evince it, I mean; and not as it has been abused by anybody: its nature, as involving distinctness of office; life-devotement to its service; constancy and regularity of officiating; a genuine call to its duties; the commission of its authority; the sanctions of its administration; its perpetuity in the world. I shall not think it neces-

sary distinctly and in form to treat of all these ; nor to care specially for the order announced.

1. *The distinctness of the ministerial office*, results from the nature of its duties ; their sacred importance ; the necessity of adequate qualifications ; the inhibition of the incompetent ; the duty of the church to try, and prove, and recognise, the competent ; and the whole tenor of scripture, speaking of the order and the office, its appropriate duties and solemn responsibilities, in a style suited to no other idea. What Barclay says about the distinction between the clergy and the laity, is little other than religious trifling and logomachy. If the order exists distinctly, then every one belongs to it, or—he does not. In this there is nothing disparaging or invidious, especially in our times. The latter class are called, by secular usage and common law, the laity, or people ; and the former, the clergy, or the order of clerks or scholars ; for reasons which history has told to all men.

2. *The ministerial commission*. In general, this is the whole written word of God ; in particular, those passages that condense the authority and the instructions of the service, in few and comprehensive and appropriate words ; and that declare the salvation or the damnation of men, the savor either “of death unto death” or “of life unto life,” according to their treatment of the gospel ; and these as the sanctions of God, to those to whom their ministrations are addressed. Thus, the whole volume is declared to be inspired eminently to this end, the accomplishing of the ministry ; “that the man of

God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Hence every preacher is required to conform his doctrine to that 'outward' rule; "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." He is required also to observe coherency, and the essential harmony of truth, and the analogy of faith in its proper outline, in all that he delivers; "Let us prophecy according to the proportion (objective symmetry or analogy) of faith." "And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," says the Savior: a sentence sufficient of itself to show the perpetuity of the office to the end of time; did not the spiritual wants of men, the same in all ages and in constant succession of generations, and the evident seal of the Spirit on a pure ministry in our own day; the experience of all genuine and accomplished christians; the history of those countries where such a ministry is enjoyed, in contrast with others that perishingly want that excellent ascension-gift of Christ; perfectly demonstrate the truth. The right and the duty and the responsibility of private judgment, however, is fully given in the scriptures: and there is it better guarded too than it can be possibly elsewhere. 2 Cor. 1:24. Acts, 17:11. 1 John, 4:1-5. John, 5:31-47. No protestant and no christian can probably over-estimate the importance of this right or the solemnity of this duty. To God we answer for its abuse. Liberty and responsibility ought always to accompany and mutually to qualify each other. Men are free—and they are accountable too! No claim of inspiration entitles a man, or a *woman*, to

be believed implicitly. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." "Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things."

The commission of Friends ——— where is it? In the inner man! in the anointing felt at the time! in "the fund of the soul!" in ——— light!

3. A minister of the gospel must be *devoted with his all and for life* to the service. The very nature, magnitude, difficulty, glory, of the work, demonstrate this. To what ought a man to be *devoted for life*; with all his powers absorbed, all his affections enamored, all his time employed, if not to this incomparable service? I will quote only one passage here. It is addressed to a young minister, and through him as well to every other minister of Christ. "GIVE ATTENDANCE TO READING, TO EXHORTATION, TO DOCTRINE. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. MEDITATE UPON THESE THINGS; GIVE THYSELF WHOLLY TO THEM; THAT THY PROFITING MAY APPEAR TO ALL:" or, "IN ALL," as is the original, with manifest preferableness; meaning, IN ALL THE BRANCHES AND PARTS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE OFFICE-WORK. From innumerable other testimonies of the "secondary rule," might the same be verified. But this is plain, full, indisputable. I only ask, What Quaker minister obeys it? The man who gives no "attendance to reading?" who abhors religious study? who de-

nounces theological application, as a profane way of preparing for public duty? who is a layman, while he preaches? and who, instead of "giving himself WHOLLY" to the things of the ministry, drives a prosperous trade all the week, and now and then on "first-day" delivers a rhapsody of inspired nonsense, to an edified assemblage, for ten or twelve minutes, or possibly only two sentences in three or ten months? The difference between a minister of the New Testament stamp, and an ordinary Quaker holder-forth, is so great and palpable, that to one who knows the appropriate characteristics of both, the attempt to prove it were superfluous and to illustrate it ridiculous. Some of the most ignorant simpletons in civilized society get inspired to preach among them; and "shear nonsense" indeed do they deliver: while tremulous gesticulation, groaning, drawling, whining, grimace, and most unearthly tunes of vocal sing-song, are the relief, and the accompaniment, and the compensation. I might here record some recollected specimens in point—but I forbear, with pity superseding the indignation it produces! Do they so obey the order of God, that their "profiting," their proficiency, "appears?" and that, "in all" the varied and lofty ramifications of the ministerial office? in interpretation, in knowledge, in doctrinal discrimination, in lucid developement, in richness of furniture, and so on? "Take heed unto thyself and to the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." Is this like their ministry, masculine or

feminine ? “ Jesus saith unto them, Have ye UNDERSTOOD all these things ? They say unto him, Yea, Lord. Then said he unto them, Therefore every scribe WHO IS INSTRUCTED unto the kingdom of heaven, is like unto a man that is an householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.” Matth. 13 : 52. “ And the Lord said, Who then is that FAITHFUL AND WISE STEWARD, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season ? Blessed is that servant whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing.” Luke, 12 : 42, 43. There is no such ministry among Friends, nothing like it in all the estate of their officers ; elders or ministers ; male or female. Some of their preachers, I speak of the best that I ever heard, have indeed a native vain of eloquence, and mental gifts of no ordinary respectability : still, their sermons are without method, concentration, or point. They show pathos and poetry of a certain kind ; but equally evince the folly that abhors mental discipline in preaching ; that calls it “ forbidden fruit ” (what a foolery) to premeditate and mature their message ; and that sincerely acts as if the Deity were just using their organs of utterance for his own speech, while they piously suffer it to “ go through ” them. Their edification, I deliberately believe, is mainly physical ; as much so as social sympathy, theatrical effect, pantomime, good animal spirits, nervous excitement, a solemn nap, “ renewing one’s strength ” by tranquil inaction, serene feeling, or electrical saturation ! See Barclay’s

physical analysis of "worship," in which he soberly proves its contagiousness, or that the inference is *catching in their society!* I often think of a charged battery of Leyden phials and a secret conductor, when I read him. To mysticise below the bathos or the abyss of all comprehension, wonderfully refreshes them. They are very fond of figurative reasoning and analogical illustration, incoherent and declamatory. In fact there is no particular need of their proving any thing. Inspiration "dwells like Uriel in the sun;" and must be right. They have no "Evangelists, or Pastors and Teachers," after the pattern of the New Testament. Their preachers often produce a great effect—on the nerves! Their incantations or cantillations are sonorous and affecting quite. But it is very much a physical effect, instead of a moral one: and their sages know little of the difference. To explain, demonstrate, define, instruct, and edify, in the pure faith of the gospel, is what the best of them do not. The scriptures they NEVER read in public worship. Their quotations are loose, disjointed, and almost all by common plagiarism from their books or their cotemporaries or recent predecessors—yet they vend it all for fresh inspiration, very sincerely. My own conviction is, after a full and perilous experience of their ways, that their ministry is altogether another sort of thing from that described in the New Testament; and that ordinarily a man might sit under it for half a century, and get all the good it was adapted to afford, and be mightily affected on every occasion, and considerably restrained and softened

and attenuated in his living practice ; without ever coming to know the way of salvation through Jesus Christ *as it is*, and without all the proper ends realized to his soul for which the evangelical ministry was divinely and certainly appointed. Not only does their influence omit to demonstrate—since it knows not—the real vitals of the gospel *as they are* ; it so blunts the edge of thought, mystifies the judgment, and pre-occupies the perceptions, that the devotee or disciple of their ways now spontaneously calls good, evil ; bitter, sweet ; and light, darkness. Attempt to reason the case—ah ! that is all in the will of man, in the wisdom of the schools, in the way of divines and doctors. Thus they are attached to the system as it were by infection communicated, or the *virtus* inoculated into the constitution : as Barclay says, “ it must be rather by a sensible [not spiritual] experience, and by coming to make proof of it, than by arguments,” that we are “ convinced ” of the excellence of their style of things. The senses, internal or external, have often a greater effect in *convincing* some persons, than evidence, even if it be the word of God ! “ Yea, and we doubt not, but assuredly know, that the meeting may be good and refreshful, though from the sitting down to the rising up thereof, there hath not been a word as outwardly spoken ; and yet *life* may have been known to abound in each particular, and an inward growing up therein and thereby.” He speaks of such an encounter in these silent meetings, “ that oftentimes, through the working thereof, the body will be greatly shaken, and many groans, and sighs,

and tears, even as the pangs of a woman in travail, will lay hold upon it." Hence, he says, "Our *work* then and *worship* is, when we meet together, for every one to *watch and wait upon God* in themselves, and to be *gathered* ⁶⁵ from all visibles thereunto." And then it is that "the good seed, as it ariseth, will be found to work as physic in the soul." Thus Barclay himself was *physically* converted to Quakerism—precisely as I was *not* converted from it to christianity: "not by strength of arguments, or by a particular disquisition of each doctrine, and convincement of my understanding thereby." Not so: "but by being secretly reached by this *life*." He adds, as a true and graphic auto-biographer; "for when I came into the *silent assemblies* of God's people, I felt a *secret power* among them, which touched my heart, and as I gave way unto it, I found the evil weakening in me, and the good raised up, and so I became thus knit and united unto them, hungering more and more after the increase of this power and life, whereby I might feel myself perfectly redeemed.—And indeed this is the surest way to become a *christian*,"——but enough! or, I will just add, this is the method of their administered ordinances! for "thus we are often greatly strengthened and renewed in the spirits of our minds without a word, and we enjoy and possess the *holy fellowship* and *communion of the body and blood of Christ*, by which our inward man is nourished and fed; which makes us not to dote upon outward *water*, and *bread*, and *wine*, in our spiritual things." They only dote upon *inward* water,

and bread and wine. But the christian ministry requires,

4. *Constancy and regularity of officiating* : this, ordinarily ; as well as all the extraordinary and inopportune and nameless ways in which one is required, seeking and watching all proper occasions to exert a wise but an aggressive and positive influence in favor of the gospel. It is plainly the duty of every preacher of the gospel to honor the following order of the Holy Ghost : “I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom ; preach the word ; be instant in season, out of season ; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine,” &c. 2 Tim. 4 : 1-4. Does this mean—keep silent meetings, that the spirits of the people may be “renewed without a word,” by a *secret* influence, galvanic, atmospheric, or *physical* of some other sort ? Friends often allege the importance of reflection, and the value of silent meetings as assisting it. But is this wise ? Why come together *socially*, for the sake of *solitary* thought ? We are indeed exhorted to “commune with our own heart and be still ;” but then it is “on our bed,” and not “in the great congregation.” Such duties are private and personal in their nature, and ought to be done in the “closet.” But public meetings are social ; and fit, as they were instituted by the great Head of the church, for public actions of worship ; such as preaching, prayer, singing, reading the scriptures, and the administration of the christian

sacraments. To come together into one place—to sit still, to reflect, to be mute, to hear no preaching of the word, and to celebrate no evangelical ordinance ; this is—Quakerism. Acts, 13 : 38-44. Matt. 13 : 3. “ Be instant,” i. e. urgent, aggressive, “ compelling them to come in :” Luke, 14 : 23, does this mean—that the preacher should wait for inspiration, an inward motion of life in the soul, by silent stillness, till “ the rest will find themselves *secretly smitten* without words, and that one will be as a *midwife* through the secret travails of his soul to bring forth the life in them, just as a little water thrown into a pump brings up the rest, whereby life will come to be raised in all,—and such a one is felt by the rest to minister life unto them without words !” What competent and impartial judge can think this to be other than *sorcery*, peculiarly refined ? It is no more the gospel than the fooleries of the *Koran* are ! “ In season :” does this mean that it is wrong to have *regular* seasons of preaching the word ? that to appoint such seasons and punctually to meet them, is all “ in the will of man ” and abominable to God ? “ Out of season ;” does this mean—*only* when you have been *sitting still* for a length of time, to get the *life* into play and pulsation ? only when you can *feel* yourself “ clothed ” with the living influence ? only when you can take out a new commission, like bread hot from the oven ? only when your nerves and your imagination have become charged with the light of Quakerism, the foxian touchwood or flame of an

ultra-spiritual vision? Quakerism, whatever else it may be, is *not* christianity.

5. *A genuine call to the duties of the ministerial office*, is one thing with Quakerism, and another thing with the religion of the New Testament. It was in the "openings" of a marvellous inspiration that George Fox was first called from the *last*, to preach about the *light*. In just such a way only, do Friends allow any other preacher to be designated. All that are not called in this way of theirs, are man-made preachers, and "divested of the noble name of *christian*."

On this subject, after I had obtained a hope in Christ Jesus, and felt "joy and peace in believing," according to the glorious *written* gospel of God, I was perplexed for a time with the recurrence of the old leaven, the secret influence, which they think the very artery of spiritual life, thrilling with its freshest circulations. The word of God was my universal solvent, my panacea, my philosopher's stone, my elixir of life! I was "thoroughly furnished" by its wisdom. There I soon saw that the way of fanatical imposture was that which troubled me, and *quite another way* that indicated in the genuine oracles. To be possessed of THE PROPER QUALIFICATIONS—this was the criterion, according to that volume of "truth and soberness:" and this question was to be judged for myself and by myself in the first instance, and then for others by my spiritual superiors in the church of God. I resolved these qualifications into the following; (1) *sincere piety*, as a lover of God and a disciple of Jesus

Christ ; (2) *a desire of the office*, enlightened, practical, predominating, hearty, and in a sense *inextinguishably strong* ; (3) *competent intellectual talents, natural and acquired* ; (4) *suitable bodily powers*, as health, vigor, voice ; (5) *a willingness to submit to authority*, and to honor the proper power of government in the church, by being subject to it for Christ's sake, as well as by exercising it on the same account ; and (6) *the sanction of the church of God*, on due experiment as a probationer. These I approved as constituting the qualifications, from which the inference is valid that he who possesses them is ordinarily called of God to the work of the ministry. [Extraordinary calls, such as that of Paul, are *never* to be looked for, and are now *never* repeated. Hence on the matter of QUALIFICATIONS the burden of the New Testament pervadingly reposes. As soon as we hear of "desiring the office," it is pronounced "a good work ;" and the qualifications are specified that authorize incumbency and investiture. The candidate must *look to these solemnly*, for his own satisfaction ; then must the church and all men, for their satisfaction. 1 Tim. 3 : 1-7. Tit. 1 : 5-11. 2 Tim. 2 : 1-26. 3 : 1-17. 4 : 1-8. Now nothing is plainer to me than this—that no Friend either does or can possess the requisite qualifications ; and consequently no Friend, as such, is called of God, or has any right to be owned by man, as a minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Is a Friend, for example, "apt to teach" or to—sit still ? does he give himself "wholly" to his work ? or only partially, fitfully, and as his more absorbing secular

profession permits? Is he seen “holding fast the faithful word AS HE HATH BEEN TAUGHT, THAT HE MAY BE ABLE BY SOUND DOCTRINE BOTH TO EXHORT AND TO CONVINCe THE GAINSAYERS?” Does he “give attendance to READING, to EXHORTATION, to DOCTRINE?” Has he any official “gift,” with “the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery?” Does he even profess to act or officiate under the high commission of the volume of inspiration, which, its author declares, was written on purpose and mainly to equip and accomplish the christian ministry? Let men of sense, unprejudiced and independent, answer the questions.

II. ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE OFFICE AS A MEANS OF GRACE, I have little to say. Brevity will suffice. I think the word of God very clearly authorizes this declaration, that, EXTRAORDINARIES APART, THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY, POSSESSING THE COMPETENT QUALIFICATIONS, IS INDISPENSABLE TO SALVATION. All history and observation confirm the whole tenor of scripture in these two positions; 1. That man is an apostate and desperately wicked creature universally; 2. That God ordinarily uses the ministry of the gospel, as his way of bringing sinners to exercise “repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.”

This view is the antipodes of what “Friends believe.” And truly, when they value the ministry as of very little worth, I grant that their estimate is wise and rational—if *they mean their own!* It is of very little worth, sure enough! They could get to heaven by the light within, just as soon, or sooner,

without as with it. And, say they, when they hear our view, "what will become of the heathen?" Answer, they are all to be converted by Friends' *missionary* efforts—or saved by the light *in every one* of them! I also will ask them a question; What is to become of "the whole world" that "lieth in wickedness?" What will become of some worse heathen at home, who need to be taught "which be the first principles of the doctrine of Christ?" See Rom. 10 : 11–17, where we are told not only of the efficacy of faith, and of its indispensableness, but of the mode of its occurrence. "So then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the [spoken] word of God." The gloss of Barclay on the context I pronounce false and contemptible. Paul is introducing no objector; in that lucid chain of interrogatories, which leads to the conclusion I have cited. He is only preparing the way to show, vs. 18–21, that salvation does not follow without faith, even where the gospel is enjoyed. 1 Cor. 1 : 18–31. Rom. 10 : 20–22. Luke, 10 : 1, 2. Rom. 1 : 20–32. 2 : 1–12–16. But I proceed,

III. To consider the topic of *a competent temporal support*, as the due of the ministry according to human and divine laws equally. If the work is one that engrosses the "laborer;" that requires self-devotement for life; that absorbs most properly all his time and talents; that occupies him wholly for the good of others:—why ought he to be starved to death for conformity to the divine requisitions? Tell me not of abuses—I am treating of uses only; besides, from abuse to disuse, of a good thing, is a

fool's argument. A worldly establishment, a sordid money-making traffic in benefices, the abominations of simony, the sin of pluralities, the distraint and the modern doctrine of tithes, a secular enforcement of "church rates," or an implication against the fundamental principle that "the kingdom of Christ is not of this world;" none of these is in the argument or need be in the objection. "But suppose one loves the wages more than the work?" Why—THEN HE IS AN "HIRELING;" and dying so, he will be lost forever! But are there none of your own clergy in that predicament? Very probably. Are there none of your own laity in the same condemnation? Know ye not that if a man practise physic and love the wages supremely, "mammon," and not "the Father," is his God; and "wrath abideth on him?" Friends often argue as if *the sacred service* was the only one in which it were sin to prefer emolument to higher considerations; or in which there was any temptation to covetousness. I pray they may not wait for the 'outward' light of eternity to teach them, that, in whatever profession or sphere a man may be placed, he is obligated to love God supremely; and has *no* piety without doing it; and is "an idolater," and so with "no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God," if he be "a covetous man." Now, why cannot a man from motives as pure as those of Paul, accept a competent income from the congregation he serves—without loving it or valuing it inordinately at all? A physician *ought* to be as really benevolent as a minister of the gospel. He ought to love his patient, seek his good in the ex-

ercise of a pure and a divine benevolence ; and he *ought to be paid* for his services ! And suppose this is the case, in reference to many of that noble and godlike calling ; as I believe it is ; for I have the happiness to know certain members of the profession whose real piety and whose unobtrusive self-denying beneficence, will receive, I think, a gracious and a glorious premium at “the resurrection of the just :” now, in reference to such, how *reasonable* would it be to call them “hirelings !” to say they ought “to work for nothing and find themselves !” to vilify their motives as pre-eminently base, because they receive for their services, (*not* for their benevolent feelings,) a proper compensation ! or to object to *such* that the business is often abused ; and that knaves and quacks and false pretenders in abundance impose upon the public most feloniously ! The doctrine of motives, however, is not more cardinal here than every where ! it is applicable alike to every man in the world ! Is it in the ministry, or the learned professions, alone, that “hirelings” are to be found ? or is it no sin out of the sacred office, and in the common callings of life ?

Friends indeed ought in justice to receive no support under the law of Christ’s house, that they “who preach the gospel should live of the gospel :” for, first, the amount of service they render plainly and equitably deserves, in ordinary, no compensation. They are not devoted “wholly” or devoted at all, in their occasional and incoherent speakings ; nor *can* they be ! inspiration is too unmanageable

and uncertain, as well as too dignified! Second, They ought not to receive any compensation, BECAUSE THEY DO NOT "PREACH THE GOSPEL." They do not even *preach!* They only jump up and let the Spirit use their devoted organs, now and then, to convey a fresh message to a meeting, otherwise "silent," and dreaming *possibly* more at random. Besides, the matter conveyed is—Quakerism and *not* the gospel! But, we will change the aspect of the subject.

1. It is a fact that Friends sometimes, on a travelling expedition in behalf of the light, DO PRACTICALLY RECOGNISE ALMOST THE IDENTICAL PRINCIPLE FOR WHICH WE CONTEND! and that not merely when a "sincere" foreigner (I particularly respect the individual to whom I refer) goes from America to Europe, and even to the presence of the northern Czar, (Alexander,) to diffuse the light, or to blow on the almost expiring flame "within" somebody; or when a public *Friendess* gets an oracular impulse to go to London (never to Shiraz or Constantinople) on such lucid errand, whether her husband and her nursery cares permit it or not; but even on a tour of domestic missionary crusading, such as occasionally occurs, as a work very like supererogation; there is a bill of traveling expenses and so forth, sometimes pretty large, to be "silently" defrayed by the society! There are *other ways* too, (some of which I *know*,) of doing the thing, that better save appearances!

2. It is strange that Friends do not carry out their principles more thoroughly and impartially!

If it is wrong to be a "hireling" or "a priest," and to perform their services, is it not wrong to be partakers with them too? Hear the order of God; "neither be partaker of other men's sins: keep thyself pure." How guilty then are the whole society in many respects! for example, on supposition that they read their English Bible as much as they would have us all infer! for who made *that* Bible? Alas! it was notoriously made by *learned* Priests, Hirelings, Bishops, Professors, and others, from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge; and at the orders of a warlike worldly king, called, profanely enough, Defender of the faith, Head of the church, &c. &c. The convention of translators [54 of them] did it all "in the will of man," were paid handsomely for doing it, and never pretended to be helped by "inward light," which was then at least one-third of a century earlier than the epoch of its foxian radiations. Now, to say nothing of the sermons, hymns, and other devout publications that they sometimes read and teach their children, and which were all made by notorious Priests, Hirelings, Bishops, Doctors, and such like, is it right for Friends to encourage *that* Bible? I leave the solemn casuistry with their conscience; only reminding them of the *bad origin* it had! almost as bad as *you* to one person!

3. I would ask Friends especially in the city of Philadelphia, to consider at their leisure the history of many of their *inspirati* since the commencement of the present century! those that have been rather distinguished preachers and more distinguish-

ed merchants—in *different* departments of trade! Are there none to prove that, even with *their* sagacity in business, seculars and sacreds do ill agree when mixed in a profession?—that confidence obtained and money loaned on the capital of affluent ‘inward light,’ and a consequent splash in business, has often terminated in a subsequent crash of bankruptcy, and “dealings,” and even “disownment?” that particular favor and enlargement “in the gallery,” though it may show the extraordinary illuminism of the preacher, is not equally a qualification for merchandizing to ultimate advantage? and that when Friends in “easy circumstances,” have been found willing specially to aid a “public Friend” in his commercial enterprizes, they have sometimes hazarded their funds upon an endorsement that neither heaven nor earth would make good to them? In the church of which it is my honor and pleasure to be a member and a servant, the reason assigned canonically of a competent maintenance, for a located and wholly devoted pastor, is that “he may be free from worldly cares and avocations;” while ENTIRELY occupied in a holy and laborious “work,” the weight of which might well crush the shoulders of an angel, without the accompanying and all-sufficient grace of “the Lord God omnipotent!”

But did not Christ himself say, “Freely ye have received; freely give.” How is this to be reconciled with the common positions of the clergy? I answer,

1. Not by interpreting it to contradict other

things that he said; and especially as if it were designed to nullify the certain law of his house, in many places laid down and most incontestably demonstrated; as shall be amply shown hereafter.

2. The sentence occurs *once only* in the New Testament; and that under circumstances quite peculiar and extraordinary. Matt. 10 : 8. See from verse 7 to 15. How *much oftener* is it found in the writings and preachings of Friends—who like no other verse of the nine as well as that, which enables them so piously to denounce the clergy! I would however *inform* them of one other verse or sentence there contained, which they may find it very mysterious or difficult to comprehend.

3. *Jesus also said*, verse 10, “for the workman is worthy of his meat;” as elsewhere, Luke, 10 : 7. “for the laborer is worthy of his hire.” Now observe, unless a *moral* inability should disqualify (as it cannot exonerate) the reader, the argument of the Redeemer: he lays down a universal law that service should be compensated; and he applies this to the ministry on the same occasion. It is “the workman,” not one who is no workman; it is “the labourer,” not the man who “sits still” and never really makes a business of his duties or ever properly performs them, that is pronounced “worthy” of a temporal support. For observe, Christ introduces this canon of universal righteousness to seal and sanction his charge to them to make no provision for their journey! Why? because, others must make it for them! *because*, “the workman is worthy of his meat!” Other reasons also appear.

4. They *were empowered in plenitude to work all kinds of miracles* ; to “ heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils :” all this he charges them also to do ; and then *immediately* adds, “ Freely ye have received, freely give.” The reason is obvious, and the consistency of the whole is plain. It means, Do not make merchandise, nor aim at wealth, nor sell at a specific cost, nor sell at all, in the benevolent exercise of your powers. Heal and cure all you can ; and do it gratuitously. You must not be mercenary, or sordid ; you must not think to make your fortunes, or exercise these gifts in any worldly money-making way or for your own secular behoof. “ And Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him,” was one of them. We can easily see how propense *he* might have been, and how tempted even the others, to make a fortune, a princely one, as (humanly speaking) easily they might, with such powers and functions at their control ! Let us here distinguish between a support while occupied in the work ; and a money-making career of avarice and sacrilege. The latter is wholly forbidden, even in its first principles ; the former, is approved and inculcated : both in the same connection, in the same charge, and by the authority of the same Savior ! How impartial is Quakerism ! How sharp-sighted ! How disinterested ! How magnanimous ! How candid ! How *inspired* ! According to the *light*, the workman is *not* worthy of his meat ! nor the laborer of his hire ! there is no difference between receiving a competent support, for service of the most exalted and beneficial kind, per-

formed with labor, sacrifice, toil; and a reprobate and "hireling" delinquency in office! Besides, What was it that they had "freely received?" I answer, *the power of miracles specifically!* And how is it that a competent ministry in our day becomes such! how gets it the qualifications plainly requisite! Is it by native talent, by intuition, by construction, by miraculous endowment! Not so: but by the most exhausting and devoted application comparatively ever exemplified! by study, meditation, midnight vigils, years of thoughtful and debilitating care; by prayer; by fasting; by afflictions; by spiritual exercises of their own intensity and solemnity; by self-denial; by ignominy, persecution often, contempt in some relations, slander of motives, mean prevaricating envy, being made the theme of infidel jargon and debate, "the song of the drunkard," the jest of the mirthful, the raillery of the profane, and the object of *inspired* denunciation.

The very butt of slander, and the blot
For every shaft that malice ever shot!—COWPER.

A *competent* education for the ministry, where no miracles are, cannot, I maintain, be acquired by any man on the globe, without cost, time, occupation, and absorption of soul, through a process of seasoning and preparation; which ought in everlasting equity to be *considered* in the argument! so that our non-miraculous acquisitions, as every one *knows* that makes them, have never come to us

“freely” in the sense of the passage. Just the reverse. Under God, we have attained them (our official furniture—I mean) by our own self-denying personal effort, through a term of devoted years! Under God, we have made them painfully ourselves! Under God, whose strength has been our all in the agony, we are self-made and self-qualified “stewards of the mysteries of God.” God qualifies men for glory and for office both, in a way which gives no premium to idleness, no sanction to presumption, no palliation to the hateful sin of supineness. Drones, idlers, usurpers, he abhors together; and he abhors “sorcerers” too, however *refined* their principles, or covert their address, or unknown to men their secret practisings! Rev. 21 : 8, 27. I say more on this topic, because Friends have it stereotyped and docketed, for inexhaustible service in calumniating the ministers of God.

But we cannot think a fixed salary, a regular income, proper; we object to stated compensation and a stipendiary ministry. Do you? *How often* would you be willing, and *how much* as related to the wants of life, to pay for the support of the ministry? *How long* ought the intervals of starvation to be; and *how certain* the instances of ‘something’ grudgingly afforded, to encourage the appetite, or to clothe the limbs, or to house the person, in the mean time? I would know too *who* gave you what you have? WHO “gave himself for you?” and WHOM do you “rob,” if you starve or straiten meanly the ministers of his religion, who is “a jealous God?” Mal. 3 : 8-18.

Where service is regular ; where all the hours and powers are absorbed "wholly" in it ; where wants are constant and inevitable to "men in the body ;" where a family as dear as others is dependent ; where all the reasons of support exist uniformly : why should "a competent worldly maintenance" be denied by those very persons who enjoy the divine advantage of the ministry ? It will be seen that we are not eleemosynary in our argument. We are not mendicants, paupers, alms-askers, or place-men. We believe it just, not kind ; right, not charitable ; due, not given ! and this by common equity and divine authority united ! We mean that the "workman is WORTHY of his meat ; the laborer, of his hire." We mean that while the rich and the poor should contribute together, "according to their several ability," so that there might "be an equality" of assessment ; it should be done by both as a holy offering, a privilege, a duty, an act of worship to the Lord ; as that to withhold which were as bad as simony, as wrong as sacrilege. We mean, however, that every man should be left to his perfect freedom and responsibility in the matter ; that no secular tax should be levied for collection by the magistracy ; that no coercion should be used in the church of God, *forcing* them to honor the laws of Christ—that is, to dishonor them. We place the position upon the basis of moral and evangelical law alone : and say, if any man scorn, let him answer it to God. We want no grudging contributors ; no press-gang for recruiting volunteers ; no civil legislation or taxation on the subject. "My king-

dom is not of this world." Wo be to the system that denies it" !⁶⁶

But did not Paul refuse to receive such compensation ? Answer,

1. That he did on several occasions ; and the same is often done, to my certain knowledge, by the ministry of our day. There are occasions that demand, and others that become, a surrendry of right in the premises. These occasions existed more in the case and work and relations of the apostles, and the preachers of the first ages, introducing and establishing christianity with its lasting jurisdiction in the world, than to the same extent they ever can in all probability again. But mark the difference. Friends (1) argue from the exception, and not from the rule. (2) They deny the law of Christ respecting support, because some of his noble servants occasionally decline the claim it gives them. (3) They *nullify the virtue of the acts they panegyryze* ; for, if there be no law in favor of support, there is plainly no right to it ; if there is prohibition of a maintenance, it were treason and perjury to demand it ; if it were sin and gross iniquity to receive it, where, I ask, is *the great virtue* of declining it ? In what a ridiculous *light* do they place those generous men, who tell us, as if it were worthy of approbation at least, that they voluntarily forewent—that to which they had no right ! they magnanimously forebore—from the sin of sacrilege ! their exalted apostolic virtue most exemplarily—omitted to rob the church of God ! Is it for such distinguished virtue as this, or for self-denial equal-

ly illustrious, that preachers of the society, male and female, expect the reward of everlasting life? Well! We may soon expect to see men claiming statues, obelisks, and monumental honors, from congress, for the enormous civic virtues of not setting houses on fire, or practising assassination, or robbing banks, or for denying themselves from such desired gratifications; if these principles of illumination become prevalent! But, (4) Paul did something beside demit his claim magnanimously, when just occasion offered: he laid down the law of Christ's house on the subject at large; maintained his own right to what he spontaneously declined; accepted "wages" of the better minded, at the very time, that, thus supported, he served others, and these wealthy as those were not, from whom (and it was their "inferiority" and dishonor) he refused to receive any thing. All this is most certain truth. I am both sure of it, and sure that I can prove it against all sober objections; and that from many passages: I will however refer only to two. The first occurs in 1 Cor. 9: 1-16. The reader may peruse it all, to verse 27, if he will: for the argument is continuous and glorious. I shall give its scope with select quotations.


Corinth was the rich and niggardly community whom Paul served at the charges of the Macedonian churches, who were comparatively poor. In that city he was their missionary; and also in his extremity, he there "wrought" at tent-making for a time, rather than receive any thing from them. Acts, 18: 3. His reasons we shall see hereafter—






Friends may well dread to look at them! In the eighth chapter he is discussing the casuistry of using "things offered unto idols;" and after despatching the main points, he introduces and largely enforces this principle; *that christian liberty ought not to be abused; and that often one's own rights are to be foregone and surrendered for the sake of the gospel.* This principle he illustrates in the whole of the ninth chapter, and then more applies it in the tenth and onward. But *how* illustrates he it? Mark! by citing his own example toward themselves. He had the perfect liberty and the perfect right to a competent temporal support; but he was so far from insisting on it *from them*, that *from them* he refused it perseveringly. "Am I not an apostle? am I not free?" he inquires. "Mine answer to them that do examine me," (they were probably Friends—so ancient is the sect substantially in several aspects,) "is this; Have we not power (right, authority) to eat and to drink? Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? (Peter?) or I only and Barnabas," are we specially excluded from it? "have not we power to forbear working? Who goeth a warfare [he might perhaps afford to "sit still" in meeting] at any time at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, THOU SHALT NOT MUZZLE

THE MOUTH OF THE OX THAT TREADETH OUT THE CORN. Doth God take care for oxen? or saith he it ALTOGETHER FOR OUR SAKES? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that ploweth, should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope, should be partaker of his hope. IF WE HAVE SOWN UNTO YOU SPIRITUAL THINGS, IS IT A GREAT THING IF WE SHALL REAP YOUR CARNAL THINGS?" Yes! Paul. Friends know by inspiration that such a reaping would prove you a base reprobate, a hireling, a hypocrite! But let us farther listen to Paul's heresy. "If others be partakers of this POWER OVER YOU, are not we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power; but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ. Do ye not know that they who minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple; and they who wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar? EVEN SO HATH THE LORD ORDAINED THAT THEY WHO PREACH THE GOSPEL SHOULD LIVE OF THE GOSPEL." What could be plainer or more decisive? Friends have a method of evading it however which is sufficiently mean. It is by saying that it is a spiritual "living of the gospel;" and the compensation of enjoying "holy things" more than others, that is meant. I will tell an anecdote. A Friend, in one of his moon-struck peregrinations of preaching, came with his retinue to a village and held a conventicle. There he denounced the wickedness of supporting the regular ministrations of the gospel, and especially his who stately officiated

in the place : and among other things, “ clearly seen in the light ” which “ makes manifest and deceives nobody,” was this gloss, just given, about *spiritual* living and “ holy things ” in the ministry. After the sedentary engagement was adjourned, a layman asked an interview with the preacher. O yes! was the reply; all kindness and good will to men: perfectly willing to see the friend. I thought, sir, said he, that Paul was a christian, till I heard your sermon this afternoon. The Friend looked, and answered, O certainly; I never meant to say he was not a christian. Thee is in a mistake surely. Rejoined the querist, Well, possibly. But let us see. You said that they were ‘ holy things ’ alone that Paul respected. I did. But Paul immediately declares——‘ But I have used none of these things.’ Now, if he never used them, and they were essentially spiritual and holy things, and he even ‘ gloried,’ v. 15. in total abstinence from them, how could he be a christian? Will you, sir, who know, inform me? O Friend, I see thee is in no mind to be instructed. Farewell. Thus endeth the story.

I now pass to the other passage to which I referred; premising its historical as well as moral connection with the former. Before I quote, I will beg the serious or the honest reader to *peruse it carefully once*: 2 Cor. 11 : 7-15. The outline of its history is this. In Paul’s absence from Corinth, where he first broke ground and “ planted ” the church alone, many false teachers had “ unawares crept in ;” and were bent upon decoying or rather reforming the church away from Paul. They impeached his mo-

tives ; denied his apostleship ; derided his pretensions ; tried to supersede his influence, to defame his orthodoxy, to degrade his person, and to ruin his usefulness. Among other things, they accused him of being a “ hireling ” in his general practice, and of preaching for money ; and to put him down and keep the elevated vantage-ground above him, they gloried in their own preaching without fee, emolument, or reward ! they were as disinterested exactly as Friends—in vilifying the ministry of God. And they seem for a time to have prospered in their corrupting influence. ON THESE ACCOUNTS, be it known, he would receive nothing in the way of salary from the church at Corinth. Not that many pious persons there were unwilling to do their duty : he would accept nothing *from them*, because of these innovating competitors. He preferred to receive a salary from the poor churches at the North ; this was the dishonor of the one, the lasting renown of the other. With this exposition, take his words ; and observe how *charitable* real inspiration is, toward those who corrupt the truth, traduce the ministry, and “ pervert the right ways of the Lord.” Thus ; “ Have I committed an offence in abasing myself that ye might be exalted,” i. e. with the benefit, “ because I have preached unto you the gospel of God freely ? I robbed other churches,  TAKING WAGES OF THEM, to do you service. And when I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man : for that which was lacking to me, the brethren who came from Macedonia supplied : (see chap. 8 : 1-6, for the resources and the financiering of their be-

nevolence :) and in all things I have kept myself from being burdensome unto you, and so will I keep myself. As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia :” i. e. in Corinth and its wide vicinity. He proceeds. “ Wherefore ? because I love you not ? God knoweth.” He means to deny that want of love to them was the reason of such ill-looking independence. The real reasons of it he next specifies ; let Friends hear it and tremble in a new vocation, and quake on a just account. “ But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them that desire occasion ; that wherein they glory,  they may be found even as we. For such  are false apostles,  deceitful workers,  transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.—  And no marvel ; for satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if HIS MINISTERS also be TRANSFORMED AS THE MINISTERS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS ; whose end”—alas ! they little think of it—“ shall be according to their works.” On this I remark, 1. That Friends are a very ancient society in some of their peculiarities. The opposers of clerical influence at Corinth were enlightened much in their way. Their leader resembled “ an angel of *light*,” more luciferous, for aught I know, than Fox himself. The apostle very often sketches their portrait, or traces a limb of their body, in other places of his epistles to the Corinthians. He felt about their preaching, which I suppose was equally *sincere* with theirs, very much, to be plain, as I do respecting that of Friends, as

related to the salvation of souls. 2 Cor. 11 : 1-6. "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh PREACHETH ANOTHER JESUS, whom we have not preached; or if ye RECEIVE ANOTHER SPIRIT, which ye have not received, or ANOTHER GOSPEL, which ye have not accepted; ye might well bear with me." The last word is improperly *him* in our translation. 2. They resembled Friends in the distinguishing doctrine that the christian ministry, apostles and all, had no right to a temporal support; and in this immense and vaporing disinterestedness (pride with a holy mask) "they gloried." A style of masquerade this, that has been long in vogue and appears to admirable advantage! Hence Paul, to "cut off" the "occasion" of their boasting, and fix himself on the same level with them in that particular, would never accept any maintenance from Corinth. "For what is it," he inquires, "wherein YE WERE INFERIOR TO OTHER CHURCHES, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? FORGIVE ME THIS WRONG!" 12 : 13. 1 Thess 2 : 6, 9. It was not I, Friends, that made the truth! 3. They are denounced as ministers of the devil; denounced by an apostle of God! This is solemn sentiment indeed! My pen seems to loiter and its ink to freeze. Like the archfiend himself, their *light* was very much annoyed by "the word of God." And yet their characteristic glorying was in their gratuitous ministry; as it impeached Paul and the "other apostles" (1 Cor.

9 : 5.) of "hireling" baseness. Like satan too, whose ministers they were, they preached without a salary : for *he* has been notoriously engaged in preaching *gratis* from the beginning! Who gave him a call to the see of Eden? who paid him for his first sermon there? It was all disinterested, all without fee, all opposed to a stipendiary ministry! What a veteran he, in the anti-salary cause! What a venerable precedent! What an ancient example! Could a real "angel of light" set off the matter more luminously as it ought to be! Hence all the whole succession of ministerial agents, that have taken orders under his renowned authority, and gloried in their amazing virtue in abstaining from that to which they had (they said) no right, and which it were spiritual felony (they said) to touch; have resembled each other not only in that particular, but peculiarly, since the christian era, in their organized antipathy to Paul! and generally in their devout and spiritual objection to the 'outward' testimony, called *improperly*, "THE WORD OF GOD!" They must at Corinth have put the epistles of Paul, I ween, very low down as "a secondary rule!" They did all they could to show the people there "a more noble and excellent rule," than the 'outward' one of Paul's ministry. It was a fine occasion for some such "opening" as that of "the light in every man." I remark, once more, on this tremendous passage, which not one Friend in ten thousand understands; 4. That the criterion of their development and detection was, what it is, SIMPLY THE WORD OF GOD, THE INSPIRED SCRIP-

TURES. One object, a great one, of the second epistle to the Corinthians, was to apprise the church of the real character and correspondence of the innovators, and help them to the proper criterion of discrimination. The same etherial test remains to this day ! The principles involved are precisely the same. All the children of false *light* tremble at its inquisition and degrade its dignity. By what other, not to say better, touchstone, shall corrupters be tried ? By their own inspiration ? that oracle sustains them. By their smoothness ? You can as soon condemn "an angel of light." By their good works ? Why, they are "transformed as the ministers of righteousness;" and they know how to act their part so as "to deceive, if it were possible, the very elect." Blessed be God, this is ultimately impossible ! The main reason, however, as the means of *their* conservation in the truth, is this ; they judge not by "the appearance;" they judge "righteous judgment," impartially using in all directions "the measuring reed" of angels and of saints, which is **THE WORD OF GOD**. Observe the style in which the Spirit of God denounces these gratuitous preachers : he denounces them *in a class* ! "for *such* are false apostles." He says not *these*, as if referring personally to the men at Corinth : but *such as these* οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι, meaning *all such*, no matter where or when they live. 'Behold, the picture. Is it like—like whom ?' It is *not* like the original of a true minister of the true God. In Palestine there were forty-eight cities of the Levites ; a tribe (one-twelfth of the population) devot-

ed to sacerdotal service, maintaining the worship of God; and the whole population required to contribute proportionately to sustain the provisionary institute. "EVEN SO HATH THE LORD ORDAINED THAT THEY WHO PREACH THE GOSPEL SHOULD LIVE OF THE GOSPEL." If this were not "a secondary rule," and to be so "esteemed," I should think its evidence quite conclusive. No doubt at all have I, possessing no light within that can nullify the word of God, that it is indeed his ordinance divine that the ministry of his gospel should be supported as competently and regularly as their wants recur; that it is the duty of every person in the world in some way to contribute heartily to this end; that a faithful ministry deserve such a support, if any other class of "workmen" in society deserve it; that it is the direct and supreme interest of all men, and of all communities, to honor this constitution; that no local community can *afford* to do without its permanent influence; and that *every other theory* in the case is human and not divine, wrong and not right, and as much opposed to the temporal as it is more terribly to the eternal interests of our kind! Every place in the world needs the benefit and the blessing of a competent and regular christian ministry—ininitely more than they need—in contrast or competition—wealth, health, or any sublunary good! But I have no more to say, rich as the subject is—except this: to oppose the competent temporal maintenance of the christian ministry, is the work of the murderer of souls; is unreasonable; unscriptural; is ad-


verse to the highest interests of probationary man ; and to be resolved into the unity and the infidelity, the deceit and the real irreligion, of the reign of antichrist and the empire of death. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

IV. On the right of females to the ministerial office, equal with that of the other sex, as alleged by Friends, I shall remark in conclusion.

1. They say, "male and female" are all one in Christ ; therefore they are alike competent. Answer, for the same reason, so are "barbarian and scythian, bond and free, wise and unwise," girls and boys ! The premises do not warrant the conclusion. They refer to membership and communion ; not to office and station in the church. Nor do such expressions refer at all to the subject of the ministry ; and where such reference is plain, women are as plainly prohibited. But,

2. They have very valuable gifts, that ought not to be lost to the church. True. For one I am less offended rather, to hear an inspired *woman* than man ! But is there no way for their gifts to be exercised, economized, and honored ; but by publicity, headship, office, and a face of nudity staring at hundreds of men ! "for IT IS A SHAME for women to speak in the church."⁶⁷

3. The Lord has used them aforetime, as say the scriptures. I reply, (1) You here argue from the exception, not the rule. Deborah, Huldah, and a very few others, were occasionally and rarely employed in extraordinary circumstances and for ends as uncommon. But, was this *ordinary* at all ? Who


ever heard of such a monster, in the history of the Jewish priesthood, as a priestess! A heathen Pythoness or vestal indeed—but no such order, no such thing, among the Israel of God! With Friends the order exists. Ordinarily too the *inspiratae*—inspired women—are far the more numerous bench. Matrons and spinsters sometimes doubly outnumber their masculine co-presbyters; and often out-preach them too, in quantity and quality, matter and manner! (2) When they allege it as proper to the new dispensation peculiarly, to equalize the sexes in office, they argue again from most questionable premises. Jesus Christ often sent out preachers, on one occasion “seventy” at once; but, in no recorded instance of his ministry did he  EVER ORDAIN OR AUTHORIZE A WOMAN TO PREACH THE GOSPEL. (3) When they speak of a woman “prophesying,” and quote Acts, 2:17, 18. 21:9. and possibly a few less considerable places; we can easily reply (what no evidence can answer or refute) first, That such an inference as theirs would demonstrate the worst kind of absolute contradiction in the scriptures; where it is a proper rule of interpreting, to compare related passages, to let the book speak for itself, to prefer the clear to the doubtful, the certain to the uncertain, the easy to the difficult; and not the contrary. And, second, That the word *prophecy* with all its cognates, is used throughout the Bible with such latitude as to show that it is generic, not specific; and of itself determines *nothing* in respect to office!⁶⁸ The passage quoted from Joel, refers mainly to the ordinary cha-

racters of a true revival of religion, where the young and the old of both sexes are brought to believe and love the gospel. Hence their speech is different. Every one of them in some way begins to "prophecy;" for, "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Third. In that age of miracles and prodigies and portents, no doubt, the exceptions were to be more expected, and were probably more frequent; still, they were exceptions to the rule, and exceptions only, that confirmed it.

My main position is, That *the rule is laid down in the New Testament as clear as day, and as absolute as the authority of God*, AGAINST A FEMALE MINISTRY. If this is proved, we *must* infer the fallacy of their whole system too; for it stands on a kind of inspiration—"strange fire"—that sanctions such a ministry.

I will here refer to two passages, each of which, and more especially both, are conclusive. If any one will not consent to this, I am sure that it is of no use to argue with him. There are multitudes of "unreasonable and wicked men, for all men have not faith;" 2 Thess. 3:2, from whom we may well pray, as did Paul, "that we may be delivered." If any man or woman is resolved, at all events, in the true temper of the *fides carbonaria* or believing what others believe with whom we were educated; I can only say, my mind is not so disciplined. I prefer evidence, truth, divine authority. To believe without evidence or against it, may justly define an infidel, but never a christian.

The first passage occurs in 1 Cor. 14: 29-40.

Here the apostle speaks of the manner in which "the prophets" or public ministers are to exercise their gifts : mark, the prophets or regular ministry ; not the people or all indiscriminately. But are females authorized ? Hear ! " Let your women keep silence in the churches ; for it is not permitted unto them to speak : but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law." I infer, 1. That both dispensations are alike in this matter. The gospel forbids them ; " as also saith the law." Shall we charge the Holy Ghost with judaizing ? 2. That women, as such, are forbidden " to speak ;" which " IS NOT PERMITTED UNTO THEM." They are positively commanded to " keep silence in the churches :"—not " a silent meeting ;" for the other sex speak. Barclay, and other phosphors " whose fire was kindled at *that* prophet's lamp," allege that this was only a special interdict under which the ladies at Corinth were put, because of their remarkable garrulity and forwardness ; with a few other things about as wise. I reply—the allegation is manifestly false ! It is a shameful fabrication AGAINST the plainest evidence. The reasons alleged by the apostle, here and elsewhere, are plainly universal ; no honesty with its eyes open can restrict them to the females of any particular church. " And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home ; for  IT IS A SHAME FOR WOMEN TO SPEAK IN THE CHURCH." A young spinster of the vocation, once asked me if I would *literalize* the order above as to " asking their husbands ?" I replied substantially thus ; Not in these times. And

if you demand, why virgin ladies were not prohibited by statute, the only reason of which I can think is this—there was then no occasion for it : the young females of that church and that age, were too sensible and modest ever to think of the shameful usurpation ! “ What ! came the word of God out from you ? ” Are you the centre and the metropolis of all christendom, from which the word of God radiated toward others ? or rather, a place on its distant frontier, that ought to aspire to learn, rather than teach, what practices are fit ? “ or came it unto you only ? ” Are you the only pagans that it reached and christianized, that you should innovate and be examples in the matter ? “ If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual,” yes, if he happen to think himself peculiarly full of light, “ let *him* acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are ☞ THE COMMANDMENTS OF THE LORD. But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant.”

I omit the consideration here of a passage of more difficulty, for that reason alone. I allude to 11 : 3-16, of THE SAME EPISTLE ; and remark, 1. That having faithfully pondered its meaning, I have no doubt of what it is ; and none that it is *more than consistent* with what occurs soon after in the passage we have considered. 2. That “ praying and prophesying ” there, refer generally to the offices of public worship, and determine nothing, at most, about *what is law on the point* : though they might refer to what was practice or innovation and disorder in that church. The law he reserves, and lays down in order in the fourteenth chapter ☞ soon

following. 3. The headship of man; the proper subordination of woman, especially in public worship; the modesty and reserve, without which her sex has foregone at once its most necessary safeguard and its finest ornament; and the sin against Christ of violating these high principles of relative decorum: are clearly deducible and amply demonstrated in the argument.

The other proof-passage to which I referred is found in 1 Tim. 2: 9-15. 3: 1, 2, read continuously as it is written. I commend it to the eye that reads this, in the opened Bible; while I observe, 1. That audacity itself will hardly say that it is not as wide in its jurisdiction as the species or the sex. 2. That it is all a continuous argument, though separated by the chapters and verses through which it extends. Hence there is special force in the expression, "If a man desire the office of bishop," (by which I very certainly understand the pastor of a congregation, or a pastor at large,) "he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife"—why not the wife of one husband? Because, 3. He had forever precluded such a supposition, as not more monstrous in nature than contrary to express and luminous statute, which he had just before laid down: where, having enjoined on the sex who "profess godliness" (would to God that all such *possessed* it too) to "adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety;" he proceeds to utter the following sweeping and universal prohibition; "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer

not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." He of course refers here to public teaching, that of office alone; for elsewhere he enjoins the sex to be "teachers of good things." Tit. 2: 3-5. The office of a teacher implies superiority; and its public duties would convey the headship of the man, and of the whole congregation, for the time and even *afterward*, improperly to a woman! 4. The inhibition from the ministry is as express as words can make it, while the whole argument is comprehensive and complete. By implication too it is applicable not remotely to the magistracy—which is properly incompetent to a woman in public and in *private*! Michal, Jezebel, Athaliah, and other specimens in scripture; and the Cleopatras, the Marys, and even the Elizabeths, of profane history, commend the wisdom of the doctrine. But 5. What reasons are assigned? I answer, UNIVERSAL ONES ALONE! (1) "For Adam was first formed, then Eve." The man is the senior, the principal, the head. "For the man is not of the woman;" that is, originally; "but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." 1 Cor. 11: 8, 9. This is the order of God; the order from the beginning; the proper order of our first parents and of all their posterity; although the laws of worldly gallantry, and feudal chivalry, and foxian usurpation, constitute the principles of its violation in modern ages. (2) "And Adam was not deceived." Here is another reason. It is a fact that Adam was not duped by Satan at all. He

“hearkened to the voice of his wife,” resigned his headship for the time to her instructions, and sinned with her, probably more from inordinate affection merely than intellectual infatuation. But (3) “the woman *being deceived* was in the transgression;” that is, she lent her easy confidence to the arguments of the devil, sophisticating the word of God in the way of his vocation : and she frequently does this yet with such tender feminine facility that she must not have the ministry “committed” to her ! This reason, though densely stated, plainly indicates the necessity of intellectual strength and the vigor of a well disciplined and masculine mind, in the high and holy trust of the christian ministry. The soft and silly sentiment that sincerity and singleness of heart is all, may be Quakerism—but is not christianity. Let simpletons go to congress or write an encyclopedia or glitter on a throne ; but keep them forever from the christian ministry ! How many facts have I witnessed of softness and sympathy, elegantly perverting the truth, to accommodate the feelings of distress, by the kindred feelings of a lady oracle ! Their feelings almost govern them : their influence is often a kind of fascination ; musical as that which first seduced the mother of mankind. And who could resist such refinement of influence, when every nerve was a conductor, every feeling an advocate ! They make converts, for aught I know. But I suppose them ordinarily nearer heaven before than afterward. It was so with the first effort of mother Eve ! The sex in their places, I honor and respect as much as any man. “There

they are privileged ;” there their tenderness, their fine attractive courtesy, the kind assuasion of their manners, their dignity and majesty of movement, their usefulness and high desert, especially when the gem of piety radiates through an eye of sound intelligence—when education and modesty, prudence and self-control, charity and sentiment, combine to bless the spheres of private life, to make of home a sublunary heaven, and to train a household in the ways of wisdom for the happier state eternal ! I am too much the friend of the sex to flatter them—which never yet was done from a good motive ! and consulting their happiness for both worlds, I would have them at once fully honored in those rights, powers, and immunities, all and singular, which their benevolent Maker originally ordained for them ; and at the same time guarded and restricted to those spheres, for which exclusively and obviously they were designed, and from which adventuring, the word of God considers them as “usurping authority,” doing violence to their proper delicacy, incurring “shame” before the universe. It must be an *amazon* temper alone, one would think, and very unlovely in the conjugal regards—but, inspiration has no alternative ! God takes hold of them ; the divinity possesses and overwhelms them ; when it is all passivity and sufferance, and wrong is right !⁶⁹

Una salus victis, nullam sperare salutem.—VIRG.

The only hope the vanquished can command
Is desperation—or, submission bland.

I cannot admit, however, that God is to answer so absolutely for their wrong actions. Their agency is quite distinct, much their own, and very absolutely accountable! I *know*—and alas! OFTEN HAVE I WEPT WITH REASON AT THE FACT, that they can throw off the whole responsibility. God is surety for them! He inspired them. This they *know*—as well as Eve, when, “being deceived she was in the transgression.” This they know—and could never survive the discovery of the opposite! This some of them have been *heard* to affirm: a pretty frame of mind for impartial investigation! Preach on then! Tell the people how clearly you see “that the tree is good for food, and that it is pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise! and take of the fruit thereof and eat! and give also to others whom you can influence: and fear not! Remember *who* has assured you that “you shall not surely die;” and call to mind the ancient and venerable example of that lady, first of her sex, who acted so before you! She was the first female preacher that “usurped authority over the man;” but not the first preacher whose labors were spontaneous and without salary! There is another reason for the prohibition, which deserves to be considered; (4) “notwithstanding, she shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith, and charity, and holiness, with sobriety.” I would thus at large explain or paraphrase it: She is indeed restricted from the offices of authority, headship, and harder toil; but there is ample compensation and honor in her case. If the scenes which

her presence illumines are more retired, they are not less dignified, or useful, or influential. To her especially is committed the nurture of children. Her downy lap is the cradle of their infancy; her bosom their pillow and their nutriment; her arms their vehicle and defence. And their minds, in the very forming time of life, yield to her plastic influence. She stamps their characters; forms their manners; and almost fixes their destinies! And what kind of an education ought she to have, fitting her for this high and more than senatorial trust? That kind that so expands the mind, and elevates the ideas, that now her highest regards are to shine in the eyes of fools! to be commended in the vapid circles of fashion, for her manners, her brilliants, and her dress! "whose adorning" is mainly that of "plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel?" Or ought she to learn that "the body is more than raiment," and the soul more than the body; and that her best ornaments are those that last forever—"that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." I am here rebuking many that are *not* Friends, more than them—for I bear them record that herein their ladies are ordinarily *patterns for others* in several respects: in delicacy of attire; in neatness, with little comparative extravagance; in comfort and prudence, in respecting health and the proper ends of dress; and in being in a good degree independent of the caprices of the *ton*. But far more than this is necessary mentally and morally in the educa-

tion of woman. Deserves she no intellectual culture? no mental discipline, no science, no cultivated vigor of thought? Ought not her understanding to be marshalled in its operations, wonted on common and on sacred subjects to philosophize correctly, enriched with the spoils of solid learning rather than the tinsel accomplishments of life? Ought she not to be fitted for her noble sphere; qualified to instruct, as well as sparkle; to last, as well as shine? Ought she not to know that gems and drapery, and all the courtly foppery of the worldly and the gay, degrade rather than dignify; becoming the cause, as they were at first only the effect, of vanity and pride? How ought woman to be promoted in all that is excellent and useful? How ought her breath to be prayer and her actions piety! How skilfully should she plant the seeds of life eternal in a soil comparatively unoccupied! How well should she understand the nature and the ruin of the common apostacy; and the "new and living way" by which we are restored through the rent veil of the Redeemer's flesh! Like the mother of Dodderidge, she should know how to lecture from the tiles around the fire-place and the common objects of life! and like the mother of Timothy, should she take care that each one of her charge may "from a child *know* the holy scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." This is the exalted service to which God promotes her; and I have no doubt that her real influence on the salvation or destruction of souls is of immense and uncomputed efficacy, in

the development of their destiny forever! That influence is wrong, if not right. It is bad, if not good. It is neglect, if not assiduity. It is vanity, if not wisdom; wickedness, if not religion. Besides, impressions here are strongest. They are first, and ordinarily indelible. Tell me—Is not this enough for her? If she did this well, or competently prepared to do it, would she wish to be a magistrate or a minister? would she have time for the duties of the foreign office? could she be a physician, a lawyer, or a judge? Let her magnify her appropriate work. Let her love her proper sphere; “looking well to the ways of her household and eating not the bread of idleness.” I scarce ever knew, said the late Dr. Mason, a fine man, but, upon inquiry, I ascertained that he had a fine mother. So is it almost universally. If all mothers were wise and faithful, there would be more Jacobs and fewer Esaus in every family. What a charge! How competent ought she to be to this high work! It is that to which God hath appointed her. As such she should appreciate it well; realize it solemnly; occupy her place, with serene self-devotement and resigned piety; prepare herself to suffer, as well as do, all the will of God.

Our outward acts indeed admit restraint;
 'Tis not in things o'er thought to domineer.
 If nothing more than purpose is our power,
 Our purpose firm is equal to the deed.
 Who does the best his circumstance allows,
 Does well, acts nobly, angels could no more.—YOUNG.

Thus, well and wisely should a christian female know her place and keep it. For her reward is rich and her salvation sure. "She shall be saved" in this way of real excellence, glorifying God ; that is, if she "CONTINUES" in it and sustains her duties there, in faith and benevolence, with real wisdom joined, vindicating the grandeur of her being as originally produced, and the splendor of her destiny as an immortal, though a sinner, restored forever through the grace that is in Jesus Christ.

What now are we to think of her usurpations ? That they are inspired ? By whom ? Him who inspired the first example of the sort ! What murky and mischievous inspiration ! It is well adapted to ruin domestic scenes ; to kill the charities of nature that love the circle of "sweet home ;" to outrage, invert, defeat, all the ends of order in society ! to make confusion, folly, misery—infidelity in the end ; where God had appointed order, beauty, blessing ! For if a *woman* desire "the office of a bishop," she is only resuming her old way, desiring or taking the fruit that is—forbidden.

Nor reigns ambition in bold man alone ;
Soft female hearts the rude invader own.
But there, indeed, it deals in nicer things
Than routing armies and dethroning kings.

* * * *

The sex we honor, while their faults we blame ;
Nor thank their faults for such a fruitful theme.

* * * *

A dearth of words a woman need not fear ;
But 'tis a task indeed to learn—to hear !

* * * *

Doubly, like echo, sound is her delight.
And the last word is her eternal right.

* * * *

She strikes each point with native force of mind ;
While puzzled learning blunders far behind.

* * * *

What angels would these be, who thus excel
In theologies—could they sew as well !

* * * *

An angel ! pardon my mistaken pen,
A shameless woman is the worst of men.

* * * *

Naked in nothing should a woman be,
But veil her very wit with modesty.
Let man discover, let not her display ;
But yield her charms of mind with sweet delay,
Or, " for a sign," if " naked " one must go,⁷⁰
Select some sterner victim for the show.
But test the claiming inspiration well ;
Or trust too soon a forgery from hell.
Things that are lovely and of good report
But ill consist with such outlandish sport.
I would, were he alive, prefer that Fox
Should be " a sign " to teach the orthodox.
And " testify " to hesitating Friends
Where *inspiration* or begins or ends.
But know such duties of rare piety,
My lady Friend, may next solicit thee !
Alas ! how few, in these degenerate days,
Would own the mandate in its equal ways !
Still, for the best we hope and should prepare ;
Some, if th' occasion called, perhaps there are !
In times like ours, few striking " signs " are found :
But soon with Friends, who knows ? they may abound !

* * * *

Frown not, ye fair ! so much your rights we prize
We hate those arts that take you from our eyes :
Those arts deceptive, which, though well refined,
Infect your manners and pervert your mind ;

Transform your husbands into passive drones,
 And for like tameness educate your sons ;
 Depose the headship of your proper Lords ;
 Who love you less for your usurping words :
 The arts that metamorphose and disguise
 Your tender womanhood, in wisdom's eyes ;
 That clash with all the institute of God,
 And challenge from his righteous hand—the rod !
 True to your duty, thank the christian code
 For all your dignity, your safe abode ;
 And, in his church, hear *others* preach ! be still, and worship
 God ! ⁷¹

In the conclusion, I commend the BIBLE to the
 higher and more devout estimate of every reader.
 To the worldly or fanatical neglecter of “ the word
 of God,” I would say—

Retire, and read thy Bible, to be gay.
 There truths abound of sovereign aid to peace :
 Ah ! do not prize them less, because inspired ;
 As thou, and thine, are apt and proud to do.
 If not inspired, that pregnant page had stood,
 Time's treasure, and the wonder of the wise !
 * * * * *
 'Tis easy ; it invites thee ; it descends
 From heaven to woo and waft thee whence it came.
 Read and revere the sacred page ; a page
 Where triumphs immortality ; a page
 Which not the whole creation could produce :
 Which not the conflagration shall destroy.
 In nature's ruins not one letter lost :
 'Tis printed in the mind of God forever.—YOUNG.

“ He said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart
 to believe all that the prophets have spoken ! Ought
 not Christ to have suffered these things, and to en-

ter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them *in all the scriptures* the things concerning himself. And he said unto them, these are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that ALL THINGS MUST BE FULFILLED which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding *that they might* understand the scriptures." Luke, 24 : 25-27, 44, 45. Thus, the illumination of Christ is always *in subserviency* to our knowledge of the scriptures. It is so now, as it was and will be. He illumines our minds not without his written word, nor in opposition to it, nor as if the illumination itself were a rule—since it is only bringing mind to take purely the sense of scripture and to act accordingly in honor of that supreme rule, with affectionate faith in the eternal testimony of God.

To all professing christians, members of the church visible of the Redeemer, I would say—think of your high duty, to this charter of your hopes, this mirror of the divine glory, this development of infinite grace! and hold it, not only,—but “hold it fast :—contend earnestly for the faith *once delivered* to the saints ;—striving together for the faith of the gospel.” In one short epistle, Paul *thrice* enjoins it on the church, to maintain the truth of scriptural revelation even against any members of their own body, baptized and regular professors, who should in any way occasionally dishonor it. He says, “Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epis-

tle." The "traditions" of inspired men, the apostles of the Lamb, it is orthodoxy itself to maintain; as well as to resist all other traditions, as those of human invention and authority. "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that *walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us.*" We are here solemnly required to "withdraw" fellowship from such! "And if any man obey not *our word by this epistle*, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." Is it then a lower rule than something *in* him? All these passages occur in 2 Thes. 2: 15, and 3: 6, 14. It is the pervading exhortation, and the most solemn injunction of the whole word of God. Experience, reason, history, and the nature of the case, concur with all other sources of right influence known to us, to urge the momentous duty of GUARDING, in this hostile world, the invaluable deposit of the oracles of God!—for ourselves, for our cotemporaries, for our children, for our posterity, for eternity, and for the glory of their adorable Author! guarding them in their unrivaled excellency; in their celestial fulness of grace and truth; in their wonderful adaptation to the states and wants of fallen probationary man; in their absolute supremacy, on the principle that THE WORD OF GOD is the highest law in the universe, equally for saints and angels, in this world and that which is to come—and that the mere circumstance or incidental fact that his word to us is *written, printed*, contained identically in "the

holy *scriptures*," only defines more steadfastly our duty, while it also facilitates its performance. "Who-soever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father who is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven."

NOTES.

1. Dr. Alexander's inaugural discourse.

2, 3. Parents of the present PROFESSOR DOUGLASS of the University of the city of New-York.

4. My father died at thirty-four years of age, in the city of Philadelphia; from which he had a few years before removed, and where he had recently arrived on business. I may be excused for transcribing in this place—for special reasons—an OBITUARY that appeared in *Poulson's Daily Advertiser*. It proceeded (I judge) from the pen of an honorable citizen of that metropolis, who well knew him, who is still alive, and whom his cotemporaries universally and justly esteem.

“DIED, 1st month, 4th, 1801, of an inflammation of the heart, James Cox, of Rahway, East New-Jersey. He left home about three weeks since, apparently in the enjoyment of vigorous health; having possessed an excellent constitution, and lived in the habits of strict temperance. He seemed to have a peculiar claim to the attainment of old age: his prospects were bright and his conscience unsullied. He was in the prime of life; and blessed with a lovely wife and five small children, who, by his early and unexpected exit, are bereaved of an excellent husband and father. His mind was uncommonly energetic, his heart warm and affectionate, and his principles sound and correct. His life was marked with valuable and manly traits of character, and his last moments were gilded with the serene hope and confidence of the CHRISTIAN.”

5. As whose colleague the venerable Ashbel Green, D. D. LL. D. now in his seventy-first year, was ordained in April, 1787.

6. The opposers of a female ministry, as all enlightened christians are, in obedience to the plainly revealed will of God, are very far from denying either that they are sisters in Christ Jesus, or that they are endowed with very valuable gifts to be exercised in his service, or that there are appropriate spheres in which their talents and their virtues may shine together, with his reflected light and to his purest praise. If a christian lady has the talents of a Miriam, she need not have her usurpation too, Numb. 12, or incur her terrible rebuke, in arriving at distinguished usefulness. She need not become *amazonian* in order to be *christian*. In fact every private christian, of either sex, may wisely occupy a place or improve an occasion, always to be found, of service to souls and of honor to God. “And a wise man's heart discerneth both time and

judgment." Eccles. 8 : 5. In this way, without affectation, indelicacy, disorder, or ill manners, the wisdom and the usefulness of christians might be augmented ten fold, to the *infinite* benefit of the world! For God will bless ordinarily wherever and whatever he approves. The way to get good, is to do good; the way to increase and retain personal religion, is to communicate and dispense what we have. "And Moses said unto him, Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them?" Numb. 11 : 29. And no one knows *how much good* may sometimes result from "a word fitly spoken."

In all such converse, it were well to observe certain rules and principles, as perhaps the following; 1. Speak wisely and to the point, or not at all. 2. Time things well and consider the characteristics of those whom you address. Sometimes silence is eloquence; and leaving the company, the best refutation. 3. If you would reprove, endeavor to do it so as to make the party reprove himself. 4. Regard ultimate more than proximate effects; what will be thought *to-morrow* or long afterward, of what you now aver; and what reflection will attest, when sensation has utterly subsided. 5. In teaching, take care to tell *only* what you know. David would use none but the armor he had "proved." Some subjects may be new to you; or plainly superior to your attainments; or they may require an investigation and a library not at your command; or involve a difficulty which you see no way of solving: in such cases never attempt presumptuous solutions or arrogate a clearness of vision which you do not possess. Acknowledge the difficulty, and your own ignorance; as well as your persuasion that it is not insuperable, but with proper helps might be and doubtless has been often and fully explained. This will commend your ingenuousness, as well as evince your confidence in christianity. 6. Beware of wrong motives. Right ones are the eloquence and the unction and almost the effect. "Let love through all your actions run." Still, care rather to profit than to please: and respect God more than man. If you really love the soul, you will show it, incidentally if in no other way; and in proportion as this temper is seen, it will also be felt and honored, at least in the privacy of conscience, where the effect is often wonderful and astounding! Besides, every man has a conscience; every man thinks more and feels more, occasionally, on the supreme subject, than he is willing to confess even to himself. And God uses the wise efforts of his people. They are the chosen sub-agents of his own glorious action, in conciliating souls. Thus he replenishes the empire of his grace. Hence, faith acquires a kind of omnipotence, by availing itself of the resources of God! "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thy hand: for thou knowest not whether shall prosper either this or that,

or whether they both shall be alike good." Eccles. 11 : 6. And what service possible to men, can for a moment be compared to this, for "glory, and honor, and immortality;" or for certainty and richness of reward? The laurels and stars of vulgar ambition are here demonstrated puerile and contemptible; while the grandeur and worth of such subserviency can be impoverished or reduced by no competition, nor by any increase or success of numbers. The cause is common, unique, eternal. The more the happier. Each contributes to the riches of all; and all rejoice in the successes of each. The tender female here becomes a champion; the contest and the victory alike exercise the goodness and improve the character: Heaven is enjoyed and Christ is glorified in two worlds, one of them "without end!"

The author is happy in the acquaintance of many excellent and "elect ladies" among his countrywomen, not restrictively those of his parochial charge, whose example is luminous and beneficent in an eminent degree; and with whom, as living "epistles of Christ," and amiable specimens of the religion of his gospel, the unchanging principles of truth and grace, are discernible in their truly refining efficacy; commended to the approbation of the world in kindred fellowship with the softness and the sympathy, the instinctive purity and the tender attraction, of the female character. "A virtuous woman; her price is far above rubies! She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness. Favor is deceitful, and beauty is vain: but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised." Prov. 31 : 10, 26, 30.

7. See Blackstone, vol. 1, pp. 301 and 441, et alia.

8. "He thought he saw an unusual blaze of light fall on the book while he was reading, which he at first imagined might happen by some accident in the candle. But lifting up his eyes, he apprehended, to his extreme amazement, that there was before him, as it were suspended in the air, a visible representation of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross, surrounded on all sides with a glory; and was impressed, as if a voice, or something equivalent to a voice, had come to him, to this effect, (for he was not confident as to the very words,) *O sinner, did I suffer this for thee, and are these the returns?*" Life of Col. Gardiner, by Dr. Doddridge, p. 25. The influence may be genuine, divine, saving; and yet our imagination and judgment may be erring and extravagant, in what they attribute to it. The luminous quality may be all in the mind, and the images or representations be there only delineated and enstamped.

9. But this feeling of the preacher was not peculiar to him. Fox was the primate of their whole system of sympathies as well as sentiments. "I was moved also to cry against all sorts of music"—"But the black

earthly spirit of the priests wounded my life : and when I heard the bell toll to call people together to the steeple-house, it struck at my life ; for it was like a market-bell to gather people together, that the priest might set forth his ware to sale." Journal, vol. 1. pp. 114 and 115. In England, it is well known, that a *steeple* always indicates a church of the establishment: the dissenters having none, according to law, and *their* places of worship being called chapels or meeting-houses. The antipathy of early Friends against "steeple-houses" became one of their characteristics. It was a signal of the justly odious tithe system, and a remembrance of their own frequent amercement.

10. This, and some other parts of this volume, were written as early as 1824 ; before the schism, and while *its main occasion* was yet alive. He is now no more in this world. *Where* he is, in that which is to come, I am very far from *deciding* even in the privacy of thought. God knows what to do, and will do what is gloriously right, with each one of us and with all men. In the text I mean only—that I am now relieved from any sensible obligation to account for his errors on the supposition of his genuine christian piety. Equally cautious would I be in resigning *wholly and always*, to the arbitration of the Great God, the destiny of individuals or persons ; as courageous in the treatment of principles, whatever their application to myself or others, and in the confession of the truth, whatever the consequences to be apprehended. I desire here to *assure* the reader, that with me the idea of denouncing *persons* as absolutely graceless, or passing judgment on the eternal condition of any individual of the mighty congregation of the dead on whom scripture hath not expressly passed the judgment of God, is both alien and awful ! I denounce only—a system. It is *one* of the most happy cogitations of my life, that I know not concretely or in reference to particular individuals, who may not be pardoned and saved in spite of his errors and his sins ! or who may not be brought to repentance and faith in Christ, before he leaves the world ? There are several things in the characters of Fox and Barclay that I very sincerely respect and even admire—and *far enough* should I be from daring to say of either of them—He is lost forever ! No man *knows* any such thing in fact ! and my soul is very *very* far from wishing it—I need not declare !

It was wise in one who said, to his circle of christian companions ; If any or all of us shall actually arrive in heaven at last, we shall see **THREE** wonders there : *first*, many whom we never expected to meet there ; *second*, many not there whom we did expect to find ; and *third*, the greatest wonder to find—**OURSELVES** there !

In treating of truth and principles, however, I know not how to do justice to the subjects of revelation without free thought and unrestrain-

ed argument. If this wounds, lacerates, or even injures some, I can only say—I know of no alternative! truth will never surrender to error; and truth will hurt some spirits, and only hurt them, world without end!

“The keen vibration of bright truth, is hell.” *The sword of the Spirit* is sharp, refulgent, piercing.

11. Remarkably characteristic and *Quakerian*! I have often been asked by others, “How do they get over such and such passages?” Answer—You know nothing of their way, or you would not ask the inapposite question. A man who carries about with him *a light within* which is PARAMOUNT to reason and the oracles of God, can *nullify* at pleasure, and that as easily as by “turning over the leaf,” WHATEVER it may have pleased “the eternal Spirit” to reveal and record “for our learning.” The confession, made in great simplicity, is a most important development. It reveals, I think, purely, what is more valuable because indeliberate, the character of the sect, the nature of their inward luminary, and the connection that exists between their views and evidence. It shows the way which some have of pleading *conscience*, when they wish to escape responsibility or do what they dare not allow to be inspected: and reminds me of an anecdote that I have somewhere known, of a certain miserable and ignorant man, who, having done a reprehensible action publicly in church, was arraigned for it before his ecclesiastical superiors, where he pleaded that he was *conscientious* in it all. “And pray,” said one of his judges, “What is conscience? or what do you mean by it, if you mean any thing or know what you mean?” He answered, “O yes! I know, very well. Conscience is something,” putting his hand significantly on his stomach, “something down here that says, every now and then, I WONT!” Humor apart, I sincerely suspect that Barclay’s “little small thing” that “boasteth” such “great things,” is not only resident in the same locality, but is very much of one identity with the famous definition of conscience above recited. It is the conscience of NULLIFICATION—a principle that might, for aught I know, have “originated in heaven:” but sure I am it did not long remain there.

12. Respecting predestination, without discussing a subject so extensive, so “sinned against”—not sinning, and so glorious and fundamental, I would affectionately suggest the following things: 1. It is both foolish and unfair to charge its alleged difficulties, as is often done in this country, on presbyterianism or calvinism. Before either of these existed, the very difficulties—which are wholly *relative* and result from our ignorance and folly and unbelief alone—existed and were amply known. The premises of the doctrine are *fully* contained in Barclay’s *Apology*: since they are ultimately resolvable into the attributes of the INFINITE GOD.

Omniscience—who can deny?—eternally knows all things, and anticipates them infallibly, in a system over which God presides, which he created and constantly upholds. For “although in relation to the foreknowledge and decree of God, the first cause, all things come to pass immediately and infallibly, yet, by the same providence, he ordereth them to fall out according to the nature of second causes, either necessarily, freely, or contingently.” Presbyterian Confession of Faith. Chap. 5, sect. 2. No absolute contingency exists; yet all *relative* contingencies, such to us, (and the world is full of them,) are infallibly and economically foreknown in the system, and most wisely ordered and overruled by the eternal Owner of all things. The means and the end of every related series are reciprocally connected and mutually dependant in the constitution of God. He has no purpose, for example, to fill a barn with the fruits of autumn, that does not as well imply his purpose of antecedent toil, forecast, perseverance, care, and skill, on the part of the husbandman. A correct view of this subject is not only noble and philosophical, expansive to the mind and salutary in an *infinite* degree to the heart; but, it rectifies the conduct, is the best cure of the natural *fatalism* of men, the wisest corrective in the world of the whole doctrine of *fate*, and moreover—IT IS ETERNAL TRUTH! God knows all events, with just as much precision and exactitude, and knows them just as HISTORICALLY, as he knows those of yesterday and earlier in infinite preterition. He knows you, reader, and all your *voluntary* conduct, perfectly and from everlasting. It is indeed to me a wonder of difficult solution (much more difficult than the revealed doctrine of predestination) that any man of sense and honesty can at once believe the Bible, and *read* it, and doubt the doctrine. If not contained in Romans, 9, 10, 11, nor in Ephesians, 1, 2, I am sure it is to be found ALMOST EVERY WHERE ELSE, expressly or by implication, in the whole Bible. If somewhat medicinal and painful, it is still a MOST SALUTARY doctrine. 2. Our *moral* relation to it is SIMPLE, ENCOURAGING AND ENTIRELY PRACTICAL—whence our duty is to submit to it believingly and to believe it affectionately, to the glory of the eternal and infinitely benevolent Founder of the system. To do this, is JUST AS EASY as it is to love God or cordially to say, “Thy will be done.” Without such unqualified submission, we are, however disguised, only the enemies of God—because we wickedly choose to be! With it—we are his friends, his children, his elect for ever. The doctrine can be easily ABUSED, however, by any one so minded. Hence 3. There is no proper difficulty PRACTICALLY, or just repulsion, in the doctrine. If we can love God sincerely at all, why *hate* him because of the infinite sovereignty in which he describes himself as “declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, MY COUNSEL SHALL STAND

AND I WILL DO ALL MY PLEASURE." Isaiah, 46 : 10. Shall we hate him for being infinitely wise and good in governing the universe?

4. If it be said—Then he makes some men on purpose to damn them! I answer, (1) This is no logical result from the premises. It is moreover an averment of guilt and blasphemy, when absolutely uttered. He made all men for his own glory and the good of the universe; and this end he is most wisely determined that they *shall* in some way subserve—either in their punishment or pardon, according to their own moral agency in this world. Gal. 6 : 7, 8. He might know a thing and order it in the system, without at all making it an end desired. He knew from everlasting that Paul would persecute the church; and eternally ordained the system in which it should occur: was that the end for which he created him? (2) The difficulty, if it be one, is JUST AS GREAT—to say the least—with those who deny the doctrine and are not universalists. The God whom *they* profess to worship, created the finally reprobate *knowing infallibly* that they would be lost forever. Did HE create them for this end—or, for no end—or, to confound himself? (3) Election, as a branch of predestination, damns nobody; it only INSURES the piety and salvation of an innumerable multitude. If you say, why are so many lost or left to their own way, which is at last the same thing? I reply—The question is based ON FACTS which all must admit in common, namely, THAT MANY DO PERISH. The reason is twofold; first, touching *their* agency; THEIR OWN WANTON WICKEDNESS IS THE REASON. Second, touching the agency of God—why does he not interpose preventively and save them? Answer—Because he cannot in wisdom and righteousness! because he sees it better to punish some for their iniquity than that he should exert such an agency in the circumstances. It is not because he could not do it absolutely; but because he could not do it morally. In this important sense we may say, GOD SAVES AS MANY AS HE CAN; AND WOULD DOUBTLESS SAVE ALL IF HE DID NOT SEE THAT IT WAS PREFERABLE FOR HIS INFINITE BENEVOLENCE TO PUNISH SOME, AND AS FEW AS POSSIBLE, FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSE OF BEING FOREVERMORE! GOD IS LOVE.

13. Now under the pastoral care of my spiritual cotemporary, my early and excellent friend, Rev. Philip Cortlandt Hay, A. M.

14. I was regularly "disowned" on *my birth day*, (after a respite of six months, in which they neither said nor wrote anything to me,) according to their laws in such cases made and provided. A certified copy of *disownment* was sent me, which I received and kept for several years, but which is now mislaid. I can recollect, however, and shall endeavor to transcribe it (not with *perfect* exactness) from memory.

Whereas, Samuel H. Cox, had a birth-right membership among us ;

but, having joined another religious society, we therefore testify our disunion with him: but desire, nevertheless, that by the clear inshining of divine light, he may come to know the voice of the true Shepherd and thereby experience preservation from the snares of the enemy of all good.

Signed in and on behalf of the Pine-street Monthly Meeting.

Philad. Aug. 25, 1813.

— — — — —, Clerk.

On this I remark,

(1.) That thus far I have had no *inshining*, (their own word,) "clear" or otherwise, that does not confirm my conviction that their system is illusory and wrong.

(2.) That their *charitable* insinuation against the whole presbyterian denomination, when they speak of "the true Shepherd," and "the snares of the enemy of all good," are quite comprehensible.

(3.) That I do not reprehend or at all regret the fact that they have "disowned" me; I *first* and conscientiously *disowned* them: but I have often asked myself *why*, in the times of worldly foolery, when *they knew*, (their preachers, I mean,) that I and *hundreds of others* of their youth were habituated to attend the theatre and to follow other godless practices, *why* did they not then "disown" or even "deal with" me? The only *unpardonable* offence I have committed was—to *believe the Bible with some degree of practical consistency!* My soul's most ardent benevolence prays that they may come to the same experience; thus "knowing the voice of the true Shepherd," and realizing "preservation from the snares of" Quakerism. And that "by the clear *inshining* of the divine light" of *outward* scripture testimony! May the God of all grace bring them to taste his salvation in Christ Jesus! I feel compassion for them, abhorrence only of their system, and anguish of heart on their account: but so far as I know my own heart in the sight of God, I can aver that I am very far from *any* vindictive feelings toward them—whatever I sometimes think of their manner of treating me.

Jesus! have mercy on my soul,

And give me grace to do thy will:

Keep me in truth's divine control

And be my God and Savior still!

15. This is hating human nature.

16. Cardinal lie.

17. Though it is revolting to the feelings of real piety and disgusting to all enlightened sense, even to peruse his infatuated "Journal" of vanities, I will here append only a specimen, of hundreds that might easily be furnished. "Now was I come up in Spirit, through the flaming sword, into the paradise of God. All things were new; and all the creation gave another smell unto me than before, beyond what words

can utter. I KNEW NOTHING BUT PURENESS, INNOCENCY, AND RIGHTEOUSNESS, BEING RENEWED UP INTO THE IMAGE OF GOD BY CHRIST JESUS ; SO THAT I WAS COME UP TO THE STATE OF ADAM, WHICH HE WAS IN BEFORE HE FELL." Vol. I. p. 104. Far enough beyond any saint or apostle of whom we have scriptural memorial. Paul was nothing to him ! And his ministerial influence was equally pre-eminent. When he spake, he says, "The Lord's power came over them. Yea, the Lord's everlasting power was over the world, and reached to the hearts of people, and made both priests and professors tremble. It shook the earthly and airy spirit, in which they held their profession of religion and worship ; so that it was a dreadful thing to them, when it was told them, 'The man in leathern breeches is come.' At the hearing thereof the priests in many places got out of the way ; they were so struck with the dread of the eternal power of God ; and fear surprised the hypocrites." Vol. I. p. 158.

I should think that *other causes*, than depravity and a reprobate consciousness, *might* account for their aversation to an interview with such a column of light !

O why were people made so coarse ;

Or clergy made so fine ?

A kick that scarce could move a horse

Would kill a sound divine ! COWPER. [F] PROV. 26 : 5.

19.* An intelligent and respected ministerial brother, whom I thank for his kindness, has lately put in my hands a volume entitled, "The society of Friends vindicated ; being the arguments of the counsel of J—H—, in a cause decided in the court of chancery of the state of New Jersey, between T—L—S— complainant, and J—H— and S—D—, defendants. By George Wood and Isaac H. Williamson, counsellors at law. To which is appended the decision of the court. Trenton, N. J. 1832." Of this interesting volume, I would remark,

(1.) That it can be held to decide nothing *theologically*, or next to nothing ; since the object of the court was not to determine what doctrines were true absolutely, but only the doctrines in point of fact held respectively by the parties litigant.

(2.) That the process and the result of that singular trial (as it *once* would have been counted) have been evidently wise and luminous and right, touching the questions then pending. Of this I have no doubt. But it is secular in the main ; and leaves the society *unvindicated* in those high spiritual relations, where christian philosophy will not cease to compare Quakerism as a whole, with "the secondary rule" of christianity as a whole !

* Some confusion has occurred in the text, in numbering the notes ; there is no 18, and 20 occurs twice : hence the page will be specified to which each of these refers—this to page 04.

(3.) That the Hicksites there refused to show what their doctrines were, and so joined no issue on the *theology* of the dispute; which was plainly subordinate to the matters of "bond and mortgage," "principal and interest."

(4.) That the unitarian *hicksism* of Penn, appears to have laid palpably in the orbit of one of the counsellors of the other party, and to have *tasked*, as well as taxed, his erudite ingenuity to dispose of it. p. 24, and onward. He admits however that his writings have, not first recently "subjected him to the charge of socinianism and sometimes of unqualified infidelity:" and though he wittily refers this to "the want of attending sufficiently to the drift of the author," yet I must beg leave to express a conviction *precisely opposite* to the learned advocate; and assert that the impartial inquirer, who reads the writings of Penn so as to come most intelligently into "the drift of the author," and who has read as well and on the same principles "the Holy Scriptures," is the very man of a thousand who will soonest discard his pretensions as a christian teacher, and *deny* his soundness in the faith, whatever honor he may accord to his established fame as a man, and a general philanthropist, and the lauded founder of a noble one of the confederate states of this mighty republic.

19. p. 96. Opposition to the cause of missions.

20. p. 101. In so many words.

21. With all their might and main.

22. Let dotage accredit his pretentions, I cannot.

23. This is probably a clew to the true meaning of that much obscured, controverted, and certainly difficult passage, Rom. 9: 1-3. I will give simply the result of some pains-taking, and 'show mine opinion,' as to its proper meaning: thus; "I say the truth in Christ, and lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continued sorrow in my heart (for I myself was wishing [or glorying] to be accursed from Christ) for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh; who are Israelites," &c.

This version is grammatical and almost literal. It is the only one that I have ever seen against which *insuperable* objections do not lie. The asseveration of the apostle ill comports with the supposition of a grossly extravagant and utterly unheard of hyperbole or poetical orientalism; as it were madly and officiously conditioning his own eternal damnation as the price of the salvation of his countrymen, and thus entirely transcending the "unspeakable" love manifested in the cross of Christ! Absurd too, as the fancy of papists and universalists that hell-fire is a capital means of grace. The Jews hated Paul for deny-

ing their doctrine, their doings, and their hopes: they would not easily believe any thing he could say, avouching his sincere and tender benevolence toward their spiritual interests. Hence he assumes the solemn sanction of an appeal to the witnessing God; he panegyricizes their national eminence and relative dignity: and accounts most *naturally* for *his* peculiar feelings toward them, from the fact that he was their kinsman, that he had been one of them, that he formerly gloried to act as they were acting; as madly, as desperately, as if practically or constructively glorying in the cause!

24. Vide, Robinson's Wahl in voce.

25. And from one error learn them all.

26. It is rather surprising to see certain *limitarians* sometimes arrogate to themselves, at least by implication, the honor of exclusive *Calvinism*, as well as exclusive orthodoxy. They are certainly in an error there, if what *Calvin* believed and taught may be viewed as the criterion of what *Calvinism* is. In his *INSTITUTES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION*, written (when about 25 years of age) in his theological youth, although they were less express on the point than his subsequent writings, I recollect no sentence which determines any thing in favor of restrictive views of the nature of atonement. In his *COMMENTARY*, which was his maturer work and the rich mine whence many modern writers have taken their second-hand wisdom, and which has never (so far as I know) been rendered into *English* and published, his sentiments are full, frequent, conclusive, in favor of a full atonement. It may be well to transcribe a few of these. I could easily give more.

1 John, 2:2, where Christ is said to be "the propitiation—for the sins of the whole world." Calvin says indeed that "he would not stoop to answer the ravings of those who hence declare all the reprobate and even the devil himself to be the ultimate subjects of salvation. A position so monstrous deserves no refutation. But others, who have no such purpose, affirm that *Christ suffered sufficiently for all men; but efficiently for the elect alone*. And this solution of the matter is commonly received in the schools. I question however its relevancy to the present passage, while I confess its absolute truth." Hence (1) Calvin believed the fulness of the atonement, and made it a part of his christian confession. (2) Just as obviously is it no modern speculation; since it had *obtained in the schools* of protestant orthodoxy, even *commonly*, three hundred years ago. I subjoin his own words. Sed hic movetur quaestio, quomodo mundi totius peccata expientur. Omitto phreneticorum deliria, qui hoc praetextu reprobos omnes, adeoque Satanam ipsum in salutem admittunt: tale portentum refutatione indignum est. Qui hanc absurditatem volebant effugere, dixerunt; Sufficenter pro

toto mundo passum esse Christum: sed pro electis tantum efficaciter Vulgo haec solutio in scholis obtinuit. Ego quanquam verum esse illud dictum fateor; nego tamen praesenti loco quadrare.

2 Pet. 2: 1. "Even denying the Lord that bought them." He says—"those therefore who, despising restraint, have abandoned themselves to all licentiousness, are deservedly said to deny Christ by whom they were redeemed. Moreover, that the doctrine of the gospel may remain safe and entire in our hands, let us fix it in our minds that we have been redeemed by Christ to this very end—that HE may be at once the Lord of our life and our death: and so let us propose to ourselves this end, that to him we may live, and to him we may die." His words are—Qui igitur excusso freno in omnem licentiam se projiciunt, non immerito dicuntur Christum abnegare a quo redempti sunt. Proinde ut salva et integra evangelii doctrina apud nos maneat, hoc animis nostris infixum sit, redemptos esse nos a Christo ut vitae simul et mortis nostrae sit Dominus: itaque nobis hunc finem esse propositum ut illi vivamus ac moriamur.

Rom. 5: 18. "Therefore, as by one offence [sentence came] upon all men unto condemnation, so by the righteousness of one [sentence came] upon all men unto justification of life." Stuart's translation. Calvin says, "The apostle here makes it the common grace of all, because to all it is exhibited, though to all it is not realized in eventual fact. For although Christ suffered for the sins of the whole world, and to all without discrimination is he offered by the benignity of God, yet all men do not apprehend him." His words are—Communem omnium gratiam facit, quia omnibus exposita est, non quod ad omnes extendatur re ipsa: nam etsi passus est Christus pro peccatis totius mundi, atque omnibus indifferenter Dei benignitate offertur, non tamen omnes apprehendunt.

Matt. 26: 28. "For this is my blood of the new testament, [covenant,] which is shed for many for the remission of sins." He says, "Under the word *many* Jesus Christ designates not a part of the world only, but the total human race. Therefore, when we approach the table of the Lord, not only should this general thought occur to our mind, that the world has been redeemed by the blood of Christ, but each for himself ought to consider that his own sins have been expiated." I give his words. Sub *multorum* nomine non partem mundi tantum designat, sed totum humanum genus. Ergo dum ad suam mensam accedimus, non solum haec generalis cogitatio in mentem veniat, redemptum Christi sanguine esse mundum; sed pro se quisque reputet peccata sua expiata esse.

In modern technology (which I approve) they only are said to be *redeemed* who are actually accepted in Christ: for all, atonement is

made; to all, is it offered; the Spirit striving through the truth as extensively, as the sufficiency and applicability of the atonement are extensive. Still, to accept the offer and correspond with the offerer, is, in the very nature of things, the only way to be saved. Are all men saved? Yes—if all repent and believe the gospel! Do they this? He that believes men are saved *in sin*, or that all men renounce it, must have very strong faith! We however do NOT believe that the atonement was INDEFINITE in the sense of the *Remonstrants of Holland* or any other *Arminians*. God had a design in making it, which no event should frustrate. Christ eternally designed the salvation of the elect; and for these, in this sense *exclusively*, he gave his precious life. But this makes not the atonement less full, or alters its nature at all. When THE ELECT are all brought to piety and heaven, by supposition, THE OTHERS—whoever they are—have just as good an opportunity every way to realize the same blessedness, as all the world have on the theory that denies election. Election is one thing, atonement another. Election is all gain and no loss—and the reverse precisely is true of the error that denies election. See John, 6: 36-40, 44, 65. 10: 11, 15, 26-30. 17: 2. Eph. 5: 25-27. Rev. 17: 8. Matt. 25: 34. Rom. 9: 29.

27. This same one, as I have heard, once attended a funeral at the house of a pious Methodist, as no other minister could be procured. As he sat colloqually preaching to a circle in the room, he soon glided into his favorite strain of vituperation against the “hirelings or divines as they call themselves.” He concluded by warning his hearers to beware of them. “Yea,” said he with an oracular whine, “beware of the scribes and pharisees, hypocrites.” Rejoined a venerable old Methodist, “yes, my friends, and I think you ought also to beware of the *Sadducees*, who say there is no resurrection.”

28. Such a custom is most pernicious—a gratuitous kind of protestant *canonizing* of the dead, against which christians ought to show themselves decisive protestants; and blame not the Quakers alone.

De mortuis nil nisi bonum, 'tis said:

Say nothing but good of the men that are dead.

More christian the adage if thus it had come—

Say truth or say *nothing*, no matter of whom!

It is a common and most perverse error. Men are often blessed and sainted at death, in a style flatly infidel and plainly false. “The dead that die in the Lord,” and no others, does “THE SPIRIT” order to be written “blessed:” and we know of but one way of *dying* in the Lord—and that is, the way of *living* in the Lord! Let a man pass this divine

limit, and he has lost all rule, certainty, truth: and so far as his malign power extends, he will deceive credulous multitudes with the hope of rottenness that rushes to ruin. In the words of a forgotten author,

Turk, Jew, and Papist,
Infidel and Atheist;
Might all enter in,
With scorn and with sin;
If such graceless trust
Gets part with the just.

29. Let every one keep to his own vocation.

30. The strict and true exegesis of this passage is difficult, and has been critically controverted. It is here used in its ordinary and popular acceptation. The moral, however, is much the same, whatever view we adopt. Possibly "the Spirit" is to be taken in a good sense, for the grace of the Spirit of God inhabiting the mind of the christian. On that hypothesis, which seems to me probable at least, it ought to be rendered in parts as two questions, and not one merely; thus, "Think ye that the scripture testifieth falsely? Is it to envy (or malice) that the Spirit persuadeth, that hath taken up his abode in us?"

31. Conscious rectitude.

32. The subject of *original sin* is often regarded, too grossly, or without due concessions and discriminations, as a cardinal point, on which if a brother comes not to *my* views and phrases, I am at liberty and at duty too in denunciation or impeachment. On this important article, I would remark,

1. That there are difficulties in the philosophy or metaphysics of it, which it is either not easy or not possible to resolve; and which are almost equally great on every theory that does not utterly deny the doctrine—which were an alternative of much more and greater difficulties! We ought perhaps to be modest and forbearing toward others—especially till *we* can show (1) *precisely when* the soul begins to exist, that is to endure forever? (2) *precisely when* the subject becomes a moral agent? (3) *precisely how* it is affected by the sin of Adam, *whenever* it commences the perpetration of its own? and (4) *precisely how* we are metaphysically to reconcile the facts ascertained, with all the known principles of the divine moral government and the certainly revealed doctrines of the mediatorial economy? Surely here is some "debateable ground;" and debateable it *will* long remain! Nor can I see why we may not differ and debate in such aspects, without disturbing "the bond of peace," and without *specially* marring "the unity of the Spirit."

Only I believe that to *settle* such questions is about as impossible as to attempt it is ordinarily useless. The difficulties are metaphysical alone—not practical, I take it. They respect *modes* more than facts.

2. Without using any of the many technicalities that have obtained, I would impeach or doubt the soundness of no brother who should give evidence of intelligent and honest faith in the substance of the following propositions:

(1) That the whole species are morally fallen and sinful; “by nature children of wrath” and destitute of all conformity to the law of God.

(2) That this condition results, in the grand economy of things, from the sin of our first parents; so that their sin was *quasi* ours, was in effect ours, was in certain consequence the sin and ruin of human nature; so that angels, could they have known the future historical relations of the matter, would have wisely and well exclaimed; “man is ruined, is fallen, is lost;” grouping the whole species in the dire catastrophe.

(3) That depravity, or personal wickedness in some form, commences *whenever* moral action commences; and this in every instance of our moral history.

(4) That no member of the race, old or young, can be in fact saved in any other way than that of “the common salvation,” or as all others are, through the grace and mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ.

I have some special reasons (with *five* dear infants—I trust—in glory, of whom the oldest was not as many years of age) to feel and love the doctrine or implication of the *fourth* proposition; which however I have neither made nor modified since their tenderly remembered exit—when I gave them cheerfully and tearfully back to the hands of Jesus Christ!

3. There are questions and facts unresolved, on this article of “the common faith,” which embarrass, really, if not equally, every theory that was ever soberly framed for its elucidation: such as these—Have idiots souls? What becomes of them? and monstres, what of them? And so of millions of unborn children, of dead-born, of destroyed embryos, &c. Were all these represented in Adam? how are they related to him—how to Christ? Where there is no evidence, we had better have no theory. The scripture is often eloquent in its omissions. If, for example, it had affirmed the salvation of *all* infants, or any class of them, under a certain age, the consequences had been terrible! What fears for those who should die ever so little past that age! What temptations to infanticide under it, especially to *guilty* parents! What vain repinings and murmurings, among some, that they did not die earlier! How were the value of life cheapened, and a due preparation for death obstructed and postponed! These difficulties are not properly the *opprobria theologiae*—they are only “the secret things that belong to God.” All the principles on the topic which we need to know and thoroughly to

digest as theologians, seem to be contained correlatively in the *eighth* and *thirty-third* chapters of Ezekiel, the *fifth* of Romans, the *first three* of Genesis. But—*hic labor, hoc opus est.*

4. The definition of original sin contained in the Institutes of Calvin, popular rather than philosophical or metaphysical though it be, is not very objectionable, I should think, to any soundly thinking theologian; especially as explained in the second quotation below: Videtur ergo peccatum originale haereditaria naturae nostrae pravitas et corruptio, in omnes animae partes diffusa: quae primum facit reos irae Dei, tum etiam opera in nobis profert, quae scriptura vocat opera carnis.—Neque ista est alieni delicti obligatio; quod enim dicitur, nos per Adae peccatum obnoxios esse factos Dei judicio: non ita est accipiendum, acsi insontes ipsi et immerentes culpam delicti ejus sustinerimus; sed quia per ejus transgressionem maledictione induti sumus omnes, dicitur ille nos obstrinxisse. Ab illo tamen non sola in nos poena grassata est, sed instillata ab illo lues in nobis residet, cui jure poena debetur.

Not a bad definition for three hundred years ago, and by a young man who had lived just the fourth of a century. Contrary to my first purpose, I venture to translate it: I say *venture*, because some may question any rendering as to the exact sense conveyed. "Original sin therefore appears to be the hereditary pravity and corruption of our nature, diffused through all parts of the soul; which renders us primarily liable to the wrath of God, and then produces in us those works which are called in scripture "the works of the flesh." This bond to punishment however is not for the sin of another; for, when it is said that we are by the sin of Adam rendered obnoxious to the judgment of God, it is not so to be taken, as if we, being innocent and without all personal ill-desert, were necessitated to suffer the blame of his defection: but, as by means of his transgression, we are all indued with the malediction, he is said to have devolved it on us. By him however not the penalty alone hath overwhelmed us: for, by him instilled the moral mischief inhabits us, which is on its own account justly deserving of the penalty." I have given his words *boldly* in English, where I could; and I need not say that the sense is rendered with an honest aim, at least. My original design in quoting Calvin here, was simply to supply those who cared for it, with his own definition in his own words. Since writing all the above, I have compared the translation, with the more easy and familiar one of *Allen*, and see no reason to alter it.

I have no sympathy with those hyper-orthodox—whoever they are—who assume that they know (what God alone knows) *precisely when* the soul commences; and *precisely when* moral agency begins. I know that they *know* nothing about it; and that more knowledge or more candor would bring them to own, as many of the noblest living chief-

tains of the truth have done, their utter ignorance on such obscure points of metaphysical uncertainty—instead of presumptuously deciding, and even erecting them into cardinal and rallying points of *party* orthodoxy.

It is indeed *impossible for me* not to distinguish between *physical* depravity, and that which is *moral* in its proper nature: and hence by *lues* I interpret that excellent reformer to mean, *moral evil* with its consequent misery and exposure. And according to his own definition and the very reasoning of President Edwards, God, in the day of judgment, will charge individuals with their personal sinfulness and with this alone respectively, in the light of his own *spiritual* eternal law; condemning the wicked and pardoning, through Christ, the good, according to the measure of that unalterable standard.

5. A denial *de facto* of this doctrine *ought to be* matter of offence to the whole church of God, no matter who broaches or advocates the opposing heresy. To say that men are by nature pure and innocent, is abominable ignorance and infidel error. To say that their sin is merely incidental, owing to circumstances or evil example or education or neglect, and might be *prevented* by pious prophylactic care, is the very sum and substance of *pelagianism*—a fundamental heresy! On this article of faith Friends are mystical, evasive, ignorant, false; as Fox denies what he calls “the entail of sin,” and charges “the hireling priests,” with defending and advocating *sin itself*; because they merely maintained the true doctrine against his heresy, that denies original sin *in toto* and affirms the infatuated conceit of sinless perfection attained in the present life. Barclay says that we are involved (in some inconceivable style) in the fall of Adam; “nevertheless, this seed [of depravity] is not imputed to infants until by transgression they actually join themselves therewith.” Those who misunderstand *either* the malady or the remedy of our fallen condition, ordinarily misunderstand *both*; and discern not the glorious symmetry of the scheme of redemption. God imputes to us all the sin we have and all the *seeds* of it, in every case, and continually, till we are pardoned and justified in Christ Jesus. The *lues* is the sin itself: and sin is—*sin*, universally; and this when pardoned as really as when punished.

33. This proposition would be comparatively unobjectionable, if the sacred name were superseded by that of the arch enemy.

34. Quere—Is there any *inward* testimony of the scriptures.

35. Of which the plain English version is—That any ignoramus, of either sex, may preach, any where and at any time, under *internal* influence and responsibility alone. See 21, *Infra*. This is pretty large license. Learning, knowledge, probation, and order, are not quite ca-

nonical. The *avalanche* of inspiration clears the way for itself, by its own momentum, wherever it comes. It scorns to be anticipated by outward light of any sort; and it can be read and remembered afterward, mainly from the records of desolation which its own fury makes in the formidable rush! It seems not improper to remark that the very history of Friends demonstrates *the opposite* of their creed on this article. Their worst influences have emanated from their most ignorant pretenders; their respectability, from the labors of the more intelligent and the better educated. This may be seen as a criterion-principle in the schism. With few exceptions *the informed and cultivated* went one way; *the ignorant and intractable*, the other. Nor do I think it wrong to record that the heresiarch who led the latter class was *a grossly illiterate and ignorant man*; and touching his intellectual character, as sublimely elevated in his own imagination, as he was compassionated by all competent judges. I have heard him preach twice, conversed with him often, and corresponded on several occasions. I have *three letters* of his now in my possession, which fully warrant these reflections; as sordid and vicious in their literature, as false and treacherous in their doctrinal positions. "That the soul be without knowledge, it is not good." Prov. 19: 2. What kind of inspiration is it that makes ignorance almost a necessary qualification for the ministry?

36. This is an article which, though fundamental to Quakerism, is not carefully protruded, or zealously pressed into public view, by *modern* Friends. What is its bearing on the piety or profession of all other denominations? It explodes all others, *QUITE AS PERFECTLY* as this publication denounces Quakerism. It is however theoretically, practically, continually, in the very heart of their system. The result is that prayer—except in instances "few and far between" of apprehended motion, "the *inward and immediate* moving and drawing of his own Spirit," prayer is almost wholly omitted by Friends; as it *NEVER CAN BE* stately performed, in the closet, the family, or the meeting! This is fact, they know! Very few families notoriously have *any* domestic worship or religious order in them, they know! They must *ALWAYS* "get still," and wait in silence for a motion, (which often comes not,) and feel its inspiration in full glow, before they worship at all. *THIS IS HORRIBLE DELUSION AND WHOLLY ANTI-CHRISTIAN.* Luke, 18: 1-14, and especially, 1. I will put a case—such as occurs in substance often in the life of every individual and occurs even ordinarily, where "man's extremity becomes God's opportunity:" suppose a passenger in a ship at sea should fall astern overboard, and swimming "with heart of controversy" should see the vessel glide diminished on her way, evidently ignorant of his condition. It remains for him—to die and sink in the vast sepulchre of waters alone. But his strength will last some moments or minutes.

—Shall he pray or not? If he were to invoke the great God, by the faith of Jesus Christ, and pray for mercy and salvation for his name's sake, "coming boldly to the throne of grace" accessible then and in every other "time of need," and entreat for "grace to help" him; would it be "abominable idolatry" and so forth, "to be denied, rejected, and separated from, in this day of his spiritual arising?" Is it "will-worship" or "superstition?" O yes! for Barclay's "eleventh proposition" or thesis says that "ALL OTHER WORSHIP," and especially "prayers conceived extemporarily," are in this condemnation. This is impiously nullifying the revealed system of the grace of God; and needs only to be universally and consistently believed, to banish true worship from the world.

37. I wonder if they ever attentively study such a valuable work as the treatise, by the present excellent BISHOP WILSON of Calcutta, on "the divine authority and perpetual obligation of the Lord's day?" or Dick's philosophy of religion? or Dwight's five sermons on the fourth commandment?

38. From the third cardinal numeral, *tres*, is formed, *trinus*; and thence, *trinitas*; (as *unitas* from *unus* or *universitas* from *universus*;) I judge; without the word *unus* as an etymon of its composition; though Dr. Webster and others think differently.

39. To subdue the proud.

40. As if in independent or absolute possession—for the time.

41. Some are so conscientious or consistent that they never vote; viewing it as unlawful for them and for all men.

42. *The last argument—*

43. —*of kings—*

44. —*of laws.*

45. A great Preacher once said thus to me, and refused every answer but his own.

46. For our altars and firesides.

47. Some may suppose that the author has had sufficient time or leisure, in which to give his work the last and the best touches of correction. The facts are otherwise. While contemplation on the topics involved has been long habituated, leisure he scarcely knows: and most of this volume has been written at intervals and fragments of time, in the last four months of the year 1832. A large parochial charge, in such a proverbially *busy* city as that of his residence, may convince

any thoughtful person, *in some small degree*, of the impossibility that he should prepare a work, such as, in other circumstances, might seem comparatively worthy of public approbation. No part of it has been re-written for the press; except as the manuscripts were indebted to notes incidentally taken through previous years. In the near approach (as it seemed) of eternity, toward the end of July last, when the CHOLERA was upon him, the thought that death might supervene before the purpose of publication was executed, determined him, if spared and prospered to recover, to "perform the doing of it" as soon as practicable. It has cost him, with reduced strength, some effort, made often when others were sleeping; and without any intermission of his public duties. He repeats the declaration that it aspires to no superiority on the score of fine writing; being too sensible of its real defects and those of its author to indulge such a vanity. In regard to manner, if due allowance be accorded him, the graver questions, touching THE MATTER OF THE PERFORMANCE, may find a wiser tribunal and a more candid audit, as well as an equitable decision, at the court of public sentiment—from which, however, the christian knows, when he needs it, to what HIGHER JUDICATORY he may carry his ultimate appeal.

48. Sometimes *two at once*—both inspired! Of this I have often heard, and *have myself once seen it*. The result on that occasion, when a man and woman rose at different ends of their "gallery" or long continuous pulpit, was (if I rightly remember) that the man, *pausing* longer, heard the voice of his *supplantress* about 50 feet to his left, (in Arch-street meeting,) at which he was startled, looked at her, and then composedly sat down till that *head feminine* of the whole assembly, that *female* "master of assemblies" was done! Their commission to "usurp authority" of this sort will be investigated hereafter.

49. See summary of their doctrine, &c. "written at the desire of the meeting for sufferings in London 1800" appended to Mosheim, New-York edition, 1821.

50. A proud *a priori* argument, which, though abstractly true, inasmuch as it is evident that no contradiction can proceed from the Holy Ghost; yet, in reference to the assumed matters of fact connected with the *inspiration* of Friends, it is destitute of all evidence and truth: for, the question to be tried is *not the consistency of the Eternal Spirit in all his genuine revelations*, which none but an atheist can deny; but *whether FRIENDS are in fact thus inspired?* "Try the Spirits."

"Moreover, these divine inward revelations, which we make absolutely necessary for the building up of true faith, neither do nor can ever contradict the outward testimony of the scriptures, or right and sound reason. Yet from hence it will not follow that these divine revelations

are to be subjected to the examination either of the outward testimony of the scriptures, or of the natural reason of man."—BARCLAY.

According to this it is plain, 1. That the deniers (and I am one of them) of "these divine inward revelations" are all destitute of the grace of God, because destitute of that which is "absolutely necessary to true faith." 2. That all such will be lost; for, "he that believeth not shall be damned." 3. That we are required to believe *the vaunted fact that Friends are thus inspired* without any evidence. 4. That we are required to believe this alleged fact *without any scrutiny*; for these "revelations" are not "to be subjected" to scripture or reason. This is fact—as well as argument! What a paralysis of mind does this system inspire! What miserable credulity does it demand! Barclay is "no imitator and admirer of the *school-men*, but an opposer and despiser of them as such; by whose labor," says he, "I judge the *christian religion* to be so far from being bettered, that it is rather *destroyed*."

And this is an *inspired* judgment, remember. No wonder that he deprecates "examination" and all learning that is equal to it. Having utterly perverted christianity, he *has reasons* for degrading the wisdom that could expose his deeds and manifest his darkness. Let christians value learning; and make it, in its place, *a part of their religion!* They are recreant to christianity, if they dishonor that philosophy, which is *not* "falsely so called." I bless "the Father of lights" for "the good and perfect gifts" of sound learning and true science—and value them *religiously* and for Christ's sake, more than in any other relation incomparably: and am indebted, by the rule of contraries, to Quakerism, in a sort, for my deep conscientious estimate of their immense subsidiary value. O that all christians were sufficiently wise to abhor ignorance as they ought, and cultivate its genuine opposite devoutly and universally! For myself, I know enough to feel the value of learning; and much more to *feel*, to my dying day, distressingly, the defects of my own attainments.

51. If any doubt it, let him examine the following scriptures and *digest* their common scope; Numb. 23: 16. 24: 2-4, 15-24. 31: 8. Josh. 13: 22. 24: 9, 10. Micah, 6: 5. 2 Pet. 2: 15, 16. Jude, 11. Rev. 2: 14. 1 Sam. 10: 9-12. 28: 5, 6-25. 31: 4. 1 John, 3: 15. 1 Kings, 13: 20-22. John, 11: 49-53. Matt. 7: 21-23. John, 6: 70, 71. 1 Cor. 13: 2. Remembering that the word *charity* ought to have been translated *love*, WHEREVER it occurs in the New Testament.

52. Errors on the subject of *the influences of the Spirit* are multifarious; and not confined to any one aspect, or monopolized by one description of men. It may be well here to state some sentiments that have their respective advocates, and which, it is thought, may easily be proved erro-

neous—some of them dreadfully erroneous. We will state, however, in positive form, the views we deem correct, and *the opposite* of which will show the errors to which we refer.

1. There is no proper *miracle* in these times connected with them or to be expected from them: the same is true of *inspiration*, strictly such.

2. Miraculous influence or inspiration is not *nobler and to be preferred* to that which mainly sanctifies and cleanses the soul as the "living temple" of God.

3. They are not *with generations, as such*; but with individuals.

4. They are not *given to saints alone*, or to the elect alone; but to all men who hear the gospel. Were all the antediluvians, or the hearers of the protomartyr, saints?

5. They are not *independent of "the word of God,"* which is ever "the sword of the Spirit:" as if the agent and the action were to be affirmed, in exclusion of the uniform manner and the known instrument of his working in all. We know of no such influence, except in what may be called the natural and universal energy of God—to which absolutely we have no moral relation. Mediately, it is our privilege and our duty to believe it, as a doctrine of the word of God.

6. They are *not* to be identified with what is *purposed and effectual*—with the executed "purpose of God according to election;" as if with them we are certainly saved: as if one could in no sense be "made partaker of the Holy Ghost" even, and perish. Heb. 6:4. Matt. 13:20, 21. 2 Pet. 2:1, 20-22. The things are twain and to be distinguished—as often they are not.

7. They are not *general only*; but *special also*: these are *as and when* the influences *take hold* of an individual; as distinguished from others that affect the subject little or not at all. Still, special influence must be in a given degree powerful or it will be resisted fatally: for *special* and *saving* influences are *not* always identified in the event, however they may be in general nature.

8. They are *not irresistible*. The error results from confounding them with the purposes of God, *after* misconceiving their nature. (1) Sinners resist them notoriously. (2) So do saints in some respects, every day. Will any *christian* deny this in his own case? (3) They are *resistible* in their very nature, even when *not resisted*. They were better said in such case to be *effectual*; because they then secure the event, because they were *fatalizing* otherwise, and because this is about all that orthodoxy means. It is also, I think, the usage and the meaning of scripture. (4) I know not what beside can be *so easily resisted* as the influence of the Spirit! such delicacy, tenderness, refinement, holiness, and cordiality, combined, on the one part; with such grossness,

presumption, instability, and impurity, on the other. The Bible no where represents them as irresistible; as might be shown.

9. They are not *physical* or mechanical, instead of *moral* and spiritual, in their nature. Some theologues identify their error here—angrily enough—with orthodoxy.

10. We need not be immediately and always *conscious* of them: the idea is enthusiastical, or rather fanatical and false—as well as very ruinous. Many a man under the influence of the Spirit knows not what is the matter with him, and is *sensible* only of—moral wretchedness or some other revealed truth. The Spirit brings us to honor heartily his own word.

11. *Internal sensation* is not to govern us, or our feelings to be our leaders—instead of being led and governed by “the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth.” We are to walk neither by *internal* nor external sensation—but *by faith*; and the word of God is our highest rule always. Wo to the man who, inverting the proper symmetry of his being, allows *feelings* to control him in religion or—almost—in any thing else!

12. Their genuine fruit or result is identified with *all the moral excellence or evangelical holiness* ever found in ransomed men.

13. Their mere *restraining* power, however vast or excellent it may be in certain aspects, infers not grace in the heart of its subject. Gracious affections are spontaneous, positive, free, happy, joyous, and comparatively unrestrained.

14. They are in any wise *absolutely necessary* to salvation. Are not regeneration, sanctification, illumination, necessary?

15. We are not *passive* under their action—when all their *efficacy* consists in *actuating* us in goodness! *Not Friends only* have made this mistake! I have some reason for *knowing* that *passivity doctrines* are not the legitimate progeny of truth.

16. We need not *wait for them*. In fact they are waiting for us—and the *waiting system* on our part is compounded only of false views, contracted thoughts, and disobedient feelings, combining for an excuse in sin! The waiting system is ordinarily subverted *before* conversions or revivals ensue.

17. They are not necessary to *make us accountable*, or necessary to accountableness. They may *increase*, not constitute, our accountableness. We are accountable absolutely and universally, perfectly and eternally.

18. They are not given to *reveal new truths*; but to illumine our minds and vivify our feelings, by faith, toward old, fully revealed, and well known ones.

19. They are not given to *inspire our actions*, or preclude our vigi-

lance or prudence or responsibility in the "ordering of our affairs with discretion."

20. They are not given *independently of the means of grace*; or, otherwise than in connection with them, and in proportion ordinarily to their purity and due improvement; or, as if involving contrariety, instead of coincidence, with them. They honor those means as their legitimate conductors; and every christian *needs* to be "educated in righteousness," in a way of child-like trust and duty attending on them; expecting God to meet us in his ways and lead us in his paths; being constituted "righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." Isaiah, 64 : 5. Exod. 20 : 24. "The unity of the Spirit" means his consistency or identity with himself, and the homogeneousness of all his proper influences. The revealed system is one; He hath inspired it; and "the fruit of the Spirit" in us conforms to that unity and "keeps" it.

53. In all respects and at all hazards.

54. No recognition of its existence in the title page.

55. In New England, says Cotton Mather in his "Magnalia," the Quakers were punished, "non qua errone, sed qua turbones," for what they did, not what they taught, by the magistracy: and among other offences of intolerable abomination, which they practised against the peace and decency of the commonwealth, the pious nudity of females, like the naked goddess of Reason worshipped in revolutionary France, or the miserable *lupercalians* of Rome, was conspicuous. Mather justly condemns their capital punishment by the civil authorities; though the instances were few and in circumstances of provocation singularly high; but insists on their tumultuary proceedings, and inspired obstinacy in "crying against" all authority of the laws, as deserving and as absolutely requiring the intervention of the magistrates. "I would also entreat the world," says that excellent and learned man, "that they would not be too ready to receive all stories told by the Quakers about their New England persecution; because the Quakers have in print complained of such an one upon two women of their sect, who came STARK NAKED AS EVER THEY WERE BORN into our public assemblies, and they were (*baggages* that they were!) adjudged unto the whipping-post for that piece of *devilism*." The same scene was acted, with equal inspiration, (as Mosheim and other writers also assert,) in Old England, how often I know not; Fox himself (and ALL Friends *have* to sanction and *must* defend it) being the underwriter of the history. He charges it all on the agency of God, who, he says, *inspired* it! These are his words: "The Lord made one to go naked among you, a figure [a *figure* in-

deed!] of thy nakedness, and of your nakedness, and as a sign amongst you, before your destruction cometh; that you might see you were naked and not covered, with the truth." I have no doubt that all this belongs *legitimately* to the 'orthodox' system, and may result from it again. Such things, generally such, that is, grotesque symbolical actions and "figures," made each "for a sign," in some conspicuous place or august presence, were *common* among them in the seventeenth century. Many more specimens might be given, and many authors quoted. I have reason to think that the spectacle of naked females, to be piously looked at "for a sign," was often repeated, and in a sort familiarized, in the old country, before "that piece of devilism" was repeated in the new. Says Fox, "Some have been moved [no doubt—*moved*] to go naked in their streets, in the other power's days, [meaning Cromwell's,] and since, [i. e. it was all along common in the days of either power,] as signs of their nakedness; and have declared amongst them, 'That God would strip them of their hypocritical professions, and make them as bare and naked as they were.' But, instead of considering it, they have frequently whipped, or otherwise abused them; and sometimes imprisoned them." Terrible magistrates these! Where was their toleration? their *charity*, their faith, their regard for tender consciences, or their respect for inspired actions and the fair sex? There is reason to fear however that Friends themselves have degenerated, very considerably, since these pure and spiritual times! Very few modern female preachers are favored with such inspiration "for a sign," and few perhaps would be found sufficiently faithful to make the demonstration. Ah! this worldly refinement! But I would not presumptuously decide against them. I have witnessed myself enough to think they can do almost any thing—when *inspired*. The moving of inspiration is the very soul of the orthodoxy of their system—though they will little thank me for telling the truth as it is in this publication.

56. In respect to a *pre-eminently stupid calumny* that "Friends believe" quite extensively, concerning a *conspiracy* in the Presbyterian denomination, to unite *Church and State, and all that*, I can only say, being about as deep in the plot as Dr. Green himself or Dr. Ely even, that we should all utterly despair of accomplishing the important object during the present century, were it not for one circumstance—which I feel some hesitancy in evulgating! But IT IS TRUTH, I know; and hence, without consulting one of my fellow conspirators, or divulging my present purpose to any human being, I will—I think—just write it here, come what may; and say with Pilate, "what I have written, I have written." Take it then. We do not *despair* of the enterprize, because—WE CANNOT; FOR IT NEVER HAD, AND NEVER CAN HAVE, ANY IN-

CEPTION OR EXISTENCE! Presbyterians would have more to lose and less to gain, than any other sect probably by such adulteration! Any man who wishes more information on the subject may call at my house at his leisure—any time after the 29th of February, 1833: and in the mean time I would refer him to the CONSTITUTION of the Presbyterian church; Confession of Faith, chap. 23, and Form of Government, chap. 1, or, if this should not satisfy his deep patriotic suspicions, I refer him, for a full exposition, and a thorough eclaireissement, and a most convincing demonstration, of the whole matter, to the *infallible* showings and guidings and leadings and dreamings especially—of the *inward light!* since it, as Fox says, “hath dominion over all and deceives nobody.”

57. Rt. Rev. Chas. P. McIlvaine, D. D. in his EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

58. Dr. Campbell's translation; the *degree* of the darkness, as total, is plainly the sense of the text.

59. See the learned reasoning of JONES ON THE CANON OF THE N. T.—a very valuable work!

60. The work done, irrespective of the motive.

61. This was written previous to the schism, when Friend Hicks was living and prosperous. It is not at present—far from it, I am persuaded—wholly without application!

62. To this there are some exceptions, (perhaps many to me unknown,) who, as such, had been more complete and mighty, if their doctrinal views of the nature and relations of the atonement had been thorough and discriminating. Among these I am happy to name our truly venerable and excellent late countryman, LINDLEY MURRAY. In his “Compendium of religious faith and practice;” in his numerous and useful compilations; in his private writings inserted in his “Memoirs;” and in his constant experience and conversation: to say nothing of his long and most exemplary sufferings as an imprisoned invalid: he so honored THE LORD JESUS CHRIST AND HIS GLORIOUS ATONEMENT, that I feel singular freedom and pleasure, uniting with the popular voice of two hemispheres, in acknowledging, as the peerless crown to the many accomplishments of a highly finished character, that the title of *christian* belongs to him. Would to God that every Friend, and every baptized person, were equally enlightened and sincere! While I really reverence and love his memory, and am one of thousands whom his publications have benefited, and have much reason tenderly to esteem in the Lord several of his honored relatives in this city; while I know that he inculcated too much sound truth, and elevated the standard of orthodoxy too near its proper

altitude, to be very acceptable in his *doctrinal* influence to Friends generally: I am compelled to record my regret that he did *not* proceed farther; that he did *not* avow the PARAMOUNT authority of the scriptures as THE WORD OF GOD, with all the consequent obligations and duties of *such* "a good confession;" and my conviction that the *reliquiae* of his Quakerism constituted a real and even a great defect in his otherwise exalted and very amiable character. Quakerism would be still wrong and false, if every one of its nominal members were—in spite of it—as sound and christian. His many redeeming excellencies, however, form a capital that may well sustain (as few others could) the brunt of the allegation in our impartial estimate. I could not do justice to my own sense of duty were I to say less: and great is the joy of my soul in hoping to meet ALL THE PIOUS DEAD in the eternal world, and in that palace of "light ineffable" where "the spirits of just men are made perfect," as well as—through the blood of the LAMB—admitted and forever glorified together.

The COMPENDIUM of Mr. Murray I take to be, every way, one of the most worthy documents I ever saw from a member of the society. Its simple classic excellence of diction, constitutes not at all its highest claim—it is generally *so* clear and sound in its matter! Still, I object to it; (1) that it is so wary in *not asserting* the supremacy of the scriptures: and (2) that its other defects, resulting from that prime one, are *such* and in detail so many. If my own father, or any nearer relative, were the subject of animadversion here, I could not suppress or qualify this censure!—or record it with scarcely more anguish of heart! And as for the praise—it is *wholly* founded on the recognition of qualities derived from christianity, as *contradistinguished* from Quakerism; qualities that have rendered the COMPENDIUM unacceptable and useless, where it was *designed* to be especially adapted and serviceable; qualities that have commended their subject to the esteem of christians everywhere, not more than they have *discommended* him to many of his own denomination.

63. With the *anniversary* abominations of heathenism—sol et annus—was its known and base and proudly pompous original: and much the same could be said of myriads of other excellent and even holy words.

Solemnes tum forte dapes et tristia dona
 Ante urbem in luco, &c.
 Annua vota tamen solemnesque ordine pompas
 Exsequeretur, strueremque suis altaria donis.—VIRG.

64. Pythagoras divided the doctrines of his dogmatism into two classes: the *exoteric*, which were publicly avouched and inculcated; and the *esoteric*, which were entrusted to the initiated alone. I do not

mean, however, by this allusion to the sage of Crotona and the father of dogmatic philosophy, that Friends resemble him in all his errors, or that they practise a systematic legislation of one code of principles for the nation and another for the clan: but only that some of their sages see, and sometimes confess to each other, certain truths, of whose *exoteric* currency they would not be particularly ambitious. Any usage of theirs, which seems to me to be a limb of their system and properly no limb or member of Christ, I think it just to bring into the animadversion of the community.

Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.—HOR.

To no dogmatic master am I sworn;
To think and act, a freeman, was I born.

There is one hidden feature of their system on which I might voluminously enlarge—not so much the mystic, as the mythic or fabulous character. Their old men, as well as “old wives,” have “fables” of the marvellous, as “a secondary rule” almost, a store of them. These they relate and interchange, with very placid satisfaction, in select circles around the fire of a winter’s evening; while the younger, with “ductile minds” intent, listen, wonder, believe, and become edified in their turn to—transmit the precious treasure to their heirs of a coming generation. These goodish stories are very entertaining, romancing if not quixotic—only that it is so spiritual and so inspired and so fresh in the experience of Friends, that “the truth” in comparison is plausibly and practically disgraced—

Loses discountenanc’d and like folly shows.

In this way they illustrate, manifest, and enforce “what Friends believe,” more impressively than “truth and soberness” could ever affect them. I might almost compose a distinct volume of *Quaker mythology*, from notes and my own memory; recollecting *a score at least* of quite interesting stories, all luciferous and tributary to the interior light with its prodigious efficacy and feats. Their stories seem all true—to those who think it ‘carnal reasoning’ to apply the known laws of evidence: and the inference is hence all ‘in the light,’ very sincere, and no very bad logic either, that—their system is true! They believe it; and so did their fathers before them, who knew when and where it happened and all about it: and their children believe it in their turn, and transmit the precious information to their children, and so on progressively; while,

like old wine, it continually improves by time and travel. All this, and a thousand other things of the sort, result, I think, from the system.

Mobilitate viget, viresque acquirit eundo.—VIRG.

By motion increasing, it prospers and grows ;
 New vigor acquires and new speed as it goes ;
 Believed and rehearsed, till each trusts it and *knows* :
 But tells it to Friends—since, why should they to foes ?

65. The italicising is all his.

66. Since writing the above, I have received from a respectable hand the following bill of exhibited abuse in England, which I am as willing as any man in the world to denounce and expose. Where the kingdom of Christ is secularized, subordinated to the mere ends of intriguing statesmen, and made a mighty wheel in the machinery of political oppression, I say with any others—it is christianity no longer: no more of it! Let its end come! Religion can best flourish and protect the state, when left free and independent of all such perilous and polluting influence. If God will not uphold christianity, let it fall! Only spare it from the embrace in which it perishes; from the communion that is its dishonor; from the ignoble and rickety supports that prevent a safer basis and portend a dreadful fall!

It is one of the hand-bills that were circulated through the kingdom by thousands, during the late pendency of the spirit-stirring question of REFORM. I would suggest a *thirteenth* reason—Because the church is not the state, and the state is not the church; and since God hath *not* joined them together, it is *lawful* for man to put them asunder. What a horrid *misnomer*, to call a collection of worldly and greedy aspirants, *the church!* as they often do, meaning ultimately themselves alone. I know there is “salt” in the church of England; possibly even in some of its high places, where THE KING OF HEAVEN is duly honored as its proper and only legitimate HEAD.

TWELVE REASONS why Dissenters should not be compelled to pay church rates, tythes, or in any way to contribute toward the support of the Establishment.

BECAUSE—

1. The cause of God and truth ought to be supported by the *voluntary* contributions of its adherents—and is disgraced when *compulsory* measures are adopted.

2. It is compelling Dissenters to support a system which they conscientiously view as unscriptural.

3. Dissenters derive no commensurate advantage in return from the Church.

4. Dissenters bear all the expenses connected with their places of worship without asking or receiving any aid from the Church.

5. There is nothing more fair, equitable, and unobjectionable, than that every denomination of professing christians should meet its own expenditure.

6. The Church has resources in herself amply sufficient to defray all her pecuniary engagements.

7. It is taking from Dissenters an amount which they might much more profitably employ in the cause of christian philanthropy.

8. It is an infringement of religious liberty, and in direct violation of the divine mandate, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." How would Churchmen approve a compulsory tax for the support of *Dissenting* places of worship?

9. The remission of this claim by Churchmen, would efface one foul blot which now attaches to the Establishment.

10. Many Churchmen see the impolicy and injustice of thus taxing Dissenters, and are prepared to concede the point.

11. Dissenters now equal, if they do not exceed in number, Churchmen.

12. On no principle of honor, justice, or honesty, can the exaction be defended, and therefore REFORM here must ensue.

On a moderate calculation, the *washing* of surplices costs this nation annually, upwards of £13,000! A considerable proportion of this amount is exacted from Dissenters. Might not the whole be much more beneficially appropriated?

"There are probably in England, Scotland, and Ireland, not including the Roman Catholics, not less than 8,000 congregations of Dissenters; which build their own places of worship; which sustain their own ministers; which support their own colleges, to the number of nearly 20; which conduct the tuition of perhaps 7,000 Sunday Schools; and which expend nearly £150,000 in support of Foreign Missions."

67. But in other ways and in thousands of forms, can they be nobly useful and excellent auxiliaries to the ministry. They can sometimes speak well and effectually, as also eloquently, in private circles and to individuals, for their Master's honor; witness the lady mentioned page 16 of this volume: They can subserve most valuably the usefulness of others. For we need "helps," as well as "governments," in the church of God. Thus Priscilla, the beloved Persis, Junia and Phebe, Euodias and Syntyche, with other "honorable women not a few," helped the apostles usefully and acceptably; as Paul says of one of them to the church: "Receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you; for she hath been a suc-

corer of many and of myself also." An honorable testimony—which I could bear in favor of many, who have in different ways assisted me in the Lord; and of *one* (now a member of my own church and the wife of one of its honored eldership) who, when I was "perplexed, but not in despair, persecuted but not forsaken, cast down but not destroyed," so kindly and wisely, in the love of Christ, "ministered unto me of her substance," Luke, 8: 3, and in other ways encouraged me in God, when I first knew him, that my heart will never forget its obligations to *Mrs. Sarah Sayrs*—and, if it were equally pertinent, I should have *previously* named her excellent husband, *Mr. Isaac Sayrs*; both remembered by many with similar sentiments and feelings. "The Lord grant unto" them and their large household, that they "may find mercy of the Lord in that day!" However little it may be in my power to compensate their generous and christian kindness, I rejoice to think that "my God shall supply ALL THEIR NEED, according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus." And to many other *friends indeed*, do I extend the hope and the invocation that God would crown them with grace and glory, in his own perfect kingdom.

68. On one occasion a dumb animal of the sex *prophecied* "with man's voice." Shall we argue here from a rare exception, to a general rule of prophetic investiture, and instate an order of *such officers* in the church? I know of no other instance *in the scriptures*, where inspiration ever authorized *their* preaching: and have no idea that a solitary precedent of the sort ought to be pleaded in favor of their regular ministrations. Numb. 22: 25.

69. Ventum erat ad limen, cum virgo, Poscere fata
Tempus, ait: Deus, ecce, Deus! Cui talia fanti
Ante fores, subito non vultus, non colour unus,
Non comptae mansere comae: sed pectus anhelum,
Et rabie fera corda tument; majorque videri,
Nec mortale sonans: afflata est numine quando
Jam propiore Dei.—VIRG.

Their inspiration often shows some of the contorsions and gesticulations of the Cumæan sibyl—shivering, transported, tremulous, unnatural in voice, as if borne along by a tide of irresistible influence, in spite of themselves. It is heathenism! How "gross" are their conceptions who see no sin in forging the signature of God; declaring one's self inspired—when it is not so!

70. See note 55.

71. I have taken these lines chiefly from the 'Universal passion,' by Dr. Young. Those referring to the nudity of females "for a sign," I have mainly supplied, (referring to note 55,) for the following reasons:

(1) Very few have heard or believe the facts of the case, as they are well authenticated.

(2) I not only believe that they occurred, and that often, in the times of Cromwell and the second Charles, as well as on several occasions in New England, but that they are *legitimate fruits of the system*. I put this torvous dilemma to Friends: Either this "sign" business results from the system, and so MAY OCCUR AGAIN; or, the system is false; for, its capital foxian inspiration authenticates it as true, solemnly sanctions it, and refers it absolutely to the agency of God, who "made" them do it. If the latter—the proposition in the title of this book is demonstrated: if the former, then let the public judge a system that inspires such actions and may unexpectedly at any time turn droves of naked females into "your streets," as Fox says, "for a sign before your destruction cometh!" I think indeed that the title of this book is fully proved by either alternative: for when did christianity ever inspire "that piece of devilism?" If a Friend admits the facts, and condemns them too—he condemns Fox, and his inspiration, thus blowing up the system at once! In fact a Friend must *go the whole*; and in all consistency every other person must canonize—or cannonade the total mass.

Quakerism is not christianity: and let the man who can see no difference, read the *INSPIRED MOTTOES* of this book, and refer the matter, if he chooses, to the unalterable decision of the judgment-seat of Christ, staking the hope of his own salvation on the forlorn expectancy that *there* it will not be exploded and anathematized forever! "If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful; HE CANNOT DENY HIMSELF."

—ἀδυνατον ψευσασθαι θεον—

THE END.