

R E M A R K S

ON

DR. MOORE'S ADDRESS

TO THE

M E M B E R S

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

IN THE

CITY OF NEW-YORK.

By WILLIAM LINN, D. D.



NEW-YORK—PRINTED BY THOMAS GREENLEAF,

M, D C C, X C, I I I,

1773

R E M A R K S

O 2

DR. MOORE'S ADDRESS.

IT was not without serious deliberation that I published my Sermon on the character of Simon the Sorcerer, with an Appendix. Fully aware of the evils which often spring from religious controversy, nothing but a sense of duty could have influenced me to engage. Though I read Dr. Moore's Discourse on *Regeneration* soon after I heard of it, and was dissatisfied with his sentiment, yet it was not until lately that I determined to give it particular and public opposition. It struck me at first, as being so contrary to holy Scripture, to the belief of the Church, and to the experience of Christians, that it would make little impression; and this was the principal reason why animadversions were so long delayed. But, as it was probable that a few might be misguided, or at least perplexed in their minds, and as I considered it to be an unfavorable token to the Church that such a sentiment was inculcated from the pulpit

and the press, I thought, at length, that some opposition would be necessary and useful.

HAD it been a matter merely speculative, or of doubtful disputation, it would still have been unnoticed by me; but it respects no less than that change which is absolutely necessary to qualify us for the enjoyment of eternal happiness. If we misapprehend the nature of this change, we may deceive ourselves, and build on an improper foundation. Besides, the sentiment advanced on Regeneration necessarily leads to the maintenance of other doctrines equally dangerous, in my opinion, to holiness of life, and the salvation of men. I do not mean that no wise and good men have ever embraced these doctrines. Far be such uncharitableness from my breast. If I incline to any extreme, it is to the opposite one. As far as my observation extends, the least enlightened in the different sects of Christians, are always the most bigoted and censorious; and the sincere among all require only to know one another better to be more united.

SINCE the publication of my sermon and appendix, Dr. Moore has published an address to

the members of his own Church, in which he attempts to vindicate his sentiment, and to invalidate what I have written against it. My performance might have been too dilatory, and his, probably, will appear to have been too hasty. It is now before me, and I purpose to examine it, as far as is necessary, with all impartiality and faithfulness, knowing that I must render an account unto the great *Shepherd and Bishop of Souls*. I write not with a view to keep the controversy alive, or because my arguments have been answered, but to prevent the danger of some misapprehensions, and to set the subject in a clearer point of light. Nothing is now foreseen which will easily induce me to write again. Let me only premise farther, that should any expressions escape me which border on severity, or make light of the arguments of those who differ from me, they must be imputed to an honest warmth. I ask no unfair weapons; I seek no advantage but what my cause gives; I contend not for victory, but for truth.

DR. MOORE continues to alledge, that every person regularly baptized is *regenerated*; which he explains by being "taken out of his natural state," having "a work of holiness begun in

“ him by the Spirit of God ;” and that he is supported in this opinion by the Scriptures, by the primitive Fathers, and by the language of his own and other Churches. I have not denied, but endeavoured to give a satisfactory account of this language ; that it arose from the use of a well known figure, by which the sign is put for the thing signified ; and from certain circumstances in the primitive Church. That as her afflicted situation had nothing to allure, but every thing to deter the hypocritical pretender, so a profession was the great test of men’s sincerity, and their conversion and baptism were spoken of as the same, because the one soon followed the other. I showed that this language is used by the Church, at this day, particularly with respect to the Holy Supper. But I denied that Regeneration, in the sense which he affixes to it, always accompanies the administration of baptism, and that this can be proved by any of the testimonies before mentioned.

INSTEAD of examining here the texts of Scripture, and the language of the Churches which he produces, let me refer the reader to an excellent sermon on Regeneration now publishing

by my Reverend and worthy Colleague, Professor Livingston. The Confession and Catechism of the Reformed Dutch Church are there truly represented, and the texts of Scripture explained agreeably to the generally received opinion of the most approved interpreters. So fully and clearly is the subject treated, that it greatly shortens the remarks which I would otherwise make, and indeed, is a complete answer to all that Dr. Moore has written.

WITH respect to the testimonies of the Fathers, they are too much relied upon in this case, as well as in many others. Tertullian and Origen both maintained very singular and dangerous opinions. The first held, that one Montanus was that Comforter which our Saviour promised to send; and, in discoursing on baptism, he expressly contradicts himself more than once. Origen held, that the souls of all men had a being before the world, and were sent into bodies as a punishment; that they sinned in a former state, and not in Adam; with numerous other errors. One would think, that the nearer the fountain, the purer the streams, yet they were soon polluted, and these two early and learned Fathers departed from the

faith, and corrupted the simplicity of the gospel. The reason of their language, when speaking of baptism, has been already given; and if this be judged insufficient, it may be matter of inquiry, whether they were perfectly accurate in this, and convey the true meaning of Scripture.

THEY do not, however, so generally speak this language, as is alledged. Let me produce a few instances. Clemens Alexandrinus plainly uses the word Regeneration for a *change* of character by true repentance; when speaking of a penitent harlot, he says, “that being born
“again by conversion, or a change in her temper and behaviour, she has the *Regeneration*
“of life.”* The following words are quoted from a learned author: “The Catechumens
“enjoyed not the privileges of the faithful until
“they had, through a considerable time of trial,
“evidenced the sincerity of their hearts by the
“sanctity and purity of their lives: And then,
“as Origen says, *We initiate them in our mysteries, when they have made a proficiency in holiness, and according to the utmost of their power, have reformed their conversation.* When

* Strom. Lib. II. pag. 425. Ed. Sylburg.

“ they had changed their manners and rectified
 “ their irregular carriage, then they were wash-
 “ ed with the water of baptism, and not before.
 “ For as Tertullian observes, We are not bap-
 “ tized, *that we may cease to sin*; but *because we*
 “ *have already ceased.*”* Basil, speaking of
 adults, says, “ One must *believe* first, and then be
 “ *sealed* with baptism.”† Hear also the words
 of Austin: “ There are two infants born: If
 “ you ask what merit they have; they both are
 “ of the lump of perdition. But how comes it
 “ that the mother of the one brings him to the
 “ grace, the mother of the other in her sleep
 “ overlays it? You will ask me what merit had
 “ one that he should be brought to the grace?
 “ what merit had the other that was overlaid by
 “ his sleeping mother? Neither of them de-
 “ served any good. But *the potter has power*
 “ *over his clay, of the same lump to make one ves-*
 “ *sel to honour, and another to dishonour.*”‡ I
 quote this principally to show, that the doctrine
 of predestination was inculcated in the primi-
 tive Church. To understand the passage, it is
 necessary to consider, that the Fathers believed

B

* Inquiry into the Constitution, Part I. p. 102.

† Lib. 3. contra Eunomium.

‡ De Verbis Apost. II.

that an infant could not be saved without baptism, and on this principle Austin ascribes to the sovereignty, or good pleasure of God, that one infant was baptized, that is, saved; and another not baptized, that is left to perish. That he argued on a wrong principle is no evidence against his holding the doctrine; and though he calls baptism here the *grace*, yet the inference is not fair that he held this to be always conferred by baptism; for he is speaking of those who died in infancy, and not of those who lived to years of understanding, nor of those who offered themselves for baptism, when they were come to age. The reader will please to remark, that it is not denied by me that grace is often conferred at the time of baptism, and perhaps always to infants who *die* in infancy, but it is denied that Regeneration or grace is necessarily and invariably connected with the administration of baptism.

I SHALL only quote, once more, part of Austin's letter to Boniface, which though long and very inaccurate in expressing doctrines, is yet extremely pertinent to the matter in hand. "SACRAMENTS would not be sacraments, if they had not a *resemblance* of those things

“ whercof they are sacraments: And from this
“ resemblance they commonly have the *names* of
“ the things themselves. As therefore the sa-
“ crament of Christ’s body is after a certain fa-
“ shion Christ’s body, and the sacrament of
“ Christ’s blood is Christ’s blood ; so the sa-
“ crament of faith is faith. And so when an
“ infant that has not yet the faculty of faith, is
“ said to believe; he is said to have faith, be-
“ cause of the sacrament of faith; and to turn
“ to God, because of the sacrament of conver-
“ sion. So the apostle on this same subject of
“ baptism, says, *We are buried together with*
“ *Christ by baptism unto death.* He does not say,
“ *We signify a burial,* but he uses the word it-
“ self, *We are buried.* So that he calls the sa-
“ crament of so great a thing by the *name* of the
“ thing itself. And so an infant, though he be
“ not yet constituted a believer by that faith
“ which consists in the will of believers; yet he
“ is by the sacrament of that faith: For as he
“ is said to believe, so he is called a believer,
“ not from his having the thing itself in his
“ mind, but from his receiving the sacrament
“ of it.” Every one who reads attentively and
impartially these words will find the true reason

why the Fathers called baptism Regeneration. From the *resemblance*, in the sacraments, between the signs and the things signified, the sacraments have the *names of the things themselves*. If this language be taken in a literal sense, then the sacrament of Christ's body is not, as Austin asserts, *after a certain fashion Christ's body*, but it is *really* his body, and the doctrine of transubstantiation is established. An infant baptized is here *called a believer, or faithful Christian*; not from his having the thing itself in his mind not from acting faith, or its being known that he ever would believe for himself, *but from his receiving the sacrament of it*. It is true that Austin in other places speaks of infants being *regenerated and sanctified* by baptism, and he has here given a reason for this language. Besides, it may be that many, yea that all who die in infancy are then regenerated, and the Church, in the administration, invariably proceeds upon the supposition of it in every instance. The infant is accounted a believer through its parent, and those come to age are believers by their profession. No man then ought to stumble at the expressions of the Fathers. Much as we may esteem their eminent learning, piety and zeal, they were fallible; and

and we must follow them no farther than they followed Christ. Though they were born so many centuries before us, yet we have still access to the same pure fountain of truth. We have the same rule of faith and practice, the same Spirit to guide us which they had.

HAVING produced some instances in opposition to Dr. Moore's, or rather explanatory of them, how shall we decide in this matter? Which doctrine do the Fathers prove? If they contradict one another and themselves, their testimony must be laid aside. If they can be reconciled, on what other principles can it be than those I have mentioned; that they used figurative language, and charitably concluded, that every person who made a profession of the Christian religion was already regenerated, and received baptism as the seal of it. If they cannot be reconciled, then these ancient Doctors, like the modern ones, differed in opinion, and we must bring them all to that unerring standard, the word of God. One thing, however, is clear, that my doctrine is *old*, and not a "modern invention utterly unknown to the ancient Fathers and Martyrs of the Church."

It is always a successful method in destroying errors to raze the foundation of them; and therefore I mention in my appendix three probable causes of this error, in ascribing a too great efficacy to baptism. Let us see how Dr. Moore treats these. The first is, "Inattention to the figurative language of scripture, and the nature of a sacrament." What he says on this is wholly evasive. It was incumbent upon him to show, either that this figurative language does not exist, or wherein the use of it as to baptism, differed from the use of it as to the Lord's Supper; why baptism might not be called *the washing away of sins*, just as the bread and wine are called the *body and blood* of Christ; and why his own Church might not speak of infants being *regenerated* by baptism, as well as pray that communicants in the Supper "may be partakers of the most blessed *body and blood*" of Christ. This he could not do; for he knows that it is common in all languages to give the name of the thing signified to the sign, and that this is peculiarly the case with respect to the sacraments. Instead of meeting this, he flies from it by dragging in election; and he drops one sentence which seems destructive to

his cause. "When persons," says he, "come to age, the Church, indeed, supposes faith and repentance to be necessary, in order to render the sacraments efficacious." There is a little ambiguity in the words, but in whatever way they are understood, they are in favor of my sentiment. Does he mean by *persons come to age* those who had been baptized in infancy? Or does he mean persons who offer themselves at mature age? If the first, then the Church, in baptizing them, proceeds upon the supposition that they will *repent* and *believe* when they *come to age*; that is, they treat them as being already in covenant, and that they will, if they live, show themselves to be regenerated persons. Or, in fewer words, the Church supposes them to be regenerated, and therefore administers baptism as a sign and seal. "Faith and repentance" being "necessary in order to render the sacraments efficacious," they are *supposed* to exist; but as infants are incapable of these for themselves, they are accounted to have them by right of their parents, and we deal with them as those in covenant. If he means here adult persons, then the Church supposes faith and repentance; that is, that they are re-

generated; for otherwise the sacraments will not be rendered efficacious. I see no way in which Dr. Moore can escape being condemned by his own words, except by asserting, that baptism is no more than an admission into the Church, or that persons may be regenerated more than once; for without faith and repentance, real or supposed, the Church has no authority to dispense the ordinance, and it has no efficacy.

THE second cause of error assigned by me is, "The not distinguishing between the visible and the invisible Church, or between the external dispensation of the gospel, and the real communication of grace." To this Dr. Moore makes no reply, farther than to say, "As to the *invisible Church*, we know nothing about it;" by which he must mean, that we know not the particular persons who belong to the invisible Church; and not that there is no such distinction. In another place, to suit his purpose, he makes the distinction. Indeed he pretends to know much more about it than I do, and to have discovered a *secret list* of names; for he has inserted in the roll of the invisible Church, "Socrates and Cicero, and many

“others” (that he keeps to himself) who, he says, “were made wise and good, and fitted “for the enjoyment of heavenly felicity.” The most, in my opinion, that clarity demands in this case, is to say, that God *can*, by his blessed Spirit, reveal a Saviour to those who never heard his gospel, and regenerate them; and we *hope* that he does so as to many; but to assert positively, that he has done so with respect to Cicero, Socrates, Demosthenes, Plato, or any other, is bold and unwarrantable. It is, in some measure, to countenance deism, to call in question the wisdom of God in the dispensation of the gospel, and to render our Lord’s commission, to preach it to every creature, unnecessary. Whatever we may admire in some of the heathen, and whatever we may charitably hope concerning them, it should check our presumption when we remember, that it is written, *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.** And again, *How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? †*—After Dr. Moore denies

C

* 1 Cor. i. 21. † Rom. x. 14.

that he knows any thing about the invisible Church, though he tells us in another place of some who belong to it, he proceeds to declaim against election, and, by this expedient, to change the subject of dispute. But of this I shall take notice in the proper place.

THE third cause of error is, “ the not attending to certain circumstances in the primitive Church.” What those circumstances were, I mention, and he has not so much as attempted to show, that they are of no weight.

HE, afterwards, goes about to invalidate some arguments which I have comprised in few words, and which, in my opinion, are immovable. One is, “ Regeneration, being a change of our natural state and condition, is absolutely necessary to salvation; but baptism is not absolutely necessary; and therefore baptism is not Regeneration.” That a change of our natural state is absolutely necessary, dare not be denied. That baptism is not absolutely necessary Dr. Moore asserts in the Appendix to his sermon. “ To assert,” says he, “ that it is *absolutely* necessary, would be a severe and unreasonable declaration, excluding from the

“ hope of salvation all those who never had an
“ opportunity of receiving it.” He cannot
think it absolutely necessary, for he has said,
that Cicero and others “ were fitted for the
“ heavenly felicity.” These were not baptized,
and yet, according to him, they must have been
“ taken out of their natural state,” and “ a
“ work of holiness begun” in them. The
reader will remark, that these words, *taken out
of our natural state, or a change of our natural
state and condition, and a work of holiness begun,*
are those which Dr. Moore uses to define bap-
tism, and which is, with him, Regeneration.
Are they not then, on his own reasoning, two
different things? I appeal to every rational
and candid man. To avoid the force of the
argument, he is driven to the necessity of assert-
ing, that under the gospel, baptism is necessary
to salvation. “ We know of no method by
“ which to gain admission into the *invisible*, but
“ through the *visible* Church. The Scriptures
“ represent baptism as necessary for the remis-
“ sion of sin.” Some time ago it was not ne-
cessary; now it is become necessary, and indis-
pensibly so (for he makes no exception) to all
under the gospel. Are all infants then, who
die unbaptized, forever miserable? Would it

not then be the duty of Ministers to baptize all infants wherever they can find them? To do it by stealth, and even by force? Ought not the Church to authorize laymen and midwives to baptize in danger of sudden death, that so souls might be saved?—Though baptism be a most solemn ordinance of high significancy and importance, instituted by the head of the Church, and not to be contemned, or neglected but at our peril, yet it is not, nor can be absolutely necessary to salvation. To assert so, would be *severe and unreasonable* indeed. Dr. Moore has been very charitable to the heathen, but expresses no hope of infants that die without baptism. That he may not seem to exceed me in charity, I venture it as my hope, that all children dying before the commission of actual sin, whether baptized or not, are admitted to the kingdom of heaven, by virtue of my dear Redeemer's purchase. So that there was no propriety in making a parent say, in his soliloquy over his child after baptism, that I had taught, there was as great a probability, in case of death, of its "going to hell, as to heaven;" or in asserting, that my doctrines left the "greater part of mankind without a Redeemer." Though I undauntedly own myself to be a Calvinist, and

am ready to give a reason of my faith, yet I do not obsequiously bow to Calvin, or to any other; nor will I vindicate the improper conduct and unguarded expressions of some who have professed themselves Calvinists. I believe, that the atonement of the Son of God is of value sufficient to redeem ten thousand worlds; that its efficacy is extensive and sure; but that it neither is, nor is designed to be universal.

IN reasoning upon another of my arguments, he does not deny, "that faith and repentance" are the fruits of Regeneration, and that a "profession of these is required of adults previous to baptism," as I assert; but admitting these things, he endeavours to show an absurdity which will follow. This he could do, only by assuming a false principle. "Baptism," says he, "is necessary for the remission of sin;" which is the very thing in dispute, and which, being denied by me, no absurdity follows, but my argument is strong and conclusive. In the arguments used by me, I lay down principles granted on both sides, and from these establish my doctrine; but he, in controverting one of them, introduces, either through design or inadvertence, the matter in debate, and rests his whole structure upon it.

HIS reasoning on my third argument is equally unavailing. There is a difference between the sign and the thing signified in baptism. I will prove this by his own words. “ God can communicate grace without the use of sacraments.” Here is grace without baptism; if then baptism be the visible sign of inward grace, it cannot be the grace itself.

IN this small group of arguments there remains one untouched by Dr. Moore, and which perhaps he overlooked. It is this; “ Baptism is to be administered to all who profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him; but the profession may be insincere, and the heart remain wicked; and therefore Regeneration is not inseparably connected with baptism.” To illustrate this position is the main scope of my sermon, and is one of the reflections made from it. I have inserted it here, and every one will allow it what weight he thinks proper.

THE arguments quoted in the words of Mr. Davies, some of them taken from Limborch, are also unnoticed. The words of Scripture, expressive of Regeneration, such as *a new heart created, a right spirit renewed, new creature, born of God, &c.* are kept out of view in every part

of the address. It is not denied, that the sense which I affix to Regeneration is the generally received sense at this day in the Church, nor is any good reason given for a change in our language. Where would be the propriety of every Minister addressing his congregation in the following manner: “ Dearly beloved brethren, “ it appears, on the authority of Dr. Waterland, “ that the Church has, for several centuries “ past, been mistaken as to the term *Regenera-* “ *tion*, for it means only baptism regularly ad- “ ministered. When, therefore, I use the word, “ please to understand me as meaning baptism; “ and when you meet with the word in practi- “ cal writers, substitute baptism, and, on the “ contrary, for baptism substitute Regeneration. “ The business will be a little awkward at first, “ and you will stare when you hear me speak of “ baptized heathen, and regenerated infidels; “ but it will grow familiar; and if any of you, “ from this uncommon language, should really “ think, that because you have been baptized, “ you are new creatures, so much the better; “ for a certain *Waterlandish* divine defines “ faith to be, a persuasion (no matter how you “ come by it) and according to your faith it “ shall be unto you.”

REGENERATION, as it is treated by Dr. Moore, one would imagine to have no certain meaning ; to be something that was and is not ; efficacious and inefficacious ; most efficacious when it does not exist ; for after grace is entirely lost, it produces faith and repentance. It never was known but in connection with baptism, and yet heathens have found it without baptism. What a labyrinth of absurdity, contradiction, paradox and mystery, is this plan, into which it is surprizing that any man should ever enter, and still more surprizing if ever he find his way out !

IN short, reader, if there now remains any doubt in your mind on this subject, let me only ask you, in justice to my cause, to read my Appendix once more ; see whether my arguments have been fairly answered ; and I will cheerfully submit to your candid decision. You need not think deeply, nor long. Perhaps there is no jury but what, without leaving the box, would give a verdict in my favour.

I MIGHT here take my leave of Dr. Moore, not being under any obligation to follow him from the original matter in dispute to other

subjects. But as he has been pleased, in vindicating his sentiment, to paint in dismal colours some important doctrines held by his own and other Churches, the reader will bear with me while I pay them a little notice. Though most who deny election and perseverance do not embrace his sentiment on Regeneration, and are under no necessity to do so, yet all who defend his sentiment are obliged to deny these doctrines. This is what makes it the more dangerous. Error is called in to support error; we proceed from bad to worse, and know not where we may end. Whenever we deviate from the right way, by the admission of a false principle, every step we take leads us farther from the knowledge of the truth. There is no other possible way of evading the force of my sermon on the character of Simon the Sorcerer, than by a denial of these doctrines; it being an established principle, that though we may endeavour to account for facts, yet we can never controvert them. Dr. Moore has accordingly given his creed with great plainness and freedom. Were it in my power, I would not prevent him from avowing and defending principles which he thinks to be true; and though he differs so widely from me, yet I must believe him to be equally sincere

with myself. The bounds allotted to this performance will allow me to make only a few general remarks. Were it not for this, and the many excellent things formerly written and unanswered, I should have no objection to the fullest discussion. A person who has never read my sermon would suppose, from the answer, that I had already written a treatise on *election*, so often is it introduced, and sentences printed, in more places than one, with inverted commas, as though they were my express words: Whereas I refer to the subject little more than occasionally, as being part of my belief, and do not rest my cause wholly upon this. It is true that I say, "Were he followed in his denial of election and perseverance, he would be found equally unsupported by Scripture and the articles of his own Church." This I did, and do still believe, notwithstanding what has been written; and think it very probable, that nothing that ever can be written will convince me to the contrary.

THE account which Dr. Moore has given of the *seventeenth article* of his own Church, concerning predestination, is not supported by proper authority. He alledges, that it was drawn

up, on purpose, with a "latitude of expression" to suit "men of different sentiments." This indeed has been said by some of latter days as an excuse for those who have subscribed and then departed from them. It can be proved, by the testimonies of civil and ecclesiastic historians, by the writings of the Reformers, and of Arminians themselves, that the articles and liturgy of the Church of England were compiled, as far as relates to doctrines, by Calvinists on the Calvinistic plan; that the Reformers, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, were avowed Calvinists; that Calvinism, all through the reign of Elizabeth, until the time of James I. was considered as the undoubted system of the Church of England; that not until the beginning of the reign of James, and after Arminianism had been condemned by the Synod of Dort, it began to spread in England; that it received its principal encouragement first in the reign of Charles I. by Archbishop Laud. This haughty and ambitious prelate having rejected the doctrine of predestination, used all his power and artifice to destroy it in the Church, and to propagate Arminianism. Had he prospered, the articles of that Church would, probably, have had more latitude of expression, and been ac-

commodated to those who wish not to stretch their consciences. Even in his time, Calvinism was rather silenced than disbelieved by the Clergy. He was the first Protestant Arminian Prelate known in England. From the Reformation there had been six Protestant Metropolitans before him, all Calvinists. The proofs of these things, and of much more, are in my possession.* The present generation do not require these proofs, because they have the articles, can read them, and judge for themselves. Let any man read the first part of the seventeenth article, and see whether it only "*seems*" to hold forth the doctrine of a particular election." If these words only *seem*, then we have no words *really* to express the doctrine.†

* See Toplady's Historic Proof, and The French Constitution, &c. by Benjamin Flower.

† That the reader may, the more easily have recourse to the article, it is here inserted. " Art. xvii. *Of Predestination and Election.* Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby, before the foundations of the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation, those, whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called accord-

It is the prevailing opinion among all denominations at this moment, that the articles and liturgy of the Episcopal Church, as to doctrines, are Calvinistic. Ask one of another Church, and he will answer, "They express the same doctrines as the Dutch and Presbyterian Churches." Ask some belonging to the Church itself, and they will answer, "Yes, our

"ing to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season :
"they, through grace, obey the calling : they be justified
"freely : they be made sons of God by adoption : they
"be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus
"Christ : they walk religiously in good works, and at
"length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

"As the godly consideration of predestination, and our
"election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeak-
"able comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in them-
"selves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the
"works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and
"drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things ; as
"well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their
"faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ,
"as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards
"God ; so for curious and carnal persons, lacking the
"Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the
"sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous
"downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into
"desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living,
"no less perilous than desperation.

“ articles are good, but, alas! too many of our
 “ Ministers contradict them; there is too often
 “ a glaring contrast between the pulpit and the
 “ desk.” I cannot forbear remarking, that it
 is an evidence of a bad cause, when so many
 subterfuges are taken to defend it.

WHEN I produce the venerable names of the
 Reformers and other Divines in that Church, I
 am told, that “ some pious men have supported

“ Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such
 “ wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture.
 “ And in our doings, that will of God is to be followed,
 “ which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of
 “ God.”

Had the compilers of this article left no other trace behind
 them, they would be immortal. It is so clear, particular,
 and well guarded, that perhaps, next to holy Scripture, it
 is the best text from which to preach the doctrine of elec-
 tion. Calvin himself would have signed this article; for
 Calvin was active in the Reformation; and just so Calvin
 explains the doctrine. There is no possible way in which
 an Arminian can satisfy his conscience, when he signs it,
 except by alledging a *latitude of expression*: a pretext which
 may be found in all writings human or Divine. For such a
 pretext, however, there is no good reason. The articles
 were compiled to avoid *diversities* of opinion, and are to be
 taken in the *literal and grammatical sense*, without comment.
 The proofs are abundant. .

“ the opinion, but the Church knows nothing
“ of it.” I appeal to the Church, and behold
what I took for substance is fleeting air. It
seems, but *is not* ; so wondrously does Dr.
Moore divide, transform, and destroy an article
of his own Church before my eyes.

WHAT do the quotations from other parts of
his standards avail him? They are perfectly
consistent with election. If they prove any
thing, as he has produced them, they prove too
much. They prove the salvation of all men ;
for if I believe, that Christ “ hath redeemed *all*
“ *mankind*,” and made “ satisfaction for the
“ sins of *the whole world*,” in the strictest and
most unlimited sense, then I must believe, that all
will be saved ; because I believe that he made a
sure purchase, and did not die in vain. I be-
lieve, that a Being supremely wise must propose
to himself some certain end in all he doth. As
all mankind then will not be saved, the expressi-
ons are to be taken in a limited sense, and in-
terpreted in connection with other express de-
clarations of Scripture.

BUT Dr. Moore's plan is, that all mankind
are put into a salvable state, by the death of
Christ ; that a sufficiency of grace is given to

them, the improvement of which depends upon themselves; and according to this improvement shall be their final condition. Let us examine this for a moment. Is this grace given to all in equal measure? Or is it given to some more, and to some less? If it be unequally given, then there is an election; for God makes one to differ from another. I presume the meaning is, that though some may have more and some less, yet considering their different situations and circumstances, it is equal to all, but the improvement still depends upon themselves. Does it not then rest merely on the human will, whether one soul shall be saved or not? What signifies it to say, that the provision and offer of a Saviour is by grace, when this provision and offer may be rejected, and the completion of the plan after all rests upon man? What signifies it to talk of free agency, and the inexplicable operation of the Spirit of God? No one ought to pretend to account for, or reconcile these. They are beyond our comprehension on the one plan and on the other. On both, grace is allowed to be given, and grace which is not efficacious is no saving grace. How far does this grace aid and assist? It is said to be sufficient. Why then is it not effectual? It will be said,

because not improved. But as, on Dr. Moore's plan, Regeneration is no thorough, supernatural, and lasting change, I can see no meaning in his doctrine. Man has no *power* to improve; and therefore no grace can be sufficient, unless it not only provide the means of salvation, but impart the power to improve them. Man, say the Oracles of God, is by nature *dead* in trespasses and sins; and therefore no grace can be sufficient which does not make him spiritually *alive*, before it assist him in spiritual *work*. This notion of universal sufficient grace affects me much in the same manner as I would be affected by the behaviour of those who should place food by the side of a corpse, and gravely assure it, that would it only be active, this food is abundantly sufficient to maintain it in health. Ye silly contrivers! Ye physicians of no value! The man is dead! First make him alive, and then bid him eat! Upon the plan which I oppose, Ezekiel might have prophesied over the dry bones until this hour; and all his prophesying would not have produced an inch of sinew, or an ounce of flesh.

UNTIL these things be explained, I must believe, that, on this plan, either all mankind will

be saved, or that none can be saved; and that there is no difficulty attending election, that does not equally attend this doctrine of a sufficiency of grace. Some change of the human will must take place on either plan, if any be saved; and every Arminian is as much obliged to account for difficulties as I am. Let us hear the pious Bishop Beveridge on this subject, in his exposition of the articles. “ By this recti-
“ fying, or bringing of the will into its right
“ order again, its liberty is not *destroyed*, but
“ *healed*: so that it is *free*, after, as well as be-
“ fore conversion; free to God and holiness, as
“ it was before free *only* to sin and wickedness.
“ *And this was the doctrine of the primitive Church.*
“ St. Augustin, in whose days Pelagius *first*
“ rose up against this truth, hath written several
“ volumes to this purpose.”

THERE is no need of the aid either of the Fathers or of modern Divines, or of the articles of any Church whatever, to establish the doctrine of election. Were I to enter upon the argument, I would not use the standards either of my own Church, or ask Dr. Moore for his, except they should be alledged against me, and I laid under the necessity of rescuing them from

misinterpretation. Much less would I confide in the rotten principles of some of the modern dignitaries of the Church of England. I, who regard a mitre just as I regard a crown; both pretending to Divine right, and both pretending falsely; am apt to view the man, stripped of the pageantry of human folly, and to estimate one Owen above ten thousand Lauds. There is higher and more indisputable authority than any of these. The terms *ordination*, *election*, *counsel*, *fore-knowledge*, *decree*, and *predestination*, are scriptural, and whoever quarrels with the use of them, quarrels with his bible. Perhaps there is no doctrine so little understood, so greatly misrepresented, and so grossly abused, as that of particular election. Its opposers do not reason, but rail. Many of them judge without reading, and speak without thinking. That some wise and good men have been inclined to Arminianism, I have already said; but they have never been the wisest and best. The weight of learning and piety has always been on the side of Calvinism. Various opinions in religion have, since the beginning, successively and briskly shot up, and, after a short-lived verdure, gradually perished; but Calvinism, like a veteran and sturdy oak, has continued and

will continue to flourish amidst all the tempests which beat upon it.—Though I am blamed for making it “a mark of natural depravity to dispute the doctrine of particular election and absolute decrees,” yet I must insist, that every pious soul is brought to submit to the sovereignty of God; and that the very strength of sin in the human heart is rebellion against this. I do not say “dispute the doctrine,” but “quarrels with his absolute decrees,” and in the connection, I think it justifiable, and wrote it, fully aware of the objections. I wrote it on the supposition, that a man believes the doctrine; and then surely, to find fault, and not to be reconciled to the wise and just proceeding of the Almighty, is the certain mark of a carnal heart. At the same time, this does not say, that a pious man, from his education and other circumstances, may not have scruples as to the doctrine, and even in words deny it. It is impossible to tell how far the head may be wrong and the heart right, and with what degree of corruption grace itself may subsist. Every Arminian is a Calvinist when he prays. To be willing that God should reign over us, to justify him should he condemn us, and to acknowledge that our salvation is from his good pleasure, will

ever remain evidences of grace. Let me venture what to some will, perhaps, seem more exceptionable ; that the great reason why the doctrine of election is so unpopular, is, because it contradicts the pride and self-sufficiency of man. Calvinists, in this respect, maintain an unequal conflict ; for they fight against what Omnipotence only can subdue. Let me venture farther, what will be called a paradox ; that the doctrine of grace, not being generally and faithfully inculcated of late years, from the pulpits in England, has raised and given system to the Methodist Episcopal Church. 'Let the reader try if he cannot find facts to establish this opinion, and if he can account for these facts in his own mind.

WHOEVER would oppose election, ought, after defining clearly what he means by it, to show, that it cannot be proved by testimonies from Scripture—by any argument drawn from the perfections of the great God—from his government of the world—from prophecies, and their fulfilment. He ought to show how the prescience of God, the free agency of man, the use of means, and the universal call of the gospel, can be better reconciled and explained on some other plan. Before he goes about this work,

he ought to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the Calvinistic doctrines, and, above all, earnestly implore the illumination of the Divine Spirit to keep him from error, and guide him into truth. If, after all, he thinks it his duty to oppose these doctrines, he is accountable to that just and merciful Being, who, *like a father, pitieth his children ; who knoweth our frames, and remembereth that we are dust.*

HAVING disclaimed the need of the Fathers, it may seem improper now to produce a few instances from them, but the use will directly appear. . Clemens Romanus was a fellow-labourer with Paul, and intimately acquainted with several of the other Apostles. His first Epistle to the Corinthians has been highly esteemed in the Church, and thought inferior only to the books of the New Testament. In this Epistle we find these words, “That the *number* of his *elect* might “be saved.”* “He hath *established* them *firmly* “by his own Almighty purpose.”—“*Who hath “made us a part of the election unto himself.*”—

* Very similar are these words in the burial service—
 “That it may please thee, of thy gracious goodness, shortly
 “to accomplish the *number* of thine *elect*, and to hasten thy
 “kingdom.”

“ Having *afore prepared* his benefits for us, even
“ *before we were born.*”—“ This blessedness ac-
“ crues to *those who have been elected of God*
“ through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Ignatius
was a disciple of the Apostle John. In his Epistle
to the Ephesians, addressing them, he uses
these words, “ *Predestinated even before time unto*
“ the glory which is *perpetual and unchangeable.*”
In his Epistle to the Romans, he says, “ A Chris-
“ tian is not the workmanship of *suasion*, but of
“ *greatness.*” Polycarp was also a disciple of
John. In his Epistle to the Philippians, are
these words, “ Them that have been really *elected*
“ by God and our Lord.” And again, “ Ye
“ are saved by *grace* ; not of *works*, but by the
“ *will* of God through Jesus Christ.”* After
these few short citations, out of many, from
writers in the Apostolic age, besides the others
made before, what must the reader think of this
declaration ? “ I will venture to affirm, that for
“ the first three hundred years, the most learned
“ and pious Fathers, from the best information
“ I have been able to obtain, give no counte-

* I might have referred more particularly to the places
from which the words are taken, but as different editions of
the same works are differently paged, it would be of no great
use. I will be accountable for the justness of them.

“ nance to those doctrines advanced by Dr. Linn
“ in his Sermon and Appendix.” What must
he think of an appeal to the first three hundred
years, when Dr. Moore has not quoted a single
Father, except Justin Martyr, who lived within
that period ? Both Basil and Chrysostom, whom
he quotes to prove his doctrine of Regeneration,
did not flourish until the close of the fourth cen-
tury, and Theodoret not until about the middle
of the fifth, and after the time of Austin.* It
might be added too, that as Justin Martyr speaks
of the baptism of adults *merely*, the testimony, if
properly examined, will be found little to the
purpose for which it is produced. Least of all
the Fathers, ought we to doubt the piety and
information of Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, and
Polycarp ; they were all acquainted with the
Apostles, or an Apostle ; they were all burning
and shining lights, and they were all martyrs for
the cause of Christ.

IN the latter part of his address, Dr. Moore
alleges, that my doctrine has a more danger-
ous tendency to virtue and religion than his,

* Austin, or Augustine, was a learned and pious Father,
in great esteem among the Reformers, and quoted with res-
pect in the Homilies and articles of the Church of England.

and he makes a comparison between them. To a fair comparison I cheerfully submit ; yea, I challenge it, and confidently appeal to the experience of every age. His doctrine derogates from the perfections of the great God, and renders his government without a plan ; but mine exalts him, and shows his government to be stable and consistent. His, nourishes the pride and self-righteousness of man ; but mine humbles him at the foot-stool of Divine mercy. His makes sinners secure and thoughtless ; but mine awakens and alarms them. His, makes the salvation of any to be uncertain, and the Son of God to stoop in vain ; but mine gives him a sure purchase, and requites him for the travail of his soul. His, contains this uncomfortable truth, that the believer, after the longest course of piety, may, at his last hour, fall under condemnation ; but mine affords strong consolation to the heirs of promise, from the immutability of the Divine council. His declares, that “ even Paul himself, with all his high attainments, may *become a cast-away* ;” but mine exults in saying, that nothing *shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord*. His, unites with the work of

F

the Saviour some merit of our own ; but mine exclaims, *Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us ; but unto thy name give glory.* Does his ensure the moral agency of man ? So does mine. Does his include the use of means ? So does mine. Does his render significant the sacraments ? Much more does mine. Does he preach the gospel to all ? So do I. Does he “ consistently press the “ indispenfible necessity of repentance, faith “ and obedience ? ” So do I. Does he, “ with- “ out violating his principles, urge attention to “ the precepts of sobriety, righteousness, and “ godliness ? ” So do I. Does he “ consistently “ urge the most perfect man in Christ Jesus to “ be perpetually vigilant and industrious ? ” And does he “ warn the sinner of the dreadful “ aggravation of his crimes, because they are “ committed against the remonstrances of God’s “ Spirit, and with a voluntary rejection of prof- “ fered mercy ? ” All this is perfectly consist- ent with my plan. I cry aloud, “ Sons and “ daughters of men, God, in his infinite wis- “ dom and mercy, hath provided for sinners of “ our race, a way of redemption, through the “ obedience and death of his own Son. This “ is now offered to you, and you are entreated “ to accept of it. Guilty and depraved, you

“ can have no hope from any works of your
“ own; but must be wholly indebted to Christ
“ for righteousness to justify you, and for grace
“ to heal your disordered natures. Though
“ God is free and sovereign, both in the provi-
“ sion and application of redemption, yet he
“ commands you to believe and repent; he
“ hath appointed means, upon which you are
“ called to attend, and in the use of which he
“ communicates his grace. The revealed, not
“ the secret will of God, is your rule. You
“ are not to enquire whose names *are written*
“ *in the Lamb's book of life*; but to give diligence
“ *to make your calling and election sure*, by re-
“ *pentance toward God, and faith toward our*
“ *Lord Jesus Christ*. If you continue in impe-
“ nitence and unbelief, you will inevitably pe-
“ rish. If you seek God in the means of his
“ appointment, you have an encouraging hope
“ that you shall be saved. Why wilt thou, O
“ presumptuous man, arraign the sovereignty
“ of God? Canst thou change or defeat his
“ purpose? Hath he not said, *My counsel shall*
“ *stand, and I will do all my pleasure*? Why
“ wilt thou draw an argument from this against
“ thine own soul? Why not cease from know-
“ ledge which is too wonderful for thee? Sub-

“ mit then to his dominion. Comply with
 “ what thou must know he requireth of thee.
 “ Hear and obey the call of the gospel: *Awake,*
 “ *thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and*
 “ *Christ shall give thee light.** Say no longer,
 “ that, on the supposition of election, and of
 “ thine own inability to save thyself, the ex-
 “ hortations and promises of the gospel are
 “ vain; for these are connected in the Divine
 “ plan. Thou art unable to comprehend this;
 “ it is not necessary that thou shouldst; but it
 “ is the best reason to believe and obey Him,
 “ *all whose works are truth, and his ways judg-*
 “ *ment.*”—Thus have I followed Dr. Moore,
 farther, perhaps, than was proper, in those doc-
 trines which he has studiously introduced to
 assist his cause. True, I had mentioned election
 and perseverance in opposing his sentiment of
 baptism; I had drawn an argument from them;
 but neither the assertion, nor denial of them, is
 necessary to show, that BAPTISM is *not* REGENE-
 RATION.

I HAVE only to say farther, that if this con-
 troversy produces any alienation of affection

* Ephes. v. 14.

among professing Christians who think differently, I shall most seriously lament it. My friendship for him whom I particularly oppose, is ever the same ; and I have here given a disinterested proof of it. He will recollect, that *open rebuke is better than secret love, and that faithful are the wounds of a friend.* I ask no man to embrace my sentiments, unless he thinks them agreeable to reason and scripture. Every doctrine that cannot be supported by these—let it fall forever. As to a damning and persecuting spirit for religious tenets, the bloody monster of former days, may we not hope, that it is now bound in adamant chains in the abyss of Hell, whence it first arose ? To save my doctrine from being misapprehended, to excite people to talk, and think, and judge about the principles of religion, occasioned these Remarks. Some will condemn me, and all who know me, will be surprised to find me engaged in controversy. Every discerning mind must acknowledge, that the first provocation came from him, who, not contented with one edition of his sermon, published a second, and in both misapplied the standards of that Church to which I belong. — Notwithstanding this procedure, my appendix was written in the spirit of weakness, and neither

46 REMARKS ON DR. MOORE'S ADDRESS.

then nor now have I indulged a severity in which, perhaps, I would have been justifiable. Conscious that my motives were pure, and prepared for the calumny of superficial thinkers, if any good should result to one soul, I shall rejoice ; and if God should restore me, so as to undergo the labours of the pulpit, I shall, through Divine aid, love the doctrines of free grace, and preach them with renewed ardour. At the same time, I wish to exercise charity ; to show mercy, as I hope to obtain it ; to *keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace* ; knowing, that *the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God* ; that truth, examined, is like gold tried in the fire, and that it is ALMIGHTY, AND SHALL AT LAST PREVAIL.

New-York, March 11, 1793.

P. S. *When I referred the Reader to Dr. Livingston's Sermon, I supposed that it would have been in the press before this was published. He has been prevented from attending to it for some time past, which has occasioned a delay ; but he has promised to forward it as soon as convenient.*

