

# METHODIST ENTHUSIASM

## Warburton Letters, 1738-1740

by M. Lawrence Snow

I call it fervency . . . because it is the very word (*ardor*) whereby Latin Authors do very frequently express the Greek *Enthusiasme*.  
—Meric Casaubon (1656)

*Enthusiasme* is nothing else but a misconceit of being inspired . . . The Spirit then that wings the *Enthusiast* in such a wonderful manner, is nothing else but that *Flatulency* which is in the Melancholy complexion . . .

—Henry More (1656)

### I. *An Historical View of Enthusiasm*

*Enthusiasm* by the late Ronald Knox, an English convert to Rome, became a minor classic within its author's lifetime.<sup>1</sup> A substantial portion of Knox's book is devoted to the Moravians and Wesleyans. But there are other reasons for Methodists to consult this excellent religious study. First, Methodists generally need to see their history from sympathetic, outside points of view. Second, and closely related, Methodists must continue to examine the unique features of their heritage within a larger historical context. Third, percolating in every generation, there is a latent but pervasive "mood" which is ever ready to erupt in one of the guises of religious enthusiasm. (Our generation is no exception; perhaps the Jesus Movement and Pentecostalism are current examples.)

Beginning with the New Testament and coming up to modern times, Knox treats religious enthusiasm as a recurrent sectarian experience in the church. However, most of his book deals with examples of enthusiasm after the Reformation, particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Knox's disproportionate attention to enthusiasm in this period is more than personal whimsy. Nor should one conclude that there were in fact more cases of religious enthusiasm in that era than any other. The plain fact is that the churches became more discriminating, indeed more critical,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ronald Knox (1889-1957), *Enthusiasm. A Chapter in the History of Religion with Special Reference to the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (N.Y.: Oxford Press, 1950; reprinted A Galaxy paperback, 1961). The facts and views of my essay have been developed with only passing reference to Knox.

I make no basic judgment about the validity of the eighteenth-century charge of enthusiasm against Whitefield and the Methodists. In the 1802 Bampton Lecture (Oxford), Anglican George Frederic Nott presented a formidable argument on the basis of the Methodist "schism." His work, *Religious Enthusiasm Considered; in Eight Sermons . . .* (Oxford: At the University Press, 1803), almost totally ignored in Methodist bibliographies, deserves modern attention.

of the enthusiastic experience after the Reformation. That is to say, while enthusiasm had always been a perplexing and disruptive reality in the churches; it first became an important *historical* problem for the churches after the Reformation. The reasons for this heightened historical consciousness of enthusiasm are complex.

The purpose of this brief essay is: (1) To indicate in broad strokes that the criticism of enthusiasm during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was part of a larger historical argument over church miracles. (2) To illustrate a feature of this historical argument in some Warburton letters which were critical of Methodist enthusiasm at its earliest appearance. (3) To suggest that such church attacks on enthusiasm encouraged a more secular style of history-writing. A little-noticed irony is that Methodist enthusiasm provoked a growing secular understanding of religion in the very process of fostering a renewal of spirituality.

## II. *Polemical Erosion of the Miraculous*

The writings of the sixteenth-century Reformers open an era of widespread criticism of traditional church history. Their overall intent was to disavow the authority and to discredit the teachings of the Roman Church. This deliberate assault on medieval history took many forms. One was the growing flood of Protestant tracts which argued that popery was a copy of biblical or classical paganism. The point was to deny that God had ever supernaturally supported "corrupt" church systems and "fanatical" religious practices.

As might be expected, Protestant interest in profane enthusiasms was sparked by renaissance classical studies and inflamed by sixteenth-century anti-Roman polemics. Papists became the modern examples of Christian enthusiasts. The Roman Church's claims that God had continued his extra-ordinary works through saints and sacraments, especially after Constantine, were repudiated. The God of the Bible could not (doctrinally) and did not (historically) disclose his power and spirit in later superstition, priestcraft and "pagan" fanaticism. At first, these corruptions were thought to be demonically-inspired; but as Protestants became increasingly rationalistic, they charged Romanism with outright deception and delusion.

Protestants soon began to use these anti-Roman arguments against the more Catholic and tradition-minded parties among themselves. Within the English Church, Puritans and dissenters became increasingly strident about the message of the Bible, because of their opposition to the Established Church's prayerbook and bishops. In this sense, much of the seventeenth century can be treated as a struggle among English churchmen to maintain a

middle way between Papist and Puritan enthusiasms. For example, Cambridge "latitude men" like Henry More, would have judged that the fanaticism of the Puritan regicides was as evil as the conspiracies of the Jesuits. Warburton, a later latitudinarian, remarked in a letter to Thomas Birch that these "wicked actions . . . will not suffer us to think their spirit was of God."<sup>2</sup>

By the early eighteenth century English deists were boldly attacking all miracles and prophecies; even those in the Bible itself. They contended that God had really never acted in a supernatural way; at least not since the very act of creation. Most churchmen, of course, were scandalized at that radical, rationalistic conclusion. But in the decade of the 1730's, these very same churchmen—William Warburton is a good example—<sup>3</sup>were equally shocked at new Methodist testimonies to God's work in dramatic awakenings and conversions. The deists had rejected the historical records of miracles as so much superstition. More moderate churchmen, outraged at that "atheism", nonetheless wheeled to attack Methodist claims of God's work in their midst as so much morbid enthusiasm.

Orthodox churchmen, like the Methodists, distinguished between supernatural and natural enthusiasms. That is to say, they distinguished between God's *miraculous* work in the church, which (by the eighteenth century) they assumed had ceased shortly after New Testament times—an assumption originally made in the Protestant case against Romanism; and God's *ordinary* work of the Spirit in the lives of all Christians, which they assumed still continued. Historically, enthusiasts might be found making claims about either God's miraculous or ordinary work. If, however, by common (Protestant) consent, God's supernatural acts had ceased, then fervent and extravagant testimonies to God's ordinary works (e.g. personal conversions and special blessings) seemed inappropriate, to say the least. Traditional churchmen judged that enthusiasts were mostly confusing their own "humours" and excitement with some special manifestation of God's spirit in their lives.

In popular usage and polemics—certainly by the 1730's—enthusiasm had generally come to mean a naturally-fired fanaticism. For its enemies, such "melancholic zeal" had had many precedents in the English Church since the Reformation; to say nothing of the many examples in classical pagan history which seventeenth-century scholars like Meric Casaubon had cataloged.<sup>4</sup> "Were we

<sup>2</sup> March 31, 1740. John Nichols, *Illustrations*, II, 121.

<sup>3</sup> Warburton attacked both the deists and Methodists in *The Divine Legation* (London, 1742, second edition), II. See also *The Doctrine of Grace* which is briefly discussed at the end of this essay.

<sup>4</sup> Meric Casaubon, *A Treatise Concerning Enthusiasme* (1655). A facsimile reproduction of the second edition of 1656, with an Introduction by Paul J. Korshin. (Gainesville, Fla, 1970). The quotation at the head of this essay, p. 22. Compare Frank Manuel, *The Eighteenth Century Confronts the Gods* (1959), 15f.

to make our estimate of the present State of the religious World from the Journals of modern Fanatics," Warburton wrote of Methodists, "we should be tempted still to think ourselves in a land of Pagans."<sup>5</sup>

### III. George Whitefield's Journals

In a pastoral letter dated August 1, 1739 the powerful and orthodox Bishop of London, Edmund Gibson, summarized the surviving Anglican assumptions about God's actions in sacred history.

The *extraordinary* Operations were those, by which the Apostles and others, who were entrusted with the first Propagation of the Gospel, were enabled to work Miracles, and speak with Tongues, in Testimony that their Mission and Doctrine were from God. But these have long since ceased; and the *ordinary* Gifts and Influences of the Spirit, which still continue, are convey'd in a different Manner, and for Ends and Uses of a more private Nature.<sup>6</sup>

This prelate was hardly interested in giving a theology lecture to his diocese. He was in fact introducing a warning against the recent enthusiastic outbursts in George Whitefield's Journals.<sup>7</sup> Whitefield's spectacular preaching during 1737, and the publication of his first diary in August 1738 hardly seemed to most English priests and bishops as promoting "Ends and Uses of a more private Nature."

The charges that Whitefield's Journal was full of enthusiasm started immediately after the first pamphlet edition had gone on sale at the London booksellers. On August 27, William Warburton wrote his recently-acquired friend, Dr. Conyers Middleton:

<sup>5</sup> Warburton, *The Doctrine of Grace* (1763) in *Works* (1811), VIII, 318.

<sup>6</sup> *The London Magazine*, VIII, 391. Extract from Gibson's "Pastoral Letter to the People of his diocese by way of caution against lukewarmness on the one hand and enthusiasm on the other." (Italics in the extract.) The letter and later publications by the moderate bishop against the Methodists are carefully discussed in Norman Sykes, *Gibson* (1926).

There may be some irony in the expression "the first Propagation of the Gospel," since it was the recently-chartered Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts (S.P.G.) which had sponsored missionary Wesley in Georgia. The Bishop of London also had considerable jurisdiction over the American plantations (i. e. colonies).

<sup>7</sup> *LM*, VIII, 392-293. The Extract includes the bishop's eight groups of enthusiastic testimonies excerpted from George Whitefield's first three Journals (1738-39).

For full titles of the two different editions of the first Journal, see notes 9 & 11 below. For the title of the second Journal, see note 12 below. The third Journal, published June 1739, was entitled: *A Continuation of the Reverend Mr. Whitefield's Journal, from his Arrival at London, to his Departure from thence on his way to Georgia.* (London: Printed for James Hutton, at the Bible and Sun, without Temple-Bar, 1739.) Cf. *Gentleman's Magazine*, IX, 332; *LM*, VIII, 364.

Pray have you seen Whitefield the Missionary's Journal. You will find Enthusiasm Triumphant. These are fit men you will say to advance the Banner of ye Cross.<sup>8</sup>

Warburton was almost certainly referring to Thomas Cooper's "surreptitious edition" of Whitefield's Journal which had been published, so far as I can tell, at the end of July or early in August of that year.<sup>9</sup> Since he does not directly cite the Journal until a letter to Thomas Birch (September 16, 1738), Warburton may simply be calling Middleton's attention to Cooper's defensive advertizements in London newspapers.<sup>10</sup> James Hutton had criticized Cooper for publishing Whitefield's Journal without permission; and, further, for printing only the second half of the manuscript dealing with an account of Whitefield's voyage from Gibraltar to Georgia. Consequently, even though he did not have the author's permission either, James Hutton rushed out a more complete, but editorially less accurate, edition the week of August 18, 1738. He did so, as he explained in the Preface, "lest something should be trumped up for a voyage from London to Gibraltar."<sup>11</sup>

Like most of his contemporaries, Warburton's first real impression of the Oxford's Methodists came from Whitefield's Journal. Ironically, as I have noted, it had been released to the public without Whitefield's knowledge. In fact, the twenty-three year old "boy evangelist" was still in Georgia at the time. Nonetheless, Whitefield was so cheered by friend's letters, that as soon as he got back to London (December 1738), he gave a copy of his second diary to Hutton for publication. It was typical of Whitefield's impetuosity that this second Journal's last entry was December 8, 1738; and

<sup>8</sup> Egerton MS 1953, ff. 35-36. The complete Warburton-Middleton correspondence is mostly unpublished. British Museum, Add. MS 32, 457 and Egerton MS 1935. "Enthusiasm Triumphant" is the anglicized title of Henry More's famous book, reprinted a year later under a different title. Had Warburton read an earlier edition? (See note 17 below.)

<sup>9</sup> *A Journal of a Voyage from Gibraltar to Georgia. By Geo. Whitefield . . . Containing many Curious Observations and Edifying Reflections, on the several Occurrences that happen'd in the Voyage.* (London: Printed for T. Cooper, at the Globe in Pater-noster Row. M.DCC.XXXVIII.) Cf. *Bibliotheca Americana*, XXVIII, 259.

<sup>10</sup> Cooper was defending the authenticity of his edition against disclaimers by James Hutton. See *London Evening Post*, August 10 & 22, 1738; also *The Weekly Miscellany*, August 11, 1738. Cf. John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, II, 121 (sic); Luke Tyerman, *Life of Whitefield* (1877), I, 118 footnote.

<sup>11</sup> "Preface." *A Journal of a Voyage from London to Savannah in Georgia. In two Parts. Part I. From London to Gibraltar. Part II. From Gibraltar to Savannah. By George Whitefield . . . With a short Preface, shewing the Reasons of its Publication.* (London: Printed for James Hutton at the Bible and Sun next to the Rose Tavern without Temple-Bar, MDCCXXXVIII.)

Cooper printed names of persons in the text; Hutton used initials and excised some entries. Hutton's went through five editions in the first year. Cf. *Bib. Am.*, XXVIII, 260; *LM*, VII, 416.

its published version was at the booksellers within a month, January 1739. Certainly the Preface indicates that something more than God's Spirit was moving him.

Though the Journals already published, were printed without my knowledge, yet as God has been pleased to let me see, by letters sent to me that He has greatly blessed them, I now, upon the importunity of friends, consent to the publishing of a Continuation of them. . . .<sup>12</sup>

The pious ejaculations and rash outbursts against parochial clergy in this deacon's diaries served to inflame smoldering rumors about the Methodists. As early as 1732 a lengthy article in *Fogg's Weekly Journal*, a respectable London newspaper, had reported some of the first gossip on the Holy Club at Oxford. Some thought one thing, some another, but still "others judge that their way of life is owing to enthusiasm, madness, and superstitious scruples."<sup>13</sup> (A young Oxford Methodist had died, and enemies were intimating that a harsh regimen of fasting had caused it.)

Whitefield was to rush into print seven of his Journals before the end of 1741. (These were all the diaries that were published in his life-time.) Despite the hue and cry they provoked—scores of sermons and pamphlets in 1739 and 1740—Whitefield was slow to admit any haste or indiscretion in putting the diaries to press. He published nothing like a public apology until ten years later (1748) when he was revising them for a new edition. An unnoticed personal letter of his had crept into print across the Scottish border. He defensively excerpted from it at the end of his *Remarks on the Bishop of Exeter, George Lavington's first part to Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared* (1749). "To convince you," Whitefield wrote the supercilious and superficial bishop, "that this is the real language of my heart, and not extorted from me by your pamphlet, I will lay before you an extract of a letter . . . published in Scotland months ago." Whitefield had written:

Being fond of scripture language, I have often used a style too apostolical, and at the same time I have been too bitter in my zeal, wild fire has been mixed with it; and I find that I have frequently written

<sup>12</sup> "The Preface." *A Continuation of the Reverend Mr. Whitefield's Journal, from his Arrival at Savannah, to his Return to London.* (London: Printed for James Hutton, at the Bible and Sun, without Temple-Bar. M.DCC.XXXIX.) Cf. *Bib. Am.*, XXVIII, 260; *GM*, IX, 52; *LM*, VIII, 52.

Whitefield, referring to his Journal, priggishly observed in this Preface: "I am sensible that this, as well as everything else of such a nature, must necessarily meet with great contempt from natural men, who are strangers to the influences of the Holy Ghost upon the heart." This was the sort of self-righteous remark that infuriated the parochial clergy.

<sup>13</sup> December 9, 1732. Quoted at length in Tyerman's *Life of John Wesley* (1870), I, 85-86. Cf. Tyerman's *The Oxford Methodists* (1873).

and spoken too much in my own spirit, when I thought I was writing and speaking entirely by the assistance of the Spirit of God.<sup>14</sup>

A prod to Whitefield's belated confession had undoubtedly been Gibson's original Pastoral Letter, which the evangelist, despite a couple of impromptu efforts, had never satisfactorily answered. The learned bishop, nicknamed "Dr. Codex" for his standard work on English canon law, had stipulated Whitefield's sin of confusing spirits in language fit for a legal brief.

We are firmly persuaded in general, that we live under the gracious Influence of the *Holy Spirit*, and that he both excites and enables us to do good. But that this or that *Thought* or *Action* is an Effect of the sole Motion or immediate Impulse of the Spirit without any Co-operation of our own Mind; or that the Holy Spirit, and our natural Conceptions, do respectively contribute to this or that Thought or Action, in such Manner, or to such a *Degree*; these are things we dare not say; both because our Saviour has told us, that we know no more of the Workings of the Spirit, than we know of the Wind, *from whence it cometh, and whither it goeth*, and because we clearly see, that all Pretences to that Knowledge, unless accompanied with the Proper Evidences of a divine Inspiration would open a Door to endless Enthusiasm and Delusions.<sup>15</sup>

What could be "Proper Evidences?" Whitefield had hastily replied that "it is possible, my Lord, for a person to feel and discern these ordinary gifts and influences of the Spirit *in himself*, when there is no opportunity of discovering them to others."<sup>16</sup> This sort of arrant subjectivism of course begs the bishop's question. Eighteenth-century notions of enthusiasm were diffuse. Common to most were clichés of (1) fanaticism, and of what Henry More had

<sup>14</sup> Original letter dated June 24, 1748. Whitefield, *Works* (1771), II, 143, IV, 242-243.

In Whitefield's day "wild fire" had the literal Latin sense of *ignis fatuus*. John Locke remarked on this enthusiastic hazard: "This light, they are so dazzled with, is nothing but an *ignis fatuus* that leads them constantly round in this circle; it is revelation, because they firmly believe it, and they believe it, because it is revelation." *Essay on Human Understanding*, Book 4, chapter 19, section 10. Locke, *Works* (London, 1824), II, 277.

<sup>15</sup> *LM*, VIII, 391-92. Extract of Gibson's Pastoral Letter (August 1, 1739). (Italics and capitalization in extract.)

<sup>16</sup> "Answer to the Bishop of London's Last Pastoral Letter," in Whitefield, *Works*, IV, 9. Published early in August 1739. Cf. Whitefield, *Works*, I, 62; entries in his fifth Journal for August 8 and 13, 1739: *A Continuation of the Reverend Mr. Whitefield's Journal, from his Embarking after the Embargo, to his Arrival at Savannah in Georgia*. (London: Printed by W. Strahan for James Hutton, at the Bible and Sun, without Temple-Bar, 1740.) Also, *LM*, VIII, 416.

A generation earlier John Locke had characterized Whitefield's type of self-authenticating enthusiasm: "This is the way of talking of these men: they are sure, because they are sure: and their persuasions are right, because they are strong in them." Locke, *op. cit.*, II, 275.

called a century earlier (2) "a misconceit of being inspired."<sup>17</sup> Precisely the two excesses to which Whitefield finally pleaded guilty.

Methodist historiography has not been sufficiently critical of either Whitefield's Journals or the polemics they provoked. Alexander Gordon put the matter bluntly more than a century ago:

Whitefield's journals were too egotistic for publication, and they prejudiced the Methodist cause. Their issue set an example followed with more judgment by John Wesley who began to publish his journals in 1740.<sup>18</sup>

Between the summers of 1738 and 1740 it was Whitefield's, not Wesley's, Journals which were scandalizing the London-Oxbridge public. Wesley's first journal *Extract* "did not see the light until the summer of 1740."<sup>19</sup> Four, possibly five of Whitefield's Journals had been published by then. They were also published as early as 1739 in the Colonies, and soon stirred up negative "testimonies" among New England clergy and at Harvard College.<sup>20</sup>

#### IV. William Warburton's Letters

Typical of the English outcry at Whitefield's diaries are incidental comments in Warburton's private letters to scholarly friends. Couched in gossipy parodies, they are, to be sure, the stuff of coffeehouse chatter. Still, they propose some useful modern precedents and parallels to Methodist enthusiasm. After two centuries of upheaval and fervent quarreling in the English Church, they suggest a petulant disgust at these fresh examples of enthusiasm.<sup>21</sup> Warburton's smirking wit sharply contrasts with Whitefield's juvenile gushing.

<sup>17</sup> Henry More, *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus, or a Brief Discourse of the Nature, Causes, Kinds, and Cure of Enthusiasm* (London, 1656). See 1662 edition done by the Augustan Reprint Society, No. 118, (Los Angeles, 1966), 2.

This work was published as an unacknowledged abridgement entitled, *Enthusiasm Explained* in July 1739 at the height of the furor over Whitefield's early Journals. *Ibid.*, v. Cf. *LM*, VIII, 364. Neither Tyerman nor Richard Green's *Anti-Methodist Publications* (1902) identify More's authorship. More's work had a major influence on Shaftesbury's *A Letter concerning Enthusiasm* (1708) which helped to shape early eighteenth-century views on enthusiasm; it also pioneered some positive, though non-religious views about that natural sentiment.

<sup>18</sup> "George Whitefield" in *Dictionary of National Biography* (1937-38 ed.), XXI, 86. Roderick Hall Pierce did a Princeton doctoral dissertation, 1961: *George Whitefield and His Critics*. I have not read it.

<sup>19</sup> Frank Baker, "The Birth of John Wesley's Journal," *Methodist History* (January 1970), VII, 26.

<sup>20</sup> *Bib. Am.*, XXVIII, 259-60; Tyerman, *Whitefield*, II, 123f.; Whitefield, *Works*, IV, 203-26. On the cooling of a leading New England divine, see Charles W. Akers, *Called Unto Liberty: A Life of Jonathan Mayhew* (1964).

<sup>21</sup> Compare John Walsh, "Origins of the Evangelical Revival" in *Essays in Modern English Church History*, eds., G. V. Bennett & J. D. Walsh (1966), 138f.

I have seen Whitefield's Journal, and read it with great curiosity. The poor man is quite mad. I could not but take notice of some very ridiculous expressions he uses: as that "the more you do for God, the more you may;" and that "he never finds himself so well as when he is on the full stretch (for God)"—that "the officers suffer him to put in a word for God."<sup>22</sup>

Had not Henry More written: "*Fantasticks* and *Enthusiasts* seek nothing more than the admiration of men, wherefore there is no such sovereign Remedy as scorn and neglect, to make them sober."<sup>23</sup>

A century ago Luke Tyerman observed in his standard *Life of John Wesley* that Warburton "was one of the first to fall foul upon the poor Methodists." Using at least a third-hand source—J. S. Watson's *Life of Warburton* (1863)—Tyerman quotes two frequently-reprinted pieces of gossip about Wesley from Warburton's letters of 1738. Tyerman regards these as "specimens of the foul falsehoods which malignant men already circulated concerning Wesley and his companions."<sup>24</sup> This is comically defensive. "If men of that calibre fell foul of the Wesleys and of Whitefield, we cannot diagnose mere blindness or mere intransigence."<sup>25</sup>

Furthermore, as original sources disclose, Warburton's caricatures of Wesley are, despite their "color," largely extraneous. True, Warburton fancied his parodies enough to repeat them himself to more than one correspondent; but he enjoyed passing around overdone conceits.<sup>26</sup> The letters' context make it clear that Warburton was basically provoked by Whitefield's journalistic enthusiasm. Thus, the critical reader's attention is taken with the historical allusions, rather than with the gossip about Wesley.

#### V. Modern Stereotypes for Methodist Enthusiasm

In letters between August 1738 and March 1740, Warburton compares Whitefield's enthusiasm to half a dozen examples which had appeared in England since the Reformation: (A.) *High Church*; (B.) *Nonjuring*; (C.) *Puritan*; (D.) *Moravian*; (E.) *Jesuit and*

<sup>22</sup> Warburton to Thomas Birch, September 16, 1738. These paraphrases seem to be from Cooper's edition of Whitefield's first Journal. (See note 9 above) Nichols, *Illust.*, II, 96.

<sup>23</sup> Henry More, *op. cit.*, (Augustan Reprint), "To the Reader," iii, viii. Cf. Shaftesbury, *op. cit.* in *Characteristics*, ed. J. M. Robertson (Library of Liberal Arts, 1964), 21f.

<sup>24</sup> *Loc. cit.* (1870), I, 208-209. The originals are in the British Museum, Birch MSS 4288 & 4320. Portions are reprinted in Nichols, *Lit. Anec. and Illust.* I use the latter source.

<sup>25</sup> Knox, *op. cit.*, 505. He is referring to Warburton.

<sup>26</sup> August 27, 1738, Warburton to Middleton (Egerton MS 1953, ff. 35-36); and September 16, 1738, Warburton to Peter des Maizeaux (Nichols, *Illust.*, II, 65-66.)

"Bp. Warburton was in the frequent habit, when any thing occurred to his imagination, to write the same thing to various correspondents. . ." *Ibid.*, II, 167 footnote.

*Quaker*. As Methodism gained in notoriety, many of its critics cited these sorts of comparisons as stock clichés. In later years, Whitefield and Wesley repudiate most of these comparisons.<sup>27</sup> Today, the significance of these comparisons hardly lies in the theological quibbles. Rather, it is in the hostile presumption that a new enthusiasm like Methodism had modern church precedents. Most important of all, the significance of these comparisons lies in the fact that each historical example was treated as a case of *human* fervor rather than an instance of *divine* indwelling.

#### A. High Church

After taking note of "Enthusiasm Triumphant" in Whitefield's first Journal, Warburton continued in a letter to Dr. Middleton:

Another of them, I think it was Westley, told a friend of mine that he had been last summer in Georgia where he lived most divinely, feeding on boiled Maize with the sauce of Oak-ashes, and sleeping in Fresco, under Trees: That he intends to return thither, and that then he will cast off his English habit, and wear a dried-skin like the Savages, in order to ingratiate himself the better with them.<sup>28</sup>

This parenthetical piece of gossip about John Wesley (repeated in a later Warburton letter) is simply intended to parody the sort of "missionary" fanaticism running through the entries of Whitefield's Journal. Incidentally, Whitefield had embarked for Georgia on the same day and in the same place (Deal) that Wesley had disembarked on his return from Georgia.

According to pre-modern psychology of "humors," holy zeal and misconceptions of divine leading were apt to be the result of a "heated Melancholy."<sup>29</sup> Ardor and misconceits of afflatus—More punned with "flatulency"—were two symptoms of the same melancholic disorder. Burton, Hobbes, Locke, Shaftesbury, Swift and many others discuss the melancholy humor and its fanatical religious symptoms. In the same letter to Middleton, Warburton suggests a cure: "How happy would it be if we could ship over some of our hottest Zealots on a Mission to cool themselves in an Indian Savanna!"<sup>30</sup>

<sup>27</sup> For example, Quaker "illumination"; Moravian "quietism"; High Church "historic succession." However, Wesley: "It is the point we chiefly insist upon that orthodoxy or right opinion is at best but a very slender part of Religion, if any part of it at all." Warburton returns to this point over and over again in *The Doctrine of Grace*. See Warburton, *Works*, VIII, 348, 395, etc.

<sup>28</sup> August 27, 1738. Egerton MS, *op. cit.*

<sup>29</sup> More, *op. cit.*, section XVII, 12. "The mistake of heated Melancholy for holy zeal and the Spirit of God."

<sup>30</sup> Egerton MS *op. cit.* That Warburton considered enthusiasm a humoral disorder can be clearly seen in a paraphrase: "It would be well for Virtue and Religion, if this humor would lay hold generally of our overheated bigots, and send them to cool themselves in the Indian Marshes." (Warburton to des Maizeaux, September 16, 1738, Nichols, *Illust.*, II, 66.) Cf. Warburton to Birch, August 27, 1738, *ibid.*, 94.

Tyerman and others, using a paraphrase of this parody from a later Warburton letter, cut it off at this point.<sup>31</sup> This break in the middle of a paragraph (clearly evident in the manuscript version) gives the misleading impression that Warburton means only Methodists when he writes about "our hottest Zealots." Actually he has some particular fanatical highchurchmen in mind: William Webster and Richard Venn. The manuscript letter to Middleton goes on:

Don't you think Ven & Webster would make a proper as well as a pleasant figure in a Couple of Bear Skins? Methinks I see them march in this terrour of Equipage, like Hercules's Pagan Priests of Old, Jamque Sacerdotes primusque Politius ibant, *Pellibus* in morem cincti, *flammasque* ferebant.<sup>32</sup>

Students of eighteenth-century literature know that Webster published *The Weekly Miscellany* under the pen-name, Richard Hooker, Esq. (Many standard Methodist histories, including Tyerman's works, mention Webster and Hooker as though they were two different persons.) Richard Venn, high church rector of St. Antholin (London), was one of the regular writers for Webster's reactionary *Miscellany*. During its short life (1733—1741) *Miscellany* hobbyhorses were deism, heterodoxy, and Whitefield's enthusiasm. In their letters Warburton and Middleton commiserate with each other over recent *Miscellany* jabs at their heterodoxy. Before "Old Mother Hooker's Journal" went bankrupt, indeed as early as 1737, Webster and his cronies had also begun to flay Whitefield's pulpiteering. Venn was one of the first parochial priests to deny the pulpit to Methodists. One of the reasons for this action, which led to field-preaching, was Whitefield's journal attacks on the formal and spiritually dead Christianity of the parochial priests, who, after all, had been hosting the itinerant deacon.

Alexander Pope was surely doing a personal favor for his apologist-friend, Warburton, when he caricatured Whitefield and Webster in a pair of couplets.

Such as from lab'ring lungs th'Enthusiast blows,  
High Sound, attemp'red to the vocal nose;  
Or such as bellow from the deep Divine;  
There Webster! peal'd thy voice, and Whitefield! thine<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Tyerman, *Wesley* I, 208.

<sup>32</sup> Egerton MS, *op. cit.* Cf. Nichols, *Illust.*, II, 66. The bear-skin conceit may have been suggested by an ejaculative entry in Whitefield's first Journal (Sat. Feb. 25, 1738): ". . . O how amiable are Thy servants, O Lord of hosts! But Satan does now as formerly dress them in bear's skins, in order to have them baited." See also Shaftesbury, *op. cit.*, 22.

<sup>33</sup> *The Dunciad* (1742). See James Sutherland edition (1953), 308. The same Cooper who bootlegged Whitefield's first Journal did this edition of Pope's poem.

A commentator, quite likely Warburton himself, explains this coupling of the two zealots.

This (Whitefield) thought the only means of advancing Christianity was by the New-birth of religious madness; that (Webster), by the old death of fire and faggot: and therefore they agreed in this, though in no other earthly thing, to abuse all the sober Clergy.<sup>34</sup>

However, in his Middleton letter, Warburton was suggesting a more basic comparison between the fanatical highchurchman and the fervent evangelist than their common "abuse of sober Clergy." (The Bishop of London had taken Whitefield to task for his harsh Journal remarks about parish priests in the 1739 Pastoral Letter.) This abuse was only the bitter fruit of a naturally-rooted fanaticism. Such might either be fed by high church ardor; or by evangelical delusions of inspiration.

A few weeks earlier Whitefield had written a friend (probably James Hutton):

America is not so horrid a place as it is represented to be. The heat of the weather, lying on the ground, etc. are mere painted lions in the way, and to a soul filled with divine love not worth mentioning.<sup>35</sup>

Warburton did not know that Whitefield had gone to Georgia *after* an evangelical conversion (June 1735), and Wesley *before* his Aldersgate experience (May 1738).<sup>36</sup> In any case, it would have made no difference to Warburton whether Wesley's missionary zeal were motivated by high church scrupulosity (like Webster's), or Whitefield's by claims of "a soul filled with divine love." As far as he was concerned, both would be the two faces of fanaticism.

#### B. *Non-juring*

The Non-Jurors were virtually a defunct high church party by the time the Methodists appeared. But memories of their fanaticism were still sharp enough for Warburton to compare Methodists with them in a letter to Thomas Birch (September 16, 1738). Methodist students like Tyerman were scandalized at the gossip on Wesley; and they ignore the letter's more important historical allusion. The commonly-deleted sentences are enclosed in parentheses.

(Your sentiments of the Methodists are unquestionably right; and of their original, from a discountenanced party. Fanaticism rises from

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* Cf. Nichols, *Lit. Anec.*, V, 166-167 footnote.

<sup>35</sup> Savannah, June 10, 1738. Whitefield, *Works*, I, 44.

<sup>36</sup> Wesley's account of Aldersgate did not get published until his second *Extract*, late in 1740. *Bib. Am.*, XXVIII, 58. Cf. Baker, *op. cit.*, 31, note 17. Whitefield's *A Short Account of God's Dealings*, telling of his conversion, was published in June 1740. *GM*, X 220.

oppression ever.) A couple of these Methodists, of which Wesley was one, travelling into this neighborhood on foot, took up their lodging with a Clergyman of their acquaintance. The master of the house going into their chamber in the morning to salute them, perceived their chamber-pot full of blood; and, on asking the occasion, was told it was *their method*, when the blood grew rebellious, to draw it off, by breathing a vein, in this manner—that they had heated with travel, and thought it proper to cool themselves. (If common report may be credited, the men from whom they sprung, as Hickes and Collier, had a more natural way of evacuation.)<sup>37</sup>

George Hickes and Jeremy Collier were members of the "discountenanced party" of Non-Jurors; both, sooner or later bishops. Scrupling among other matters the divine right, these Jacobite highchurchmen had refused the oath of loyalty to William III. Their religious and political fanaticism was both cause and result of deprivation (February 1690); and exclusion from the Established Church. They formed something of an underground church party.

Birch apparently suggested to Warburton that the Methodists had "an original" in the Non-Juring type of fanaticism. This was a shrewd guess. We know better than Warburton that the roots of Oxford Methodism went deep into the soil of high church piety. Indeed John Wesley's mother had at one time seriously antagonized her husband over the Oath.<sup>38</sup> The connection between excessive scruples over externals of religion and excessive fervor of an inner faith is more than accidental. To Warburton, they would be two faces of enthusiasm. It has been suggested in a recent monograph that

the transition from High Church to Evangelical may perhaps also be seen in another way as the substitution of one type of religious authority for another: the replacement of the appeal to the linear, unbroken, historical tradition which connected the Church of the Apostles with the contemporary Church of England, by an appeal to the authority of religious experience, confirmed by the test of Scripture.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup> September 16, 1738, Warburton to Birch. Nichols, *Illust.*, II, 94-95. (May parentheses.) Cf. Tyerman, *Wesley*, I, 208-209. *Fogg's Weekly Journal* (December 9, 1732) had parodied the Oxford Methodist regimen: "All Wednesdays and Fridays are strictly to be kept as fasts; and blood let once a fortnight, to keep down the carnal man." *Ibid.*, 85.

<sup>38</sup> Susanna Wesley, when she alienated her husband, Samuel, on the issue of the Oath, sought the counsel of Non-juring George Hickes. V. H. H. Green, *The Young Mr. Wesley* (1961), 49-50. In the year 1680, before his deprivation, Hickes published a sermon delivered at the University of Oxford, entitled, *The Spirit of Enthusiasm Exorcized*. He was attacking the doctrine of papal infallibility, based on the "enthusiastical principle of immediate inspiration." For an extract see P. E. More & F. L. Cross, eds., *Anglicanism* (1957), 68.

<sup>39</sup> John Walsh, *op. cit.*, 139.

### C. Puritan

A few months later Warburton was reading an account of the regicide trials, dealing with the seventeenth-century Puritans who had executed King Charles I.<sup>40</sup> They suggested another memorable case of enthusiasm. He wrote Birch:

I have been lately reading the Trials and last Behaviour of the Regicides. They were mostly, you know, Enthusiasts; but what surprised me, of the same kind with the Methodists; and bottomed all on their grand principle, Regeneration; for, when it was objected to them that the Jesuit Traitors had the same extacies and overflowings of joy in the spirit, they replied, "Yea, but not on our principle: theirs was Enthusiasm, ours the real fruits of the Spirit."<sup>41</sup>

The Puritans were another stereotype for scrupulosity and claims of divine inspiration. Warburton is taken with their misconceit of regeneration rather than their "precise" quibbles about Catholic ceremonial—literally, precisianism. (Puritans were first called Precisians.) Warburton admits that the Methodists were a moral lot in comparison to the regicides. But the presumption of divine direction can lead to rash actions.

The wicked actions of the Regicides will not suffer us to think their spirit was of God. The moral lives of the Methodists will not suffer us to think theirs of the Devil. What is left but to conclude both a *natural Enthusiasm*? Though the Methodists ought not to be persecuted, yet that the Clergy are right in giving no encouragement to their spirit, appears from the dismal effects it produced amongst the Fanatics in Charles the First's time, who began with the same meekness and humility with these.<sup>42</sup>

It is of course a rhetorical point that Methodist morality is not "of the Devil." But to blame neither God nor the Devil left only the possibility of a "natural enthusiasm." The conclusion was in the premise. Recent signs of Methodist fervor were similar to earlier instances of self-righteous fanaticism. Despite Whitefield's pulpit and journal testimonies, was it not likely that his enthusiasm was self-induced (i.e. "natural") rather than of God?

### D. Moravian

In this same letter to Birch, Warburton proposes a startlingly coincidental comparison.

<sup>40</sup> Almost certainly Heneage Finch, the Earl of Nottingham's often-reprinted compilation: *The Indictment, Arraignment, Tryal, and Judgment . . . of Twenty-Nine Regicides, the Murderers of King Charles the First . . . October 1660. . . To which is added, their Speeches.* (1660 first edition.) In the eighteenth century it was published *With a Preface, giving an Account of the Rise and Progress of Enthusiasm.* See British Museum Catalogue entries; also "Heneage Finch" in *DNB*.

<sup>41</sup> March 31, 1740. Warburton to Birch. Nichols, *Illust.*, II, 121.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.* (My italics.)

I lately received a letter from Dr. Doddridge, of Northampton, in which he gave me a long account of Count Zinzendorf and his Church near Frankfort. He keeps a kind of correspondence with the Count, and transcribed one of Zinzendorf's Letters to him, by which I find him and his Church to be as great Enthusiasts as the Methodists, of much the same species.<sup>43</sup>

I have no information that Warburton knew of Wesley's visit to Herrnhut in the summer of 1738. Whether in fact he knew of the Methodist-Moravian connections, it is fascinating that Warburton should discern their common enthusiasm through information from the famous Dissenter, Dr. Philip Doddridge. (This was within a very few weeks of John Wesley's initial break from the London Fetter Lane Society in July 1740.) Doddridge was no admirer of Whitefield, and for much the same reasons as Warburton.

I still fancy that he is but a *weak* man.—much too positive, says rash things, and is bold and enthusiastic . . . I think what Mr. Whitfield says and does comes but little short of an assumption of inspiration or infallibility.<sup>44</sup>

#### E. Jesuit (and Quaker)

As we have already observed, Protestants had refined the polemical art of comparing passages from popish and pagan literature to prove their "conformity" in superstition and fanaticism. As Warburton knew very well, his fair-weather friend, Dr. Conyers Middleton, had brought this technique to "classical expression in the English-speaking world" in *A Letter from Rome* (1729).<sup>45</sup> Warburton is copying this hackneyed technique when he tells Birch:

I tell you what I think would be the best way of exposing these idle Fanatics—the presenting of passages out of George Fox's Journal, and Ignatius Loyola, and Whitefield's Journals in parallel columns. Their conformity in folly is amazing.<sup>46</sup>

In a later letter, he also proposes "collecting flowers" from Puritan tracts, "the very counterpart of Whitefield's," to draw "some general conclusions: as, that, the effect being the same, the cause

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.* For a non-sectarian view of the Moravians in this period, see Skyes, *op. cit.*, 321-322; also Knox, *op. cit.*, 389-421.

<sup>44</sup> *The Diary and Correspondence of Philip Doddridge*, ed. J. D. Humphries (1829), III, 38.

<sup>45</sup> F. Manuel, *op. cit.*, 23. Cf. M. L. Snow, *Conyers Middleton: Polemic Historian* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Inc., 1970). Chapter II, "Popery and Paganism."

<sup>46</sup> September 10, 1739. Warburton to Birch. Nichols, *Illust.*, II, 109. "I have seen Whitefield's Journal, and he appears to me as mad as ever George Fox the Quaker was." Warburton to des Maizeaux. *Ibid.*, 65.

Quaker eccentricities were stock clichés in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries for enthusiasm. Cf. Casaubon, *op. cit.*, 173f; More, *op. cit.*, 18f; Knox, 138-175.

must be so.”<sup>47</sup> Warburton is arguing that these particular historical examples of enthusiasm seem to be the same when compared as Journal entries; therefore, their origin in an “upset” human nature must be the same. This, of course, is careless logic and polemical historical criticism. Warburton would have been more cautious if he had argued that historical examples of excessive religious fervor *may* have “natural” causes.

Warburton is most impressed with similarities he fancies between Loyola’s and Whitefield’s fanaticism.

One thing was extremely singular in Loyola: he became, from the modestest fanatic that ever was, the most cold-headed knave, by the time his Society was thoroughly established. The same *natural* temperature that set his brains on a heat worked off the ferment. The case was so uncommon, that his adversaries thought all his fanaticism pretended. But in this they were certainly mistaken. The surprising part of all was, that his folly and knavery concurred so perfectly to promote his end . . . If I be not mistaken in Whitefield, he bids fair for acting the second part of Loyola, as he has done the first.<sup>48</sup>

Whitefield did not have the capacity, in any sense, to act “the second part of Loyola.” Warburton, however, returns many times to the Jesuit—Methodist comparison in his later book, *The Doctrine of Grace*.

#### VI. Warburton’s Later Criticism

There was an avalanche of stuff against Whitefield and his Journals in 1739 and 1740. Warburton seriously considered, and then gave up the idea of doing a pamphlet that “would well expose the Methodists.” “When I considered the method some Churchmen have used in writing against them, I expected no good from such a kind of pamphlet, and so laid the thoughts of it aside.”<sup>49</sup> He was in fact pre-occupied at the time with expanding and re-editing his eccentric masterwork, *The Divine Legation*.

Only in 1762/3 does Warburton pick up an old sermon and puff it up into two volumes under the descriptive title: *The Doctrine of Grace; or The Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit Vindicated from the Insults of Infidelity and the Abuses of Fanaticism: With Some Thoughts (Humbly offered to the Consideration of the Established Clergy) Regarding the Right Method of Defending Reli-*

<sup>47</sup> Nichols, *Illust.*, II, 121.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 109-110. (My italics.) Cf. Tyerman, *Whitefield*, I, 282. According to Warburton, Loyola’s disciplined enthusiasms were “ecstasies begun in mire” (i.e. in a corrupt nature). Warburton, *Works*, VIII, 383.

<sup>49</sup> Nichols, *op. cit.*, 121. *GM* (1739) listed over 50 titles; and *LM* (1739) has over 40 entries. Cf. Richard Green, *op. cit.*, 3-20; Tyerman, *Whitefield*, I, 283-285.

Green’s standard work needs updating; there are new entries, and the notations are quite incomplete.

gion against the Attacks of Either Party.<sup>50</sup> For this last major work of his life, the (now) Bishop of Gloucester ransacked John Wesley's early journal *Extracts*; virtually ignoring Whitefield's altogether. This was a tacit acknowledgment of Wesley's later pre-eminence in the Methodist movement. In short, two decades later Warburton applied the polemical clichés of his early letters to another Methodist's journals.<sup>51</sup>

If Methodists were making too many claims for God's work in the present church, the deists were making too few claims for God's work in the primitive church. In *The Doctrine of Grace*, as in *The Divine Legation* written at the time of his letters twenty years earlier, Warburton attacked both fanaticism and infidelity. Ironically, one of his illustrations for infidelity was his former friend, Dr. Middleton's sceptical views about the enthusiastic gifts of tongues (*glossalalia*) in the primitive church.<sup>52</sup> Warburton did not seriously doubt God's role in Christian enthusiasm before the rise of Romanism in the fourth century.

This reverence for Christian antiquity helps to explain why Warburton's polemics against Whitefield's, and later, Wesley's enthusiasm used the method of comparing them to modern rather than primitive examples of enthusiasm. Within his framework of history, the latter was generally authentic and the former was generally fanatic. Warburton's case against Whitefield's enthusiasm

<sup>50</sup> In three books. Published in two volumes November 1762 and post-dated. Lengthy synopses were printed in the liberal journal, *The Monthly Review* (1762), XXVII, 369-381; 399-410.

At the time of its publication, Warburton wrote his old friend, Thomas Birch, November 17, 1762: "It gives me much pleasure that my little book is approved of by one whose judgment I so much value." Nichols, *Illust.*, II, 141. Richard Hurd, editor of Warburton's *Works* (first edition, 1788), rashly remarked in the introductory biography that *The Doctrine of Grace* would singly preserve the name of Methodism after it had died as a movement! Cf. A. W. Evans, *Warburton and the Warburtonians* (1932), 235f.

<sup>51</sup> John Wesley read *The Doctrine of Grace* in the loose sheets that Warburton had sent him; and he published his line-by-line rebuttal in February 1763: *A Letter to the Bishop of Gloucester, occasioned by his Tract on the Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit*. GM, XXXIII, 99. (Whitefield also published a brief, general answer.)

The writer for *The Monthly Review* wrote a one-line supercilious notation on Wesley's book: "Mr. Wesley has answered the Bishop's book with all that art, address, and specious appearance of primitive integrity, decency, and dove-like innocence, which must be naturally expected by such as are acquainted with the character of a man who is so much master of his own, as well as other men's passions." *Loc. cit.* XXVIII, 235.

<sup>52</sup> Warburton, *Works* (1811), VIII, 251f. Cf. Middleton, "Essay on the Gift of Tongues" in *Miscellaneous Tracts* (1752), 79-103; also passing references in *A Free Inquiry* (1749).

The brief Warburton—Middleton friendship had chilled in 1741 because of a scholarly difference over the source of paganism in the pre-Nicene church. Warburton said it was a natural corruption; Middleton contended it was historically caused. Cf. Egerton MS 1953, ff. 50-52; Middleton, *A Letter from Rome*, "Postscript" (1741, fourth edition); Warburton, *Remarks on Several Occasional Reflections* (1744); Snow, *op. cit.*, 72-83. Warburton had also been offended by Middleton's historical arguments against all early church miracles in *A Free Inquiry*. See Warburton, *Julian* (1750).

depended upon the increasingly anachronistic notion that God had ceased his special work at an "arbitrary" time in sacred history. As we have noted, this time had been more or less determined by Protestant convictions that the church had become corrupt in ritual and doctrine by the third or fourth centuries. Warburton, like most orthodox and even liberal churchmen of his day, was caught on the horns of a dilemma. The awkward alternatives seemed to be either that God's special work had never ceased (the view of Methodists and Papists); or that God's special work had never really begun at all (the view of deists and sceptics).<sup>53</sup>

In retrospect, it is evident that Warburton's line of attack on Methodist enthusiasm gave (unwitting) support to the deists' secularizing views of sacred history. In short, partisan Christian attacks on *recent* church history were abetting a more thoroughgoing rationalistic understanding of *all* church history. For example, the greatest rationalistic historian of the eighteenth century, Edward Gibbon, was an attentive reader of Middleton's works; and an acute critic of Middleton's and Warburton's divergent views on Christian antiquity.<sup>54</sup> Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* specifically treated primitive church enthusiasm as simply "intolerant zeal."<sup>55</sup>

Warburton's letters attacking Whitefield's diaries provide a footnote to the large body of eighteenth-century religious polemics which played a substantial part in the almost imperceptible shift from a sacred to a secular view of church history.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Addressing these churchmen on the very issue of recent versus *ancient* church miracles and enthusiasm, Middleton wrote: ". . . Let them be so ingenuous at last as to confess, that we have no other part left, but either to admit them all, or reject them all; for otherwise, they can never be thought to act consistently." *A Free Inquiry*, 226. He is pressing the case against English churchmen who universally decried the enthusiasm of the "French Prophets" who had been hounded out of France at the turn of the eighteenth century. Cf. Shaftesbury, *op. cit.*, 20f; Knox, *op. cit.*, 356-388; David Hume, "Of Miracles" in *Philosophical Essays Concerning Human Understanding* (1750, second edition), Note on *Recueil des Miracles de l'Abbe Paris*.

<sup>54</sup> Gibbon, some years before he wrote his masterwork, remarked on implications of the Warburton—Middleton quarrel cited in note 52 above:

"Messrs. Warburton and Middleton are divided on this question. The latter thinks that the Christians borrow (their rites) from the pagans. The former admits that both (Christians and pagans) simply followed the natural impulses of the human spirit which of itself is always inclined to these superstitions. Are these opinions really different? Our will must be motivated." Lausanne, December 5, 1763 in *Le Journal de Gibbon a Lausanne 17 Aout 1763-19 Avril 1764*, publie par Georges Bonnard (Lausanne, 1945), 167. (My translation.)

<sup>55</sup> *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776), chapter 15. Cf. Gibbon, *A Vindication of Some Passages in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Chapters of The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1779).

<sup>56</sup> Several formidable works against miracles and enthusiasm were published in the late 1730's and early 1740's. For example, David Hume's "Of Superstition and Enthusiasm" in *Essays Moral and Political* (1741) in which he noted how enthusiasm in the English church had been a "friend" to civil liberty; hence unwittingly abetting the rise of the modern secular state. (His famous essay on miracles, though only published in 1748, had been written in the 1730's.)