

---

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

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



BENSON

The Inspector of Methodism Inspected  
and the Christian Observer Observed,

BX  
8334  
H3  
B4



LIBRARY

THE

*Inspector of Methodism Inspected,*

AND THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER OBSERVED.

By JOSEPH BENSON.

BEING

AN ANSWER TO A PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED,

*METHODISM INSPECTED,*

PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM HALES, D. D.

RECTOR of KILLESANDRA in IRELAND:

And to the

REVIEW THEREOF IN THE CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.



Thou shalt not bear false Witness against thy Neighbour.



LONDON:

Printed at the Conference-Office, North-Green, Worship-street: G. STORY, Agent.  
1803.

To

I

rece

Per

app

imp

ratio

trou

and

you

re

very

fact

the

view

Ov

mon

ture

Pr

high

you

tim

we

sim

THE

*Inspector of Methodism Inspected, &c.*



To the EDITORS of the CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

GENTLEMEN,

I Have been a constant reader of the *Christian Observer*, from its first publication, and acknowledge that I have received both pleasure and profit from the perusal of that Periodical Work. Most of the pieces inserted in it, have appeared to me worthy of commendation for their *truth* and *importance*, and but few to merit censure. The moderation which you have manifested on the subjects of controversy, between those that believe the doctrine of *General*, and those who hold that of *Particular* Redemption, with your constant care to guard your Readers against *Antinomianism* and *false-liberty*, on the one hand, and *self-righteousness* and *formality* on the other, has met with my most decided approbation. I have especially much approved of the impartial manner in which several books have been reviewed in your Work. I might mention the Rev. Mr. Overton's True Churchman, Simeon's Skeletons of Sermons, Magee's Discourses on the Atonement, Paley's Natural Theology, Hayley's Life of Cowper, Bates's Rural Philosophy, and many others. I have, indeed, had such an high opinion of your judgment in this particular, that if you commended a book, it was, with me, a sufficient testimony in its favour; and on this ground I have recommended sundry Publications thus approved, and at the same time have taken occasion to promote, in different parts of the

Kingdom, the circulation of the *Christian Observer*, as a Work well calculated to serve the interests of genuine religion and virtue. Sorry am I therefore to observe that in some late Numbers you have seemed to depart, and that in no inconsiderable degree, from your former character of impartiality. Instead of attacking only vice and irreligion in their various forms, defending and elucidating the great truths of Christianity, and promoting a spirit of love, harmony and mutual forbearance, among all the true disciples of our common and divine Master, you appear to have deviated into an uncharitable and sectarian Spirit, and have begun to entertain unworthy jealousies of some denominations of Christians, who in certain lesser matters, differ from you. The Methodists, of late in connection with the Rev. John Wesley deceased, have, in particular, been the objects of uncandid animadversion. I shall pass over some indirect attacks made upon this numerous body of Christians, whose sole aim and endeavour it has long been to spread true religion and virtue in the world; and shall principally notice your Number for September last, in which, in a more direct manner, you commence hostilities against them.

In that Number you review a Pamphlet entitled,—“*Methodism Inspected*,” and begin by informing your Readers that, “this Pamphlet commences with the Author’s Remarks on some Accounts, recently published by the Arminian Methodists, of the progress and proceedings of their Missionaries in Ireland.” Now, this I must notice as a mistake. Dr. Hales’s Pamphlet *commences*, not with remarks on any accounts of our Missions in Ireland recently published, but with an history of the “new mode of *Itinerant Preaching* adopted, of late years, by the followers of Mr. Wesley” in that country. “Their Missionaries,” the Doctor tells us, “frequent Markets and Fairs, and harangue on horseback in the most crowded places of public resort:”

resort :”—“ That they wear black coifs, or skull-caps, like the Puritans formerly ;”—“ an usage condemned,” Dr. Hales says, “ by St. Paul, when it crept into the disorderly church of Corinth,” he having signified that, “ *Every man praying or prophesying, that is preaching, having his head covered dishonoureth his head :*” That they are “ no less ostentatious than the Pharisees of old, who loved to pray, standing in the corners of the streets, to be seen of men :”—That they “ compass sea and land to make profelytes, and literally compel all within hearing, traders, and passengers in the streets and highways, to come in to their fold, with a persevering zeal, amidst various obstructions and annoyances of oxen, swine, and noisy dealers ;”—contrary, the Doctor thinks, to our Lord’s prudential maxim, “ Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine ; lest [the swine] trample them under their feet, and [the dogs] turn and tear you.”

Such, Gentlemen, is the commencement of this Pamphlet ; and this commencement, I think, you should not have passed over without favouring the public with some remarks on the extraordinary particulars it contains. As *Christian Observers*, your office called upon you to inform the friends of christianity, what your judgment is of this new mode of Itinerant Preaching, and whether you think it deserves countenance and support, or merits condemnation and opposition. You might also have contributed to the direction and relief of scrupulous consciences, and thereby eventually have served the cause of religion, by giving us your opinion respecting the Doctor’s discovery, viz. that the christian men at Corinth wore black caps, and that for a man, when he is praying or preaching, to wear a black cap, or to have his head covered with a cap of any kind, is a breach of an Apostolic Precept. It might have answered some valuable end, likewise, if you had told us whether you agree with the Doctor, in judging that those

“ noisy



“noisy dealers, traders and passengers,” who are found in the streets of Towns and Cities, and in the highways leading to them, on Market and Fair-days, are such “dogs and swine,” as our Lord intended in the passage referred to; and, if so, whether the doctrines of the Gospel are those “holy things,” and “pearls,” which must not be given to or cast before them. You would then, in course, have proceeded to inform us, whether such persons are to be permitted to continue in sin and folly unmolested; or, if not, what better mode can be used to bring them to repentance, than that of preaching the Gospel to them. And on the supposition that you judged the Doctor’s opinion on this head to be rational and scriptural, and that the truths of Christianity are not to be declared to or inculcated upon such, no doubt you would have shewn us how Jesus Christ and his Apostles, who continually preached in streets and lanes of Towns and Cities, and in the highways and open places of the country, to persons of all descriptions, can be exempted from the charge of the same sin and folly of “giving that which is holy to dogs, and casting pearls before swine.” I hope, also, that if you had judged proper to notice this commencement of the Pamphlet, your charity would have enabled you to discover, and would have inclined you, to assign a better reason, why men, praying and preaching in the open air, amidst rain and snow, frost and cold, should cover their heads, whether with black or white caps, than the desire of attracting attention by appearing *singular*; and a better reason for a Missionary’s preaching to the poor and ignorant Irish Catholics in the streets, than “Ostentation.” However, as you have not been pleased to notice this commencement of the Doctor’s Work, we must be obliged to forego the pleasure and edification we might have received from your remarks.

To return to your Critique.—Mentioning these “Accounts recently published,” (which, by the by, are only two private

private Letters, not written, nor originally intended for publication,) you say, "After briefly and justly censuring these accounts, Dr. Hales proceeds to discuss, &c."—"After justly censuring these Accounts!!" Permit me to enquire, here, Gentlemen, have you *seen* and *considered* the Letters to which Dr. Hales refers, and have you ascertained and compared them with the facts in question? Or, have you contented yourselves with merely casting your eyes over the garbled extract, (garbled indeed most strangely!) which the Doctor has made from them, without being at the pains by yourselves, or your agents, to examine, on the spot, whether the accounts are true? If, as I suspect, you have only done the latter, I presume, you are not sufficiently qualified to decide whether the accounts are justly or unjustly censured. But let us observe the nature of the censure which the Doctor pronounces upon them. "These few Extracts," says he, "are sufficient to shew what manner of spirit they are of." In this Dr. Hales is partly right. Even these Extracts, imperfect and unfairly made as they are, shew, in some degree, altho' not *sufficiently*, not as the entire Letters would have shewn, some of the best passages being omitted, what spirit these Missionaries are of. They shew that they are influenced by an high degree of the spirit of *love*, to *God* and *man*, and with an *ardent zeal* for the glory of *God* and the good of their fellow-creatures, perishing for lack of knowledge and of grace.

Were it not for these and such like qualities, I cannot conceive what should induce any thinking man, endued, although but with a moderate share of common sense, to undertake such labours, and expose himself to such hardships, dangers, and sufferings, as these zealous and indefatigable Missionaries undergo. It is an easy thing for a Rev. Divine, in his warm and comfortable parlour, or, for "The Christian Observer," in a commodious

dious habitation, to censure such men and their proceedings, and to impute their labours to unworthy motives: But who of those that censure them will go and do likewise? Who of the Clergy, although solemnly appointed by authority, which they deem sufficient, and engaged by promise made before God and his Church, to seek the lost sheep of Christ, wherever they can find them, will imitate good Mr. Gillin, the Apostle of the North, or the late Rev. Messrs. Wesley and Whitefield, and go out into the streets and lanes of the cities, and into the high-ways and hedges, to compel, by argument and persuasion, the souls that are ignorant and ready to perish, to enter the fold of Christ, and become his people?

Your English Readers are, perhaps, not acquainted with the extreme difficulty, if not absolute impossibility, of preaching the Gospel to the Irish Catholics in any other way than that practised by the Methodist Missionaries. The poor, ignorant, Priest-ridden Papists in Ireland, dare not, in general, venture into a Protestant Church or Chapel, lest their Priests should discover it, and pronounce the most dreadful Anathemas against them. It is a fact which I can prove, that Roman Catholic Priests have repeatedly stood at the doors of the Methodist-Chapels, on winter evenings, with lanterns in their hands, to watch and prevent their people from hearing the Word of God. A very respectable young man, now in London, first heard the Gospel, from an Irish Missionary preaching on horseback, at the peril of all his comfort, the Priest, at the same time, uttering the most bitter denunciations against him. It is lamentable, therefore, that a Protestant Clergyman should endeavour to turn into ridicule such disinterested and zealous endeavours to enlighten these grossly ignorant people, when he must be sensible that, in the present state of things, no better mode could possibly be adopted.

Dr.

Dr. Hales proceeds to say, "That they court *persecution*, and are *willing to lay down their lives* for the sake of the cause in which they are embarked, and even to *give their bodies to be burned*, as a proof of their sincerity, we can scarcely doubt." I acknowledge, Gentlemen, that I doubt the whole of this. I see no shadow of proof that these Missionaries "court persecution." I cannot imagine what good it should do them, or the cause in which they are engaged. And as to their "being willing to lay down their lives," or, "give their bodies to be burned," altho' I am well convinced of their sincerity, and of their great zeal in the work, I dare not affirm, that their religion would carry them thro' such a trial; and, I sincerely hope, that it will not be put to that test. Dr. Hales, it seems, however, has a different view of them, and can scarcely doubt either of these particulars, altho' evidently in contradiction the one to the other; that is, he can scarcely doubt but that persons who "court persecution," and thereby commit known sin, will, nevertheless, have such fortitude given them in the time of trial, that they will be willing to lay down their lives for the sake of the cause in which they are embarked, and even to give their bodies to be burned in proof of their sincerity! "Therefore," adds he, "it is with real regret and concern we remark, that they seem to be rather deficient in that evangelical virtue of charity,—which is unwilling to arraign or censure the motives or conduct of others, and attribute them to the worst causes."

I see nothing in the Letters of the Missionaries, even as garbled by Dr. Hales, to which he can refer here, unless it be the following sentences. "The Romish Clergy know not what to do to defend themselves: Vain are all their attempts to prevent the people from hearing, for keep them they cannot."—"We had no opposition till we came to Tralee, on the Sabbath:—And there you would have imagined hell was let loose! Tho' my voice is pretty loud, I could not be

B

heard:

heard : Such shouting of men, women, and children, I never heard before : And altho' we had the Magistrates (*four or five* of them, according to their Letter,) on our side, and Officers, and Yeomen, and many Protestants, it did not avail. But we got the Court-house that evening, and a guard of soldiers, and preached to many hundreds. One of them," (observe : not one of the missionaries, but one of the Catholics) "said to their Priests, in whose company he was that night, 'Your people are in the dark, and so you would have it.' "From Kerry we went to Skibbereen, where many of the poor Catholics attended preaching. We preached in the Market-Place, and had an attentive hearing. Next day, being the Sabbath, the poor Catholics flocked in hundreds about us; when a Priest came riding up furiously thro' the people, and lashing with his whip, on every hand, like a merciless tyrant : The people ran from him, and the crowd being great, were tumbling one over another. After he had dispersed them, he called them to the chapel, and lectured them. A Catholic magistrate who met him, lectured him severely, and said he would write to his Bishop, and have him discarded. This, I believe, was one of the worst days the Priest ever beheld, for all his people seemed to be cast down a his conduct."—"In Bantry,—we had no persecution but from an old woman, who made a loud noise in the Market, and came out also on the sabbath; but one of our friends put her to silence. I thought satan was very destitute of friends, when he had none to bring forward but this poor individual."

Now, these sentences are quoted from the Extracts which Dr. Hales himself has made from the Missionaries' Letters, and are the only passages in them on which he can ground his charge of *uncharitableness*. And the reader is left to judge whether they can support such a charge. They appear to me to contain only a simple relation of matters of fact, (which, if mis-stated, the Doctor should have disproved,) without

without any reflection upon them whatever, unless in two instances; I mean, 1st, when the Missionary observes, that "he believed it was one of the worst days the Priest ever beheld, because all his people seemed to be cast down at his conduct:" And, 2ndly, that he thought "Satan was very destitute of friends, when he had none to bring forward but the poor old woman." And, I think, few of my readers will discover any strong proofs of uncharitableness in these two observations.

But what would an impartial Reviewer of Dr. Hales's Pamphlet say to him here? Would he not assume the well-known proverb, "Physician, heal thyself?" Is not he deficient in this same evangelical virtue of Charity, when he ascribes the conduct of the Missionaries to the worst possible motive, attributing their preaching in the streets and markets to *Ospretation*, and intimating that their wearing black caps, (with which they cover their heads, solely to preserve them from the cold,) is an artifice to draw attention by the singularity of their appearance? Would not charity have suggested some better motives to which to ascribe such proceedings?

But I have yet another part of the Doctor's censure to attend to. "They arrogate to themselves," says he, "an Apostolical commission, from heaven, represent the *noise and shaking, cries and tears*, excited by the vehemence of their discourses, especially in the weaker sex, as unequivocal signs of the presence of God, and infallible proofs of the power of the Holy Ghost: and their opponents as instigated by the devil."

Where the Doctor finds ground for the former of these charges, I am at a loss to conjecture, discerning no trace of the kind in the Letters which he has quoted. Nor do I see any evidence that they consider "noise and shaking, cries and tears, excited by the vehemence of their discourses, as unequivocal signs of the presence of God, and infallible

proofs of the power of the Holy Ghost." It remains, however, for Dr. Hales to prove, that the mere vehemence of a preacher's discourse, without any divine influence attending it, will *usually* or *usually* produce *cries* and *tears*, among an ignorant and hardened people. I would advise him, or any that are of that mind, to make the attempt for a few times, and I am inclined to think, that notwithstanding all their pathos and power of persuasion, they will find it less easy than they imagine, to produce "cries and tears," in thoughtless and abandoned sinners. As to the censure which the Doctor pronounces on the Missionaries for intimating that their opponents are "instigated by the devil," it appears to me, if their undertaking be of God, and I think that the Doctor will have hard work to prove that *it is not*, they who oppose them in it must be influenced by some such enemy of all righteousness; and, I hope the Rector of Killesandra, and the Authors of the Christian Observer, will take heed to themselves that they be not found aiding and abetting him in his designs.

If "the conversion of the great body of Irish Catholics, to genuine Christianity, from the gross errors of the Church of Rome, in which they have been, for so many ages, immersed," be "indeed," as this Rev. Divine asserts, "most desirable, and an event most devoutly to be wished," let him, and all others, that have any influence, take care that they do not pour cold water on any well-devised and promising scheme, to promote, altho' but in a small degree, this desirable end, nor lay obstructions in the way of its accomplishment. "But," says the Doctor, "we apprehend it is not to be effected by itinerant preaching, even the most truly unexceptionable in point of doctrine." Perhaps not *entirely*, nor to the extent desired or expected: But if it be effected in any degree, it will be matter of rejoicing. And that it may be, and actually is, effected in some degree, we have abundant proof. Dr. Hales, who has been so liberal

liberal in presenting his readers with quotations from the Letters of the Missionaries, ought in justice, not to have kept back from them the following sentences, which would have cast more light upon this subject than any thing he has advanced. In the former Letter, dated Monaghan, Aug. 2, 1801, Mr. Graham observes, "As we passed through Ballijamesduff, it being the market-day, brother Ouseley went to speak to the market people, who appeared to be *like the thirsty ground prepared for the falling rain*. I was afraid to trust myself, (not being well) therefore, I did not go to the Market, until I thought he stayed too long; and when I came up, I found the poor Catholics in tears, some of them sitting on the ground, wringing their hands, and crying for mercy; at which I could not help speaking a little, and praying with them, indisposed as I was. After we came to Clones, we visited Cavan and its neighbourhood, where a Catholic woman was converted," (they not only mean from Popery to Protestantism, but from sin to righteousness,) whose husband and daughter were converted the last year. A school-master also came to me enquiring what he should do."—"In the neighbourhood of Clones, I met a woman, whose husband was savingly converted," (that is, from popery and from the service of sin,) "last year, and I believe that she is convinced. I desired her to come to Class-meeting, and accordingly she has since met: And I have cause to hope, that both of them will be steady members of the society. Glory be to God, our Catholic converts are going on steadily, and, I trust, they will prove a leaven in their families, and among their neighbours. Last Thursday, brother Ouseley preached in the Fair in this Town, and we had a blessed hearing. The truth, when delivered in public, bears down all before it, and the Lord is reviving his work in this Town."

In the second Letter, dated from the same place, the 17th of March following, he observes to Dr. Coke, "That  
strong



strong desire which was in your soul for many years for the salvation of the poor Catholics, was not in vain. Glory be to God for what he has already done among them. They have got a spirit of hearing the Word. We had a blessed prospect on our way to Limerick, preaching in the streets and markets. Even in places, where we might have expected nothing but persecution, we saw them *weeping* and *praying* in the open streets."

These passages of the Letters, which the Doctor prudently kept out of sight, will shew to all who have charity enough to believe that the Missionaries do not tell wilful lies, that they are not without encouragement in their work. Indeed, we can produce many instances of persons that were notoriously ignorant and wicked, who have been evidently changed in heart and life, and turned, not only from the errors of the Church of Rome, but from the error of their ways, from their sins and vices, to genuine piety and virtue, by the preaching of these Missionaries. I myself have met with some of these in London, who, since their conversion, have left their bigotted and persecuting friends and relations, have come to England, and are now pious and exemplary Members of our Societies. "But whether their conversion to the tenets of Methodism, supposing it feasible, by the indefatigable labours of the Missionaries, is, indeed, an object to be desired by the friends of sober and rational religion, and of loyal attachment to the constitution of Church and State," this Protestant Divine thinks, "may well be questioned." Permit me to inform this Rev. Gentleman, that the "tenets of Methodism," to which, by his own confession, the Missionaries endeavour to convert the Roman Catholics in Ireland, as I shall soon make appear, are no other than the tenets of the Inspired Writers, and of the Church of England, and that the Methodists in general, and the Missionaries in particular, are as loyal, and as much attached to the constitution of their country, as any others of their fellow-subjects

subjects, and, I am inclined to think, give full as satisfactory proof of it. I do not wonder, however, that Dr. Hales should have a different view of our tenets; nor will this be a mystery to any one who is acquainted with his sentiments on the subjects in question, or with his singular mode of interpreting the Holy Scriptures. But of this by and by.

In the mean time the Doctor tells us, that "until the salutary work of reformation shall begin with the Romish Clergy themselves; until they shall *pray with the understanding*, and celebrate the Mass in English, like the reformed Romish Church in America; until they shall recommend it to their flocks to read the Holy Scriptures in approved translations; and not, on the contrary, persist in prohibiting, and (in some instances, I am informed of late,) even *burning* copies of the New Testament in English and Irish, disseminated among the Roman Catholics, by the pious and well-meant zeal of Protestant Clergymen and Laymen; in vain may we look to any radical reform or evangelical conversion of the Roman Catholics in Ireland."

In this point, Gentlemen, I presume, you will hardly be of the Doctor's mind. You will rather think, that if the work of reformation in Ireland can only begin with the *Romish Clergy*, whose inveterate enmity against Protestantism and the true and genuine Scriptures, according to his own confession, is so great, that they even seize upon and burn copies of the New Testament, when they find them circulated among their people, it will not be begun at all. For my part, I should quite as soon have expected a reformation from idolatry, in the days of Ahab and Jezebel, to have begun among Baal's Priests. The truth is, it is their interest to keep the people in ignorance, and therefore we may be sure, that persons so utterly unacquainted with the Gospel, and devoid of principle as they too generally are, will not fail to endeavour to accomplish it. Add to this, that matter of fact is on the other side. A reformation from the errors  
and

and superstitions of Popery has taken place in sundry countries of Europe, as in England, in Scotland, in Holland, in some parts of Germany and Switzerland, and among the Waldenses and Albigenses in the south of France: Did it begin in any of those Countries among the *Romish Clergy*? Had *they* the principal hand in it? Or did they not in general oppose it to the utmost of their power?

But pray, what sort of a *reformation* of the Romish Clergy must that be which allows them still to persist in "celebrating the service of the Mass," whether in English or any other language? In other words, that permits them still to persevere in "consecrating the bread and wine into the very body and blood of Christ, and in offering them, so transubstantiated, as an expiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead?" Would our Reformers have considered those Romish Priests as being *reformed from Popery*, who still maintained this irrational and unscriptural practice? And what would they have thought of a Protestant Rector who should have used such language? Would they not have suspected that he was a Protestant only in profession?

But to return to your Remarks: "After briefly, but justly censuring these accounts," you say, "Dr. Hales proceeds to discuss, at considerable length, two points which are much insisted on by these Methodists, viz. *sinless perfection, and the assurance of the divine forgiveness and favour, by means of sensible impulses of the Holy Spirit upon the mind.* The inconsistency of these tenets with scripture; and with the *liturgy, articles, and homilies* of our Church, we think that Dr. Hales has satisfactorily established: He has even shewn, that as now held by some of the Methodists, they are at variance with the more matured opinions of the founder of Methodism (Mr. Wesley) himself." When, Gentlemen, I read this paragraph in the *Christian Observer*, which I did before I saw the Doctor's Pamphlet, I was very much surprised indeed; and as I had not before observed

served that you had mis-stated any facts, or misrepresented any Author, whose work you had reviewed, I was afraid that our Missionaries in Ireland had either *erred from the faith*, or had acted very imprudently, in inculcating the higher truths of Christianity upon those who had not yet obtained any proper acquaintance with its first principles. But, how was I astonished when I took up the Doctor's book, which had been put into my hands by a friend, and found that this same "sinless Perfection," which the Missionaries were said to preach, was only, that professing Christians ought not to live in the commission of known voluntary, and actual sin; and that what you term "the assurance of divine forgiveness, &c. by means of sensible impulses of the Holy Spirit upon the mind," was neither more nor less than that scriptural doctrine of the *knowledge* of our sonship by "the Spirit of Adoption, sent into our hearts, crying, Abba Father," and, by his enlightening and sanctifying influences, and the fruits produced thereby, "bearing witness with our spirits," or consciences, "that we are the children of God!" I think, Gentlemen, when I have proved these points, which I hope to do to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced reader, I may release you and myself from all further trouble about the Doctor's Pamphlet:—unless, indeed, you shall think proper to return to a second Review of this noted Publication (a duty which is certainly incumbent upon you) that you may repair the errors of your former Critique, and as far as possible, prevent the bad effects thereof. As to the Doctor's Pamphlet, it can neither hurt the Methodists, nor the cause in which they are engaged, with any individual that has common sense, and is in any tolerable degree acquainted with the Divine Oracles, and the doctrines contained therein. By its glaring inconsistencies, its absurd and ridiculous interpretation of Scripture, and its evidently false doctrine, and that on some most essential points, it testifies against itself, and

C

carries

carries with it a sufficient antidote to the poison it conveys : So that to trouble the public with a formal refutation of it is perfectly unnecessary.

To proceed then to the consideration of the first point you mention, viz. that the Methodist Missionaries in Ireland "insist much on *sinless Perfection*." You wish to be understood, I believe, Gentlemen, as affirming this, not on your own knowledge, but on the information of the Rector of Killesandra : and the Rector, I think, does not say or intimate that he has heard these Methodist Missionaries himself : nor does he mention any individual, or number of individuals, of credit, from whom he has received his information : but he grounds his allegations on a *Tract*, which he says has been "industriously circulated by these same Missionaries among his own flock, and which, of course, fell into his hands." "It is an half-sheet Address," he says, "TO EVERY LOVER OF TRUTH, signed G. O. Philanthropos: written in a loose, declamatory style, and of which, however guardedly expressed, the substance is fairly reducible to the following *syllogism*, or logical argument.

"1. All impenitent sinners, catholics, protestants, and dissenters, who persist in their sins, after death, will be irrecoverably cast into hell-fire :

"2. But their Clergy, being 'sinners' themselves, 'false prophets,' 'blind guides,' and 'filly teachers,' are neither able nor willing to save them from the wrath to come.

"3. Therefore come unto us, 'the servants of God,' and 'the holy people,' or 'the people of God,' and ye shall feel sweet peace with God ; and the love of God shed abroad in your hearts by the HOLY GHOST given unto you, (Rom. v. 5.) and then you shall know that all your sins are truly pardoned."

It is an happy circumstance that this same Address is now in my hands, and as I am persuaded you have not seen it,

it, and have been misled by the Rector's incorrect statement, I shall take the liberty of laying, the whole of it before you in an Appendix, and that *verbatim*; only premising, that when you recollect for whom it was intended, the poor, ignorant, and abandoned Catholics in Ireland, raised but one degree above the beasts that perish; and that it was written by a plain man, who makes no pretences to literature or refinement of taste, you will not expect elegance of style or even grammatical exactness. If you find plain truth expressed in an intelligible manner, it is all you will look for.

Now, Gentlemen, presuming that you have turned to the Appendix and read the Tract, I leave it to you to say, whether Doctor Hales has given a just Analysis of it. The 1st. Particular, I grant, "That all impenitent sinners, whether Catholics, Protestants, or Dissenters, who persist in their sins, will, after death, be irrecoverably lost;" is contained in it; save that the Author of the Address is not so inaccurate as the Doctor, who distinguishes the *Dissenters* from *Protestants*, as if, because they *dissented* from the Church of England, they were not *Protestants*. But where does this Address assert or insinuate, 2dly. That "*their* Clergy" (viz. those of the *Dissenters*, and *Protestants*, as Dr. H. distinguishes them, as well as those of the *Catholics*) are "false Prophets," "blind Guides," and "silly Teachers," and "neither able nor willing, to save their people from the wrath to come?" But, above all, 3dly. Where does its Author, say, "Come unto us, 'the servants of God,' and the 'holy people,' and ye shall *feel* sweet peace with God, and know that all your sins are truly pardoned?"—I hope, Gentlemen, in your 2nd. Review of this Pamphlet, you will notice this most unfair representation, made by this Rev. Divine, and that you will rebuke him for so flagrant a violation of truth and justice.

But where, in this little Tract, is the proof that these Missionaries preach "sinless Perfection?" It does not appear, I think, that either of these words occur so much as once in it, and altho' I have read it carefully over twice, I cannot discover one single passage in it, from first to last, that implies any such doctrine. "No?" methinks I hear Dr. Hales say, "what then do you make of the following passage?" "Seest thou a Teacher that is a sinner? thou seest an enemy to God and a false prophet; for his sin is his mark, say what he will; these say, none can be 'free from sin,'—so they need not blame their people nor their people them, for their sinning: they play into each others hands, and bear with and strengthen each other till death: but what will they then do?" This passage the Rector quotes in his Pamphlet. (pa. 12.) and then observes, "Unhappily the censure, here levelled against the Clergy, falls upon himself: for while he imputes to them as false doctrine, 'that none can be free from sin,' he greatly errs, *not knowing the Scriptures*, and holds forth a most dangerous delusion, that they *can* be free from sin:"—that is, according to this Protestant Rector, they hold forth a dangerous delusion, in declaring the very same doctrine, which the Apostle declares, and in his very words!!!

But, adds he, the Addresser confounds "freedom from the *punishment* of sin, with freedom from the *commission* of sin; or GOD's pardon, thro' the all-sufficient atonement of Christ, with man's unfinning obedience." Permit me to observe here, The confusion is in the Doctor's ideas, not in those of the Missionary. As the Missionary distinguishes, and that properly, between *pardon* and *holiness*, or between deliverance from the *guilt*, and deliverance from the *power* or *dominion* of sin; so he was far from confounding the latter with *unfinning obedience*. Of *unfinning obedience*, or *sinless perfection*, he has not said one word: nor is any thing of the kind so much as mentioned in his Address. He  
 simply

simply uses St. Paul's phrase "freedom from sin," and that in St. Paul's sense; meaning thereby freedom from its *power* or *dominion*, or in St. John's language, and that of our Lord, John viii. "not committing it," that is knowingly and voluntarily. But he does not use the terms *unfinning obedience*; as not finding them in the sacred writings. The Rector, however, confounding things quite distinct from each other, is persuaded that, because we cannot perform *unfinning* or *sinless obedience*, therefore we cannot be free from the dominion of sin, or from the commission of it, altho' both St. Paul and St. John, nay and even our Lord assert, in the plainest terms, that we may. Hence, after observing that we may indeed be "free from the punishment of sin," and producing sundry proofs of a doctrine nobody disputes, the Doctor roundly affirms, P. 13, without any explication *whatever*, that to be "righteous in the sight of God," "from the frailty and imperfection of human nature, is impossible," and in the sentence immediately following (P. 14.) that "none can be free from the commission of sin:" thus flatly contradicting both St. Luke and St. John; the former, where, speaking of Zacharias and Elizabeth, he says, "They were both righteous *before God*, walking in his ordinances and commandments blameless," and the latter when he declares, "He that doeth εὐνομίαν, practiseth) righteousness, is righteous, even as, (or because) he (Christ) is righteous: He that committeth sin is of the devil," &c. Had the Doctor said, that it is impossible for us to be righteous *by nature*, or "according to the law of innocence" or "covenant of works," no person, acquainted with himself, and with the scriptural doctrine of justification by grace thro' faith, could reasonably have objected to his assertion; but to fly in the face of the plain letter of scripture in this manner, without adding *one word* to palliate or elucidate his meaning, is certainly a conduct not to be justified.

But



But is it indeed the doctrine of a Doctor of Divinity, that when St. Paul, (Romans vi. 18,) describes believers as "*being free from sin,*" he means only that they are free from "*the punishment of sin,*" or acquitted from guilt, and condemnation? I answer, it is indisputable that this is the Rector's doctrine: he avows it in the plainest terms and most explicit manner. The Missionary confounds, says he (P. 13,) "*freedom from the punishment of sin,* with freedom from the commission of sin," alluding to the words of the Address quoted above: and again (P. 18) "If we enquire into the origin of G. O's error, it may perhaps be traced up to the following important but difficult passage of St. Paul in his epistle to the Romans, misunderstood by him and several others of the same persuasion: 'But now *being made free from sin,* and made servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end eternal life,' &c. This is the first time that I ever heard this passage accounted "difficult." But difficult indeed it must be to any one that would force it into the meaning here attempted to be put upon it, a meaning as *new*, as I will venture to say, it is *ridiculous*, and contradicted by every verse of the chapter, the whole of which treats on *holiness* or *sanctification*, and not a single sentence of it on *pardon* or *justification*. Indeed the Apostle signifies what is the subject of it in the very first verse, "What shall we say then? Shall we *continue in sin* (Does he mean in the *punishment* of sin?) that grace may abound? God forbid: How shall we that are dead to sin, (surely not the *punishment* of sin) live any longer therein?" He speaks of being "buried with Christ by baptism unto death,"—of being "planted together in the likeness of his death, and of his resurrection,"—of "walking in newness of life."—He says that "our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin may be destroyed, that henceforth we *may not serve sin:*" that we must "reckon ourselves to be DEAD INDEED UNTO

UNTO SIN, but alive unto God :” that “ sin must not *reign* in our mortal body, that we should obey it, in the lusts (*concupiscences*) thereof.”—He teaches that “ sin MUST NOT HAVE DOMINION OVER US :”—that “ to whom we yield ourselves servants TO OBEY, HIS SERVANTS we are, whom we OBEY, whether of SIN unto death, or of OBEDIENCE unto righteousness :”—that “ we were the servants of sin, (not the punishment of sin,) and then were free from righteousness,” strictly speaking, having no righteousness at all, being neither inwardly renewed, nor practically obedient to God’s law : “ But now,” says he, “ being made free from sin, ye are become servants of God, have your fruit unto holiness, and the end eternal life.” These and such like expressions are a demonstration, that the Doctor totally mistakes the sense of the Apostle, and that it is not concerning freedom from the “punishment” of sin, but from the power and from the commission of it, that the Apostle is here speaking. Indeed, I never yet met with an Author, in the whole course of my reading, ancient or modern, that ever understood the Apostle in any other sense. \* I observe again, however, that we do not suppose the

\* I have never understood that the learned and judicious Dr. Doddridge, was at any time charged with Heresy, or with going to an extreme on the subject of holiness ; yet it should seem that he had similar views with those of the Methodists on this head, when, in his reflections on the 7th and the beginning of the 8th chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, he thus expresses himself : “ Admirable and adorable indeed were the condescensions of the blessed God, in sending his own Son in the likeness of our sinful flesh, stripped of its original glories, that he might become an expiatory sacrifice for sin. Let us remember the grand purpose for which he did it ; that he might condemn sin in our flesh, that he might enable us to do execution on sin as a condemned malefactor. In his name, therefore, let us pursue the victory, and rejecting every overture of accommodation, with determined zeal do justice upon it. And may what we have been reading establish our resolution of walking, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, since we are now delivered from the curse of a broken law, and blessed with a dispensation so properly called *the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus* : a dispensation, by attending to the peculiarities of which, we may be enabled to

*extend*

Apostle to be speaking here of an *absolute and entire* freedom from sin, viz. from its *nature and being*, but simply and only of that freedom from the dominion of it, mentioned in the 14th verse, which freedom is immediately consequent on *justification* and the *new birth*. He is not, we believe, treating here on those higher degrees of purification, which he has in view elsewhere, as where he exhorts us to "cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, and to perfect holiness in the fear of God," and testifies that Christ "gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works;" and "gave himself for his Church that he might sanctify and cleanse it, and present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or

*extend our conquests over sin in the most effectual manner, and to attain heights of virtue and piety to which no legal considerations and motives alone could raise us. Let us remember that the law of God is holy, just, and good: delighting in it more and more after our inner man, and taking heed, that we do not deceive ourselves by such a passage as this (from the 12th to the 22nd verse of the 7th chapter) into a secret, but vain and fatal hope, that because we are convinced of our duty, and feel in our conscience a sense of the evil of sin, we might be said to serve the Law of God, while by abandoning ourselves to known acts of wilful transgression, we are in our flesh serving the law of sin. Habitually to allow ourselves in neglecting the good we approve, and committing the evils we condemn, is the readiest way that hell itself can point out for the ruin of immortal souls; in such a case all that we know, and all that we feel, concerning the obligations of duty, and the excellencies of holiness, aggravate, rather than extenuate our failures; and tho' the sublime views which eminently good men, under the gospel, have of religion, may sometimes incline them to adopt such complaints as these (Rom. vii. 15, &c.) in reference to the unallowed and lamented deficiencies and infirmities of a truly upright and pious life; it remains an eternal truth, which instead of being abrogated under the New Testament, is most expressly confirmed, that he who doth righteousness is righteous, and not he that merely wishes to do it; and he who committeth sin, is of the devil, even tho' he should speak against it like an Apostle or an Angel." See Doddridge's Fam. Expos. Vol. IV. p. 83, Octavo Edit. 1799. And the excellent Note (a) at page 75, and Note (k) at page 79-*

wrinkle.

wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish." I wonder what Dr. Hales thinks of these and such like passages of Scripture: Are not they also of "difficult interpretation?" Certainly they carry the subject of holiness much further than the 6th to the Romans, and give us reason to expect a much higher degree of sanctification than a bare freedom from the commission of known, voluntary, and actual iniquity?

Dr. Hales, however, is of another mind, and is confident that it is the uniform tenor of Holy Writ, and of the Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies of the Church of England, "that none can be free from the *commission* of sin," and quotes a variety of passages from them, for that purpose, not one of which, I will venture to say, either asserts or implies any thing like the sense he would put upon it. And some of them prove quite the reverse of what he intends, especially 1 John i. 8, 9, "If we say we have no sin," (to be cleansed from) "we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us: But if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and TO CLEANSE US FROM ALL UNRIGHTEOUSNESS."

In the same profligate way, he quotes the following passage from our Minutes of the year 1770, to prove that Mr. Wesley held the same opinion, viz. that "no man can be freed from the commission of sin." "Question 8. Does not talking, without proper caution, of a justified, or sanctified state, tend to mislead men: almost naturally leading them to trust in what was done in one moment? Whereas, we are every moment pleasing or displeasing to God, according to our works; according to the whole of our present inward tempers and outward behaviour." My readers will undoubtedly wonder how the Doctor came to produce this passage as a proof that Mr. Wesley held the above-mentioned doctrine: But their wonder will partly cease when they are told, that, instead of reading it as it stands in our Minutes, "We are every moment pleasing or displeasing

pleasing to God:" he leaves out the preposition *to*, and reads, "We are every moment pleasing or displeasing God:" Thus making Mr. Wesley assert, what he never thought of, that justified or sanctified persons, are either obeying or disobeying God, pleasing or offending him every moment. Whereas, all that Mr. Wesley meant, and all that he expresses, is, that we are more or less approved or disapproved of God, more or less pleasing or displeasing to him, in proportion as we are more or less *like him*, more or less holy, or conformed to his image; a truth founded on the surest principles of reason and revelation.

With a view to the same end he endeavours, 2dly, to press into his service, a sentence of a Letter from Mr. Wesley to Mr. Maxfield, written in 1762, which is this: "I dislike your supposing that man may be as perfect as an angel, that he can be *absolutely* perfect: That he can be *infallible*, or above being *tempted*: Or the moment that he is *pure in heart*, he cannot fall from it:" From hence, Dr. Hales infers, that Mr. Wesley believed "no man can be saved from the commission of sin," as if there were no difference between "not committing sin," and being "perfect as an angel," "absolutely perfect," &c.!!

In proof of the same point, he produces and recommends to "the serious attention of the Addresser, and of all the Preachers in the Methodist Connection," some passages from Mr. Wesley's 'Plain Account of Christian Perfection,' the purport of which is to shew, 1st. "That there is no *such perfection* in this life as implies either a dispensation from doing good, and attending all the ordinances of God; or a freedom from *ignorance, mistake, temptation*, and a thousand infirmities necessarily connected with flesh and blood;" and, 2dly. "That they who are *perfect*:" that is, as Mr. Wesley explains it, "who experience all he means by *Perfection*; who have both the *fruit* of the Spirit and the *witness*," "can fall from grace;" "there being no such  
*height*

*height or strength of holiness,*" Mr. Wesley observes, "as it is impossible to fall from." But pray what has this to do with the point in hand? How does it prove that Mr. W. held, "that no man can be freed from the *commission* of sin?" If Mr. Wesley held "that we *may* fall," did he therefore hold that we *must* fall? And if he believed that we cannot have a "dispensation from doing good, and attending all the ordinances of God," or "a freedom from *ignorance, mistake, temptation,* and a thousand *infirmities,*" did he therefore believe that we must *do evil, omit doing good,* and attending the ordinances of God, and must yield to *temptation*; and that, in cases in which neither *ignorance* nor *mistake* can be pleaded in excuse, we must commit known, voluntary, and actual sin.

After quoting these, and other similar passages from Mr. Wesley's writings, equally irrelevant to his argument, and which might with as much propriety have been quoted to shew that we cannot be free from a *French Invasion*, as that we cannot be free from "the commission of sin," the Rev. Doctor infers as follows: (p. 22,) "Hence it plainly appears, that the notion of *sinless perfection*, or that any one can be free from sin, *meaning thereby,*" (N. B. these are Dr. Hales's own words,) "*free from the commission of sin,* is not only at variance with the whole tenor of SCRIPTURE, the *Liturgy, Homilies, and Articles*; but is the injudicious revival of an error, long since retracted and exploded by the Founder of Methodism; who expressly states, that "*absolute perfection* belongs not to *men* nor to *angels*; but to God alone:"—so that this nicely discriminating Divine, knows no difference between absolute Perfection, and not committing sin!! And as he has the authority of no less a person than "the *Founder of Methodism*, for asserting "that *absolute perfection* belongs not," even "to *angels*; but to God alone," he evidently charges, even angels, with the commission of sin!!

But

But that you may see, Gentlemen, how far this learned Divine was mistaken concerning Mr. Wesley's sentiments, and how little he knew, when he wrote this Pamphlet, what his doctrine was on this most important subject, I shall here lay before you a few Paragraphs from his sermons. The first is from that on, "Salvation by Faith, preached before the Univerfity of Oxford, at St. Mary's, June 18, 1738, and published and republished by him, without any alteration, from time to time during his whole life, and that both in a separate Pamphlet, and in the first Volume of his Works, so that, at the time of his death, it had gone thro', at least, twenty editions. Speaking concerning that salvation which is by Faith, he observes, (p. 9, 1 Vol. Works,) "Thro' this faith they are saved from the *power* of sin, as well as from the guilt of it. So the Apostle declares,\* 'Ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin. Whosoever abideth in him, sinneth not.—Again, Little children, let no man deceive you. He that committeth sin is of the devil.—Whosoever believeth is born of God, and whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.' Once more, 'We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God, keepeth himself, and the wicked one toucheth him not.'" This Mr. Wesley explains as follows, "He that is by faith born of God, sinneth not, 1. By any *habitual* sin: for all habitual sin, is *reigning* sin. But sin cannot *reign* in any that believeth. Nor, 2. By any *wilful* sin, for his *will*, while he abideth in the faith, is utterly set against all sin, and abhorreth it as deadly poison. Nor, 3. By any *sinful desire*; for he continually desireth the holy and perfect will of God; and any tendency to an unholy desire, he, by the grace of God, stifleth in the birth. Nor, 4. Doth he sin by *infirmities*, whether in act, word, or thought. For his

\* 1 John iii. 5, &c. and v. 18.

infirmities

infirmities have no concurrence of his will; and without this they are not properly sins. Thus, *He that is born of God, doth not commit sin.*"

In his sermon on Rom. viii. 1, (in the same Vol. pa. 148,) he speaks to the same purpose; "They (that are in Christ,) are not condemned for any *present* sins, for *now* transgressing the commandments of God. For they do not transgress them, they *do not walk after the flesh, but after the Spirit*. This is the continual proof of their love to God, that they 'keep his commandments:' even as St. John bears witness, 'Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin. For his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God:' he cannot sin, so long as that seed of God, that loving, holy faith remaineth in him. So long as he 'keepeth himself' herein, 'that wicked one toucheth him not.' Now it is evident, he is not condemned for the sins which he doth not commit at all. They, therefore, who are thus 'led by the Spirit, are not under the law:' not under the curse or condemnation of it; for it condemns none but those who break it. Thus, that law of God, 'Thou shalt not steal,' condemns none but those that *do* steal. Thus, 'Remember the sabbath-day to keep it holy,' condemns those only who do not keep it holy."

Again, in his Sermon on the Marks of the New Birth, 2 Vol. pa. 27, after citing the words above mentioned, (1 John iii. 9,) he adds, "Suffer we the Apostle to interpret his own words, by the whole tenor of his discourse. In the fifth verse of this chapter he had said, 'Ye know that He (Christ) was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.' What is the inference he draws from this? 'Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: Whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him! To his enforcement of this important doctrine, he premises an highly necessary caution. 'Little children, let no man deceive you, (for many will endeavour so to do; to persuade you that you  
may



may be *unrighteous*, that you may *commit sin*, and yet be the children of God,) ‘He that doth righteousness, is righteous, even as he is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning.’ Then follows, ‘Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.’ In this, (adds the Apostle,) the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil.’ By this plain mark, (the committing or not committing sin,) are they distinguished from each other. To the same effect are those words in the fifth chapter, ‘We know that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God, keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not.’

And, again, in the very next Sermon of the same Vol. pa. 49, on “the great privilege of those that are born of God,” after explaining what is implied in the *New Birth*, Mr. Wesley proceeds to shew in what sense those that are born of God, do not commit sin. “By sin, I here understand *outward sin*, according to the plain, common acceptance of the word: An *actual, voluntary transgression of the law*; of the revealed, written law of God: of any commandment of God, acknowledged to be such, at the time that it is transgressed. But ‘whosoever is born of God,’ while he abideth in faith and love, and in the spirit of prayer and thanksgiving, not only *doth not*, but *cannot thus commit sin*. So long as he thus believeth in God thro’ Christ, and loves him, and is pouring out his heart before him, he cannot voluntarily transgress any command of God, either by *speaking* or *acting* what he knows God has forbidden: So long as that seed, which remaineth in him, that loving, praying, thankful faith compels him to refrain from whatsoever he knows to be an abomination in the sight of God.”

Such were Mr. Wesley’s sentiments on this subject, when he wrote these sermons, and such they continued to the day of his death, without any variation. These Sermons went thro’

thro' sundry Editions in his life time, unaltered by him, and I make these quotations from an Edition published in 1787, only four years before his death, and surely it will not be pretended that his views were altered after that time. Indeed in this point in particular, as all his writings evidence, he continued uniformly the same, testifying that dominion over sin is essential to saving faith, and a never-falling fruit of the New-Birth.\*

And now, what must the Reader think of the Rev. Doctor's judgment of Mr. Wesley's sentiments respecting "the commission of sin?" And what must he think of his Remarks, when (p. 25,) referring to these passages so often quoted by Mr. Wesley, from St. John's 1st Epistle, he observes, "These texts form the *principal fastnesses* of this

\* That Mr. Wesley did not alter his sentiments, as contained in his Sermons, towards the close of his life, may be most unequivocally proved by the very remarkable Legacy which he left to each of the Travelling Preachers who should remain in the Connection six months after his decease. "I give to each of those Preachers, as a little token of my love, the eight Volumes of Sermons." This was the last Legacy in his Will, and (except the appointment of his Executors,) the last sentence. With his dying breath, as it were, he recognizes these Sermons, some of which, it must be observed, were written only a few years before his death, and published in our Magazine. And he leaves them all, unaltered, as a token of his love, and modestly, as a standard of the doctrines which, he judged, ought still to be preached by his successors. Mr. Wesley had too great a mind to perform this last act without due solemnity and deliberation. His Will was dated Feb. 20, 1789, only two years before his decease. I would here recommend the consideration of the above circumstance to the Writer of that unwarranted attack upon the Methodists, contained in page 609 of *The Christian Observer*, for the month of October 1803: wherein he charges them with now generally holding doctrines, respecting the knowledge of salvation by the forgiveness of sins, which he says, were "distinctly opposed by Mr. Charles Wesley, Mr. Fletcher, of Madeley, and, in the latter part of his life, by Mr. John Wesley." Let the Writer of this paragraph know, that however "credibly" he may think he has been informed of this, he has been *misinformed*. The sentiments which the Methodist Societies hold on this subject, are the very

this extravagant and dangerous doctrine of sinless perfection." And do we indeed quote these texts in proof of the Perfection, (not "sinless," observe,) which we preach, and which is held forth in the Scriptures? Does Mr. Wesley cite them in that view, in the Paragraphs quoted above from his Sermons? Surely he does not. Nor do we ever produce them with any such intention. We know that St. John affirms these things, not of christians whose religion is *matured*, who are *fathers* in Christ, and have arrived at "the measure of the stature of his fulness," but OF ALL THAT ARE BORN OF GOD, and made his children, even of BABES in Christ. For his expression repeatedly is, "WHOSOEVER IS BORN OF GOD *sinneth not, or doth not commit sin*;" and *in this*, in committing or not committing sin, THE CHILDREN OF GOD ARE MANIFEST, AND THE CHILDREN OF THE DEVIL: Exactly according to our Lord's doctrine, "HE THAT COMMITTETH SIN IS THE SLAVE OF SIN." So that the Doctor is egregiously mistaken in supposing these to be "the principal fastnesses of the doctrine of "sinless perfection," were any persons so absurd as to hold any such doctrine. We understand St. John and

very fame that they have held from the beginning, and are so far from having been opposed by the pious and well-informed Ministers of Christ just mentioned, that their writings are considered and appealed to by us as the most clear elucidation, and best defence which we have, next to the Scriptures, of our views on that subject. And we may challenge those who make such groundless assertions, to produce one single sentence or expression from any part of their numerous publications, in prose or verse, in proof of them. Examples to the contrary, if need were, may be produced in great abundance. I shall only add, that I myself was intimate with them all, and with the Rev. John Wesley in particular, for above thirty years, and can testify that there is not the shadow of a foundation for any such opinion. There are also many others of the Brethren, remaining to this present time, who can bear the same testimony. What a pity it is that a Work, professedly established for the diffusion of religious truth, should thus deviate from its original design, and become the mean of vilifying and traducing a Society whose sole object is the good of mankind!

OUR

our Lord, as indeed Mr. Wesley has stated in the above passage, in the same light in which we understand St. Paul in Rom. vi. We believe they refer, not to the *existence* or *nature*, but to the *power* or *dominion* of sin, and speak, not of *unfinning* obedience, but of “not committing, known, voluntary, and actual transgression,” a privilege which we believe belongs to all that are born of God. But to be “cleansed from all unrighteousness,” from “all filthiness of flesh and spirit,” and “to perfect holiness in the fear of God,” we consider as a much higher attainment.

The Doctor however, has found out a new mode of interpreting St. John: whether it will suit our Lord's words also, he does not say. “These observations,” he tells us, “may lead us to a sober and rational interpretation of some of the texts which form the principal fastnesses of this extravagant and dangerous doctrine of sinless perfection.” Having then produced three of the texts, above quoted from St. John's 1 Epist. viz. chap. iii. 6, and iii. 8, and v. 18, he proceeds to lay before us this his “sober and rational interpretation” of them. And, it will be acknowledged, I believe, that it is indeed *sober* enough: But whether it be equally *rational*, may admit of some doubt. “These three passages,” says he, “are evidently of the same import; whatsoever, therefore, will furnish a clew to the right understanding of one, will also serve to explain the rest.” In this I am of the Doctor's mind: And if I thought that there was any obscurity or difficulty in St. John's words, which rendered a clew to guide us in our interpretation of them necessary, I would say the Apostle has evidently given us that clew, yea, several clews, and that in the verse immediately preceding and following them.

The words preceding the former passage, (where, surely, if at all, we should look for such a clew, and not in a subsequent chapter,) are, “When he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as

E

he

he is pure." It then follows, "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the Law, for sin is the transgression of the Law. And ye know he was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin. Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not," &c. Here we have no fewer than three clews to the passages, which all manifest that the Apostle does not speak of some, one, *particular* sin, for instance, of the sin of Idolatry, as the Doctor understands him, but of sin or sins in general, as being, 1st. Contrary to that *purity*, which is to prepare us to see him as he is; as being, 2dly. Transgressions of God's Law; and, 3dly. That evil which Christ was manifested to take away. We have still more clews to the passage in the following context. "Little children, let no man deceive you: He that doth righteousness is righteous, even as (or because) he is righteous: He that committeth sin is of the devil. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

Now, here, 1st. *sinning*, or *committing sin*, is opposed to *doing righteousness*, and that surely not in some, one, *particular* instance, as Idolatry is opposed to the worship of the true God, but in every instance. For as the transgression of any Law, especially of any *known* Law of God, is *sin*, so if we would be righteous, we must "have respect to all his commandments," must endeavour to "walk in all his commandments and ordinances blameless." 2dly. All sins, without the exception of any, and especially all *known* sins, are *works of the devil*, and Christ was manifested to destroy all these works. In this passage itself, therefore, and in the verses immediately preceding and following, we have clews in abundance, and clews perfectly sufficient to direct us in our investigation of its meaning. Dr. Hales, however, overlooking these, or not finding it convenient to his purpose to use them, has recourse to a clew of an entirely different kind. Contrary to all rules of just interpretation, he passes over this *important, clear, and decisive* paragraph in the  
 third

third chapter, in which the Apostle explains himself at large, and in as plain and express terms as can be used; and he has recourse to a passage occurring two chapters afterwards, where (ch. v. 10,) it is true, that the same doctrine is asserted, and that even more *confidently* than here, yet only *transiently*, in much fewer words, and without any such care of explanation; for he was only affirming a truth sufficiently and fully explained before.

Having quoted this sentence of the Apostle, with two others from the third chapter, as stated above, the Doctor proceeds, "Fortunately the Evangelist himself, in the entire sentence which includes the last, has clearly ascertained his own meaning; rectifying that iniquity of quotation, to which *Methodists* and *Religionists* of every kind are too prone; of drawing general conclusions from partial premises, by citing maimed texts or scraps of sentences." Now, what will the Reader think, when he sees that the Doctor, in this very passage, and while in the very act of censuring *Methodists* and *Religionists* of every kind, for "*iniquity of quotation*," as he expresses it, and for "drawing general conclusions from partial premises," altho' undoubtedly he is neither *Methodist* nor *Religionist*, is guilty of the same faults he charges on them? Instead of citing the whole and entire passage from the third chapter, the bare citing of which, without one word added by way of explanation, would have manifested, with perfect clearness, the Apostle's meaning, and have entirely precluded the absurd interpretation the Doctor wishes to force upon it, he quotes the text in a "maimed" form, and only two "scraps of sentences." And then, as the Reader will also observe, he draws a "general conclusion from partial premises." These partial premises are stated in the Apostle's words, ch. v. 16, which he quotes and interprets as follows, "If any one see his brother *sinning a sin not unto death*; he shall ask (in prayer,) and (God) shall give him life, for *them that sin not unto death*. There is a

*sin unto death*, I do not say that he shall pray concerning that ; (all unrighteousness is sin,) and there is a *sin not unto death*."

Now, from these "partial premises," 1st. That there is a *sin unto death*; 2dly. That even a brother in Christ may fall into this sin; and 3dly. That if he do, he must not be prayed for;—from these partial premises, I say, the learned Doctor draws this *general conclusion*, that in all the passages in which St. John teaches, that he that is born of God, "doth not commit sin," he only means that he doth not commit the *sin unto death*; and this in direct opposition to the Apostle, who, as if to preclude any such interpretation, affirms in this very passage, and in the words immediately preceding the declaration in question, that "ALL UNRIGHTEOUSNESS IS SIN, and that there is a SIN NOT UNTO DEATH." The Doctor, however, even after quoting these words, proceeds to interpret the very next as follows: "We know that whoever is born of God sinneth not, (a *sin unto death*,) but keepeth himself; and the wicked one, (the devil,) toucheth him not." And, omitting the 19th and 20th verses, the former of which, especially, would not have harmonized with his interpretation, he strangely tacks the 21st, respecting shunning Idolatry, to the 18th, respecting not committing sin, intending hereby to prepare the reader's mind for receiving his unscriptural and irrational comment on the passage.

Now, the best way to ascertain the truth and propriety of the Doctor's interpretation, will be to bring it to the test of the paragraph it is intended to elucidate, and to try how it agrees with it. "He that hath this hope in him, (of seeing Jesus as he is,) purifieth himself even as he is pure. Whosoever committeth sin, (the *sin unto death*, viz. Idolatry,) transgresseth also the Law, for sin, (viz. the *sin unto death*,) is the transgression of the Law. And ye know He was manifested to take away our sins, (our idolatries or sins unto death :) Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not (this *sin unto*

*unto death* :) Whosoever sinneth (this *sin unto death*) hath not seen him neither known him. He that committeth sin (viz. *the sin unto death*, idolatry, is of the devil : For the devil (has been an idolater and committed the *sin unto death*) from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, (viz. this *sin unto death*, idolatry.) In this (in committing or not committing the *sin unto death*) the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil."

Now, Gentlemen, may I be permitted to ask, Is this sound doctrine? Is it a fact that the *committing or not committing* the sin of gross idolatry, is the main point of difference, and the grand and most prominent line of distinction between the children of God and the children of the devil? And 2dly, is it your opinion that this is a rational and scriptural interpretation of this important passage of the divine Oracles? But I am persuaded these are enquiries I need not make. At least they are questions which you will not be disposed to answer in the affirmative. By this time, I presume, you must be pretty much sick of the Doctor's *sin unto death*, and must be sensible how far you neglected your duty, as CHRISTIAN OBSERVERS, to let such an erroneous interpretation of so important and decisive a passage of the Holy Scriptures pass without censure.\*

In

\* Dr. Whitby paraphrases the paragraph quoted above, from the 1st Epistle of John, in a way quite similar to that pursued by Mr. Wesley, chap. iii. 5. "Ye know that He (Christ) was manifested to take away our sins; (not only by suffering, to remove the guilt of our past sins, but also to purify us from the power and dominion of it, that henceforth we might not serve sin, Rom. vi. 6, that ἀμαρτίας ἀπογενομενοι, being free from sin, we might live unto righteousness, 1 Pet. ii. 24.) And in him is no sin (and so our likeness to him must consist in ceasing from it.) Whosoever (therefore) abideth in him sinneth not : Whosoever (thus) sinneth, hath not seen him neither known him, (as the truth is in Jesus, Eph. iv. 21.) Little children, let no man deceive you, (with pretensions that faith, without



In the mean time, what are we to make of our Lord's words quoted above? Are they also to be understood in the same light? When he affirms, "He that committeth sin is the servant (*δουλος slave*) of sin," does he also speak merely of *Idolatry*, which Dr. Hales defines to be the *sin unto death*?" If not, what has the Doctor gained by his strange and extravagant interpretation of the two passages of St. John's 1st Epistle? Certainly *nothing*. For surely all the declarations of our Lord, are as absolutely *true* as they are

without works of righteousness, will make you righteous before God; for only) *be that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He (Christ) is righteous, (by doing the will of his Father.) He that committeth sin is of the devil, &c. Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin; for his seed (the word of God, Matt. i. 3. 1 Pet. i. 23.) remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."* And in his Note on verse the 4th, he observes, "*He that committeth sin, &c. (i. e.) who lives in the commission of it, lives in opposition to the Law of God; for he is of the devil, v. 8. He is not born of God (v. 9.) which could not be truly said of him who is guilty of any one sin, or violation of God's holy Law."*

Again, on v. 8, 9. "*He that committeth sin, (i. e. He that lives or goes on in any way of sin. That this is the true import of this phrase in the writings of this Apostle, will appear, 1st. From the same phrase used in his Gospel, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin, John viii. 34. Now to be the servant of sin is plainly to continue and to live in it, Rom. vi. 1, 2. to yield obedience to it in the lustings of it (v. 12.) for then sin reigns in our mortal bodies, and we are slaves and subjects to it. Though the conscience may boggle at it, our reason may condemn it, our will be somewhat averse to it, so that in obeying it, we do the evil that we would not; yet if εμπλακενεις ητωμεθα, we are so entangled as to be overcome by it, we are servants to corruption, for of what a man is overcome, to that he is brought into bondage, 2 Pet. ii. 19, 20. If the law of our members leads us captive to the law of sin, Rom. vii. 23; so that we yield our members, instruments of unrighteousness to sin, we so commit sin as to be the servants of sin. And he that is born of God, cannot (thus) sin, because by that new birth, he is made free from the service of sin, John viii. 36, and is become a servant to righteousness, Rom. vi. 18. He hath that seed within him, which alienates his mind and his affections from sin, and that spirit which causes him to mortify the deeds of the flesh, Rom. viii. 13, to die to sin and live to God."*

infinitely

infinitely momentous, and we must stand or fall by them in the great day of final accounts.

To conclude this point. It appears evidently from all that has been advanced, that all the "sinless perfection," which, according to Dr. Hales's own account, our indefatigable Missionaries preach, in Ireland, to the poor and ignorant Catholics, is that mankind may be saved from committing *known, voluntary, and actual* sin; a doctrine which both St. Paul and St. John assert in the plainest terms, and which the Rev. Rector of Killesandra, is confident means no more than that they may be saved from idolatry, or the sin unto death. So that, according to his explanation, it turns out at last that all the perfection which they preach is that men may be freed from *Idolatry*; doctrine, very proper, I should suppose, to be inculcated on the worshippers of the Virgin Mary, of St. Peter, and of the consecrated wafer. In this particular, then, I should hope that even Dr. Hales can unite with them. Ashamed that I have drawn out this Letter to such an enormous length, and fearing that I have for some time been quite tedious, I shall reserve my remarks on the second point to another opportunity, and shall now beg leave to subscribe myself, in the pure and unadulterated Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ,

GENTLEMEN,

Your very obedient Servant,

JOSEPH BENSON.

~~~~~

## THE SECOND LETTER.

GENTLEMEN,

I Now take up my pen to address you on the second branch of that doctrine which the Methodist Missionaries are said to preach to the Roman Catholics in Ireland, and that is, "The assurance of divine forgiveness and favour by means of sensible impulses of the Holy Spirit upon the mind."

mind." Now on this head, I wish to enquire what proof there is that our Missionaries ever use any such expressions, "as sensible impulses of the Holy Spirit upon the mind?" Certainly no such expressions occur in the Address referred to above. And yet from that alone, it seems, the Doctor takes his views of their doctrine. What they say on this subject is, "That Jesus Christ will baptize with the Holy Ghost those that take the alarm, and earnestly, and with penitent hearts, perseveringly intreat him to do it:"— That "a true Dissenter is one that, with true repentance and sorrow of heart, has turned from all sin to God; has fled to Christ, has been freely justified by his grace thro' faith in his blood; and has an assurance of God's love, peace of conscience, and joy in the Holy Ghost; leads an holy life, and being elected, thro' sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the Truth unto obedience, keeps the commandments of God, blameless." Again, they exhort, "Burst into tears of penitential woe; fly quickly from every sin, and turn to God; believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and cry, thro' him, to God, to send the Holy Spirit into thine heart: Then, by the power of the Holy Spirit, convincing thee of sin, thou shalt feel a true, godly sorrow, working repentance unto life; a brokenness of heart, a great hatred to sin, to thyself for having sinned, and to the company of sinners. And when the Spirit works in thine heart faith in Christ, whereby thou mayest be enabled to apprehend him, thro' the promise of life, and have his blood savingly applied to thy wounded conscience; then thou shalt feel sweet peace with God, and the love of God shed abroad in thine heart by the Holy Ghost given to thee, Rom. v. 5. Then thou shalt know all thy sins are truly pardoned, (Psal. xiii. 3, 12. Col. i. 14. Eph. i. 7. 1 John ii. 12.) Thy soul shall then be happy in God, and thy very nature changed. Then shall the Word of God be dear to thee; None will be able to dissuade thee from reading it: They shall

shall all the means of grace, the ways and people of God be delightful to thee :—Then, and not till then, (till this divine change take place in thine heart,) shalt thou be a true christian, a new creature, one born again. Then will appear the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, gentleness, goodness, &c. Against these there is *no Law*, no law of God, here or hereafter, Gal. v. 23.”

Now, Gentlemen, I beg leave to ask what fault you have to find, with this? What sentence, what *expression* of this have you to object to? And yet this is the very way in which the Irish Missionaries teach that a man may know his sins forgiven. And, permit me to say, our doctrine is every where the same upon this subject. We never use any such expressions as “impulses of the Spirit,” altho’ you are in the constant habit, for what reason is best known to yourselves, of ascribing them to us: Thus in this same number of your work, in your review of the Bishop of Lincoln’s late Charge, (pa. 546,) you say, “*Sensible impulses* of the Spirit have no necessary connection with Calvinism: on the contrary, it must be well known to his Lordship, that the principal assertors of such enthusiastic notions, in this country, are the Wesleyan Methodists and the Quakers. The Calvinistic Methodists are also, in some degree, infected with the same unscriptural views on this subject, but neither so generally nor so deeply as the other.” Again, in your Number for October, a person who signs his name X. Y. observes, that the doctrines now supposed to be generally held in the Wesleyan Societies is, “that the forgiveness of sin is manifested by internal impulses and impressions, and that assurance, communicated by impulses, or otherwise obtained, is an indispensable and infallible mark of a state of salvation.” Now this, Gentlemen, is surely extraordinary. Pray what authority have you to speak of us in this manner? In which of the writings, circulated among us, have you read any thing like this? or

F

when

when and where have you heard any of our people using such language? For my part, I have been united with the Methodists for nearly forty years, have been a preacher among them upwards of thirty, have laboured in almost all the great Towns in the Kingdom, and yet do not recollect that I ever heard the expression, "Impulse of the Spirit," used by any of them, in the sense you intend, in all these years.

To return. Dr. Hales, I apprehend, will not acquiesce in the doctrine above stated by the Missionaries. "Nearly allied, says he, (pa. 35,) to this arrogant and delusive tenet of sinless perfection, is the fanciful and mischievous doctrine of experimental feeling of divine favour, regeneration, and sanctification, and positive assurance, and even knowledge of the forgiveness of sins, inculcated also by the Missionary, in the following passage of this Address." Then follows a part, a garbled, or in the Doctor's language, a "maimed" part, a "scrap" of this very passage, on which he remarks as follows. "Of the several texts here cited, the first and most important to be rightly understood, is Rom. v. 5, which therefore I shall first examine, producing the whole passage in which it is found." After quoting the verses from the first to the sixth, he says, "This whole impressive passage seems to be peculiarly addressed and directed to masters in Christ, and proficient in the faith; such as the Apostle himself, and the first fruits of the Church of Rome; whom he styles *saints*, *beloved* of God, and *called*, whose exemplary faith was celebrated throughout the whole world, and to whom, therefore, he longed to impart some spiritual gift or miraculous power for their confirmation in the faith, and for their mutual comfort and edification."

Whom the learned Doctor means, here, by this new phrase, *Masters in Christ*, he does not explain, and it is not easy to determine. We read of *Babes in Christ*, of *Young Men*, and of *Fathers*, but not of *Masters in Christ*. Perhaps

haps he means, *Teachers of others*, or only such as he immediately terms *Proficients in the faith*. Let it be observed, however, that he supposes they need *confirmation in the faith, comfort, and edification*, and therefore that the Apostle longed to impart unto them some spiritual gift. He proceeds, "These, then, were no ordinary christians, but considered as *on a par with the Apostle himself* in spiritual graces and privileges." Did then the Apostle, who, by imparting unto them some spiritual gift, wished to confirm them in the faith, need confirmation *himself*? For it seems he was only "on a *par* with," and not superiour to them "in spiritual graces and privileges." But, adds the Doctor, "To suppose the abundance of spiritual gifts showered down on them, either easily or speedily at ainable by awakened sinners in the first stages of their conversion from the power of satan unto God, seems to be a most unreasonable expectation, calculated to engender presumption on the one hand; in such novices as mistake the transient impulses of a lively and heated imagination, for the 'witness of the Spirit,' or despair, on the other hand, in dejected minds, who feel not these impressions, and therefore rashly conclude themselves outcasts from the divine Favour."

In answer to this, I observe, If by "spiritual gifts," he means, as he explains himself above, "miraculous powers," such as were frequently exerted by Christ and his Apostles, he is utterly mistaken if he imagines that we suppose them to be easily or speedily, or even at all attainable, either by awakened sinners, in the first stages of their conversion, or by the most advanced Christians. Nor do we think such gifts, in any respect, essential to the salvation of any one. On the contrary, we believe that a man may "prophesy in the Name of Christ, cast out devils, and do wonderful works," and yet not be acknowledged by him as one of his. But if, as I think evidently appears, by these "spiritual gifts showered down, as he expresses it, on the

believers at Rome, he means only those ordinary *graces* or *fruits of the Holy Spirit*, which the Scriptures continually and expressly declare to be essentially necessary to eternal salvation, we certainly do suppose that they are attainable by awakened sinners, and that even in the first stages of their conversion, yea, “easily and speedily,” if awakened sinners will but be prevailed upon, to use the means which God hath appointed in order to the attainment of them.

We know, indeed, that it is possible for persons to mistake, (to use the Doctor’s phrase,) “the impulses of a lively and heated imagination for the witness of the Spirit.” But this, we think, is a reason why we should take care to speak *scripturally* and *rationally* on the subject, not using such words as *impulses*, so continually in the mouths of some persons, a word not found in the Sacred Scriptures. We judge, however, that it is not a reason why we should keep back from the children of God the very bread and wine of the kingdom which their heavenly Father hath appointed for their support and refreshment, because such precious sustenance, like our temporal food, is liable to abuse. As to “dejected minds, who feel not these impressions:”—(Say rather, who find not in themselves these fruits of the Spirit of God,) and who, the Doctor signifies, are driven to “despair, and therefore rashly conclude themselves outcasts from the divine favour:” Let *those* see to this who confine the merit of the death of Christ, and the influence of divine grace within narrow bounds, and teach that all mankind, except the small number of the elect, are passed by and reprobated. But this does not concern *us*, whose known and constant doctrine is, that Christ “tasted death for every man;”—that “every one that asketh receiveth, that seeketh findeth;” and that “whosoever will may come and take of the water of life freely.” We teach, however, that those, in whom the fruits of the Spirit are not found, are at present destitute of regenerating grace, and therefore ought to  
 despair

despair of being saved eternally, saved into heaven, without experiencing a change of their state and character, or without being made new creatures in Christ Jesus.

It appears from the next Paragraph of the Doctor's Pamphlet, that I am not mistaken in supposing, that by "spiritual gifts," Dr. Hales means no more, than the ordinary endowments, graces, or fruits of the Holy Spirit. "These high and distinguished attainments," says he, (pa. 37,) were, 1st. Justification by faith, or, acquittance from the punishment of their past sins, and peace or reconciliation with God thro' the atonement of Christ," &c. And are these the "spiritual gifts," which the Inspector of Methodism is confident are not attainable by awakened sinners in the first stages of their conversion from the power of Satan unto God? And is this one of the learned Author's remarks on the subject of "sensible impulses, (say influences) of the Holy Spirit," in which the Authors of the Christian Observer "are ready to concur?" Then, I think, it is high time for the Methodists to *observe* that *Observer*, and to appeal to the public, whether their observations are *scriptural* and *just*. But I hope, Gentlemen, altho' for reasons which are not very problematical, you have not thought proper to censure this most unscriptural and erroneous doctrine of the Rector of Killefandra, that nevertheless you do not *approve* of it. You know that, according to St. John, even little children, or babes in Christ, have their sins forgiven them; that, according to St. Paul, "there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus:" That, "thro' him is preached unto all," without exception "the forgiveness of sins;" and, that "ALL that believe in him," with a faith preceded by repentance, accompanied with love, and followed by obedience, "are justified from all things:" That according to John the Baptist, "He that believeth on Christ," be he who he may, with such a faith, "is not condemned, but is passed from



“remission of sins” and the “knowledge of salvation” thereby,\* on penitent sinners that believed in him, of all descriptions; so he commissioned his Apostles and Messengers, in every age, to “preach the gospel,” (or glad tidings of salvation) “to every creature;” to “preach repentance and remission of sins, in his name, among all nations, beginning,” among his very murderers, “at Jerusalem.” Accordingly the commission given to Paul was in these words, “I send thee to open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them who are sanctified by faith that is in me.”† And their language was, “God hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses to them.” Hence it is that, in their Epistles to the Churches, they addressed all that believed in Christ as persons that were God’s “adopted children,” “accepted in the Beloved,” and made partakers of “Redemption thro’ Christ’s blood, the forgiveness of their sins.”‡

But how is it that, in this case, the learned Rector has forgot the Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies of that very Church of which he is a minister? Does he not recollect that they declare “That if we confess our sins God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins:”—“That he hath given power and commandment to his ministers to declare and pronounce to his people being penitent,” (and therefore

\* Luke i. 17.

† Acts xxvi. 18.  
and Col. i. 3,—15.

‡ Eph. i. 4,—7.

not merely to persons far advanced in grace) “the absolution and remission of their sins:” That he “pardoneth and absolveth all that truly repent,” altho’ but awakened lately, “and unfeignedly believe his holy gospel:” that the true and christian faith is “a sure trust and confidence which a man hath in God, that by the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favour of God,—whereof doth follow a loving heart, to obey his commandments.\* In the 17th Article we are told, that “godly persons feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of God;” are “justified freely,” and “made the sons of God by adoption.” Hence, this Church very properly puts the following words into the mouths of all her true members, “Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation.” Surely, then, our Rector strangely forgot himself, when he represented, Remission of sins, Justification, and Peace with God, as “high and distinguished attainments” in the divine life, and hardly to be expected “by awakened sinners in the first stage of their conversion, from *the power of Satan unto God.*” Before he had done this, he should have represented *repentance, fruits meet for repentance, and faith in Christ*, as “high attainments;” for it is indisputable from every part of the Holy Scriptures, and the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of our Church, that all true penitents, that believe in Christ, are justified, and freed from condemnation.

It seems hardly necessary, after this, to pursue the Doctor’s plan of doctrine, (if a farrago of inconsistencies can be called a *Plan*,) any further. He says and unsays, affirms and contradicts in almost every page, and like some disciples of John at Ephesus, mentioned Acts xix. seems hardly to have heard whether there be any Holy Ghost; and yet you, Gentlemen, gravely tell us, that, “in almost

\* Homily on the Salvation of Man.

all

all the learned Authors' remarks on the subject of sensible impulses, (say influences) of the Holy Spirit, you are ready to concur!!" You "cannot help wishing, however, that while he exposed the delusive and unscriptural notions which lead men to rely on visionary impressions, as proofs of divine favour and acceptance, he had been at some pains in stating the scriptural mode of ascertaining so very important a point." But pray, Gentlemen, how could you expect this, when his express words, (pa. 49,) are, "We disclaim a positive knowledge of the forgiveness of our own sins, in particular, without an immediate revelation from heaven, which few sober and sedate christians will pretend to;" and when you find him, (pa. 37 and 41,) ranking "the love of God shed abroad in the heart, by the Holy Ghost given to us," among the extraordinary and miraculous gifts of the Spirit, bestowed on the Apostles and first gifted Preachers of the Gospel," and labouring by sundry quotations from Scripture to prove it?

It is a pity but some one had prevented the Doctor from exposing thus the imperfection of his acquaintance with genuine Christianity, by reminding him of the following passages, "Thou child, (the Baptist,) shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his way, to give knowledge of salvation to his people by the remission of their sins;" Luke i. 76, 77. "If any man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be Anathema, Maranatha:" "He that loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is Love." The Readers will observe, however, that altho' he thinks *Justification, Peace with God, the Love of God, &c.* too high attainments for young converts to aspire to: yet he allows, pa. 49, that "in particular cases of confirmed piety and holiness, especially at the approach of death, God may vouchsafe to grant to his faithful, and long-tried servants, some animating sense of his approbation, to support them under their change." But, if we are not to expect such a blessing as "the knowledge of salvation,"

salvation," (viz. of *present* salvation from the guilt and power of sin, producing a lively hope of *future*,) "by the remission of sins," except "in particular cases of confirmed piety," or, "at the approach of death," I should be glad to ask this learned Divine in what sense we are to understand such passages of Scripture as the following: "They that are in the flesh, (carnally minded,) cannot please God; But ye are not *in the flesh*, but in the *spirit*, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." "Because ye are sons, God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." "Ye have not received the Spirit of bondage unto fear, but ye have received the Spirit of Adoption: The self same Spirit, (*αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα*,) beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace." "We know that we are of God by the Spirit which he hath given us." "He that believeth hath the witness in himself." "Examine yourselves whether you be in the faith: Prove your own selves: Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates." "Christ in you the Hope of glory, whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

Methinks all these, and such like passages of God's holy Word, imply that we may "*know* that we are of God," (1 John v. 19,) even while we see the whole world around us lying in wickedness; and that we ought not to conclude our state is *safe* while we are without this knowledge. Great reason, therefore, had you, Gentlemen, for censuring the Doctor, and in a way very different from that in which you have done it, for omitting to "state the scriptural

G

mode

mode of ascertaining so very important a point," as the *manner* in which we may know that we are forgiven and accepted of God: You think, however, that "this defect" in his book, "is in a great degree supplied in the Appendix, into which," (you say,) "the learned Doctor has transcribed, with very flattering expressions of approbation, the whole of a paper on the Evidences of a state of salvation, which appeared in our Number for March last." But while you speak thus, do you not forget, Gentlemen, that at the very time when the Doctor introduces your paper, he not only terms this point, viz. the Evidences of a state of salvation, "a most delicate and difficult subject," (contrary I apprehend, to the plain letter of the above cited, and many other equally clear and obvious texts of Scripture,) but declares, that your paper "concurrs entirely with the drift of his publication," and that it "contains a faithful and correct summary of the principal points of his Argument, better than he could frame himself?" By which it appears, that he either flatly contradicts himself, or he understands your Paper as only shewing how, "in particular cases of confirmed piety and holiness," or "at the approach of death," persons may know that they are justified, and have peace with God. Whether this was all you meant, you best know. I should suppose it was not: But that you intended to lay down marks of justification, by which all believers, all that are in Christ, even *Babes*, might know that they are freed from condemnation.

I have no material fault to find with your Paper, unless in the following particulars. You here again frequently use the expressions, "internal impulses," or "impulses of the Spirit," and impute them to others. Thus, in the 86th page of the Appendix, the Author of the Paper says, "I do not conceive that there is a single text of Scripture, which, if rightly interpreted, directs a person to refer for the decision of these points to "*internal impulses*." Pray, who

who says there is? Who uses any such phrase? I am sure we do not. We speak as the Oracles of God, whether those that watch over us for evil understand us or not. Again, in the next sentence you say, "To rely on these impulses is unwarranted, and therefore must be unsafe." Pray, Gentlemen, what are they, and who rely on them? Unless by this unscriptural, and, I had almost said, unintelligible word, you mean *Influences*, or *Operations*, when you impute it to us, you entirely misrepresent our doctrine, and are encountering a shadow.

But I have a 2d, and more material objection to your Paper on Evidences, as quoted by Dr. Hales, when you enquire, as he states, pa. 89, "May we believe that a conviction of forgiveness of sins, in this life, is often or ever an instantaneous operation of the Spirit; so *strong* and so *clear* as not to be mistaken by the person operated upon? Or is it more frequently a gradual work, by which the whole soul is drawn to God?" The answer to this enquiry is as follows. "It would be presumptuous to limit the proceedings of God; and therefore it would be too much to say, that in *no case*, God will, at present, operate on the heart of an individual, an instantaneous conviction of the forgiveness of his sins." So far is well; but when the Author adds, "I know no reason for expecting such an event;" and signifies further, that such convictions are "miraculous," and that now, when other miracles have ceased, they not only are "not necessary," but that "there seems no reason in the nature of the thing itself, nor any foundation in Scripture for expecting them," I must dissent from him. To term them "miraculous," is begging the question; and yet, who dares to say that nothing, in any respect miraculous, is ever effected? nothing, save in the ordinary course of nature? nothing, by any extraordinary interposition of divine Providence, or exertion of divine Power? Does not God interpose, and prevent, or counteract

the ordinary course of nature, when, whether by slow degrees, or by a more speedy process, he heals the sick in answer to prayer, or gives *peace*, or *war*, *rain* or *fair weather*?

But, not to insist on this, why should an instantaneous conviction of *righteousness*, or of justification, by the *Gospel*, and by faith therein, be any more deemed miraculous, than an instantaneous conviction of sin by the *Law*? And why, may not the *former*, miraculous or not miraculous, take place in a moment, in the mind of a *penitent*, thro' his believing in Christ, as well as the *latter*, in the mind of a *sinner*, who, before this was living in habitual iniquity? I think there is both reason in the nature of the thing itself, and a foundation in the Scriptures for expecting this. It is acknowledged, I presume, that a sinner, who had all his life long been unacquainted with his sinfulness and guilt, and utterly unconcerned about obtaining the remission and renovation held forth in the Gospel, may instantaneously, under a sermon or otherwise, as in the case of the Jailor at Philippi, receive such a view of that divine Law which he has continually violated, and of the purity, spirituality, extent, and obligation of the precepts of it, as to be suddenly convinced he is guilty before God, and exposed to his wrath. Now why may not a broken-hearted penitent, or, in our Lord's language, "a weary and heavy-laden" sinner, receive, in a similar way, such a view of the Person and Offices, Love and Sufferings of Christ, of his ability and willingness to save, and of the grace of God, in and thro' him, manifested in the Gospel, as suddenly to accept the offers of mercy, come to Christ by faith, and find rest to his soul? What is there unreasonable in this? What is there unscriptural? Is it not probable that it was in this way Abraham was justified, when, on God's promising to him that his seed should be as the stars, and that in his seed all nations of the earth should be blessed, "he believed on the Lord, and he, (the Lord,) accounted it to him  
for

for righteousness," Gen. xv. 5, 6. Does it not appear, on the very face of the story, that not so much as a moment intervened between God's making his gracious purpose known to Abraham, and his crediting and confiding in the divine declaration? Was it not in the same way that David received pardon, when, finding God's "hand heavy upon him, day and night," and his "moisture turned into the drought of summer," he said, "I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord," and the Lord: "forgave the iniquity of his sin?" Is it not likely also that Hezekiah found pardon the same way? "Behold for peace," says he, (Isa. xxxviii. 17). "I had great bitterness; but thou hast, in love to my soul, delivered it from the pit of corruption, for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back."

But, whatever might be the case with these Old Testament Saints, we find abundant examples in the New Testament, both of instantaneous deliverances from the guilt of sin, and from a wounded spirit consequent thereupon. "If the whole church," says St. Paul, (1 Cor. xiv. 23,—25.) "be come together into one place, and all prophesy," that is, evidently, declare the word of God, "and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced, of all: he is judged of all: And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so, falling down on his face, he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth." Does this imply nothing instantaneous? And pray what is there so singular in this, that nothing of the same kind can possibly now happen, in any similar meeting of religious people? And, when, at the day of Pentecost, 3000 were "pricked in their hearts, and cried out, Men and brethren, what shall we do? and Peter said, Repent, and be baptised every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins;" and "they that gladly received his word were baptised," and added to the church; what was there so singular in their case, (I except the miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit in the gift of tongues,) that

it



it would be unreasonable to expect any similar conversions now? May not any individual, or a number of individuals, when hearing a faithful discourse, be now, as well as formerly, pricked in their hearts or wounded in their minds, on account of their past sins? And upon having the glad tidings of salvation announced to them, may they not believe, and find instantaneous peace and joy in believing? And when any person is brought, by whatever means, under a serious concern respecting a future world, and asks with the Jailor mentioned above, "What must I do to be saved?" what reason can be assigned, why he may not as soon be enabled to understand and comply with the terms of acceptance (viz. living faith in Christ) as he was, and obtain deliverance from his guilt and fear? Again, was not the *Eunuch*, of whom we read in Acts the 8th, speedily enlightened by the preaching of Philip? And, upon learning that Jesus of Nazareth was the Lamb of God, led to the slaughter, as an expiatory sacrifice for his sins, did he not immediately believe in him with his heart unto righteousness, and find peace with God? And may not any true penitent, receiving the same information, imitate herein his example, and find as readily the same blessing?

The truth is, whatever may be the case with persons who have long been habituated to read, think, examine themselves, watch and pray; altho' light, whether into the *Law*, or *Gospel*, may be communicated to such by slow and imperceptible degrees; yet, I apprehend it is very different with such thoughtless sinners as compose the bulk of all nations, even of those termed christian. A sentence in a sermon, a text of Scripture occurring to their minds, a *doctrine*, *precept*, *promise*, or *threatening*, offered in whatever way to their attention, and apprehended, will, sometimes, in a few minutes, or even in one moment, communicate such light to them, and be a mean of such discovery, as shall either suddenly wound or heal, bruise or bind up. I

am free to declare, that I myself have met with many, I had almost said innumerable instances of the kind, and am still in the habit of meeting with them frequently. For, blessed be God, he has not yet ceased to work in the hearts of mankind, nor has he yet forsaken our land: nor, I trust, will he forsake it. Only, let us not exemplify among ourselves the *unbelief* and *obstinacy* of those of old, whom the Apostle addressed in the following words, "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which ye will in no wise believe, tho' a man declare it unto you." (Acts xiii. 31.) Let us not *deny*, let us not *undervalue*, and especially, let us not *reproach* the work of God. At least, let not *serious professors*, who fear him, and wish well to his cause, do this. Let not *them*, term it, *enthusiasm*, *fanaticism*, or a *delusion* of the devil. Let them remember the rule which Jesus hath given us, for the direction of our judgment in such matters. *By their fruits ye shall know them*. And when they see evident proofs of a change from sin to holiness, in the heart and life of a fellow creature; let them acknowledge, that a genuine work of the Spirit of God has been wrought there. And if such a person, with every mark of sincerity and truth about him, do attest that, at a certain time and place, all his guilt and fear, anxiety and distress of soul on account of sin, past or present, was removed, and that a firm confidence in God, as a pardoning God, accompanied with peace and joy, thro' believing, was communicated to him, let them not doubt his testimony.

Now this, Gentlemen, is what we sometimes term *christian experience*, because it is the knowing by *experience*, or *trial*, or *proof*, the things which we only knew in theory. And, I doubt not, you will allow that there is a wide difference between knowing any thing, human or divine, temporal or spiritual, by experience, and knowing it only in idea. To have an idea, suppose, of sorrow for sin, of confidence

fidence in God, of gratitude for his mercies, of love to his name, of an hope of immortality, of joy in that hope, is surely not the same thing with experiencing these graces in our own hearts. But the learned divine, you commend, is confident, pa. 39, that "the Methodistic sense of the word *experience*, is totally incompatible with St. Paul's train of argument, which ranks experience before hope, as productive thereof; whereas," says he, "an experimental *feeling* or perception of *sweet peace with God*, is equivalent to exultation, and therefore cannot be placed *before* but *after* hope." So much for the Doctor's knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and of divine things! You see, by this, Gentlemen, that, to use St. Paul's language on a similar occasion, he neither understands what he says, nor (the subject) whereof he so confidently affirms! Instead of considering the *hope of the gospel*, in the light in which it is always represented in the New Testament, as consequent on *justification and peace with God*, and as having *eternal salvation* for its object, he considers it as preceding faith, and justification thereby, and as having only *present pardon* for its object! He is not aware that the New Testament *hope*, is the *hope of eternal life*, Tit. i. 2. of the *glory of God*, Rom. v. 2. of the *inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled*, and which *fadeth not away*, 1 Pet. i. 3; and that we cannot possibly possess this, till we are constituted *heirs* of that inheritance, and life eternal. For would it not be madness in any one to hope for an inheritance, of which he was not an *heir*, or to which he had no title? Now in order to our being *heirs* of the inheritance, we must be children of God: "If children," says the Apostle, Rom. viii. 17, "then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ." And in order to our being children of God, we must be "justified by faith," and "have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ;" yea, we must be adopted into his family, and regenerated by his grace. "According to his mercy," says the Apostle,

Tit.

**Tit. iii. 5—7,** “ he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost ;—that, being justified by grace, we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” Again, **Gal. iv. 4,** “ When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son,—that we might receive the adoption of sons : Wherefore, thou art no more a servant but a son, and *if a son, an heir of God thro’ Christ.*” Justification, therefore, and adoption into God’s family, are absolutely necessary in order to our being heirs of the heavenly inheritance, and entitled to entertain a well-grounded hope of it.

“ But an experimental feeling, or perception of sweet peace with God, is equivalent to exultation.” No ; by no means : it is an entirely different thing from it, and as the Apostle himself states, evidently precedes it. 1st. We are justified by faith, and have peace with God. 2dly. We have access by faith into the grace or state of favour and acceptance, in which we stand as God’s children. 3dly. We have an hope of the glory of God, and rejoice or exult in that hope. But our mistaken Divine tells us, that peace with God “ cannot be placed before, but” must come “ after hope.” In other words, an *enemy* and a *rebel*, not so much as pardoned or reconciled to his Prince, must, nevertheless, hope to share his crown. No : Let him first be *forgiven* and *reconciled* ; secondly, taken into his Prince’s peculiar *favour* and *friendship* ; thirdly, be adopted for his *child* : and then, and not before, being made an heir, let him entertain an hope of the Kingdom.

It is evident by all this, that what Dr. Hales means by *Hope*, is not an expectation of future felicity, in consequence of being entitled to it, but rather an expectation of present pardon, not yet received. He proceeds, “ The Apostle himself, in the sequel, describes the state, even of the saints themselves, in such terms as are no way calculated to inspire implicit confidence, hardy assurance, or infallible

H

knowledge

knowledge of their own salvation." Strange expressions these indeed! But here, again, he totally mistakes the question. He means confidence, assurance, or knowledge of eternal salvation. But who speaks of this? Not we: Not any that believe a child of God may fall from grace. Only those can, with propriety, speak of an assurance or knowledge of this, who hold the doctrine of the *infallible perseverance* of the saints. What we mean by "an assurance or knowledge of salvation," is, not an assurance or knowledge that we shall be *saved into heaven*, but that we are saved *on earth*: so far saved, at least, that we are justified, born from above, and made the children of God. But in order to our being saved *eternally*, we must *persevere*; which we *hope* to do, and in consequence thereof, to "receive the end of our faith, the eternal salvation of our souls." All, therefore, that he advances on this head, is said in *ignorantia elenchi*, in mistake of the question.

This is still more evident from the Doctor's strange paraphrase on St. Paul's words in the 8th chapter to the Romans, which follow: (pa. 40,) "We ourselves who have the first fruits of the Spirit, do groan in ourselves, waiting for the adoption, the redemption of our body: For by hope were we saved, but hope beheld is not hope, but actual knowledge, for why should one hope for what he beholdeth? But since we hope for what we do not behold, we wait for it with patience." Leaving Dr. Hales to assign his reasons for undertaking to mend our Translation here, I shall only say, that he appears entirely to mistake the Apostle's meaning; which is not to distinguish between *hope* and *knowledge*, and to set the one in opposition to the other: but between *hope* and *enjoyment*. Nor does he say, or intend to say, that they *were* saved by hope, as the Doctor would render his words. The indefinite tense, used by the Apostle here, *εσώθημεν*, must be rendered as our Translators have rendered it, *we are saved*, or, our salvation is, by hope: The plain and  
evident

evident meaning of which is, that our final salvation, including, as the Apostle here states, "The redemption of our body" from the grave, is not seen or enjoyed, while we are in the present world, but only *expected*; a declaration nearly similar to one in the 5th chap. of the 2 Epist. to the Corinthians; "While at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: for we walk by *faith*, and not by *sight*;" that is, while on earth, we only *believe* in the future and heavenly world, we do not see it, or enjoy its felicity.

But what has this to do, in shewing that "the Methodistic sense of the word *experience*" is wrong and incompatible with St. Paul's doctrine? Why, says Dr. Hales, "St. Paul ranks experience before hope, as productive thereof." But will the Doctor permit me to remind him, that St. Paul also ranks *hope* before *experience*? Does he not say, "We have access into the grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. We glory in tribulation also, knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope." The sense of which passage is perfectly obvious. When, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, and access into a state of grace, "We rejoice in hope of the glory of God:" yea, "We even glory in tribulation, knowing that tribulation worketh patience," that is, it exercises, and thereby, thro' the divine blessing, increases our patience; and the patient bearing of tribulation "worketh *experience*" or *trial*, or *proof* on trial, that is, it gives us an opportunity or occasion of knowing by experience, or trial, that God can and does support us under our tribulations, and, according to his promise, does not suffer us to be tempted above what we are able, but in every temptation, makes a way for our escape, that we may be able to bear it." Hence, of course, arises a farther degree of *hope* that we shall persevere and obtain the crown. A soldier, as soon as he has enlisted, and learned his exercise, may hope

to be victorious in the engagement; but his hope is not so *firm* and *assured*, as that of the experienced veteran, who has often been engaged in battle, and as often come off victorious. The Apostle adds, "and hope maketh us not ashamed," that is, we neither are, nor shall be, ashamed of our having entertained this hope of eternal life, "because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us;" for this love is an infallible evidence of our being children of God, and heirs of glory. For "every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God," and "it is eternal life to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent."

But to return to your Paper of Evidences, upon which I have two more observations to make. You lay before your Readers many very just and scriptural marks of the New-Birth, marks, by which it is highly proper, that all should examine themselves, who profess to have experienced that divine change, and have had space of time sufficient, and opportunity to bring forth such important and necessary fruits of righteousness. Nevertheless, I think you will allow, Gentlemen, that a man may know, and that *assuredly*, that he is born of God, before he has had opportunity to learn by experience himself, or to manifest to others, that he has all these marks. I refer chiefly to the following, "Doing righteousness," "keeping the commandments of God:" "conquering all sin," "overcoming the world," "crucifying the flesh with its affections and lusts," "walking in the light," "loving and doing good to our neighbour," "living a life of perpetual holiness," "persevering in the grace of God." Surely, before a man has had opportunity to evidence his regeneration in this way, he may know that he is of God, by the Spirit that God hath given him;" not "the Spirit of bondage to fear, but the Spirit of Adoption, whereby he cries, Abba, Father," and which inspires him with *confidence* and *peace, love* and *joy, graces, which,*  
with

with all his efforts, he could not create within himself, and which are infallible proofs of the presence and agency of the divine Spirit.

Such a knowledge had Peter, before he had time to evidence his conversion, when he said, "Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee;" and Thomas, when, his doubts being scattered, he exclaimed, "My Lord, and my God!" The Jailor also, when he rejoiced with all his house in the salvation which he had received, and in the prospect of that which he further expected, had not yet had time to evidence the genuineness of the change wrought in him, and yet his joy proves, that he was in no uncertainty as to his acceptance with God. The same may be said of those converted on the day of Pentecost. They gladly received the word, and were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus for the *remission of sins*, altho' they had not had opportunity to prove their repentance or their faith, in the way which, no doubt, they would in general, afterwards shew it. And, to add no more instances, such, Gentlemen, was the knowledge which the Quaker Woman had, of whom you have introduced the Rev. Charles Leslie, giving so long an account in your Number for August last.

And, I cannot but observe here, that, notwithstanding all the scriptural and excellent advice, which that Rev. Divine gave her, it is evident, on the face of the story, that she was still in a state of *doubt*, as to her acceptance with God, and therefore of *fear* with respect to death and its consequences, till she received that manifestation of the divine favour, which is there described in the following manner. After speaking of "the terrible apprehensions" he was under, lest he had deceived her, by the manner in which he had addressed her, and of the trouble which was upon him for an hour, on her account, he says, "Just about six o'clock, her maid came running down, and said,

“ You



‘ You must come up; for my mistress hath sent for you, and she is well and strong, and more cheerful than I ever saw her in my life.’ We run up, and found her sitting up in bed, with both her arms expanded, and using them with full freedom. There was a fresh and lively colour in her face, and her eyes sparkling with such a transport of joy, as I never saw in any face before or since: Her voice was strong and loud, and her words very distinct and articulate. She said, as soon as we came into the room, ‘ I have sent for you to let you know, how gracious God has been to me; He has given me a foretaste of heaven; he has shewed it to me. Oh! the glorious sight that I have seen of angels and blessed spirits; and Oh, the ravishing music! It is impossible, to express it. My soul is exalted and enlarged! Oh! I could dance, and I could sing, I could fly,’ that was her expression. ‘ Come, said she, weep no more, but praise God with me, laugh, rejoice, and sing!’ In that rapture she continued about half an hour before we gave her any interruption. The first thing that came into my mind was, that this might be a delirium; but as she had not the least of that during her whole sickness, for which I have often heard her bless God; so it seemed strange to me that such fumes should restore her strength, speech, sight, in so wonderful a manner, after she had lain now fifteen hours in the very jaws of death; for she was every thing but dead.”

“ In all she said, bating the strangeness of what she related, there was not one disordered word, or that favoured of lightness: And for nine hours after that, she spoke to her husband, to her child, to her sister, to her servants, and concerning her temporal affairs, with as much consistency, and strength of reason, as in all her life, nor did one word, that looked in the least giddy or light-headed, drop from her; tho’ that transport and joy in her face, and cheerfulness in her voice, and all her actions continued with her all along, and in every thing she said and did. The im-  
pression

pression that transport of pleasure had printed in her countenance, was not quite worn off when she expired, and seemed to remain even after her death: An air of satisfaction appeared in her corpse. She died without a sigh or groan, or the least struggle, or any thing more terrible than seeing one fall into a sweet sleep, just at the close of the recommendatory prayer. A little before she died, when she could no longer discourse, but speak single words, I saw her put her finger to her breast, when death was making its last effort, and say, 'Hard, hard;' but then immediately, as if correcting herself, she lift up both her hands, and looking up with great cheerfulness in her eyes, she cried, 'This pain is nothing; joy, heaven!' which were the last words I heard her speak."

In the relation, which you have published in your Number for November, of the penitent death of Bishop Atherton, we find, page 644, a similar account of an assurance of the divine favour, by the influences of the Holy Spirit. "The next morning, (which was the day of his execution,) his first salutation to me was, 'God hath heard me. About four or five o'clock this morning, for the space of an hour and a half, I have had that sweetness in my soul, those refreshments in my heart, that I am not able to express. I had such a weaning from this world, might I have enjoyed all the contents of it, such a trust and relying upon God in committing my wife and children to his care, such confidence of God's love and assurance of pardon, such a longing to be dissolved, and to be with Christ, such joy and inward consolation, as if I had been in the suburbs of heaven already, that I felt where my heart lay: I arose out of my bed, and gave God thanks and praise upon my knees in the place where I had begged it:' and so he fell into abundance of tears, adding, 'Whereas before, I wept for sorrow, now I weep for joy.'" Again, Pa. 650, "When, (being on the Ladder,) he saw so many weeping, he said to them, 'I thank

thank God I dread not death ;' and that it proceeded not from a presumption, but from a *present SENSIBLE apprehension of God's mercy, and an inward peace of conscience.*"

Now, Gentlemen, after inserting in your Miscellany, and, I presume, approving of these Accounts ; to be consistent with yourselves, you must never again censure the Wesleyan Methodists," as you term us, for teaching that "the assurance of the divine forgiveness and favour, by means of sensible" (observe, not *impulses*, but if you please) *influences or operations* of the Holy Spirit upon the mind," is a blessing attainable by mankind, from him who is no respecter of persons. The Quaker Woman here, and her Biographer, Mr. Leslie, speak exactly our language, as also the Author of that Account of Bishop Atherton. And the nature of these relations is precisely the same with those, which many thousands of the Members of our Societies are wont to give from time to time, in sickness and in health, in life and in death, in all parts of the kingdom, and which we are in the constant habit of publishing to the world, in our Magazines and other Books. I expect, therefore, that we shall hear no more from you on this subject. For surely you will not so far lay yourselves open to the charge of partiality and prejudice, as to pronounce that to be *enthusiasm, fanaticism, fancy, the impulses of an heated imagination and delusion* in a Methodist, which you acknowledge to be the *Work of God* in a Quaker, or member of the Church of England ; especially as the former can, and does give as good evidence, in life and in death, that his profession and testimony are founded on truth, as the latter. Be this as it may, one thing is certain, for the lip of Truth hath pronounced it, *Wisdom is justified of all her children.* They that possess vital religion themselves, unless in cases of peculiar influence from prejudice, will discern and acknowledge it in others.

As

As I have this unexpected opportunity, I will take the liberty of making one or two observations more. In the notice which you have been pleased to take of some things, which you think deserving of censure, in the Minutes of our last Conference; (for you can find nothing worthy of commendation, not even in our Address to our Societies, respecting their duty in the present awful crisis of public affairs,) you say, (pa. 571, Number for Sept. 1803,) "We are sorry to observe that the separation of the Methodists from the Church of England, notwithstanding their professions of attachment to her communion, becomes wider and wider every year, and we doubt not, will soon be complete. At each succeeding Conference, during the last seven or eight years, numerous Societies obtained leave to have the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper administered by their own Preachers. At the last Conference no fewer than thirty-five Societies, in different parts of the Kingdom, petitioned for a similar indulgence, and had their request granted." Permit me to assure you, here, Gentlemen, that I regret this, perhaps, full as much as you do, having from my childhood been much attached to the Established Church, and that from principle, and therefore, having been earnestly desirous, from my first becoming a Member of the Methodist Society, that our people should every where remain in her communion. I have also, for many years, used my best endeavours, as my Brethren and many others, in different parts of the Kingdom, well know, to accomplish this end, which has always appeared to me, on many accounts, very desirable. But I am now more than ever discouraged from persevering in this attempt, perceiving that not only the *immoral conduct* and *persecuting spirit* of many of the unenlightened Clergy, but also and especially, that the *unkindness* and *bitterness* of many, whom I believe, upon the whole, to be pious, are insuperable obstacles in our way.

I

The

The body of our people and preachers, I am persuaded, love both the Doctrine and Service of the Church of England : But they can distinguish between *truth* and *error*, in matters of religion, between *piety* and *profaneness*, *love* and *enmity*. And they will not be prevailed upon, by any efforts we can use, to attend the ministry of those, whom they consider as assiduously disseminating destructive error, as disgracing the christian character by their conduct, or as being actuated by a spirit of bitterness towards them, merely because they judge it expedient to use other means of edification, and helps to piety, besides those which they may have, in their several parishes from the parochial Clergy. Add to this, that while our people are conscious that their end in uniting themselves together in religious Societies, in building chapels, in opening new places of worship, and in sending missionaries to preach the Gospel to the Negroes in the West-India Islands, and to the Roman Catholics in Ireland,\* and the poor and ignorant inhabitants of North-Wales, in their native languages, is merely the reformation and salvation of mankind ;

\* The Reader will please particularly to observe, that the Missionaries address the Catholics in Ireland in their own native language. The advantage which this gives them is very great. Many are hereby induced to hear them who otherwise would not, and they that are thus inclined to hear, are by this means disposed to lend the more attention, while the expressive, and forcible nature of the Irish language, seems to add greater energy to the word spoken. In a letter dated Dublin, 22d. last month, one of the Missionaries observes, " We are just returned from the Western part of the Kingdom, the County of Mayo, a part that abounds with Catholics, with a few Protestants thinly scattered among them. Our labours, in our last tour, have been more particularly confined to that County. Every town and street were open to us, the Gentlemen there, mostly understand the Irish Language. Many of them attended our preaching, and appeared to hear us with great delight, and, I hope with profit also. For, what in English they would disdain to hear, or would perhaps be offended at, they can well bear, and are pleased with when spoken in Irish. If any drunkard, or notorious sinner, were at any time disposed to annoy us in any street, such was the general disposition of our hearers

mankind; it cannot be but they must conceive an unfavourable idea of those persons, whether ministers or people, who, instead of countenancing and assisting them in their laudable designs, are continually pouring cold water upon, and counteracting their best endeavours for the good of their fellow-creatures. The same consequences must follow upon the conduct of those also, who, instead of readily acknowledging and rejoicing in every thing that is evidently disinterested

hearers towards us, that none dared to stir. The poor people understood us so perfectly, that they frequently came in crowds around us, and attended with great respect and delight. And they were the more particularly attentive to us, when we opened to them the pure parts of their own doctrines. These indeed, mixed with the impure, they generally have by heart from their little Catechisms, but (like many, very many of our Protestants, who know not their own doctrines,) they do not at all understand them. But by explaining these particular parts to them, and not heeding the rest for the present, we were enabled, without prejudicing them, fully to preach the Gospel to them. And their yielding hearts often melted like wax before the fire, and their tears flowed like water. The noise of their sighs, cries, and prayers, sometimes so filled the streets where we stood, that it was both awful and pleasing to observe it. And in several places they came out at night, and filled the houses where we were, and both men and women, and even the children were in tears. After preaching, we generally distributed a number of little Tracts among them, which we got printed, containing the substance of the doctrine which we preach. These they generally received with such eagerness, that they seemed ready to smother, or pull us to pieces, in striving to get them. These they carry with them into the mountains and villages, and I hope, are profited by them. I enclose one of these noticed by Dr. Hales, in his Pamphlet, and also one which I am now distributing.† I have thought it expedient to visit some of the Popish Clergy, and to lay before them the doctrines which we preach. This I have done both in Munster and Connaught, and they have seemed to be rather pleased that I went to see them in so friendly a way. They were civil, and received my little Tracts. One of their Bishops said he was thankful to me for calling on him, and that, whilst I preached such things as I laid before him, I ought not to be impeded. We are thankful to our English Brethren for keeping our way open, and for the supply of Tracts, Testaments, and Bibles, for the use of the poor blind creatures of this Kingdom; *in that day*, I trust, we shall all rejoice together."

† See the Appendix.

and good among us, seem to be only concerned to find out somewhat deserving of censure and condemnation.

How far the Authors of some of the pieces inserted in the *Christian Observer*,\* have acted thus, it must be left to the public to judge. For my part, I must declare, both from the acquaintance I had with some said to be concerned in conducting that Work, and from the *Prospectus* which first announced its appearance, I expected better things from it: And it has not been without considerable reluctance, that I have relinquished, in any degree, the expectation I had entertained, that both Christianity and the Church of England would receive essential service from such a Publication. At present, I acknowledge, my hopes are considerably abated; and I am inclined to think, that the circulation of it among our people, to whom it at first promised to be of singular use, will now be greatly contracted. Instead of many thousands of them becoming subscribers to, and being edified by the perusal of your Work, which, had you treated us, I do not say with the *kindness*, but with the *justice* we had a right to expect, I am confident would soon have been the case, you are taking the most effectual method to induce those who have been in the habit of reading it, to turn their attention to other books. But this is not all. By such steps, you are doing what you little imagine; you are contributing, in no small degree, to increase the prejudices of many against that very Church of England, whose interests you wish to advance, and are driving from her communion not a few that were born within her pale. Nor is this the worst. You are not only increasing the number of Dissenters,

\* One proof of this spirit of bitterness, we find in your Review of Milner's Ecclesiastical History, Number for October, pa. 614. The Editors there observe, that W. De St. Amour "chiefly distinguished himself in controversy with the Mendicant Orders, whose practices, in some respects, have been adopted in our own times with great success by self-constituted Teachers, who intrude into the folds even of those regular Pastors who are found in the faith, and exemplary in their lives." Ibid. pa. 614.

which

which many will think is no evil, but you are increasing the number of *infidels* and *sinners*. Can you suppose, Gentlemen, that *true* and *genuine* religion will gain any thing, supposing it were in your power to effect it, by your bringing the *Wesleian Methodists*, to use your own phrase, into discredit, and lessening their influence in the community? Will you say with the Latin Poet;

“ Non tali auxilio, non defensoribus istis  
Tempus eget? ”

Have you no need of their help against ungodliness and vice, at a time when so much depends on the reformation of the people? Or do you suppose that the ungodly or immoral will become better disposed towards piety and virtue, by seeing professors attack one another, and that respecting matters of little or no moment? And, pray, Gentlemen, if such a conduct were, at any time, proper to be pursued, is *this*, above all others, the fit season for it? Is our nation in no danger? If it be, what are the causes? Are they not chiefly, *infidelity* and *sin*? And, if so, ought not every well-wisher to his country, to turn his arms against these our common enemies, rather than against his fellow-servants, and the true, altho' perhaps *weak*, and, in some respects, *mistaken* disciples of our one long-suffering and gracious Master? Shall any of those ministers of his blessed Word, “ Whom he hath made rulers over his household, to give them their meat in due season,” instead of attending to their duty in this respect, and doing as they are commanded, begin, if not “ to eat and drink with the drunken,” yet “ to smite their fellow-servants,” who, perhaps, are equally faithful and diligent with themselves, and this, at the very time when He, the Lord and Master of them all, is in the very act of coming to visit and punish the Country where they all reside? Nay: for the honour of Christ, the credit of his cause, the enlargement of his Church, and the good of our Country, let us not be guilty of such folly  
and



and wickedness. Let us not contend and strive with one another: Let us only contend and strive against profaneness and immorality, against infidelity and sin! And, instead of hindering, let us assist, to the utmost of our power, all that are employed in so good a work, as that of forwarding the design on which the Son of God came into the world, and spreading piety and virtue among mankind. *Blessed, greatly blessed is that servant, whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing: Verily, says the faithful Witness, he shall make him ruler over all his goods.* Whatever idea you may have formed of us, Gentlemen, and however erroneous you may think our principles or practice to be, we are conscious to ourselves, that this is our *grand, yea, our sole* object in the whole of our economy, and therefore we have no doubt, but, however unworthy we may be of it, we shall obtain our Lord's blessing.

Indeed, I hope you yourselves, on more mature reflection, will allow this. In perusing your review of the Bishop of Lincoln's late Charge, (Number for Sept. pa. 545,) I have met with a passage which has pleased me so much, that, to shew my approbation of it, and bring it before the view of my Readers, who may not have seen that number of your Work, I shall here transcribe it. "Does a Minister insist on the doctrines of human depravity, and salvation by grace? Does he point to Christ Jesus and him crucified, as the only Saviour of sinners, and the only Refuge from deserved wrath: and to the Holy Ghost as the only Sanctifier of the people of God? Does he inculcate the necessity of repentance from dead works; of faith in the atoning blood of Christ; of a renewal of the heart to holiness after the image of God; and of a supreme love to God issuing in uniform, cheerful, and universal obedience to his commandments? Does he, from these premises, clearly and unequivocally maintained, deduce the obligation of christians to lead lives of faith in the Son of God; to cultivate all those  
holy,

holy, heavenly, and devout affections, to perform all those civil, social, and relative duties which are required, either by the precepts or spirit of the Gospel? Does he enforce the various obligations of Christianity by their proper motives and sanctions, speaking as a dying man, to dying men, earnestly and affectionately urging them to flee from the wrath to come, and to attend to the things which belong to their peace? Does he shew a real solicitude for the spiritual welfare of his flock, assiduously watching over them as one who must give account, framing his conduct and conversation, as well as his public discourses, according to the Gospel? Then, *whatever be the sentiments of such an one*, with respect to the Calvinistic controversy, he is an *evangelical minister*, of the same school with the Apostles of old; he is a true son of the Church of England, imbued with the spirit of our first Reformers; and, by whatever name he may be called, or whatever success may attend his labours, “yet surely his judgment is with the Lord, and his reward with his God.”

“On the other hand, whoever either partially, faintly, or superficially exhibits any of these grand and essential truths: Whoever either loses sight of them entirely, or when he brings them into view, treats them as mere incidental appendages, instead of necessary and indispensable parts of vital Christianity; **WHATEVER BE HIS NAME**, either assumed or imposed, **WHATEVER BE HIS CLAIMS OF PROFESSIONS**, he is not a true minister of the Gospel, nor a true son of the Church of England: He can have no just title to be denominated Evangelical.”

Now, here, Gentlemen, you have spoken our very sentiments, and if you abide by these declarations, we and you shall soon unite. At least we shall have no sufficient cause of difference. The Ministers, whose character you draw first, we cheerfully hail as true Ambassadors of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are glad you do not make their receiving *Episcopal*

*epal Ordination* to be a necessary qualification for their office. The latter, we think with you, are not true servants of Christ, nor Ministers sent by him, by whatever authority, and in whatever way, they may have been appointed. And, we hope, that, if it shall ever hereafter lie in your way to mention the *Wesleyan Methodists*, you will not fail to remember this your just and striking delineation of true and false Ministers. And, should you, at any time, be disposed even to go out of your way to notice us, I trust you will take care you do not give any of your small friends reason to say, that you drew your own character, when, in your Number for October last, pa. 625, you said, "Some are zealous, on the side of the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity; but they are, at the same time, so alive to the evils of *Methodism*, enthusiasm, and antinomianism, that they are almost exclusively occupied in opposing the growth of these errors; not considering how few are the fanatics in their congregations, when compared with the mass of nominal believers, and even of open sinners, whom it is incumbent on them to "reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." This certainly is not now your character. You are far from being "exclusively occupied" in opposing these things. In every Number of your Work, you explain and inculcate many important branches of truth and duty, and I trust you will do this more and more.

One observation more and I have done. You blame us for not suppressing entirely in our Societies the practice, which, in two or three instances has taken place, of *women teaching in public*. Permit me to observe, Gentlemen, that if we have not proceeded, at once, so far as you think we ought, it has neither been owing to our approving of the practice in question, nor to our fear of our people, whose obedience, in all reasonable points, we have cause to commend. But it is because we judge, that in a point of this nature,

nature, which, we conceive, does not involve any *essential truth* or *duty* of the Gospel, but merely a matter of prudent, altho' *Apostolic* regulation, some lenity is due to *tender*, but *misinformed* consciences. Try, Gentlemen, if you can persuade the *whole body* of Quakers, that it is absolutely *unscriptural*, and therefore *unlawful* in any case, for a woman to address a public congregation on religious subjects. If you find you cannot, consider, that, perhaps, we may have in our congregations and societies, in different places, individuals, who have received similar views with theirs, and interpret the passages of Scripture in question, (which I think with you, *expressly* forbid women to preach,) in a way resembling that in which the Quakers understand them. We do not conceive that we have any authority, from the great Head of the Church, to *lord it over* his heritage, or to bear hard on the prejudices of our misinformed or weak brethren. To urge that the Apostle expressly forbids it, and therefore that it is, in *all cases*, absolutely unlawful, is begging the question. You and I are persuaded that he does: But they are of a different opinion. And I apprehend it will be no easy task to convince them of their mistake. This, however, is no new thing in our Connection. It has existed, in some degree, and perhaps in as great a degree as at present, almost from the first rise of the Methodist Societies, and we act towards those two or three of our Sisters that have occasionally spoken in public, precisely as Mr. Wesley acted in his day. In general, if we *connive* at, we do not countenance or *encourage* their public speaking.

This appears even from the *Regulations* made at our last Conference, and noticed by you in your Number for Sept. last; Regulations which amount to a virtual prohibition of this practice, as persons better acquainted with our economy would have known. And it is still more evident from the resolution of our Irish Conference, in the year 1802, when, after mature deliberation on the subject, it was determined

K

as

as follows: "It is the judgment of the Conference, that it is contrary both to Scripture and Prudence, that women should preach or should exhort in public; and we direct the Superintendents to refuse a Society-Ticket, to any woman in the Methodist Connection, who preaches or who exhorts in any public congregation, unless she entirely cease from so doing."\* The sense of our Brethren in England, is clearly the same, in general; altho', on account of some particular circumstances, connected with the reasons above-mentioned, of regard to tender but misinformed consciences, they have not thought it proper, just at present, to proceed so far as to exclude from our Societies any woman, who, believing she has an extraordinary call to teach or exhort in public, shall, in general, confine herself to her own sex, and occasionally address them, and them only.

While, Gentlemen, you so narrowly inspect and magnify every seeming imperfection in the Methodist economy, is it fair, is it candid, is it becoming your professed character of CHRISTIAN Observers; thus, to pass over, without any sort of observation, that part of our conduct in Ireland, which, upon your own principles, you cannot but approve, when, at the same time, you so pointedly censure the English Conference upon the very same subject? Let it not be said, you do not observe our conduct there; while you retain Dr. Hales as Inspector General for that Department.

Let me remark, however, if I were asked, which of the two following is the greater or more unscriptural error, I should not hesitate one moment what to answer: I mean, 1st, That if a pious and intelligent woman, such as the late Countess of Huntingdon, or the present Mrs. Fletcher, upon a singular occasion, and when people are perishing for lack of knowledge, taking upon her to declare and enforce by word or writing, in public or private, *important, essential,*

\* Minutes of the Irish Conference for 1802, and Myles's History of the Methodists.

and

and *neglected* Truth ; or, 2dly, That of a Clergyman, or Minister, even with the commission, suppose of a Right Rev. Lord Bishop, disseminating such grand and destructive mistakes as those we frequently hear declared from our Pulpits, and which I have here shewn are contained in "*Methodism Inspected*," altho' inconsiderately commended by the *Christian Observer*. Praying that God may preserve all who wish well to his Truth and Cause, especially all that speak in his Name, from handling the Word of God deceitfully, and from every hurtful error of whatever kind.

I remain,

GENTLEMEN,

Your very obedient Servant in our common Lord,

JOSEPH BENSON.

London,  
Nov. 18, 1803.

## APPENDIX.

The Tract referred to by Dr. Hales, as circulated by the Methodist Missionaries among the Irish Roman Catholics, addressed *To every Lover of Truth.*

“’Tis better to Read and Think, and Obey GOD in Time, than Feel his Wrath, and Weep and Howl, for ever.

“AS it is appointed unto men once to die, and after death the judgment, and then, if fit for glory, to dwell with God for ever; or, if unfit—if unholy, to be cast into that place where the smoke of the torments of the DAMNED ascendeth up for ever and ever; and as none that are lost, can come back to have another offer of mercy, but then are lost, irrecoverably lost; and that through all eternity: Doth it not now behove every one of us while yet God graciously affords time and space to repent, maturely to consider our state, and PREPARE to meet our GOD?

“In what state then are the following? viz.—Swearers, liars, perjurers, murderers, fighters, brawlers, and backbiters; persecutors, and haters of good people; proud, vain, malicious, passionate, or angry persons; hypocrites, and deceivers; sabbath-breakers, lovers of pleasure, drunkards, and gamesters; covetous persons, lovers of the world, extortioners, and thieves; whoremongers, unclean persons, and adulterers; idolaters, and covenant breakers; that have broken their vows with the God of Heaven, and still do persist in their sins?—(And, Oh! what swarms of these are every where to be found!) In what state, I ask, are these? Are they that do these, or any of these things, in a state of grace? Are they christians? Are they children of God? Are they at all of the church of Christ? No:—And yet what other in the general have we but these?—Oh, that men would open their eyes ere it be too late! If thou art an honest Catholic, (that is one *freed from sin*,\* by the Spirit of God, for none other is a CATHOLIC) thine own reason and the word of God tell thee, these are not in any good way. As Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. iv. 33. having received the mind, or nature of a beast, (though he retained the form of a man,) ran from men and dwelt with beasts, and did eat grass with them, so these sinners, though men as to their bodies, yet in nature or spirit are like devils; any thing they do for God, they do it with reluctance; yea, they hate the strictness of his holy law, ways and people,—they do the devil’s work, and love the company of such, and yet are called christians! Alas! What will the end of these be? See John viii. 44. Christ saith, “Ye are of your father the devil.” They are breakers of God’s holy law; (a) they have

\* The context shews the meaning to be “free from the power of sin,” so as not to be in subjection to it, nor knowingly and wilfully to commit it: which was evidently St. Paul’s meaning in these same words, quoted from Rom. vi. 18.

(a) Why is the second commandment, (in Exodus xx. 4, 5, 6.) kept out of most Catholic Manuals and Catechisms, and the tenth divided into two to make up the number? seeing God’s curse is against them that add or diminish.  
lost

lost their baptism (if any they had,) See *Catholic Christian on Baptism*, page 14. "The first wilful sin any one commits after baptism, he loses the grace of baptism and all that title to an eternal inheritance, and immediately becomes a slave of the devil, and an heir of all the woes of hell." Also the great St. Paul, concerning baptism, saith nearly the same, Rom. ii. 25. "Circumcision [or baptism] verily profiteth if thou keep the law, but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision." They are now unbaptised. They are in a state of (what the Catholics call mortal) sin, under the curse of God, let them be of what name soever, and must remain so for ever, unless JESUS CHRIST himself, baptise them with the HOLY GHOST, which he certainly will do, if they take the alarm, and earnestly, with penitent hearts, perseveringly entreat him.

"Every true Protestant will heartily acknowledge the above truths; a protestant being one that, with a broken, contrite heart, has forsaken all sin, and has, thro' faith in Christ, received the inward spiritual grace, that is, "a death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness;" (see Protestant catechism on baptism,) and after this new birth, walks before God, the remainder of his days, in righteousness and true holiness. Such an one is NO HERETIC, "but an HEIR OF GOD.—But a sinner" (one going on in known sin) "is no protestant.

"Art thou a Dissenter? Thou knowest these swearers, liars, &c. are none. As a true Dissenter is one that has been duly convinced, by the Spirit of God, that all men; while in their *natural state*, are sinners, and enemies to God; that the curse and wrath of God is due to every *sin*; therefore with true repentance and sorrow of heart, has turned from all sin to God; has fled to Christ, has been freely justified by his grace, thro' faith in his blood; and has an ASSURANCE 'of God's love, peace of conscience, and joy in the Holy Ghost;' (b) leads a holy life, and being 'elected thro' sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth, unto unfeigned obedience,' he keeps the commandments of God, blameless. (c) They that enjoy not these things have only the empty name, and are deceived. The same holds good with respect to every other name—These have not the Spirit of Christ: all must allow that; therefore they are none of his; whether they be teachers or hearers: If hearers, all their duties are an abomination to God; for before repentance, no service or duty is accepted of him.—If *teachers*, God hates and curses all their services, Mal. ii. 1, 2, 3. HE never sent sinners" (living in known sin, as the following clause explains it,) "to be teachers of his people, Psal. i. 16. 'Unto the wicked God saith, What hast thou to do, to declare my statutes,' &c. and Jer. xxiii. 21.

"Seest thou then a teacher that is a sinner? thou seest an enemy to God, and a false prophet: for his sin is his mark, say what he will; (d) these say none can be free from sin—so, they need not blame their people, nor their people them, for their sinning;

(b) See the Assembly's Catechism. (c) Luke i. 6. Rev. xxii. 14.

(d) Even tho' a worker of miracles, Matt. vii. 22, 23.



they play into each other's hand, and bear with, and strengthen each other, till death; but what will they then do?

"The deluded hearers of these may be in the Alehouses unheeded, roaring, cursing, fighting, and drinking; and in every other place where sin is practised, only let them not dare to hear the servants of God, [these, in their eyes are the false prophets;] or be found weeping and praying among the people of God! This, with them, is the CRIME of all crimes most to be punished! Oh! blindness! Oh! madness!!

"Had you but seen a man out of his reason, or in the plague, making up worthless bolusses for others in the same state, and thus destroying both himself and them:—Then you might see a just picture of those silly teachers, whose people and themselves live in their sins, [the worst of all plagues,] from youth to old age, and amuse themselves with rites and ceremonies, till they die in their sins, and perish for ever.

"Sinners may be flattered with fine names, yet they are but slaves of sin, children of Satan, and have the spirit of the evil one; the fruit discovers the tree: No man can serve two masters; so the *devil* is the sinner's master. Oh! sinner! sinner! deceive thyself no longer, but believe the truth of thy danger, and tremble at thy state; for, as the tree falls so it lies; and 'in the place where the tree falleth there it shall be,' Eccl. xi. 3. Yes, the moment the sinner falls dead, he drops into everlasting torments; therefore be not amused with being of this or that church, with the false words of men, or ceremonies of any church, for these things cannot at all save you before or after death. '(e) Without the Godhead, nothing can, have any worth or price in man.' Surely GOD dwells not in any ungodly man.

"All the contrivances of men cannot keep a sinner out of perdition; yourselves may know such things are refuges of lies; Therefore, again I warn thee from the God of Heaven, be no longer deceived; burst into tears of penitential woe; flee quickly from every sin, and turn to God; believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and cry thro' him to God to send the Holy Spirit into thine heart: Then, by the power of the Spirit convincing thee of sin, thou shalt feel a true godly sorrow, working repentance unto life;—a brokenness of heart, a great hatred to sin, to thyself, for have sinned, and to the company of sinners; And when the Spirit works in thine heart faith in Christ, whereby thou mayest be enabled to apprehend him, thro' the promise of life, and have his blood savingly applied to thy wounded conscience; then thou shalt feel sweet peace with God, and the love of God shed abroad in thine heart by the Holy Ghost given to thee, Rom. v. 5. then thou shalt KNOW all thy sins are truly pardoned, Psal. ciii. 3.—12. Col. i. 14. Eph. i. 7. 1 John ii. 12. 'I write unto you little children, because your sins ARE forgiven you for his Name's sake.' Thy soul shall then be happy in God, and thy very nature changed. Then shall the word of

(e) See the hymn in Chaloner's Garden of the soul, page 196.

God be dear to thee, none will be able to dissuade thee from reading it; then shall the means of grace, the ways and people of God be delightful to thee; then blind guides or false prophets can no longer deceive thee; then, and not till then, (till this divine change take place in thine heart) shalt thou be a true christian, a new creature, one born again.—Then will appear the fruits of the Spirit—love, joy, peace, gentleness, goodness, &c. Against these there is *no law*, no law of God, here or hereafter, Gal. v. 23. Then thou art washed in the blood of Christ from thy sins, Rev. i. 5. then thou art purged by *fire*, (f) by the *fire* of God's love, Mat. iii. 11; Mal. iii. 2. for there is no other fire can at all purge the soul from sin, in whole or in part, but the fire of God's love, infused by the *Spirit*; for sin is not matter that might be burned away by fire. Reader, knowest thou not that the Holy Ghost saith, Against the true believer, that has the fruits of the Spirit, is *NO law*, and 1 John i. 7. "The blood of Jesus Christ, cleanseth from ALL sin;" yes, from all, or from none. Now be wise, and believe the Holy Ghost before the inventions of men.—

"Good fruits prove that the tree is made good; but never boast of the tree till the good fruit appear. Never talk of the goodness of your religion till it is evident you are no longer a sinner, but a holy man; for bad fruit proves a bad tree, and God saith, 'every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire,' Matt. vii. 15. Any other way of salvation, but this change of heart and life, by the Spirit, thro' Christ, will surely let you down to hell; therefore be warned. In former times all that were warned, and took it, and repented, found mercy; but they that persisted were damned, and so it will be for ever. LOT warned Sodom and Gomorrah to quit their sins,—they laughed at him, but now they are bearing the vengeance of eternal fire. JESUS CHRIST himself warned Jerusalem, but the priests and people liking their own way better than his, stigmatised him, called him a deceiver, and crucified him. But see their end. And will any still venture to despise and neglect these truths, harden his heart, and sin on? If so, a day and time is at hand, is fast approaching, when the Lord of Hosts, who hates (not *names* but) all sin, will come at thee and open a scene, a dreadful scene to thee, that will vex thee for ever.—Not the Red Sea, that swallowed stiffnecked Pharaoh, but a sea of fire will open to receive thee; and Christ, *the Truth*, whom, [with all his Apostles and servants,] you now resist, is a stone that will fall upon thee, and prevail against thee, and grind thee to powder, JONAH the prophet, by the command of God, warned Nineveh; they took it, they repented with fasting, weeping, and cries for mercy; God heard their prayer, and spared them. Go thou, (and be not hindered by men or devils, fear or

(f) Acts ii. 3, He will purge them. Isa. iv. 4, *by the Spirit of Burning*. See also the hymn in Chaloner's Manual speaking of the fire of the Spirit to destroy sin.

shame, flattery or persecution,) and do likewise, and he, thro' Christ, will spare thee, and pour his Spirit upon thee, and will blot out the cloud of thy sins from before him. Then thou shalt feel the terror and sting of death taken away, and thyself made an heir of eternal glory. Now thou art warned, if thou take it, well; if not, thou shalt remember it, and thy stubbornness with inexpressible sorrow thro' all the ages of eternity.

I am thy friend, G. O. PHILANTHROPOS."

The Tract referred to, page 67, which the Missionaries were distributing in November last, termed *A Friendly Warning*, contains sentiments perfectly similar to the above, of which the following are a specimen.

"OPEN Sinners are in a state of (what the Catholics call Mortal, and Protestants Deadly) Sin, under the curse of God; they have not the Spirit of Christ—all must allow that; therefore, whether they be teachers or hearers, "they are none of his;" God disregards all their duties and prayers because they persist in sin: see Psal. lxvi. 18. Isa. i. 15. *When ye spread forth your hands, I will bide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear.* Prov. xxviii. 9. *He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination.* Sin, or rebellion against God, is a reproach to any people, but in a PASTOR, it is awfully scandalous, yea, it is horrible! God hates the services of all such. Mal. ii. 1. 2. Psal. l. 16.

"Will not any one of common sense allow that a congregation, or church, formed of such characters as above, is rather a congregation of Satan, than the holy, pure spouse of CHRIST. When these thirty classes, and such like, are taken out of every congregation, (as at the last day they shall be,) how few will then remain! Alas! alas! how is the world deceived and ruined!

"O Sinner! deceive thyself no longer, but believe the truth of thy danger, and tremble at thy state; for as the tree falls so it lies; all the *performances of men* cannot keep any sinner out of perdition, unless with his own heart he be contrite and believe in Christ, so as to receive the pardoning love of God.—*For there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby they must be saved, but that of Jesus Christ, Acts iv. 12. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus, 1 Cor. iii. 11.* Christ alone can save the sinner, if he truly repent and believe. Yourselves may know all other things are refuges of lies. Do not your own Clergy tell you that the Sacraments, even the very Eucharist, or Lord's Supper, is no profit to you or them, but rather great hurt, unless the grace of true contrition, and faith in Christ, be in the heart of the receiver beforehand, and a holy life follow after? See the Catechisms of the Catholic Bishops, Reilly on the Eucharist, Lesson 5. Butler's Lesson 34."

Printed at the Conference-Office, North-Green: G. SPOW, Agent.

THE LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**A** 001 032 099 2

