

---

AN EXTRACT

FROM

“ A SHORT VIEW OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN  
THE MORAVIAN BRETHERN, (SO CALLED,)  
AND THE REV. MR. JOHN AND CHARLES WESLEY.”

---

TO THE READER.

As those who are under the direction of Count Zinzendorf (vulgarly called Moravian Brethren) are the most plausible, and therefore far the most dangerous, of all the Antinomians now in England, I first endeavour to guard such as are simple of heart against being taken by those cunning hunters.

---

THE difference between the Moravian doctrine and ours (in this respect) lies here :—

They believe and teach,—

“ 1. That Christ has done all which was necessary for the salvation of all mankind.

“ 2. That, consequently, we are to do nothing, as necessary to salvation, but simply to believe in him.

“ 3. That there is but one duty now, but one command, viz., to believe in Christ.

“ 4. That Christ has taken away all other commands and duties, having wholly ‘abolished the law;’ that a believer is

therefore 'free from the law,' is not obliged thereby to do or omit anything; it being inconsistent with his liberty to do anything as commanded.

"5. That we are sanctified wholly the moment we are justified, and are neither more nor less holy to the day of our death; entire sanctification, and entire justification, being in one and the same instant.

"6. That a believer is never sanctified or holy in himself, but in Christ only; he has no holiness in himself at all, all his holiness being imputed, not inherent.

"7. That if a man regards prayer, or searching the Scriptures, or communicating, as matter of duty; if he judges himself obliged to do these things, or is troubled when he does them not; he is in bondage; he has no faith at all, but is seeking salvation by the works of the law."

We believe that the first of these propositions is ambiguous, and all the rest utterly false.

"1. Christ has done all that was necessary for the salvation of all mankind."

This is ambiguous. Christ has not done all which was necessary for the absolute salvation of all mankind. For notwithstanding all that Christ has done, he that believeth not shall be damned. But he has done all which was necessary for the conditional salvation of all mankind; that is, if they believe; for through his merits all that believe to the end, with the faith that worketh by love, shall be saved.

"2. We are to do nothing as necessary to salvation, but simply to believe in Him."

If we allow the Count's definition of faith, namely, "the historical knowledge of this truth, that Christ has been a man and suffered death for us," (*Sixteen Discourses*, p. 57,) then is this proposition directly subversive of the whole revelation of Jesus Christ.

"3. There is but one duty now, but one command, viz., to believe in Christ."

Almost every page in the New Testament proves the falsehood of this assertion.

"4. Christ has taken away all other commands and duties, having wholly abolished the law."

How absolutely contrary is this to his own solemn declaration!—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the Prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil

One jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till heaven and earth pass."

"Therefore a believer is free from the law." That he is "free from the curse of the law," we know; and that he is "free from the law," or power, "of sin and death:" But where is it written that he is free from the law of God?

"He is not obliged thereby to do or omit anything, it being inconsistent with his liberty to do anything as commanded."

So your liberty is a liberty to disobey God; whereas ours is a liberty to obey him in all things: So grossly, while we "establish the law," do you "make void the law through faith!"

"5. We are sanctified wholly the moment we are justified, and are neither more nor less holy to the day of our death; entire sanctification and entire justification being in one and the same instant."

Just the contrary appears both from the tenor of God's word, and the experience of his children.

"6. A believer is never sanctified or holy in himself, but in Christ only. He has no holiness in himself at all; all his holiness being imputed, not inherent."

Scripture holiness is the image of God; the mind which was in Christ; the love of God and man; lowliness, gentleness, temperance, patience, chastity. And do you coolly affirm, that this is only imputed to a believer, and that he has none at all of this holiness in him? Is temperance imputed only to him that is a drunkard still; or chastity, to her that goes on in whoredom? Nay, but a believer is really chaste and temperate. And if so, he is thus far holy in himself.

Does a believer love God, or does he not? If he does, he has the love of God in him. Is he lowly, or meek, or patient at all? If he is, he has these tempers in himself; and if he has them not in himself, he is not lowly, or meek, or patient. You cannot therefore deny, that every believer has holiness in, though not from, himself; else you deny, that he is holy at all; and if so, he cannot see the Lord.

And indeed, if holiness in general be the mind which was in Christ, what can any one possibly mean by, "A believer is not holy in himself, but in Christ only? that the mind which was in Christ is in a believer also; but it is in Him,—not in himself, but in Christ!" What a heap of palpable self-contradiction, what senseless jargon, is this!

"7. If a man regards prayer, or searching the Scriptures,

or communicating, as matter of duty ; if he judges himself obliged to do these things, or is troubled when he does them not, he is 'in bondage,' he has no faith at all, but is seeking salvation by the works of the law."

Thus obedience with you is a proof of unbelief, and disobedience a proof of faith ! What is it, to put darkness for light, and light for darkness, if this is not ?

