

---

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>



19  
LOGICA WESLEIENSIS:

OR, THE 4136 / 3

FARRAGO Double Distilled.

WITH AN

HEROIC POEM

IN PRAISE OF

Mr JOHN WESLEY.

---

The Church of England is your Mother to her small comfort,  
She hath borne you and repented! *Bishop HALL.*

Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel, *GEN. XLIX. 4.*

Thy own mouth condemneth thee, and not I. Yea, thy  
own lips testify against thee! *JOB XV. 6.*

Ridiculous error is to be turned out of the temple of truth,  
not only with scriptural argument, which is *the sword of  
the Spirit*, but also with mild irony, which is a proper  
scourge for a glaring and obstinate mistake.

LOGICA GENEVENSIENSIS, p. 144. note.

---

By RICHARD HILL ESQUIRE.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for E. and C. DILLY, in the Poultry;  
J. MATTHEWS, near Hungerford-market, in the Strand;  
And W. HARRIS, N<sup>o</sup> 70, in St Paul's Church-yard.

M DCC LXXIII.

[ Price One Shilling. ]




75

---

---

## LOGICA WESLEIENSIS, &c.

NOTHING is more common than to hear the drunkard affirm that every one is overtaken but himself; he cannot see plainly, he cannot speak distinctly, his senses are all confused and muddled, and therefore, for want of the proper exertion of his own organs and faculties, he is apt to imagine that every object around him is disordered and turned out of its due course; never suspecting that the real cause of all this arises from the fumes of his own heated imagination.—Just so it is with the unhappy man who is intoxicated with passion; he sees every thing with a jaundiced eye; and because he himself is transported with pride, envy, rage, &c. &c. instead of blaming his own evil tempers, he is sure to lay all the fault upon whatsoever was the innocent cause of stirring up those tempers in his heart, or of making them fume out through the lips or pen.

Poor Mr Wesley has, during the course of near forty years, been publishing various tracts and volumes in divinity, some written by himself, some by others, all either prefaced, abridged, or strongly recommended by Mr Wesley, as “*all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God (A),*” and *as expressing his real sentiments in a much better manner than he was able to do himself (B)*. These publications, upon being compared one with another, unfortunately all fall together by the ears; insomuch that out of them the author of *Pietas Oxoniensis* collects upwards of one hundred gross contradictions, and begs Mr Wesley would inform the world by what art they are reconcilable.—At this the sweetness of Mr Wesley’s temper is much more ruffled than is consistent with his own character of an *adult believer*, i. e.

B

one

---

(A) Preface to Christian Library.

(B) Preface to Goodwin against Imputed Righteousness.

one who is *perfected in love* (C); and he begins to charge, prime, cock, and fire at Calvinism without mercy; but alas! all his vollies are like what issues from the Park guns when the King goes to the House; there is paper, smoke, and fire in plenty; but if you can bear the stench, (which indeed is very nauseous) you may walk before the mouths of those cannons without the least fear of being wounded; and whosoever has had courage to approach the heaviest pieces of artillery which have been *cast* at the *Foundery near Moorfields*, must long ago have perceived that being composed of no better metal than what formed the toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image, they are utterly unfit to do any material execution in the day of battle. Mr Wesley is however resolved to put them to the *proof*; and one of them is just gone off with a loud explosion.

Now I would have thee to know, gentle reader, that as the King christens all his men of war before he sends them out against the French, so Mr Wesley gives names to all his cannons or pop-guns' (call them which thou wilt) before

---

(C) The reader is desired to take Mr Wesley's own description of these Nonparails. "They are freed from that great root of sin and bitterness, *Pride*. They are freed from *Self-will*, as desiring nothing, no not for one moment (for perfect love casteth out all desire) but the holy and perfect will of God, &c.

"They are freed from *evil thoughts*; so that they cannot enter into them, no not for one instant: aforesime when an evil thought came in, they looked up and it vanished away; but now it does not come in, there being no room for this in a soul which is full of God.

"They are freed from *wanderings in prayer*. Whensoever they pour out their hearts in a more immediate manner before God, they have no thought of any thing past, or absent, or to come, but of God alone; to whom their whole souls flow in one even stream, and in whom they are swallowed up: in times past they had wandering thoughts darted in, which yet fled away like smoke, but now the smoke does not rise at all."

*Mr Wesley's Preface to 3<sup>d</sup> Part of Hymns and Sacred Poems.*  
 Again. "Our blessed Lord had no evil or sinful thoughts, nor indeed was capable of having any; and even hence it follows, that neither have *real Christians*; therefore if he was free from evil or sinful thoughts, so are they likewise."

*Mr J. Wesley's Sermon on Phil. iii. 12.*  
 In other words; "no man is a *real christian* (consequently not a believer) who has one sinful thought." How differs this

fore they are judged fit for his service against the Calvinists, and therefore he has in his wisdom thought proper to distinguish the gun under consideration, with the appellation of "some Remarks on Mr Hill's (D) Review of all the doctrines taught by Mr John Wesley." Well, various are the opinions concerning this gun. Men of sense shake their heads, and say it is quite unfit for duty; men of grace compassionate the *caster* of it; and men of pleasantry laugh heartily at it; but some good old women, who constantly attend at the Foundery, speak very highly of it.— Let us however examine a little further, as well into the spirit, as into the matter of *the Remarks* in question.

With regard to the former, Mr Wesley would have us to know that the piece is written in much *love*. But what *love*? I suppose he must mean *love* to his own favorite tenets; *love* to his own contradictions and inconsistencies; *love* of scolding, *love* of abuse, &c. &c. for it would put the reader to his wit's end, to find out any other sort of *love* throughout Mr Wesley's whole performance, as the following loving expressions, all collected out of it; and

B 2

either

---

this from that expression of Mr Charles Wesley, *While one evil thought can rise, I am not born again?* Yet Mr John disclaims this expression, and says, (Remarks, p. 81.) "My Brother said so once: I never did; but he took the words, *born again*, in too high a sense." Pray, Sir, in what sense then did you take the words when you said that "if Christ had no evil thoughts, neither have real christians?" and that "they are no more capable of having a sinful thought than their blessed Lord himself was?" Do you, or do you not recant this extract from your own sermon? If you do, we have an additional proof of the variableness of Mr Wesley's religious sentiments. If you do not, why do you give up your Brother for saying *while one evil thought can rise, I am not born again?* You affirm, that a real christian has not an evil thought. Mr Charles affirms, *he that is born again has not an evil thought.* Where is the difference?

But whatever be the difference between Mr John and Mr Charles Wesley, herein plainly consists the difference between Mr John and St Paul (Rom. vii.) in their ideas of *adult christians*. Mr John Wesley believes that the higher they advance in spirituals, the less they feel of the evil of their own hearts: St Paul is of opinion, that in proportion as they increase in light and self-knowledge, they discern more of their hidden corruptions, and are more humbled on that account.

(D) As Mr Hill did not choose to prefix his name to that Review, it argued no great proof of Mr Wesley's *politeness*, to address him in the personal manner he has done.

either directly or indirectly levelled at Mr Hill, sufficiently evince.

Mr Hill is a bigot in grain—a blunderer—the cat's-paw of a party—He is under no restraint of good nature, decency, or good manners—He has no regard either to mercy or truth—He says all manner of evil falsely—He pours out a flood of calumny, and bears false witness—He is a sour, morose, spiteful, touchy man—yea, a bear—His sentiments are diabolical—He does evil that good may come—As a writer his name is wormwood—He is proud—haughty—supercilious—violent—impetuous—bitter of spirit—full of implacable hatred—Disdaining his opponents, as unworthy to be set with the dogs of his flock!—One of the most cruel, inhuman slanderers that ever set pen to paper—Whose whole design is to blacken—and who has abundantly poured out foul, poisonous water. He is unworthy the name either of the Christian or of the Gentleman, insomuch that Mr Wesley is amazed that Mr Hill should lay claim to either of these titles (E); therefore he expects no more mercy from him than from a mad dog, and has just as much hope of softening inexorable Pluto, king of shades (alias the Prince of the Devils) as of softening Mr Hill's spirit.

Thank you, my dear, meek, humble, loving Mr Wesley. But if this be the language of adult believers, of Fathers in Christ; I think the fewer the better; and cannot doubt but you will soon, by some amazing art of *Logica Westiensis*, find an expedient to teach us how to fight and to pull caps in love. However you must excuse me, if I inform you nearly what a friend of yours said to me upon reading your late *Remarks*. "I wish, said he, that Mr Wesley had carefully perused his own *primitive physic* before he had taken

---

(E) Mr Wesley (p. 5.) has made the following false quotation from my Review, and marked it with commas as if it were my own, though I never used any such expression with regard to myself in my whole life. His words are these, "although I have treated you (says Mr Hill) with all the politeness of a gentleman and the humility of a Christian." When, where, or upon what occasion, have I paid myself this fulsome compliment? point out the book, the page, the line. Surely as a writer I ought to leave this judgment to others; and think that any such vaunting words would come with almost as ill a grace from me in my own behalf, as they would from any Clergyman, who should either thro' his own, or another's pen, pronounce himself to be the GREATEST MINISTER IN THE WORLD.

“ taken up the pen, and had swallowed two or three cooling doses of the medicines there prescribed, this might have prevented the poor man from writing in so much wrath.”

BUT now for *the matter* of this performance.

Mr Wesley says “ it would puzzle any one to find out wherein Mr Hill has given any answer to Mr Fletcher’s *second check*, except in the title page.”

I dare say Mr Wesley wishes he could believe this were the case; but whether the answer be *full and particular* or not, it is certain Mr Wesley knows not how to get over it. However he attempts to prejudice the reader by bringing a list of quotations from the *Review*; which quotations, (though not very exact ones) it cannot be denied, bear very hard on Mr Wesley and Mr Fletcher. But how can Mr Hill help that? Has he not proved his assertions? For instance, Mr Hill affirms, that Mr Fletcher has introduced some false quotations, and that Mr Wesley has long thought forgeries of this kind to be no crime. In proof of this he appeals to the instances alledged by Mr Hervey and Mr Toplady. Hereupon Mr Wesley becomes exceedingly angry, (though he cannot gainsay the fact) and though he himself assumes the liberty of addressing a very great Dignitary in the Church, with “ *it is well for you that forging quotations is not felony* (F).”

Again; Mr Fletcher affirms that all the protestant churches, the old Calvinist ministers, and puritan divines, are on the side of the Minutes. Mr Hill makes it appear as clear as the sun, that this is a point-blank falsehood as ever was written; does he not then give it a very gentle name by calling it a *misrepresentation*?

Once more. Mr Fletcher in the most sarcastic manner represents all the celebrated ministers of the age, who do not agree with the Minutes, as so many rank Antinomians avowed, deliberate, *overthrowers* of the doctrine of holiness (G), and pleaders for sin. This Mr Hill avers to be an heavy slander and a gross calumny; whereas Mr Wesley accounts it all *meekness, gentleness, mild irony, and sweet words* (H); and falls foul upon Mr Hill only for attempting to wipe off a little of that dirt with which some of his most worthy friends have been so unmercifully bespattered by *Swiss plainness* and *Helvetic bluntness*.

(F) Review of Mr Wesley’s doctrines, 2d edit. p. 103.

(G) Third Check, p. 38.

(H) Remarks, p. 4.



But Mr Hill desires to say as little as may be of Mr Fletcher in this piece, since it is his sincere wish to be upon amicable terms with him; though till he acknowledge the great injustice of his late accusations, it is hardly possible there should be that cordial harmony between him and several of his religious friends which there used to be.

But although Mr Wesley is now come to the pious resolution of waging continual war with the Calvinists, yet he gives us to understand, that till the present juncture he and his brother have always *humbled themselves to these men, in hopes of softening their spirits by tenderness*, and thereby of living in peace and friendship with them: and to demonstrate what pains these gentlemen have been at in order to effect this benign purpose, we need only have recourse to their joint publications, in which all the Calvinist ministers, yea all who deny *sinless perfection*, have been held forth to the world for years together under the *tender, living appellations of the Devil's factors, — Satan's synagogue, — children of the old roaring hellish murderer, who believe his lie; — advocates for sin, — witnesses for the Father of lies, — blasphemers, — satan-sent preachers, &c. &c. &c.*

But if these are the overflowings of Messrs J. and C. Wesley's hearts, whilst they are humbling themselves, and courting the friendship of their Calvinistic brethren by a *well-meant tenderness*, what are we not now to expect from their wrath? *If these things be done in the green tree, what will they do in the dry?* Truly if either I, or any others of that party, whereof I am the cat's-paw, had ever stooped to the use of such scurrilous billingsgate language, as the above towards Mr Wesley, I might think that gentleman somewhat more justifiable than I do at present, in pronouncing himself, through a pamphlet of which he had the revival, to be *the greatest minister in the world*, in order to counterbalance such contumelious expressions. But as Mr Wesley gives this reason (p. 25.) for trumpeting forth his own praises in the *second check*, I must beg to put him in mind, that this same *second check* had not only received the sanction of his *Imprimatur*, but was actually published several months before Mr Hill's *Review* saw the light; and therefore it was not possible that any thing contained in that *Review* could induce Mr Wesley to send forth so many fulsome *encomiums* upon himself, unless we are to suppose that the streams of this controversy ran backwards, and that

that the muddled waters of the *second check* had received their defilement from a cause which had then no existence. So that the poor *Review* may well adopt the language of the lamb in the fable, and may truly say that “ *it never could have offended Mr Wesley by any such CONTUMELIOUS EXPRESSIONS, as it was not then born.*”

Now then as the reason Mr Wesley has already given for offering so many *sacrifices to his own drag*, is plainly proved to be no reason at all, I hope he will be pleased to assign some other cause why he did not strike all those high-flown compliments relative to himself out of Mr Fletcher's book. It is certain he must either believe them to be true or false. If the latter, nothing should have prevailed upon him to let them stand; if the former, then how widely does Mr Wesley differ from St Paul in his ideas of himself. That chosen vessel believed *himself to be the chief of sinners, and the least of all saints.* Mr Wesley thinks himself to be *the greatest minister in the world, and the most venerable Ambassador of Christ.*

I must now take a wide stride to the last paragraph of your book, from whence one would have imagined that I had not only made a particular confession of my faith to you, but that there had been an uncommon intimacy between us; an honor which I have not the most distant pretensions to lay claim to, never having seen you above four or five times in my whole life. Once in the pulpit at West-street Chapel; once at a friend's house; and once or twice at my request, you were so kind as to drink a *forbidden dish of tea* with me, when I lodged in Vine-street, St James's, as I wanted to speak to you concerning a poor man in your connections. But how you could at that period suppose me to be an Arminian, is most wonderful. For besides that we did not exchange a word upon the doctrines in dispute between Calvinists and Arminians, I do not know that my sentiments at that time, varied an hair's breadth from what they do present, unless upon the point of Mr Wesley's inconsistency with himself, I not having then read so many of his publications as I have since. If therefore Mr Wesley did at that time discover in me any of those christian graces, for which he is pleased to pass so great a compliment upon me, I desire to attribute the praise of them wholly to those humbling views I had of myself as a sinner saved from first to last by sovereign electing love, whose only language ought ever to be that of Mr Charles Wesley prefaced by Mr John.

Why hast thou to thy people join'd  
Me, the vilest of mankind,  
In cordial charity ?

Why hast thou heard the Spirit's groans,  
Intreating in thy chosen ones,  
For me, O Lord; for me ?

BUT you say, I cannot prove the facts I have alledged against some professors of sinless perfection. Indeed, Sir, I can. And *that* without the testimony of any Renegade Methodists who court the world by slandering their brethren; and the first time I have the pleasure of seeing Mr F——r, I will (if he desires it) tell him all the particulars relative to these persons, with their names and places of abode; but as most of them are still alive (and whilst there is life there is hope) nothing shall prevail upon me to expose them to public view. Nevertheless, to shew you that I could still produce many more examples of the like sort, I have transcribed the following extract from a Letter lately received from a religious friend at W——r. “ If you  
“ chuse to produce names, there are two or three shock-  
“ ing instances of bad behaviour among the professors of  
“ perfection here, which I can send you an account of,  
“ and you may use my name to prove the truth of them,  
“ if needful.” But

*Non tali auxilio.*

And as I only introduced the instances *I have* brought, in order to convince my friend Mr Fletcher of the impropriety of his own conduct in this respect, if I live to publish another edition of the Review, they shall all be entirely omitted, and the HONESTY of personal vilification shall be left to the sole pen of Mr Wesley. However, with regard to the fact of the perfect Brother being denied the sacrament by the Rev. Mr M——d, on account of his having been caught in bed with a woman, and that he said he went to her to try whether all evil desire was taken away; it is certain that Mr M——d (himself) did affirm this to be true. Though I must do the poor woman the justice to say, that she leaped out of bed in order to avoid the experiment, ran down stairs, and locked herself up in the coal-hole, to which place the perfect Mr W——n pursued her, but without effect, for she absolutely refused to hearken to his solicitations; perhaps not being able to comprehend with him the full meaning of that text,

To

*To the pure all things are pure.* And as to that preacher of perfection who declared that as the Holy Ghost had descended on the Apostles in a visible manner on the day of Pentecost, in like manner he descended on all that were converted; the gentleman from whom I had the relation, has told me since the publication of your Remarks, that he will very willingly take his oath in your presence, that he heard him speak words to that effect. And upon his remonstrating with him, and saying, "Surely you don't mean that the Holy Ghost now comes with a mighty rushing wind, or appears in a visible form." He replied, with no small warmth, "*If you deny this, Sir, you blaspheme against the Holy Ghost.*"

You cannot deny (because I have eye and ear-witness of the fact) that when you administered the sacrament to the perfect society in West-Street Chapel, the expressions quoted in *the Review*, 2d edit. p. 64. were mentioned; and that some of the congregation then assembled, did declare that they had heard voices telling them, *they were all holiness to the Lord*, with several other delusive absurdities; and yet that you thought these persons very exalted christians, we may suppose by your admitting them to the Lord's table, at which time you left the confession of sin out of the communion service; the reason of which omission was (as I presumed) because you thought they had no sin to confess: however, you now give us another reason for it (*viz.*) that you left it out *to save time*. But I have no idea of any man's *saving time*, but in order to devote that time to some more useful purpose; and yet how can a poor sinner employ himself better than in the confession of his sins? Are you not aware, Sir, that by flying to this mean pretext, you are again throwing open the door to licentiousness; and letting *Antinomianism come in full tide upon the church?* and that the very same excuse may be urged by every poor careless sinner upon earth, as a plea for his living without private prayer? "I do not pray *in order that I may save time.*" "I do not confess my sins for the same reason." If therefore for the future you should chance to be hurried on such an occasion, let me entreat you to save as much time as you please by curbing the enthusiastic reveries of those who see visions and hear lying voices, telling them *they are all holiness to the Lord*; but never think that time unreasonably spent in which a sinner is humbling his soul before God, in penitential confession of his iniquities.

But

But you ask (p. 51.) "Is this any objection against the existence of that (*perfect*) love which they professed? nay, and you verily believe, once enjoyed, though they were afterwards moved from their steadfastness?" Good Sir, can you not discharge a single squib at the Calvinists, without firing away at yourself? will you never avoid contradictions? it is but a few pages before that you tell us that *all that are perfected in love shall infallibly persevere*; and here you affirm, that many of those very persons whom you yourself allow to have been perfected in love, are *moved from their steadfastness*, and fallen from grace.

You ask again (p. 41.) "Is that scurrilous hotch-potch, Mr Hill calls a *Farrago*, true or false?" Though the question seems to be put in some degree of wrath, I will endeavour to answer it in much calmness: and therefore I reply, that if Mr Wesley may be credited, it is all as true as the gospel; part of it being taken out of his own Christian library, in the preface to which he tells us, that the contents are *all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God*. Part out of his extract from John Goodwin's Treatise on Justification, which he informs us, in his recommendation prefixed to the work, is meant as an answer to Mr Hervey, that it expresses his sentiments better than he could do himself, and that he believes it to contain *the real scripture doctrine*.—Part out of Baxter's Aphorisms, published by Mr Wesley, with a preface in praise of the work.—But the greatest part out of his own hymns, sermons and other writings. If therefore I believe the *Farrago* to be *false*, I must believe Mr Wesley to be a false teacher, since every single word of it is his own, either by birth or by adoption.—If I believe it true, in that case I only look upon Mr Wesley to be a very-self contradictory inconsistent divine, therefore of two evils I would choose the least: yet even here I am reduced to a sort of nonplus, since if one column of the *Farrago* be *true*, the other of necessity must be false. But if the whole be a *scurrilous hotch-potch*, (as Mr Wesley most justly terms it,) he knows full well who must needs be the *scurrilous hotch-potcher*, and therefore that question of Mr Wesley, *will he defend or retract it?* may well enough be put to himself; but it is just the same to me whether it be defended or retracted.

BUT I find it just as easy to catch an eel by the tail, as to lay hold of Mr Wesley for one single moment. Oh! what quirks, quibbles, and evasions does this gentleman descend to, in order to shift off his own inconsistencies; and how

how amazing must his skill be, when out of more than one hundred point-blank contradictions which he has published, he can reduce them all to one, by affirming that he is not answerable for any thing which is extracted from the Christian library, from Goodwin, Baxter, nor from his brother Mr Charles Wesley. But all I desire is, that the reader will again turn to the Farrago, where in spite of Mr Wesley's wonderful reconciling art, he will find that a principal part of the gross contradictions there exhibited, are collected out of his own *original works*: and as to the rest, he no otherwise attempts to get over them, but at the expence of giving up his brother Charles, Mr Fletcher, his own Christian library, and what he himself has published, prefaced, and recommended with his own name prefixed; as so many NOTHINGS.—Add to this, that the *Declaration* itself, which was signed at the *Conference*, by Mr Wesley and fifty-three of his preachers, is nearly in the same predicament; as appears by what Mr Wesley says (p. 41.) that *he does not know but it would have been better not to have signed that paper at all.* In the first place then the minutes are esteemed the standard of orthodoxy by Mr Wesley, at the conference of 1770. In the year 1771, he signs a *declaration*, acknowledging that these minutes are *unguarded*.—In the year 1772, he publishes a book in which he tells us, *he does not know but it would have been better not to have signed that paper at all.*—What may be his opinion of the matter in the close of the year 1773, or in 1774, cannot yet appear; however, this is certain, that he is allotting an hard task to Mr Fletcher, who is defending him through all his various revolutions of sentiment; and hence it is, that each defence only makes poor Mr Wesley appear more and more inconsistent. For instance, Mr Wesley publicly declares the minutes to be *unguarded*; Mr Fletcher vindicates them in every tittle, and attempts to reconcile the *minutes* and *declaration* together. Presently after this, Mr Wesley himself appears on the field of battle, and after Mr Fletcher had spent so many laborious hours in trying to patch up some terms of harmony between the *minutes* and *declaration*, he (this same Mr Wesley) by one unfortunate stroke of the pen, sets them once more at loggerheads; for he tells us, with great composure, that “*he does not know but it would have been better not to have signed the declaration at all;*” clearly intimating, that by such a step, he has fixed a different sense upon the minutes from what they originally bore; & se where could have been the harm  
of

of signing the declaration, if, according to Mr Fletcher, it entirely agreed with the minutes ?

Oh how changeable and transitory are all things here below ! one day the minutes and declaration are both vindicated. Another day the former are given up as *unguarded*, and the latter *had better not have been signed*. A third day the minutes are *guarded enough*, and probably a fourth may make it manifest that the declaration is better signed than not.

A like piece of instability appears in Mr Wesley, relative to the doctrines of the Mystics. *These*, he tells us in his preface to the hymns and sacred poems, *he had once in great veneration, as the best explainers of the gospel of Christ ;* but that he is now convinced that *he therein greatly erred, not knowing the scriptures, neither the power of God (I)*. He then tells us that he apprehends the mystic writers to lay *another foundation*, by establishing *our own inward righteousness*, and placing the ground of our acceptance in *our selves*. And because (says he) *this is an error which many serious minds [Mr Wesley and Mr Fletcher among the rest] are sooner or later exposed to*, he believes himself *indispensibly obliged, in the presence of God, and angels and men, to declare that he apprehends those writers (the mystics) do not teach the truth as it is in Jesus ;* yea, that he looks upon them as *one great antichrist*, and believes their doctrine to be *poisonous*,

But in his Remarks (p. 28.) he tells us, he retracts this (" that the mystic writers are one great antichrist ") as *far too strong ;* " but observe," says he, " I never contradicted it till now." Nay, he acquiesces in that declaration of Mr Fletcher, that Solomon is one of *the chief of mystics (K)*. And from his meditations in the Norwich coach (a dreadful journey) we may well conclude, that he is now come so far back to the starting post, that he esteems these same mystics, whom he lately looked upon as *one great antichrist*, and whose *poisonous doctrine laid another foundation*, to be very exalted christians.

Again.

---

(I) How agrees this with what Mr Wesley says in his Remarks (p. 89.) " That he never was in the way of mysticism at all ? "

(K) Mr Wesley says (p. 28.) that he does not acquiesce in Mr Fletcher's affirmation, that *Solomon is the chief of mystics*. Why then did Mr Wesley let such an expression stand, when he had the correction of Mr Fletcher's book ? Is not Mr Wesley here as much against Mr Fletcher, as at other times he is against himself ?

Again. No less than four times since the beginning of the year 1738, has Mr Wesley varied in his opinion whether justification by faith alone is, or is not *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*, the doctrine by which a church stands or falls. In his sermon on Eph. xi. 5. p. 11. speaking expressly on the doctrine of *salvation by faith*, he calls it *the strong rock and foundation of the christian religion*. And in his discourse on Jer. xxiii. 6. preached in West Street Chapel, Nov. 24, 1765, he has these words. " This is " his name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord our righteousness*. A truth this which enters deep into the nature of christianity, and in a manner supports the whole frame of it: of this undoubtedly may be affirmed, what Luther affirms of a truth clearly connected with it, is, *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*; the christian church stands or falls with it. It is certainly the pillar and ground of that faith, OF WHICH ALONE COMETH SALVATION (L)." How many times he changed his sentiments relative to this point, till he took his unfortunate journey in the Norwich coach [*nunquam minus solus quam cum solus*] does not appear: however, it is clear that whilst the wheels of the machine were performing their revolutions towards that city, the gentleman within experienced a very extraordinary revolution in his religious conceptions; for

---

(L.) The reader is desired to take notice, that not only in the passage quoted, but throughout all the sermon, Mr Wesley shews the close connection there is between *justification by faith alone*, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness. For he tells us expressly in that sermon (p. 11.) that " the thing which admits of no dispute among reasonable men is this. To all believers the righteousness of Christ is imputed; to unbelievers it is not. But when (continues Mr Wesley) is it imputed? when they believe. In that very hour the righteousness of Christ is theirs. It is imputed to every one that believes, as soon as he believes; faith and the righteousness of Christ are inseparable; for if he believes according to scripture, he believes in the righteousness of Christ. There is no true faith, that is, justifying faith, which hath not the righteousness of Christ for its object." Who would have thought that after Mr Wesley had taken all these pains to shew the inseparable connection between justification by faith alone, and justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ, he should not only take the same pains to set them at variance, but absolutely renounce them both. And yet this gentleman tells us, he is a thorough Calvinist in the point of justification; and that he has never altered his opinion on that head for these eight and twenty years.



for he then began to think it high time to reject that very doctrine which he had affirmed in both his sermons to be *the strong rock or foundation of the christian religion*, and by which alone came salvation; as *ampullas et sesquipedalia verba*, *high-flown bombast nonsense*. But if it was rejected in the Norwich coach, it was certainly adopted again when he revised Mr Fletcher's *third check*; as manifestly appears by p. 101 of that *check*, where he allows justification by faith to be a "*fundamental protestant doctrine; the very doctrine which Luther called articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae.*" Nevertheless if it was then adopted, it is once more rejected in *the Remarks* p. 24, where, in order to reconcile a flat contradiction, we have a most wonderful distinction between justification by *faith*, and justification by *trusting in the merits of Christ*; as if faith could exist without trusting in Christ; or contrariwise, as if there could be a trusting in Christ without faith.---What then remains but that the next, that is to say, the fifth time Mr Wesley alters his opinion on the doctrine in question, he will come back to the principles of his two sermons before-mentioned, and that justification by faith alone, shall once more be proclaimed by him to be *artculus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*, or, *the strong rock and foundation of the christian religion*.

However, as Mr Wesley still insists upon it that he never contradicted himself *but once*, viz. in the interpretation of that text, *we grow being burdened* (though, by the bye, he owns to another plump contradiction, p. 28; concerning the mystics) I must beg leave to give *the Farrago* a short review, as also to examine whether or no we have not a few more contradictions to produce from some other parts of his own writings; but before I do this, I must observe that there is very great evasion in Mr Wesley, saying, that though he believes *every tract to be true*, yet he will not be answerable for *every sentence*, or *expression* in the Christian library; whereas the matter by no means rests upon a *few sentences or expressions*, but upon whole treatises for many pages together, which are diametrically opposite to the present tenets of Mr Wesley (unless, indeed, he has changed them again since his last publication) particularly the pieces of Doctor Sibbs, Doctor Preston, Bishop Beveridge, and Doctor Owen on indwelling sin. But supposing this plea could be admitted for the rejection of such parts of the Christian library as Mr Wesley thinks proper, it will avail nothing for his setting aside what is

quoted

quoted from *Goodwin on justification*, every word of which was revised and corrected by himself; and not only so, but sent abroad into the world with this testimony under his own hand, that he believes it to be *real scripture-doctrine*; and that he himself *could not have expressed his sentiments better than the author of the Treatise has already done it for him*: and therefore I say again, that his writing **NOTHING, NOTHING, NOTHING**, against these extracts, only proves that, he has **NOTHING, NOTHING, NOTHING** to say; and that he is **NOTHING, NOTHING, NOTHING** but contradictions from beginning to end.

But not less futile and trifling is the distinction he makes, p. 15. concerning his approbation of the *sense* of what he has published and recommended from John Goodwin and Richard Baxter, but not of the *language* (M). Now what does Mr Wesley mean here by the word *language*. I suppose he must mean the *style* and *manner*; or else the *matter* or *doctrine*; these being all the parts of every book. Concerning the former, I have no dispute with him: whether the style and manner be stiff or easy, plain or flowery, has never once been brought on the carpet. No alternative therefore remains, but that when Mr Wesley says he disapproves of the *language* or *expression*, he disapproves of the *sense, matter or doctrine*. If he denies this, to what will he fly to? Is he not pinned down by his own concessions? For what is the use of *language* or *expression* in writing, but to convey the *sense* of the writer to the reader? and therefore for any man to say he gives up the *language* or *expression* of a book, and yet that he approves the *sense*, is to suppose, that the author's meaning either never came through

---

(M) Notwithstanding the great veneration which Mr Wesley expresses for Mr Baxter's Aphorisms, yet in his *Preservative*, p. 192, he makes a quotation from that author, which when compared with Mr Wesley's own words, *Remarks*, p. 26, produces a very odd sort of Syllogism. Baxter's words are these: "No man of brains DENIETH that man hath a will which is naturally free."

But Mr Wesley thinks this rather too strong; and tells us, that "both he and Mr Fletcher absolutely DENY natural free-will." Ergo, according to Baxter, neither Mr Wesley nor Mr Fletcher have any brains.

This is not at all my assertion, but must unavoidably follow from the two foregoing sentences taken together.

through his pen, or if it did, that it was contradicted as soon as it appeared on paper; and how then is it possible for Mr Wesley to approve of that which never transpired? At this rate, Mr Fletcher's *checks* may all have been written in defence of Calvinism, though his *language, sentences and expressions*, are so full of *mysticism and sinless perfection*.

Again. What are whole treatises, but so many *sentences and expressions* put together? therefore if these *sentences and expressions*, or any of them be *false*, how can the treatise itself in which they are contained be *true*? Suppose, for instance, that Mr Wesley, in his *thoughts on a single life*, had dropped a *sentence or two* in defence of matrimony: Suppose that in his *thoughts on the present state of public affairs*, he had uttered an *expression or two* in praise of Mr Wilkes: or that in his treatise against *tea-drinking*, he had spoken a few words on the excellency of that herb: Suppose that in his *letter of advice concerning dress*, he had only once pressed the necessity of wearing a long pair of ruffles; how could he then have said that he believed those treatises to be all true? Much less then can he think any treatise to be *all true*, in which his favorite doctrine of perfection is only once denied, or in which his detested doctrine of imputed Righteousness is only once asserted.—As Mr Wesley is remarkably fond of interesting himself in national affairs, what if he were to recommend, preface, and publish two tracts of different authors, in one of which it was peremptorily asserted, that the Queen of Denmark was undoubtedly innocent of the infamous charge brought against her; and in the other her guilt was absolutely maintained; could these two treatises be both true, when so contrary one to the other in so important a point? How then can Mr Wesley publish, preface, and recommend two treatises, in one of which he positively asserts, and in the other as positively denies, the imputation of Adam's sin and of Christ's Righteousness; and then pretend to reconcile such strange contradictions by saying, that *he believes each treatise to be true, but not each sentence or expression; and that he approves the sense, but not the language of both*: whereas it is intirely owing to the *expressions, sentences, and language*, that the *sense* of those treatises is so exceedingly contradictory, as the following columns most clearly demonstrate.

That

That both Adam's sin and Christ's Righteousness are imputed.

As Adam's first unrighteousness, the first sin he committed, is communicated to men, and made theirs by imputation: and not only so, but by inherency also, (for it hath bred in them original sin;) after the same manner the righteousness that Christ wrought is made ours by imputation.

*Mr. Wesley's Christ, Lib.*  
Vol. IX. p. 230.

This I believe to be all agreeable to the Oracles of God.

*Mr. Wesley's recommendatory Preface to Christ, Lib.*

But I will go further still; and since Mr Wesley has published, prefaced, recommended and sold some treatises of Dr Owen (particularly that excellent tract on *indwelling sin in believers*) Bishop Beveridge, Dr Preston, and Dr Sibbs, let him only bring me twenty lines together out of the writings of those eminent divines, as they stand in his own Christian library, and I will engage to prove that he has twenty times contradicted them in some other of his publications.—Nay I must go one step further yet; for I defy Mr Wesley (pardon a favourite expression of Mr Fletcher) to bring me twenty lines out of the above tracts by Owen, Beveridge, Sibbs or Preston, which he now believes, though when he first published their works he told the world, that *they contained the pure gold which he had extracted from baser mixtures.*

That neither Adam's sin nor Christ's Righteousness are imputed.

The Scripture no where affirms, either the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, or of the righteousness of Christ to those that believe. Either to say, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to his posterity of believers, or the sin of Adam to his, are both expressions unknown to the Holy Ghost in the scriptures. There is neither word, nor syllable, nor letter, nor title of any such thing to be found there.

*Treatise on Justification,*  
p. 101, 103.

This I believe to be the real Scripture doctrine.

*Mr. Wesley's recommendatory Pref. to Goodwin against Justification by the imputed Righteousness of Christ.*

We will also bring the matter to a short issue with regard to Goodwin's treatise against Justification by the imputed Righteousness of Christ. Does Mr Wesley believe the doctrine therein contained, or does he not? If he does not, why did he revise, recommend and publish the book? If he does, why has he so often contradicted it, as well in his own sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6. as in the before-named pieces published in his Christian library? and what does he mean by allowing in his late *Remarks*, p. 16. that the mediatorial Righteousness of the God-man Jesus Christ is imputed to the believer for Justification? for though Mr Wesley has, with his usual cunning, expunged the word *imputation* out of what he has quoted from *the Review*, 2d edit. p. 123, 124, *note*, yet if this be not his meaning, my charge there brought still stands out against him.

But Mr Wesley again insists upon it that Mr Madan, Mr Romaine and Mr Whitefield, believed and preached the doctrine of his sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6. Supposing this true, do they believe what he has published and recommended from Goodwin? He knows they do not. Therefore Mr Wesley is desired to inform the world, whether he will henceforth abide by his own sermon, or by John Goodwin, since they cannot both of them contain *the real scripture doctrine* (S). — But to the Farrago.

THE first quotation which Mr Wesley brings from the Farrago is concerning that everlasting Covenant, which, in his Christian library, vol. XLVII. p. 53, 62, he affirms was made between the Father and the Son for man's redemption; though in his letter to Mr Hervey he tells us, that he believes *there never was any such Covenant*. And in his *Remarks*, p. 12. he says, that "he believes, and always did believe the latter, (viz. that there never was any such Covenant) since he could read the Bible." Nevertheless, in his own annotations upon the Bible, Gen.

---

As Mr Wesley has been pleased to remind me, that I have not always given the page from whence I have made my quotations from Goodwin, I beg to acquaint him, that I have prepared a new edition of *the Review*, (in case it should be called for) in which I have taken particular care in this matter, and Mr Wesley will see from thence, that it was not owing to any design I had of screening my quotations, (for they were all made with the greatest exactness) but wholly to inattention, that I did not each time mention the particular page of the book in question.

i. i. he calls the *Elohim* THE COVENANT GOD, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. [So then, according to Mr Wesley, the persons in the Trinity were in Covenant, and yet there, never was any Covenant between them] And more particularly in his note on Isai. lv. 4. speaking expressly on the Covenant made between God and David, he says, THIS DAVID IS CHRIST.

The only possible conclusion therefore to be drawn from this defence of Mr Wesley is, that he became a Commentator upon the Bible, before he could read the Bible.

His next defence is on the points of election and perseverance; and, to adopt his own expression, it hobbles on both feet. 1st, As being full of contradiction. 2dly, As leaving his brother in the lurch.

First then, under this head he tells us, that by *those eminently stiled the elect*, who shall *infallibly persevere*, he means *those that are perfected in love*: whereas (p. 51.) he declares that he believes several persons who turned out to be notorious apostates, not only *professed*, but *actually enjoyed* this perfection of love; no exception being made even against G——e B——l, himself.

But several of the quotations from the Farrago on this head, are taken from some hymns of Mr Charles Wesley, for which Mr John says he will not be answerable.

But 1st, How can Mr John Wesley answer it to his conscience, to write prefaces and recommendations, with his own name prefixed, to any hymns or collection of hymns, which he does not believe?

2dly, How is the congregation to know which are true, and which are false, since Mr Wesley's hymns, and his brother's, are bound up together promiscuously?

3dly, Can it be otherwise, but that if some of these hymns maintain election and perseverance, and others deny those doctrines, the people must frequently sing lies, as two opposites cannot both be true?

4thly, If Mr Charles's hymns are discarded by Mr John, on account of their Calvinism, what sort of an ally is he likely to make Mr John, in fighting the Calvinists? Will not all Mr John's discharges against them, wound Mr Charles?

Mr Wesley says in his hymns,

From all eternity with love  
Unchangeable, thou hast me view'd.

I believe (says Mr Wesley) this is true on the supposition of *faith foreseen*, not otherwise.

Think you so, Sir: but how could God foresee this faith, unless he were determined to give it? Surely you won't deny that true faith is the gift of God, and the work of his Spirit in the heart.

If the King of England gives the Queen a jewel, I suppose it is because he *has* set his love upon her, and espoused her to himself; but he does not give her the jewel that he *may* set his love upon her; nor does he resolve that she should share his crown with him, because he foresaw she would be in possession of any pearl which he had in his own keeping, for he must know full well she never could have come to the possession of it, unless his own free bounty determined to bestow it on her. For, to use the words of the incomparable Bishop Davenant (who lived in the time of James the first) "Predestination being an immanent and eternal act of the divine understanding and will, cannot be conceived as dependent upon any foreseen temporal acts of man's free-will. A prime and eternal cause cannot depend on the self-same temporal effects, which are thereby caused. If predestination be the prime eternal cause from whence Peter's faith, repentance, and perseverance were derived, his foreseen faith, repentance, and perseverance, cannot in any good sense be imagined antecedent causes, merits, conditions, or motives unto the divine predestination."

*Treat. on God's love to mankind.*

In like manner the Assembly of divines affirm, that "God hath chosen the elect in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of *faith*, good works, &c."—But I only bring these two quotations, because Mr. Fletcher has asserted, in direct opposition to plain matter of fact, that the old Bishops of our church, *together with the multitude of puritan Divines in the last century*, are on the side of the doctrines held by Mr Wesley. And I conclude the point in hand, with observing, that the only difference between Mr Wesley and the word of God in this matter, is, that Mr Wesley thinks faith is *the cause* of a man's being ordained to eternal life. Whereas the scripture asserts, that they only believe (or have faith given them) who are first ordained to eternal life, Acts xiii. 48.

COME now to the article of imputed righteousness.

Blessed

Blessed be God; we are not among those who are so dark in their conceptions and expressions. We no more deny the phrase (of imputed righteousness) than the thing.

*Mr Wesley's Sermon on Jer.*

xxiii. 6.

For Christ's sake, and for the sake of the immortal souls which he hath purchased with his blood, do not dispute for that particular phrase, the imputed righteousness of Christ.

*Mr Wesley's Preservative against unsettled Nations in Religion, p. 212.*

“Here is no contradiction, says Mr Wesley (p. 15.) I don't deny it; yet I dare not dispute for it.”—But if, as you say, all are dark in their conceptions, who deny that phrase; how came you to beseech Mr Hervey for Christ's sake, not to dispute for it? Are not your words, when taken together, just tantamount to this. “I, John Wesley, do firmly believe that all those who deny imputed righteousness, whether the phrase, or the thing, are dark in their conceptions; and yet I beseech Mr Hervey for Christ's sake, not to dispute for either; but, for the sake of their immortal souls, to let these poor benighted creatures remain in their darkness.”—Since we are on the subject of dark conceptions; and since Mr Wesley blesses God for enlightening his mind to receive the doctrine, and to adopt the phrase of imputed righteousness, I must beg leave to take another peep into the *Norwich coach*, and to ask him how the solitary divine that rode in it on Tuesday, Dec. 1, 1767, came to think that clear conceptions of the doctrine of imputed righteousness were so very unnecessary, and the phrase itself so absolutely useless, after having so deeply lamented the dark conceptions of those who rejected the term and the thing.—So much for clear and dark conceptions.—O rare Logica Wesseiensis!

This doctrine (of the imputed righteousness of Christ) I have constantly believed and taught for near eight and twenty years.

*Sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

The use of that term (the imputed righteousness of Christ) is not scriptural, is not necessary, it has done immense hurt.

*Preservative, p. 212.*

“It has done immense hurt, says Mr Wesley (p. 15.) but here is no contradiction?” Whether there be or not, there is a plain confession from Mr Wesley himself, that



he has been *preaching a doctrine for eight and twenty years together, which has done immense hurt.*

And if the term be *unscriptural and unnecessary*, I beg to remind Mr Wesley, that he uses it in many of his hymns, as also in his notes on the New Testament; and, to bring no more instances, at least twenty times in his sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6. So that if he himself may be credited, he sings, preaches, and makes annotations which are *unnecessary and unscriptural.*

I always did, and do still continually affirm, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to every believer.

*Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

Where is the use of contending so strenuously for the imputation of Christ's righteousness?

O lay aside those questionable dangerous expressions.

*Preservative, p. 213, 277.*

Mr Wesley asks where is the contradiction? call it a contradiction, or an inconsistency, or what you please; the two columns together produce the following conclusion, viz. That Mr Wesley *always did, and does still affirm that to be true*, which, nevertheless, he thinks there is *no use in contending for*; yea, which he believes to be *questionable, dangerous doctrine.*—O rare Logica Wesleianis!

That expression, imputing the righteousness of Christ, I dare not insist upon, because I cannot find it in the Bible.

*Mr Wesley's Thoughts on imputed Righteousness.*

This is fully consistent with our being justified thro' the imputation of Christ's righteousness.

*Mr Wesley's Notes on the New Testament, Rom. iv. 9.*

These two taken together produce the following conclusion, viz. That it is *perfectly consistent* to say, that we are justified by that *which cannot be found in the Bible.*

I frequently use the expression in question, imputed righteousness, and often put this and the like expressions into the mouth of a whole congregation.

*Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

We are agreed as to the meaning, but not as to the expression, the imputing the righteousness of Christ, which I still say, I dare not insist upon, neither require any to use.

*Thoughts on imputed Righteousness.*

“ Here

“Here, (says Mr Wesley, p. 15, 16.) is no contradiction. I sing an hymn where it occurs, but I don't require any to use it; every one in the congregation may use it, or let it alone.”

However, the conclusions deducible from these two columns are.

1st, That Mr Wesley gives out and sings such doctrines himself, *as he dares not require any others to believe or use.* Consequently, (though the congregation may be very numerous,) Mr John is not to wonder if he often sings a *solo.*

2dly, That a whole congregation may have words in their mouths, and yet may be all silent.

Will Mr Wesley be ingenuous enough to tell me whether he did not write this when he was last in a certain country which abounds with *crassa ingenia*?

They to whom the righteousness of Christ is imputed (I mean who truly believe) are made righteous by the Spirit of Christ; are renewed in the image of God, after the likeness wherein they were created, in righteousness and true holiness.

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

The nice metaphysical doctrine of imputed righteousness, leads not to repentance, but to licentiousness. I have had abundant proofs, that instead of furthering mens progress in vital holiness, it makes them satisfied without any holiness at all.

Preservative, p. 212, 215.

“ I have

(N) These words [I mean, who truly believe] are put in by Mr Wesley, and the latter part of the quotation is artfully left out. It should seem by the interpolation, that he again means to make a distinction between faith in Christ, and faith in the righteousness of Christ; but how is this reconcilable with that assertion in his sermon on *the Lord our righteousness*, (viz.) that “*there is no true faith, i. e. justifying faith, which hath not the righteousness of Christ for its object.*” And how again is this latter declaration reconcilable with what he says in the *Treatise on Justification*, “*That the righteousness of Christ, is not the object of faith as justifying.*” And yet wonderful as it may appear, he absolutely refers us to this very *Treatise*, in the sermon before-mentioned; to prove the harmony of the one with the other.

“ I have known a thousand instances of this, says Mr Wesley, “ and yet they (who truly believe in Christ)” his own words as quoted by me, are “ *they to whom the Righteousness of Christ is imputed,*” “ are made righteous by “ the Spirit of Christ; are renewed in the image of God, “ after the likeness wherein they were created, in righteousness and true holiness.”—“ Where is the contradiction, says Mr Wesley, between these Propositions.”— Truly the contradiction is just this; that the doctrine of imputed Righteousness, makes those who believe it both holy and unholy.

Without going through any more of the quotations on imputed Righteousness, which, whosoever will turn to the Review will find equally contradictory, notwithstanding all Mr Wesley’s pains and evasions to reconcile them, I must observe, that he winds up this point of imputed Righteousness (p. 20.) with a resolution which astonishes me, if possible, beyond all his other strange assertions; it is, “ that he will never more use the phrase *imputed Righteousness*, unless it occur in an hymn, or steal upon him unawares.” And “ that he will advise all his brethren, “ who are in connection with him, throughout the three “ kingdoms, to lay aside that ambiguous unscriptural “ phrase.”

Dear Sir, what a determination is this, after having so lately published your reconciling sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6. throughout which you not only make use of the phrase in question (imputed Righteousness) again, again, and again, but frequently give us to understand, that there is no difference in sentiment between you and others who adopt the term. However Mr Wesley is not absolute in his determination. There is yet a salvo. He *will not use the phrase, unless it occur in an hymn, or steal upon him unawares*; so that we may flatter ourselves that it will at length *steal* into favor again, and that Mr Wesley and imputed Righteousness will some time or other be upon as amicable terms as ever they were.

LET us now proceed to Mr Wesley’s assertions on sinless perfection.

Under this head Mr Charles Wesley is again left to shift for himself, and several of his hymns, though prefaced by Mr John, with their joint names prefixed, are given up as what *he does not subscribe to*; and therefore (says Mr Wesley, p. 82.) “ *if some of them contradict others, it does not prove* “ that

“that I contradict myself.”—But still it proves that between you both, the people are forced to sing contradictions.

Here we have also a particular description of Mr Wesley's adult believers, who being *perfected in love*, have not in them two contrary principles, nature and grace. No sin, not so much as the being of it. Not one sinful thought or temper. No pride. No self-will. No wandering thoughts. No carnal mind. No evil motion. No wrestling with flesh and blood. But possess *Christ in a pure and sinless heart* (O).

It is not my business here to reason with Mr Wesley concerning this delusive dream of sinless perfection; but as he charges me with unfairness in bringing two quotations from his sermon on Eph. xi. 1. the one to prove that infirmities *are sins*, the other to prove that they *are not sins*; and urges in his behalf that the words I have cited, were, by my own acknowledgment, omitted in a former edition of the sermon; I will readily own that they were so: but they have since been put in again in a later edition; therefore Mr Wesley having first inserted them, and then omitted them, and having afterwards inserted them again, plainly proves that he repented of striking them out; and that he has altered his opinion concerning that passage once more than had before appeared. — Wherein then consisted the unfairness of my quotation, when I took it from the last edition of the sermon? Methinks, Sir, you are as inconsistent in your censures, as in your doctrines. Here you blame me for quoting the *last* edition of a sermon, whereas (p 29.) you call me to account for quoting the *first* edition of your notes on the New Testament, concerning Enoch and Elijah, each of whom you have so learnedly proved, by a peculiar rule of *Foundery logic*, to be both *in heaven and out of heaven*.

However, since Mr Wesley chooses to harp upon this string, I must now inform the reader that even in the very quotation in question, he hath both struck out some words, and put in others, which are not to be found in the sermon, in order to reconcile the contradictions; and yet even this will

---

(O) I have not here quoted one expression which Mr Wesley attributes to his brother, consequently they must all be his own, as there are no names prefixed to the hymns from which they are taken, but those of J. and C. Wesley. — If this description be a true one, who can wonder that it should have been canvassed at Mr Wesley's Conferences, whether a believer might not be in such a state, as not to need the blood or intercession of Christ? or; to have no occasion to pray for the pardon of sin?

will not answer his purpose. The words expunged by Mr Wesley, from my quotation out of his sermon on Eph. xi. 8. (where he is expressly speaking of *his adult believers*) are the following. [If we say we have no sin NOW REMAINING, we deceive ourselves.] Now by putting this and the next sentence in one column, and some other of his own and Mr Charles's words, relative to *adult believers*, in another column, we shall see what they will make.

If we say we have no sin now remaining, we deceive ourselves.

Many *infirmities* do remain.

Sin shall not *always* in our flesh remain.

He that is born of God sinneth not by *infirmities*. [Whether in act, word or thought (P).

*Serm. on Eph. xi. 8.*

No wrinkle of infirmity, no spot of sin remains (Q).

Immediately after this Mr Wesley makes a distinction between *proper* and *improper* sins, the latter of which he still calls by the name of *infirmities*, and gives his reason for imposing on them this soft epithet, (*viz.*) "that he may not seem to give any countenance to sin, or to extenuate it in any degree." Now, from Mr Wesley's extraordinary distinction, it is plain he thinks there are certain *improper transgressions* of the Law which are not sins; and that there is a medium between breaking the law and keeping it. This medium he calls *infirmity*. Now let every one judge whether Mr Wesley does not *give countenance* to sin, and *extenuate it* too, by not allowing it to be a *proper transgression* of the Law?

P. 32.

(P) These words Mr Wesley has also left out of the quotation, though they stand in his own sermon.

(Q) Mr Wesley tells us (p. 82.) that this is an expression of his brother's, *which he does not subscribe to; but for my life I cannot split the hair between this quotation from Mr Charles's hymn, and that from Mr John's sermon, which stands immediately above it: and therefore I do not see how he can desert his brother here, without deserting himself.*

P. 32. I wrestle not now,  
&c.

This is also an expression of  
my Brother's (says Mr John)  
which I do not subscribe to.

We wrestle not with flesh  
and blood.

This Mr John allows  
to be his own.

Now where is the difference between the expression in one column which Mr John *does not subscribe to*, and that in the opposite column, of which he grants himself to be the author? I still ask, *can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot.* Therefore what are Mr John and Mr Charles Wesley disputing about? *I fear about words:* especially as Mr John has told us (p. 31.) that *neither he nor his Brother suppose any such thing as that "the most advanced believers are deeply sensible of their impurity."* And that the perpetual war which he speaks of in his note on Eph. vi. 13. is a war with principalities and powers, but not with flesh and blood. But whosoever will turn to the note in question, if his words have any meaning or connection, will certainly be of a different opinion. Either way Mr John is stuck fast in the mire. For in his *Remarks* he contradicts his Brother; in his *Annotations* he contradicts himself; and in his *Hymn* he contradicts both his brother and himself.

Again, I never said, While  
one evil thought can rise,  
I am not born again.

My Brother said so once,  
but he took the words in too  
high a sense.

*Mr Wesley's Remarks, p. 31.*

Our blessed Lord had no  
evil or sinful thoughts, nor  
indeed was capable of having  
any; and hence it follows,  
that neither have *real christians*. Therefore if he was free  
from evil or sinful thoughts,  
so are they likewise.

*Mr John Wesley's Serm. on  
Phil. iii. 12.*

Again, Christians are now  
in such sense perfect as to be  
freed from evil thoughts.

*Ibid.*

Now as Mr Wesley (p. 30, 31.) has evaded several of the like contradictions by saying "true, adult believers, Fathers in Christ, have no evil thoughts; no evil tempers; no wanderings in prayer; no indwelling sin; no wrestling  
"with

“ with flesh and blood; no sensibility of their impurity; whereas infant believers, babes in Christ, have all these things;” I must therefore beg leave to ask him, if every babe in Christ, be not a christian, yea, a real christian, and born again of the Spirit? If he says yes, then he affirms, that even infant believers cannot have a sinful thought; if he says no, and denies that a babe in Christ is a real christian and born again, then he as flatly contradicts two Apostles, as ever he contradicted himself; for St John writes to his little children, (infants or babes in Christ, as standing in contradistinction to the young men and fathers mentioned in the former verse) as having their sins forgiven them for his name's sake, 1 John ii. 12, &c. See also 1 Pet. ii. 2, where the apostle's new-born babes are the same as in the foregoing chapter, ver. 23. he addresses as being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which endureth for ever.

But Mr Wesley has taken the liberty of altering the words real christians, which is the expression in his own sermon, as well as in my quotation from it, and of putting the words adult believers in the stead; as also to add the word adult before christians, in the latter part of the citation.

I should not think of giving myself the trouble of making any other Farrago than what has already appeared in the Review, if Mr Wesley had not defied me to produce any more contradictions out of his own writings; upon which account, I must now beg to treat him with two direct contrary interpretations of the same text, which he has given us in two of his own sermons.

John

John v. 18. Most express are the words of St John. We know that *whatsoever is born of God, sinneth not.*

Indeed it is said, this means only, he doth not commit sin **WILFULLY.**

Or he doth not commit sin **HABITUALLY.**

But by whom is this said? by St John? No. There is no such word in the text; nor in the whole chapter; nor in any part of his writings whatsoever. Why then the best way to answer a bold assertion, is simply to deny it. And if any man can prove it from the word of God, let him bring forth his strong reasons.

*Mr Wesley's Sermon on Phil. iii. 12.*

[Methinks Mr Wesley is here a little too warm; however, old Mordecai will not be backward to answer him in the opposite column.]

You evade the whole of your unscriptural assertion about *sins of surprize*, by saying "that there is more or less condemnation, as our will is or is not concerned in any sin." I do not deny this; but your words, quoted in the *Review*, 2d edit. p. 117, 118. convey a very different idea, (viz.) that there are some sins from which we cannot say whether a soul is or is not brought under condemnation at all.—You therefore pass over the argument, and only answer a question which was never started.

BEFORE I quit the subject of *Perfection*, I cannot help expressing my astonishment that Mr Wesley should deny that his tenets on that point exactly harmonize with those of the popish church; since all the decrees, books, sermons, &c. that have ever been published by the Romish Clergy, prove this matter beyond a doubt. However take what  
Alexander

John v. 18. The Apostle John declares, that *whatsoever is born of God, sinneth not.*

1st, By any **HABITUAL** sin. Nor,

2dly, By any **WILFUL** sin.

*Mr Wesley's Sermon on Eph. ii. 8.*

[As I do not choose to interfere between two such intimate friends, I leave it to others to determine which of them has the best of the argument.]



Alexander Ross, whose concise accuracy is deservedly admired by all parties, says on this head in his *View of all Religions*, p. 430, 431. 6th edit.

“ Concerning good works, they (the Papists) teach,  
 “ that the good works of just men are absolutely just, and  
 “ in a manner PERFECT. That a just man may fulfil  
 “ the Law. That a man is justified by works, not in  
 “ the first but in the second justification; yet not with-  
 “ out the help of grace.”  
 “ That concupiscence and ignorance are only *infirmities*.”

Ross.

I am glad you object to the testimonies of *Lindenius* and *Andradius* (the latter of whom you say (p. 46.) for ought you know, might have served as an Interpreter at the Council of Trent) as it gives me an opportunity of referring you to a most excellent and evangelical work of the late Mr Hervey, (which I would by all means advise you to purchase; and to place among your choicest collection of books,) intitled, *Eleven Letters to the Rev. Mr John Wesley*, where you will find a further account of these two grand champions for the popish cause; and the very words given you in the original, which I have transcribed in English in *the Review*, p. 60.

Your objections to the quotations from Bishop Cowper are not less trifling. This eminent prelate, in the reign of James the first, published a very valuable exposition of the 8th chapter to the Romans, in which he frequently attacks the Papists concerning their tenets of Universal Redemption, falling from grace, man's merit, perfection, free-will, and the denial of imputed Righteousness, &c. all of which he shews to be utterly repugnant to scripture, experience, and to the doctrine of the primitive church; and for this purpose he brings several citations from the writings of the ancient Fathers.

From this work of Bishop Cowper I have made some extracts in my Review; however, Mr Wesley gives me to understand that he cannot admit their evidence, and that they are *second-hand authority*. But how so? do I not refer him to the Bishop's own words? If I have made any false quotations, why does not Mr Wesley make it appear? Oh but Mr Hill should have produced the very page and edition of the writings of those fathers from whence the extracts are taken. But Mr Hill ingenuously tells you he has not their works at large to refer to; however he has given the quotations exactly as they are recorded

corded by Bishop Cowper, whose authority he makes use of. And if the Bishop had not been faithful in transcribing them, there is no doubt, but that crafty set of men, the Jesuits, against whom he wrote, would have detected him long enough before Mr Wesley ventured to call his testimony in question. But as I am now on the subject of Popery, I must beg to make a few animadversions on what Mr Wesley affirms, (p. 7.) "I always thought that the tenets of the church of Rome were nearer by half to Mr Hill's tenets than Mr Wesley's."

Now, Sir, permit me to say that you have here asserted what I am confident you yourself don't believe. You are too well acquainted with the dogmas of the Romish church, not to know that the principles of the Pope of Rome, and of John Calvin, are as opposite to each other as those of John Wesley, and the *Pope of the Foundery*.

For instance

You deny election.	So does the Pope of Rome.
You deny perseverance.	So does the Pope of Rome.
You deny imputed righteousness.	So does the Pope of Rome.
You hold free-will.	So does the Pope of Rome.
You hold that works are a condition of justification.	So does the Pope of Rome.
You hold a two-fold justification.	So does the Pope of Rome.
You hold the doctrine of merit.	So does the Pope of Rome.
You hold sinless perfection, and that a justified man can keep the law.	So does the Pope of Rome.
You hold that sins are only infirmities.	So does the Pope of Rome.
You make distinctions between sins that do, and sins that do not bring the soul under condemnation, in other words, between <i>venial</i> and <i>mortal</i> sins.	So does the Pope of Rome.

Now here are ten leading points in which Mr Wesley and the Pope are cordially agreed; whereas Mr Hill abides by the scriptures and the Protestant churches, in each of these particulars, which Mr Wesley very well knows were subject-matter of much controversy between the Jesuits and the

the reformed, during the reigns of Edward the sixth, Queen Elizabeth, James, and Charles the first. But since, he says, " he always thought that Mr Hill's tenets were " nearer Popery than his own ;" Mr Hill now gives him the challenge to make good his assertion ; yea, but in one single instance : and if Mr Wesley cannot do this, Mr Hill hopes that Mr Wesley will at least blush for his having asserted such a notorious falshood, for no other end in the world, but to impose on his credulous readers.

BUT to return to the Farrago, which I have not always followed in exact order, because I chose to go through the principal heads of it first.

<p>P. 22. The state of a justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious.</p>	<p>Does not talking of a justified, or sanctified state, tend to mislead men ?</p>
<p>Serm. on 2 Cor. v, 17.</p>	<p>Minutes of 1770.</p>

" It frequently does *tend to mislead men* (says Mr Wesley) but where is the contradiction ?" Whatever may be the contradiction, this is clearly the conclusion, viz, that *Mr Wesley, by his own confession, is a miscader of men.*

Mr Wesley, says (p. 22.) " no (good) works can be previous to justification." And yet in the same page, he asserts, that " we cease from evil, learn to do well, &c. *in order to find favor.*" From which assertions is deducible the following absurdity, viz. that a man may do works in order to find favor, and yet that such works cannot be called *good*, because previous to justification : therefore by Mr Wesley's own concession, they must be *bad works* (unless he has devised a medium between *good* and *bad*, similar to that between breaking the law and keeping it) and yet are done *in order to find favor.*

There is therefore no contradiction between Isaiah and St Paul, though there is a very glaring one between Mr Wesley and himself (R).

On

(R) Mr Wesley in his Journal from August 1738, to Nov. 1739; p. 75. mentions a report which was spread and generally believed in Bristol, " that he was a Jesuit." In answer to which charge, he acknowledges, that he was for ten years fundamentally a Papist, without knowing it, (viz.) Whilst he did not preach justification by faith alone, but mixed faith and works

ON the head of *merit* (p. 26.) Mr Wesley attempts a reconciliation of his contradictions, by *splitting the hair* between meriting in a *strict* sense, and meriting in a *looser* sense. The latter he allows; the former he denies.

Query. By this *looser* sort of meriting, does Mr Wesley mean a *merit* that does *not merit*? If he does, his distinction falls to nothing. If he does not, it is no distinction at all. Either way it is shamefully evasive.

D

And

works together. "But I now testify to all," (adds he,) "that no good works can be done before justification; none which have not in them the nature of sin." I leave the reader to make his own remarks on the above extract, particularly on its harmony with that position of the minutes, we are accepted and saved, "*by works as a condition.*"

Since I am on this article of the minutes, I must beg to direct the reader's attention to the note in the 49th page of Mr Fletcher's *Logica Genevensis*, where he attempts to vindicate that most shameful false quotation he has twice made from the minutes, "not by the merit of works," but by "believing in Christ." Whereas the real words are, *not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition.* But, saith the vindicator, "My opponent is pleased to overlook the commas, which shew that I produce two different places of the minutes." Suppose this plea could be allowed, yet these *two different places* being joined together in the manner he has linked them with those two little significant monosyllables [*but, by*] cause the whole sentence thus *patched and linked*, to speak a language directly opposite to that of the minutes themselves, in the order in which they stand. And when I read the two quotations thus jumbled into one, I could not help calling to mind the facetious extracts which were taken out of different parts of the same News Papers; which extracts on being linked together, produced something to the following effect. "On Thursday last his Majesty went to the house of Peers," "and on Friday he was detected in stealing a loaf of bread out of a baker's basket in Holborn."—"We hear that her Majesty is making a most beautiful grotto at Hampton Court." "And yesterday she was committed by Sir John Fielding to the house of correction as an idle disorderly person, where she is to be whipped and kept to hard labor for one month." Now how would any News Paper printer be astonished, or rather how would he laugh, to hear it asserted, that because these were the *express words* of the same News Paper, though culled out of different parts of it, that therefore he meant to call his Majesty a thief, or to reflect on his most amiable consort.—The application is too easy to need further illustration.

And yet, says Mr Wesley, I never use the word, *i. e.* the word *merit*. Never use it? What in the world then do you mean by *secundum MERITA operum*, According to the *MERIT* of our works? Or what have we been disputing about ever since the publication of the minutes? Never use it! What then has Mr Fletcher been taking all these pains about? Was it not chiefly in defence of this looser sort of *merit*, and in vindication of that expression? (S)

Still

(S) I believe that most of my readers, except such as resolve that Mr Wesley shall make as many *new eyes* for them, as Mr Fletcher makes *new creeds* for Mr Wesley) will be of opinion, that Mr Wesley has given a very *full*, though a very *concise* answer to all Mr Fletcher's *checks*, so far as they relate to the doctrine of merit, in his Journal from 1760, to 1762, with a preface written in the year 1767.—In this Journal, p. 39. Mr Wesley, answering the objections of some person, whom he calls T. H. alias E. L. has these words. “No, nor that neither; (*i. e.* I do not grant that works are *meritorious*, even when accompanied by faith.) But, pray, don't talk of this any more, till you know the difference between *meritorious* and *rewardable*; otherwise your ignorance will cause you to blunder on, without shame and without end.”

Surely if this be not a *check* upon the *checker*, for all he has written on the *meritoriousness* of works, nothing will. But whether it be or no, I must leave Mr Wesley to account for his own inconsistency in revising, correcting, publishing, and recommending Mr Fletcher's late writings; throughout which, he contends with so much zeal for that very doctrine, which Mr Wesley with no less zeal opposes in his Journal above-mentioned, reprinted only five years ago. And yet this is the identical gentleman, whose opinion in this matter, has been so very steady for upwards of *eight and twenty years*; and, who, as a further proof of the settled state of his principles during that long period, can effect an harmony between his assertion in the year 1767, that *works are not meritorious, even when accompanied by faith*, and his affirmation in the year 1770, that we are rewarded, *secundum merita operam, according to the merit of our works*.

It is in the same Journal, p. 94. that Mr Wesley gives an account of a miracle wrought IN A MOMENT, by the prayers of George Bell (that poor deluded *perfectionist*, who declared, *he should never die*, and that the world would be destroyed on the 28th day of Feb. 1763) upon one *Mary Special*, a young woman, whom he cured of *hard swollen breasts, as black as soot*, after she had been a long while in St George's Hospital, to no purpose. Mr Wesley, in this narration, takes care to let us know that the *first question* asked her by Bell was, *whether she had faith to be healed!*

Whofo-

STILL more evasive is the manner in which (p. 2r.) you attempt to slide over that point-blank contradiction of justification being *two-fold*, and yet one and no more.

“ It is most true (say you) that the justification spoken of by St Paul, and in our articles, *is one and no more.* “ But our Lord, Matt. xxii. 37. speaks of another justification. Now I think *one and one make two.*” — I here are your own words.

By the text refer'd to in St Matthew, you would make us believe that the quotation brought from your Journal, has no reference to justification at the great day; and that though the Apostle, and the church of England in her articles and homilies, speak only of a *first* justification in this life, yet that *our Lord mentions another, and therefore one and one make two.*

But this will not do; for in the extract alluded to from your Journal, you absolutely condemn the distinction of a two-fold justification, one in this life, the other

D 2

other

---

Whosoever is desirous of seeing a further account of this Bell (who has long since thrown off all appearance of religion) and of his prophecies and miracles, may consult a pamphlet, intitled “ The Rev. Mr Maxfield’s Vindication of himself, in separating from Mr Wesley.” In which piece the author justly censures the enthusiasm and credulity of Mr John, in paying so much attention to Bell’s ridiculous reveries, bragging of the many miraculous cures he had wrought by prayer; calling him a *sensible* man, and intreating him to continue in his society on account of the great GOOD he did. However, Bell refused to remain in connection with him, because of his **DOUBLE DEALINGS** and **UNFAITHFUL PROCEEDINGS**, as Mr Maxfield informs the reader: for, like the traveller in the Fable, who blowed hot and cold with the same mouth, he sometimes was full of Bell’s praises, at others would caution the people against him. In the same pamphlet, Mr Maxfield testifies a proper abhorrence of the self-exalting, dictatorial, overbearing spirit of Mr John; and also gives a particular narration of what he rightly enough calls the *Comet Enthusiasm*: for he tells us, that notwithstanding all his remonstrances, he heard Mr John preach *more than ten times about this comet*, which he supposed was to appear, Ann. 1758, and “ to burn up all the produce of the earth,” &c. “ And lastly, to execute its grand commission on the globe itself, causing the stars to fall from heaven.” Between this comet-prophecy of Mr Wesley, and that of Mr Bell, concerning the destruction of the world by an earthquake, on the 28th of Feb. it is certain that several dozens of old women were put into no small pannic.

other at the great day. The following are your own words.

“ In the afternoon I was informed how many wise and learned men, who cannot in terms deny it (because our articles and homilies are not yet repealed) explain justification by faith. They say, 1st, justification is two-fold: the first in this life, the second at the last day, &c. &c.

“ In flat opposition to this, I cannot but maintain, at least till I have a clearer light (T), that the justification spoken of by St Paul to the Romans, and in our articles, *is not two-fold; it is one, and no more.*” Journal from Nov. 1739, to Sept. 1741, p. 16.

Now from the whole scope of this passage, as it stands in your Journal, your words can have neither sense nor meaning, unless we suppose that *St Paul and our articles*, are of a contrary judgment to those *wise and learned men*, who hold *justification to be two-fold. The first in this life, the second at the last day.* If it were not to gain-say their error who affirm this, why did you quote the Apostle, or our articles at all? and where is *the flat opposition* you talk of to this heterodox opinion? If, when you wrote the words in question, you really thought that Christ spoke of another justification, and that *one and one made two*; you must then have concluded, that these *wise and learned men* were all in the right; and you could have no reason for bringing up the authorities of St Paul, and of the church, but in order to make them contradict a doctrine which you believed to be established by our blessed Lord himself: though by this means, you have not only set Christ and St Paul at variance, but (though at two different times) have set yourself against both, as well as against the articles of our own church, and have at length wheeled round into cordial harmony with those *wise and learned*

---

(T) Mr Wesley, with his usual prudence in making quotations, has left out these words [“ they say justification is two-fold; the first in this life, the second at the last day. In flat opposition to this, I cannot but maintain, at least till I have a clearer light.”] Now how is it possible to encounter such a man as this, without watching him through every line; and therefore I wish my readers would closely compare his Remarks with the Review itself, as it is impracticable for me to point out half the pretty little arts of this kind which Mr Wesley has stooped to.

*learned men in their notion of a two-fold justification, the first in this life, the second at the last day, which when you wrote your Journal you so FLATLY OPOSED.*

In short, THE CLEARER LIGHT is at last come.

But how agrees all this with what Mr Wesley repeatedly tells us (especially in his *Remarks*, p. 38.) that he has never contradicted himself with regard to justification, since the year 1738?—When this mystery is cleared up, I may then take the liberty of asking him how long he has held that justification is *four-fold*; and by what art he will reconcile this sentiment with his last year's opinion of its being *two-fold*; especially with his FLAT AFFIRMATION on Thursday afternoon, being the 14th of Dec. 1739, that justification was ONE, AND NO MORE?

MR Wesley, says, p. 26. “his thoughts on a single life, are just the same they have been these thirty years.” “And the same,” adds he, in his Journal, “they must be, unless he gives up the Bible (U.)” Being asked, how then he came to marry? he answers, “for reasons best known to himself.” It is therefore certain, that these reasons which induced Mr Wesley to taste of the nuptial felicity, must have preponderated against those given in his Treatise against marriage; consequently *his thoughts on a single life cannot have been the same for these thirty years past*; but during the period in which he became an humble suitor to Mrs Wesley, his judgment certainly *leaned (I won't say too much) towards matrimony*. If this be denied, we can no otherwise solve the difficulty, why Mr Wesley should write so strongly against wedlock, and declare that his thoughts on this subject *have been the same these thirty years; and that they MUST be the same, unless he gives up his Bible*; but by supposing, either that Mr Wesley has REALLY given up the Bible, or else that he entered into the connubial state, *when he had not his thoughts about him*.

This conclusion is as much deducible from Mr Wesley's own words, as that *two and two make four*.

P. 27.

---

(U) Journal from 1762, to 1765, p. 102.



P. 27. On the article of dress, Mr Wesley advises his followers to wear *nothing of a glaring colour, and nothing made in the height of the fashion, in order to increase their reward, and brighten their crown in heaven.* Nevertheless in his letter to a Quaker, he says, "To make it a point of conscience to differ from others, as to the *shape* or *colour* of your apparel, is mere superstition."

The way in which he attempts to reconcile this contradiction, which is as *glaring* as the apparel he forbids, is by saying, "So I advise: but I do not *make it a point of conscience.* So here is no contradiction still."

The syllogism, or rather the conclusion, deducible from these two propositions, and from Mr Wesley's reconciliation of them, is the following one, *viz.* That we are to *increase our reward, and brighten our crown in heaven,* by doing that which is *mere superstition,* and without acting from a *point of conscience* (X). O rare Logica Wesleiensis! *Qui bene distinguit bene docet.*

P. 27. Concerning tea, Mr Wesley, says, "he resumed the use of it (after setting an example of abstinence from it for twelve years) by Doctor Fothergill's direction."

Why then did Mr Wesley suffer his Tract against tea to be republished only two or three years ago, in which he still makes the world believe that he refrains from tea, not only by way of practising self-denial, and saving money for the poor, but because it brought a *paralytic disorder upon him* — Is it not very strange, that a physician of Doctor Fothergill's known abilities (if Mr Wesley told him all his case) should advise Mr Wesley to the use of an herb at *the close of a consumption,* which had before thrown him into the palsy? However, I greatly commend Mr

---

(X) Mr Wesley in his piece, intitled "*Advice to the People called Methodists, with regard to dress;*" even goes so far as to caution his hearers against the examples of both the Mrs Wesleys, *viz.* his own *helpmeet,* and Mrs Charles) if they should transgress in the article of wearing *velvets, silks, or ruffles;* and to desire the prayers of his societies, that neither of those ladies may ever offend in the premises. This is certainly more than *argumentum ad hominem,* for it is even *argumentum ad feminas.* How then can it be thought that Mr Wesley does not make these matters a *point of conscience?*

Mr Wesley's prudence on this head, and if he had a mind to slip his neck out of the collar, I don't see how he could do it with a better grace, than by getting the sanction of a physician's opinion; an expedient constantly practised at Rome, in order to eat flesh in Lent. However, as a friend to Mr Wesley, I would advise him, by all means, to sell no more of his *anti-tea-drinking* letters, if it were only on account of the following unfortunate paragraph, which as flatly contradicts all he says about Dr Fothergill, as he ever contradicted himself on any of the points before mentioned.

“ You need not go far to see many good effects of leaving off Tea. You may see them in me. I have recovered thereby that healthy state of the whole nervous system, which I had in a great degree, and I almost thought irrecoverably lost for considerably more than twenty years. I have been enabled thereby to assist in one year above fifty poor with food and raiment, whom I must otherwise have left (for I had before begged for them all I could) as hungry and naked as I found them.

Again, “ Immediately it struck into my mind, but example must go before precept. Therefore I must not plead an exemption for myself, from a daily practice of twenty-seven years. I must begin. I did so. I left off tea myself in August 1746; and I have now had a sufficient time to try the effects, which have fully answered my expectation: my paralytic complaints are all gone, my hand is as steady as it was at fifteen, &c.”

I here wave making any extracts from that part of Mr Wesley's Letter on Tea, which speaks of Tea as if it were the *poison* of soul as well as body, and that the drinking of it *grieves the Spirit of God*. Nor shall I make any remarks on his having recorded to posterity Mr Charles Wesley's fall in drinking a cup of Tea one night *for fear of offence*. But conclude this weighty point with the same advice to Mr Wesley, which he gives to his readers in the same Letter against Tea.

“ Will nothing else agree with you? I know not how to believe that. I suppose your body is much of the same kind with that of your great grandmother. And do you think that nothing else agreed with her?”

P. 28. On the article of Baptism, Mr Wesley is equally inconsistent. He publishes a treatise in defence of infant-baptism

baptism by sprinkling. However, as he tells us, that the word *Baptizo* is of dubious meaning; he further insists on the propriety of letting the person, if an adult, choose for himself, and the parent for the child, whether the ordinance shall be administered by *dipping* or *sprinkling*. And yet this same gentleman absolutely refused to baptize Mr Parker's child at Savannah, because the parents chose it should be *sprinkled*, but not *dipped*.

As to the story of his baptizing Mrs L. S. and almost drowning her in a bathing-tub, since he says he never heard of the thing before; and asks when, where, it happened. I must refer him to his friend Mr Toplady, who, in the second edition of his Letter addressed to him, p. 30. in a note, thus writes.

“ Mr Wesley's rebaptization of some adult persons is another proof of this charge, (viz. of his want of zeal for the discipline of the Church.) I could point out by name more than one who have undergone from his hands a reiteration of that sacred ceremony. I shall only at present mention a single circumstance, which I had from the person herself, with permission to publish her name at full length in case Mr Wesley should deny the fact, Mrs L. S. now living in Southwark, was baptized in a bathing-tub in a cellar by Mr John Wesley, who at the time kept her down so long under water, while he deliberately pronounced the words of the administration; that some friends of hers who were present screamed out, from an apprehension, that she was actually drowned; and she herself was so far gone, that she began to grow insensible, and was lifted out of the water but just time enough to save her life. Yet this is the man who, in the writings he has published to the world, professes to hold infant-baptism, and that by sprinkling, not by immersion ! ”

*Quo tenam vultus mutantem Protea nodo (Y) !*

BUT what surpasses every thing else is, that Mr Wesley cannot even speak of his contradictions, without contradicting himself afresh. For in his *Remarks*, p. 38, 39. he absolutely denies, not only that he ever was unsettled in his principles, but that he ever was accused of being so,  
*either*

---

(Y) As I hear that Mr Toplady intends giving Mr Wesley a little *wholesome discipline* for his pretended ignorance of this fact, I have only transcribed the quotation without making any remarks upon it.

either by friends or foes. " Would any man living (says he) " who does not know the fact, suppose that a *gentleman*, [put in italics by way of sneer] " could face a man down " in so peremptory a manner, unless the thing were absolutely true, and yet it is quite the reverse."

Here is a flat denial of his being accused of inconsistency and contradiction: whereas, in his *Principles of a Methodist*, p. 22. he goes about to vindicate himself from the charge brought against him (I suppose by Doctor Tucker,) of holding " a medley of Calvinism, Arminianism, Montanism, Quakerism, Quietism, all thrown together." — Besides, did the Moravians, with whom he was once in such close connection, never accuse him of inconsistency and contradiction? did Mr Hervey, did Mr Toplady, did Dr Erskine of Edinburgh never do this? Did he never hear of a pamphlet, intitled, *John against Wesley?* or of a Letter concerning his inconsistency with himself, published anno 1766? nor yet of a third piece, wherein Mr Wesley, out of his own sermons and journals, answers all the eight propositions contained in his own minutes? Why does he so heavily complain (p. 11.) " that one objector or another " stretched his throat and cried, *evasion, evasion,*" if no evasion was ever laid to his charge?

But Mr Wesley absolutely denies that Mr Delamotte ever spoke to him of his wavering, unfetted disposition; and, according to custom, leaves out the latter part of my sentence, where I say, that " he (Mr Delamotte) endeavoured to convince him that he was not on the right foundation." And whether I had not sufficient authority for all I advanced, let Mr Wesley's own words determine.

Thursday 23. " Returning from preaching at the Castle, I met once more with my old companion in affliction C. D. (Charles Delamotte) who staid with me till Monday. His last conversation with me was as follows."

" In this you are better than you was at Savannah, you know that you was then quite wrong. But you are not right yet. You know that you was then blind; but you do not see now."

" I doubt not but God will bring you to the right foundation. But I have no hope for you while you are on your present foundation. It is as different from the true, as the right hand from the left. YOU HAVE ALL TO BEGIN ANEW."

" I have observed all your words and actions, and I see you are of the same spirit still. You have a simplicity, " but

“ but it is a simplicity of your own ; it is not the simplicity of Christ. You think you do not trust in your own works, but you do trust in your own works. You do not believe in Christ.” *Mr Wesley's Journal from Feb. 1737. to his return from Germany.*

BUT Mr Hill has proved Mr Wesley to be so unsound in his doctrine, and so inconsistent in his principles, “ that, (says Mr Wesley, p. 39.) “ he is now got to his *ne plus ultra*, unless he has a mind to prove that Mr Wesley is “ an horse.” A bright and beautiful thought ! but Mr Hill had never any such intention. However he thinks, that Mr Wesley has proved himself to be a *Chameleon* (Z) ; concerning which animal, we are told by naturalists, that whatever it touches, it becomes of the same colour with the thing touched ; and so changes its appearance, from black to white, from green to red, &c. &c. &c. and then back again from white to black ; and so on.

But since Mr Wesley is become so very eminent, not only for making contradictions and evasions, but also for reconciling them when made ; I must beg leave to start a supposition ; and should be glad to know whether, upon his own principles, the *culprit* I am going to mention, would not be perfectly defensible.

Suppose any one of Mr Wesley's society was to get very much in liquor ; and being reprov'd by Mr Wesley from that text of holy writ, “ *be not drunk with wine ;*” he was to answer, “ True, father John, the Apostle does say, *be not drunk with wine*, but I was drunk with Ale, Gin, or Porter, and therefore I have by no means acted inconsistently with the Apostle's advice :” Would not such a plea carry with it much greater weight, than many of the evasions Mr Wesley has descended to, in order to reconcile his own inconsistencies and contradictions ?

BUT it should seem that the comparing Mr Wesley to an *Empiric* or *Quack Doctor*, has offended him more than any thing else : But whether the comparison be a just one or not, I must own I borrowed it from Mr Fletcher's note on the *hot and cold medicines* (A) ; and could not help thinking,

after

---

(Z) This is one of those animals which was pronounced unclean by the Levitical law. *Lev. xi. 30.*

(A) The following are Mr Fletcher's own words, ad Check, p. 22, 23. note.

“ A man who gives to different people, or to the same people at different times, directly contrary directions, does not “ always

after I had read that note a second time, that if Mr Wesley were to publish hand-bills, in praise of his skill and *nostrums*, they ought by all means to run in the following terms; and I beg to assure Mr Wesley, that the poetry, (such as it is) is neither copied from Sternhold and Hopkins, nor (to use Mr Wesley's own expression, p. 38.) *eked out by N. N. or William Wisdom* (B), but is attempted in the stile and manner of J. and C. Wesley.

*Arma*

“ always contradict himself. I have a fever, and my physician, under God, restores me to health by *cooling medicines*: “ by and by I am afflicted with the cold rheumatism, and he “ prescribes fomentations and warming remedies, but my “ injudicious apothecary opposes him, under pretence that he “ goes by *no certain rule, and grossly contradicts himself*. Let us “ apply this to Mr W. and the versifier, remembering there is “ less difference between a burning fever, and a cold rheumatism, than between the case of the trifling *Antinomian*, and “ of the dejected penitent.”

For a particular answer to this, see the end of the first letter in my Review of Mr Wesley's doctrines; and the better to discover the fallacy of the argument, consider that truth is ever the same, invariable in its nature, and cannot alter according to the different state the soul may be in; nay the very reason why any souls are really *dejected penitents*, is because they fear that the threatenings of him who is *truth* itself and cannot lie, stand out against them. Now would Mr Wesley tell such persons, in order to cure them of their *dejection*, that there was no hell, whilst at the same time he was denouncing wrath and damnation against the hardened sinner? and yet he might just as well do this, as tell his hearers that sometimes they are saved by the grace of faith as their gospel righteousness; and sometimes by the imputed Righteousness of Christ. *Dejected penitents* then are to be comforted by the consolations of the gospel; and not by being made to think that the unchangeable God of truth can lie, or *alter the thing that is gone out of his mouth*.

(B) Mr H. begs to acquaint Mr W. that the passage he alludes to p. 38. concerning the wheel of contradictions running round and round, was not inserted by another hand.—As also that Mr W. is under a mistake in supposing that the *Review of his doctrines* was corrected by Mr Romaine. It is true that Gentleman did see a part and only a part of it in the manuscript, but Mr H. does not remember that he inserted or expunged a single sentence. Mr H. must also add, that he has not near so much spare time as Mr W. imagines, his leisure hours being much taken up by his *business as a Magistrate*.

*Arma virumque cano. VIRG.*

I.

**H**ITHER, ye weak, ye sickly tribe:  
I've welcome news to tell;  
Whate'er your pain or grief may be,  
My dose can suit you well.

II.

Let your disease be hot or cold,  
You need not doubt my skill;  
*Rheumatic pains, and fever's heat*\*,  
Both fly before my pill.

III.

Let SATAN'S SYNAGOGUE (C) deny  
The virtues of my draught;  
How should THE DEVIL'S FACTORS (D) know  
What wonders I have wrought?

IV.

A choice PRESERVATIVE I have (E),  
The like was never known;  
With potions, juleps, drops, and pukes,  
Peculiarly my own.

v. Of

---

\* Turn back to the note, p. 45.

(C) Hymns and sacred poems, by J. and C. Wesley, vol. II,  
p. 292. 3d Edit. printed London, 1756.

(D) Ibid. p. 106.

(E) *Preservative* against unsettled notions in religion.

## V.

Of all the Doctors in the world,  
 The greatest sure am I (F):  
 Not *Bell* who cur'd Moll's sooty breasts (G),  
 With me could ever vie.

## VI.

Yet soon as SATAN GIVES THE WORD (H),  
 THE MURDERER'S HELLISH BROOD (I),  
 All witness with THEIR LYING LORD (K),  
 " His *nostrums* are not good."

VII. Alas !

(F) Alluding to Mr Wesley's thinking himself to be the *greatest minister in the world*. However Mr Fletcher would willingly make some excuse for this, and the like vaunting expressions; but as it is impossible to unsay them, he endeavours to fasten the same charge upon Mr Rowland Hill, and how this? Why because Mr R. H. says that *he has suffered much for God*. But (to carry on the idea of a Quack and his patients,) let us suppose that the Empiric went boasting about from place to place of his wonderful skill, and (to use a common phrase among such persons,) that he would give any man 100 guineas who should effect the like cures. Let us suppose again that a poor trembling patient comes to this Doctor, and says, "O Sir, I have been extremely ill treated; my case has been much mistaken by others of the faculty, and *I have suffered much, very much, with a violent disorder in every part of my body*." A third person looks on and says, "this Quack is certainly a great boaster, else he would never think himself the greatest physician in the world." A friend of the Quack is somewhat moved at this, and replies, "Why, don't you hear what the patient says? he is certainly as great a boaster as the Doctor; for whereas the Doctor only brags THAT HE HAS DONE MORE THAN ANY MAN IN THE THREE KINGDOMS; the other says, HE HAS SUFFERED MORE." At this the astonished man, who condemned the self-glorying spirit of the Quack, justly cries, "I see indeed much self-exaltation in the Mountebank, who says *he has done so much*, but I can see none at all in the poor afflicted patient, who tells us *he has suffered so much*."

(G) See Mr Wesley's journal from 1760 to 1762, p. 94. (lately reprinted) where he mentions George Bell's miracle in curing the Breasts of Mary Special, which were swelled very hard, and were as black as foot.

(H) Hymns and sacred poems, p. 225.

(I) Hymns on God's everlasting love, p. 62.

(K) Hymns and sacred poems, vol. II. p. 225.



VII.

Alas! WHAT NAUGHTY MEN WERE THESE (L),  
My Patients to befool;  
And tell the world that I was bred  
In *contradiction's* school?

VIII.

Yet Oh! my babes, believe them not,  
But banish all your fears:  
My drugs have always been the same,  
THESE EIGHT AND TWENTY YEARS (M).

IX.

But hence, ye horrid SPAWN OF HELL,  
Who hearken not to me;  
BLASPHEMERS, DEVILS, LIARS, FIENDS (N),  
Who credit God's decree.

X.

With love and meekness long I try'd  
To bend each stubborn mind (O);  
But hard as *rocks* and *knotted oaks*,  
Calvinian hearts I find (P).

XI.

Lo! now I draw the sword of war (Q),  
Thou *Cat's-paw* (R) dread my rage!  
For till I've gain'd or scour'd the field,  
Mine ire shall ne'er assuage (S).

XII. Help

---

(L) Hymns on God's everlasting love, p. 44.

(M) Sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6.

(N) These expressions are more or less scattered throughout the hymns on God's everlasting love.

(O) *Remarks*, p. 4, 46, 52.

(P) *Remarks*, p. 4.

(Q) *Remarks*, p. 52.

(R) *Remarks*, p. 40.

(S) *Remarks*, p. 52.

XII.

Help *Cobler* (T) Tom, and thou Swiss friend,  
“ To lay John Calvin’s ghost (U) ;”  
For what with *Cynics, bigots, bears* (X),  
I fear the day is lost.

XIII.

WE THREE shall incantations raise,  
With THUND’RINGS, LIGHT’NINGS, HAIL ;  
And if th’ Hobgoblin won’t avaunt,  
I’ll bring my Comet’s tail (Y).

XIV.

Alike in war and physic skill’d,  
I strove the foe to tame ;  
And *no one stone I left unturn’d*,  
To spread *Mordecai’s* fame (Z).

XV.

In politics I dabble too (A) ;  
*Brave Jack of all trades I !*  
And once upon a time I made,  
Two mighty Prelates fly (B).

XVI.

Let vaunting Quacks their *merit* boast,  
And swell with self-applause ;  
My *packets*, like *Buzaglo’s stoves*,  
*Health and religion* cause (C).

xvii. What

---

(T) This, as the Rev. Mr Toplady has lately informed the world, is the occupation of Mr Thomas Olivers.

(U) Rev. Mr Toplady’s letter to Mr Wesley, p. 28.

(X) *Remarks*, p. 42, 52.

(Y) Turn back to the note, p. 37.

(Z) The name given by Mr Fletcher to Mr Wesley in his *Vindication of his minutes*.

(A) See Mr Wesley’s pamphlet, intitled, “ Free Thoughts on the present state of public affairs.”

(B) Bishop Lavington and Bishop Gibson, *Remarks*, p. 4.

(C) Mr Buzaglo put an advertisement into the papers in order to recommend the use of his stoves in Churches, in which advertisement, he told the public that “ his stoves preserved health and promoted religion.”

XVII.

What tho' I once a patient bath'd  
Till all her friends scream'd out;  
I'll pledge my word she's better now  
For that blest bathing-bout (D).

XVIII.

By Chemist's or by *magic* (E) art,  
I've learn'd to conjure too (F).  
And made *that false*, and NOTHING now,  
Which lately was ALL TRUE (G).

XIX.

See this *Farrago*, mark it well,  
*Presto! hey pass! be gone.*  
One hundred contradictions now,  
Are *vanish'd* into one (H).

XX.

But still two cautions I must give,  
First then, "beware of Tea,"  
For sure it is, that baneful herb  
Had well nigh *poison'd* me (I).

XXI.

Of Marriage too take heed; nor *haste*  
To ask, or give consent,  
Lest when the *Gordian knot* be ty'd,  
*At leisure thou repent.*

XXII.

Believe not *Hymen's* yoke is smooth:  
'Tis that which few can bear;  
Yet fools ne'er think the shoe can pinch,  
But needs the shoe must wear.

XXIII. Would'ft

---

(D) Turn back to p. 42.

(E) Second Cheek, p. 8.

(F) See Mr Fletcher's *Vindication*, p. 52. where Mr Wesley is stiled a *Juggler*.

(G) Turn back to p. 16.

(H) *Remarks*, p. 33, 41.

(I) See the quotations from the Letter on Tea, p. 41.

## XXIII.

Would'st thou be free? thyself of thoughts  
 For woman-kind divest:  
 Or wouldst thou groan with strife and care?  
 "Marry:"———" *Probatum est* (K)."

## XXIV.

Great as my former days have been,  
 I heard *Jane Cowper* say (L),  
 "My latter should be greater still;"  
 Come then, "No cure, no pay."

Thus, Sir, I have given you a few hobbling rimes, in the exact language of the authors of the *sacred poems*, from which I have borrowed every *abusive* appellation with which my own *godly lampoon* (M) is decorated: and I do assure you, I have only presented you with these *pious sneers*, and this *mild irony*, in order that you may examine the feelings of your own heart, when they are brought against yourself; and may from thence form some judgment concerning the great impropriety as well of your own and of your *Vindicator's* manner of writing, as of the uncommon patience of all the free-grace-preachers of the Gospel; who, without the least provocation, and without making any reply, have been constantly vilified for so many years together, in the various editions of the *Sacred poems*, and in that shocking medley of gross misrepresentations, intitled, *Hymns on God's everlasting love*.

Now, Sir, either you do condemn me for writing this *godly lampoon*, or you do not. If you do not, then know that if I had done it from any other motive than that of shewing you your own picture, as also that of your ally; I should most heartily condemn myself. If you do con-

E

demn

(K) That is, *tried or proved*. A word which Mr Wesley frequently annexes to his receipts in his *Primitive Physic*.

Whoever will read Mr Wesley's *Thoughts on a single life*, will perceive that I have not strained his words in the smallest degree; nor have I spoken half so much on the point, as (I am informed) he has often spoken from the pulpit. And therefore, when I was summing up the articles in which Mr Wesley agreed with *the man of sin*, I should have mentioned their harmony in "FORBIDDING TO MARRY," 1 Tim. iv. 3.

(L) Turn to p. 52. for a more full account of Jane Cowper's prophecy concerning Mr Wesley.

(M) *Godly lampoons* and *pious sneers*, are expressions used by Mr Fletcher against the asserters of the doctrine of grace in his *Second Check*.

demn me, then you must much more condemn those who have not only set me the example, but have done that upon calm deliberation, and with full purpose of vilifying and exposing God's faithful ministers; which I have done only to convince you of your error, and to bring you to a detestation of this opprobrious manner of writing; which, however, it might be expected among those who are strangers to the religion of the meek and holy Jesus, very ill becomes the serious professors of the gospel, and, especially one who thinks himself *the greatest minister in the world*, and who pleads strongly for sinless perfection, and for justification by the merit of his own good works.

However, Mr Wesley will have it, that it is nothing but love, to what he calls, *the dear decree of reprobation*, which causes the Calvinists to disapprove his Minutes. But this is a great mistake, for the true reason is, that the Calvinists now believe that the *foundation* is struck at by those wretched Minutes, and by the subsequent vindications of them. But the doctrines of election and perseverance, being of all others most hateful to human pride; and Mr Wesley well knowing that he should have a numerous host of *wise and learned men* on his side, whilst he continued to fight against them; holds up these before the world, as if they were the grand cause of contention: whereas those points are very little, indeed, scarcely at all, dwelled on in *the Review of his doctrines*. But methinks Mr Wesley's stratagem in this matter, reminds me of the wisdom of some good old nurses, who, when they cannot otherwise silence the naughty child, tell it that RAW-HEAD AND BLOODY-BONES IS COMING.

Still Mr Wesley insists upon it, that all Mr Hill's dislike of his principles is, because "he (Mr Wesley) is an Arminian." Mr Hill absolutely denies the assertion, and affirms, that though Arminianism be one of those nauseous ingredients which compose Mr Wesley's doses, yet if Arminius were now living, Mr Hill is confident that he would not own Mr Wesley for a disciple; as both he and Mr Fletcher, go as much beyond the original sect of Arminians, as Mr Wesley's *his latter works exceed his former*, pursuant to a prophecy of him, uttered eleven or twelve years ago, by one Jane Cowper, a perfectionist, in the following words. "AS TO YOU, THE LORD PROMISED ME. YOUR LATTER WORKS SHOULD EXCEED YOUR FORMER, THOUGH I DO NOT LIVE TO SEE IT." Which prediction he has been vain enough [if I add an *erratum*, it shall be *weak enough*] to suffer to be printed and sent abroad unto

unto the world, with a Preface, in which are the following words: "All here is strong, sterling sense, strictly agreeable to sound reason. Here are no extravagant flights, no MYSTIC REVERIES, *no unscriptural enthusiasm*. The sentiments are all just and noble, &c."

BUT (says Mr Wesley) "there is something extremely odd in this whole affair. A man falls upon another and gives him a good beating, who, in order to be revenged, does not grapple with *him* (perhaps sensible that he is above his match) but giving him two or three kicks, falls with all his might upon a third man that was standing by."

"O, says he, but I know that rascal well; he is the *second* of him that beat me." "If he is, dispatch your business with the former first, and then turn to him. However, if Mr H. is resolved to fall upon *me*, I must defend myself as well as I can."

*Extremely odd indeed!* that Mr Wesley should be looked upon as a party in the present controversy, when his own *heretical Minutes* first gave the alarm to the religious world; and when it was entirely owing to him that the *vindications* of those Minutes saw the light, and set us all together by the ears, immediately after he had given Mr Shirley the embrace of love and forbearance.

*Extremely odd indeed!* when Mr Wesley revised, corrected, and gave his own *imprimatur* to all Mr Fletcher's *checks*, throughout which, Mr John is the *Alpha and Omega*.

Dear, Sir, did you never read the fable of the trumpeter taken prisoner? He pleaded in his own behalf, that he had not fought a single stroke on the field of battle. "Oh! but, said they who took him, by your trumpet you set us all together by the ears."

Now, if Mr Wesley's trumpet had not given the alarm, we should not have *prepared ourselves for the battle*.

IN answer to what is so clearly deducible from Mr Wesley's sermon on *Catholic love*, (*viz*) that he would have the people under his care, to hear him, and those he sends out, and nobody else; he tells us, (p. 42.) "that he advises all of the church, to hear their parish minister." But ought he not to have said, "provided that minister be no Calvinist?" Let him be Arian, Socinian, Pelagian, Deist, drunkard, swearer, reviler, &c. he may be heard, not only with Mr Wesley's approbation, but with his advice. For he advises ALL of the church to hear their own parish minister." But this is not to be wondered at; since Mr Wesley now declares so implicitly (p. 8.) that

he had rather subscribe to the doctrine of salvation by works, than to that of absolute predestination.

What a pity is it, that Mr Wesley did not well consider this matter before he solemnly subscribed to that doctrine, as being full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort.

“ But Mr Sellon has clearly shewed, that the 17th article does not assert absolute predestination (p. 13.).”

1. Peter Baroe, attempted to shew the same from the Lambeth articles, in Queen Elizabeth’s time.

2. Doctor Samuel Clarke, attempted to shew, that the liturgy of our church countenanced Arianism.

3. Bishop Wilkins, attempted to shew, that a man might make himself wings, and fly to the world in the moon.

4. Old Mordecai, and his prophet, George Bell, the life-guard-man, attempted to shew, that the earth would be destroyed, anno 1758. The former said it would be by the tail of a comet; the latter by an earthquake, on the 28th day of February. And I cannot but think that all these things would be shewn with much greater ease, than Mr Wesley can shew that

The godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ, is

Full of sweet, pleasant and unspeakable COMFORT.

—And yet—An UNCOMFORTABLE doctrine.

That it is according to the everlasting purpose of God.

—And yet—Not of God.

That it draws up the mind to high and heavenly things.

—And yet—Is horrible and blasphemous.

That it doth greatly establish and confirm our faith.

—And yet—Tends to obstruct, if not destroy this great work of the Holy Ghost (assurance of faith.)

That they who are predestinated, walk religiously in GOOD WORKS.

—And yet—That the belief of predestination tends directly to destroy all zeal for GOOD WORKS.

All this Mr Wesley, as a good son of the church of England, subscribes to in the 17th Article (N).

All this Mr Wesley, as a good son of Pelagius, writes and publishes in his Sermon, intituled Free Grace.

Oh,

(N) One would imagine by Mr Wesley’s quoting the authority of our 31st article (p. 14.) in contradiction to the 17th, that

Oh, what sad cause of lamentation, that the lot came out *preach and print!* But Mr Wesley, tells us, (p. 14.) that “this paltry story is untrue,” Why, then, did he not contradict it in the life-time of Mr Whitefield, who published the account above thirty years ago, under Mr Wesley’s own hand, as may be seen in Mr Whitefield’s letter to Mr Wesley, dated Bethesda, in Georgia, December 24, 1740, in the fourth volume of his works, p. 56. And can we suppose that the whole of the story was a base wicked forgery of Mr Whitefield, when he addresses Mr Wesley in such affectionate terms, and reminds him so particularly of the following circumstances? “The case, you know, stands thus: when you was at *Bristol*, I think you received a letter from a private hand, charging you with not preaching the gospel, because you did not preach up election. Upon this *you drew a lot:*” the answer was, “*preach and print.*” “I have often questioned, as I do now, whether in so doing, you did not tempt the Lord. A due exercise of religious prudence, without a lot, would have directed you in that matter. Besides, I never heard that you enquired of God, whether or not election was a gospel doctrine? But I fear, taking it for granted, that it was not, you only enquired, whether you should be silent, or preach and print against it? However, this be, the lot came out, “*preach and print;*” accordingly you preached and printed against election. At my desire you suppressed the publishing the sermon, whilst I was in England, but soon sent it into the world after my departure. O, that you had kept it in!” &c. &c. &c.

These are Mr Whitefield’s own words; and though he is now gone to his everlasting rest, yet if you still say that “*the story is untrue.*” I can bring several living witnesses to confront you, by proving the fact.

---

that he thought our reformers as inconsistent as himself. But that article (the 31st,) speaks nothing of the design and extent of Christ’s death, but of its *all-sufficiency*. And where is the Calvinist that ever denied there was an *all-sufficiency* in his sacrifice, to have washed away the guilt, not only of one, but of a thousand worlds, if God had so willed and ordained.—— But the very supposition that so many zealous Calvinists, as even Bishop Burnet allows our reformers to have been, would have compiled an article in point-blank opposition to their own system, is absurd to the last degree.



I heartily join Mr Wesley, in acknowledging that we have great cause of thankfulness for the good which has arisen out of the late disputes, to which his Minutes gave birth; but it is most likely that our ideas of this *good* are very different. However, waving all observations on the former publications, either *pro* or *con*; I think the following *good* ends have all been answered by Mr Wesley's late remarks on *the Review of his doctrines*.

Ends answered by Mr Wesley's late Remarks.

1st, The meek and lowly tempers of Mr Wesley are manifested.

2dly, Mr Charles Wesley's Calvinism is exposed by Mr John.

3dly, The Christian Library (once *all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God*) is giving up as NOTHING.

4thly, John Goodwin's Treatise on Justification, published by Mr Wesley, as expressing his sentiments better than he could do himself, is given up as NOTHING.

5thly, Baxter's Aphorisms, published by Mr Wesley, (and for the perusal of which, *he blesses God,*) are given up as NOTHING.

6thly, Mr Wesley's former contradictions and inconsistencies are all confirmed; and several additional ones brought to light.

**I** Shall now beg leave to offer Mr Wesley a few friendly hints, which, if he will promise to observe before he next appears in print, there is no doubt but they will be of prodigious service to him.

Certain friendly Hints and Rules to be observed by the Reverend John Wesley, A. M. late Fellow of Lincoln College, Clerk, in order to make him (the said John) a good Author.

1. Let him stick close to truth,
2. Let him lay aside quirks, quibbles, and evasions.
3. Let him abhor making false quotations.
4. Let him never get into the Norwich coach (or into any other vehicle that has wheels) before he takes up the pen.

5. As

5. As an immoderate degree of anger is very unbecoming an *adult believer*, and one who thinks himself the greatest minister in the world; as also very pernicious to the animal oecconomy; let him each day before he begins to write a syllable, read the following words *nine* times over. “*The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God,*” Jam. i. 20.

6. If he has a mind to write well upon religious subjects, let him never more dip his pen in *politics*; but let him always keep in mind those words of the Apostle, “*No man that warreth, entangleth himself with the affairs of this life,*” 2 Tim. ii. 4.

7. Let him shew what he writes to some sensible friend, and beg him to strike out all the contradictions, even though he should not leave two pages behind.

*What's done cannot be undone.* Else it is much to be lamented, that Mr Wesley did not receive these friendly directions before his last piece came out; the effects of which have been so very contrary to what he wished, that a judicious and reverend friend of mine thus writes to me on the occasion.

“You have not told me, whether you are meditating a reply to Mr John's *kind* remembrance of you. Unless his people are absolutely infatuated through blind subjection to him; I should imagine, he must have effectually stabbed his own cause.”

Now this is worse than all the rest. For if what my worthy friend says be true. That very *gun*, which was intended by Mr Wesley to make such dreadful havock among the Calvinists, particularly against *the cat's paw of their party*, on account of its being too highly charged, is burst in his hand, and has blown out his own brains. For I can by no means agree with Mr Baxter (O), that he never had any to blow out.

I Cannot intirely conclude this piece, without assuring Mr Fletcher, that, however widely I may differ from him in doctrinal points, I heartily concur with him in thinking that there is a manifest departure in too many professors from the practical part of genuine christianity; and that there is sad reason to fear, that not a few in this day are resting their poor souls upon a system of dry doctrines,

---

(O) Turn back to p. 17. note M:

trines, without the least favor of grace, or experience upon their hearts. *The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life* (that cursed trinity of the natural man) are not only insufficiently watched against, but too much pleaded for by many who sit under clear gospel ordinances: and the duties of mortification, self-denial, deadness to the world, taking up the cross, watchfulness and prayer, too little attended to.

And yet this is not owing to the doctrines they hear, but to their own *deceitful and desperately wicked hearts*, which turn the most wholesome food into deadly poison. And, indeed, we need only look at the lives of the generality of the clergy, most of whom hold, and highly approve of Mr Wesley's, and Mr Fletcher's tenets, and are therefore, properly speaking, the real doctrinal Methodists (O), to see the dreadful effects of *their* system. If, therefore Mr Fletcher had made the noble stand for holiness upon gospel principles, which he has done upon rotten legal principles, and which can therefore never effect his design; and had he avoided all unkind censures against his brethren; instead of taking up the pen against him, I would have been one of the first to have publicly thanked him for so eminent a service done to the church of Christ in this Laodicean day: And it should have been my sincere prayer, that his wholesome words might not only be treasured up in the heart, but brought forth in the life of his

Most affectionate Friend,

For Christ's Sake,

R. H.

---

(O) The name of Methodist, as it is indifferently given, by way of reproach, to all who have more zeal for religion than is consistent with the fashion of the times, I have no desire whatever to shake off; on the contrary, I would glory in it, as the badge which I believe every real christian is allotted to wear; and I would pray, that I might deserve it much more than I do. But as it conveys the idea of an attachment to those pernicious principles taught by Mr Wesley, and the vindicator, in opposition to the word of God, and to the doctrines of all the Protestant churches (that of this nation in particular) in this view of it, I desire totally to renounce it.

SINCE the foregoing pages were finished in the manuscript, I have seen Mr Fletcher's *Logica Genevensis*, or *fourth check to Antinomianism*. I shall not here make any remarks upon it; however, it has furnished me with the title and motto which are prefixed to this piece; and has occasioned me here and there to scatter a few grains of *mild irony*, by way of return for the compliments which are so frequently paid, to that he calls, *Logica Genevensis*, (*i. e.* the Geneva, or Calvinistical Logic,) throughout his whole performance. However, had he contented himself with ever so many decorations of this sort, his book would for me have remained unanswered; but tho' I fully intended to have been silent, yet the many gross perversions and misrepresentations which I have detected under the covering of much professed candor, and many appeals to the judgment of the unprejudiced (which when they are the most liberally bestowed are generally most to be suspected) will oblige me once more to enter the lists with my able antagonist; but, despairing of my own skill, I must beg leave to call in the Vicar of Madely, to be my second; and happily for this purpose I have preserved a sermon of his, which was preached by him only a few years ago, in his own parish church, from Rom. xi. 5, 6. And I think it is by far the best refutation of the unscriptural doctrine contained in the Minutes, and in all the Checks which I have yet seen. As this sermon was publicly delivered before a very numerous congregation, and copies of it handed about by the preacher's own permission; and as he tells us, that he is determined, *God being his helper, to preach the doctrine therein contained, till his tongue cleave to the roof of his mouth*; no reasonable person can think that there is the least unfairness in my availing myself of so powerful an ally; and I solemnly declare upon the word of a christian, that in the few extracts I may make from it, I will not alter the least jot or tittle from the manuscript, and only make some marginal notes and observations upon it. However, as Mr Fletcher's late work, intitled *Logica Genevensis*, or a *fourth Check to Antinomianism*, was intended as a farther vindication of Mr Wesley, and is particularly levelled at what he calls *the Calvinian imputation of righteousness*. I must beg to present my readers with the following concise Farrago, to which this same fourth check gave birth; and with which I dismiss the controversy for the present.

Mr

Mr Wesley's Vindicator.

If we shall be justified by works in the last day, there is an end of CALVIN'S IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.

*Contents to Logica Genevensis.*

I have exposed the Antinomianism of those preachers, who setting aside Christ's doctrine of justification by the evidence of works in the last day; give thousands to understand, that they shall be abundantly justified by RIGHTEOUSNESS IMPUTED IN CALVIN'S WAY.

*Ibid. p. 59.*

Mr Wesley.

I think on justification, just as I have done these seven and twenty years, and JUST AS MR CALVIN DOES. In this respect I do not differ from him an hair's breadth.

*Mr Wesley's last Four. p. 115.*

I have, during this whole time (since the year 1738) occasionally used those expressions imputed righteousness, the righteousness of Christ, and others of the same kind; but it is equally true, that I never used them at all in any other meaning, than that SOUND SCRIPTURAL ONE, wherein they are used by many eminent men, MR CALVIN IN PARTICULAR.

Mr Wesley's answer to Mr Hervey's letters.

Now after all the pains which Mr Fletcher has taken, and all the volumes he has written to vindicate Mr Wesley, it appears by the foregoing short contrast, that he has given his friend a mortal blow; and that these two gentlemen are absolutely as different from each other at this very moment in the most important of all points, viz. how a sinner shall stand before God (unless Mr Wesley has tacked about again since he wrote his last Journal) as the East is distant from the West.—How then shall they, who purchase Mr Wesley's works, and those of the vindicator, know which to believe; when they not only contradict one another in this most essential of all doctrines, but so frequently contradict themselves. But whichever side the multitude may take between these two disputants, Mr Wesley may certainly make a personal address to all the four checks, and say with the poor man mentioned by the poet—

*Pol. me occidistis amici,  
Non servastis ais.*

The

THE Reader is desired to turn back to page 31. and to compare what follows with the two columns in that page, by which means he will perceive that Mr Wesley has once more contradicted himself in the interpretation of that scripture, *whosoever is born of God, sinneth not.* A circumstance which I was not aware of till after that leaf was printed.

John v. 18. *The Apostle John declares that, Whosoever is born of God, sinneth not.*

1st, By any **HABITUAL** sin, &c.

*Mr Wesley's Sermon on Eph. ii. 8.*

[Now let the reader only cast his eyes on the opposite column, and he will find Mr John not only flatly contradicting himself, but heartily abusing himself, as a corrupter of God's word, a deceiver, — tricker, — shuffler, — and what not.]

*Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin.*

Some men will say "true, "whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin habitually." **HABITUAL- LY!** whence is that? I read it not. It is not written in the book. God plainly saith, *he doth not commit sin;* and thou addest, *habitually.* Who art thou that mendest the oracles of God? That addest to the words of this book? Beware, I beseech thee, lest God add to thee, *all the plagues that are written therein!* Especially when the comment thou addest is such, as quite swallows up the text. So that by this artful method of deceiving, the precious promise is utterly lost: By this *tricking* and *shuffling* of men, the word of God is made of none effect.

*Mr Wesley's Sermon, on John iii. 8.*

THIS pamphlet was quite finished when I was told, that Mr John Wesley had lately a very remarkable dream, which awakened him out of a sound sleep. This dream he communicated to the Society. — It was in substance, as follows: That a big rough man came to him, and gave him a violent blow upon the arm with a red-hot bar of iron.

Now the interpretation thereof I conceive to be as follows;

- 1st, *The big rough man,* is *The Cat's-paw.*
- 2dly, *The bar of iron,* is *Logica Westiensis.*
- 3dly, *The blow* denotes the shock which Mr John will receive by the said pamphlet.
- 4thly, His being awakened out of a sound sleep, signifies, there is yet hope, that he will some time or other come to the right use of his spiritual faculties.

## P O S T S C R I P T.

**I**T is possible this may fall into the hands of some who have little or no concern about their own souls. To such I beg to offer a few words before we part.

1st, Take care how you draw any conclusions against religion in general, because you see disputes among the professors of it. Rather suppose it is the more lovely and desirable upon this account. If there was no true value in gold and precious stones, there would not be so many litigations about the former; nor so many dangerous voyages to obtain the latter. And yet one who was well acquainted with the worth of real religion, tells us, that *God's commandments are more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold.* Take then the Angel's advice to the church of Laodicea, Rev. iii. 18. *I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire.* And think no labor too great to search for the pearl of great price.

2dly, Examine what your heart is most set upon. Try whether the love of Christ, or the love of the world, has the chief seat in your affections. And remember, that there is no serving *God and Mammon*.—Think seriously how short a time you have to stay here below, and how often you have been disappointed in your pursuit of earthly felicity; and even when you have attained the utmost of your wishes, how little solid or durable satisfaction has been the result? Still you found something or other about you to make you uneasy, or you soon wanted the addition of something or other, which you vainly thought would render you completely happy.—It has been with you as with Jonah's gourd, there was a canker-worm at the root of all your joy.

3dly, Be careful how you silence the voice of conscience. When you are alone, you have often secret misgivings, that all is not right between God and your soul. If you put off these remonstrances, with saying, like Felix, that you will hear them at a more convenient season; it is much to be feared that such a season will never come. **Still death, death is approaching, even while you are striving to put the thoughts of it out of your mind; and,**

death find you unprepared for his reception, he will prove a king of terrors indeed; for *the sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law.*

4thly, Be careful how you harbour prejudices against *pure undefiled religion*, and against the professors of it.— You need not be told, that the *faith which worketh by love*, and which *overcometh the world*, is not an article for which there is any great enquiry made in this degenerate age. Consider that real piety continues the same, whether you approve, or reproach it. That you, yourself, are the creature of a day; that you have within you an immortal spirit, which must be eternally happy, or eternally miserable; that nothing separates you from this eternal state, but the breath in your nostrils. And when you come to lie on a sick bed, and to have the near prospect of eternity before your eyes, riches, honors, pleasures, will all lose their relish, and appear to be only empty bubbles. But sin will then be found to have a dreadful reality in it, and unless you are arrived at that worst of states, a *feared conscience*, it will turn a pillow of down into a bed of thorns.— If these are not the words of truth and soberness, *reject* them; if they are, does it not well behove you to pay attention to them?

5thly, Would you be truly happy in life, and would you wish to find comfort in death? Then do not mistake the shadow for the substance any longer. It is true, the law of God finds you guilty, and sin lies at your door; but the gospel brings you relief, by telling you, that Christ hath put away sin by the sacrifice of himself; and that he hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, *Heb. ix. 26. Gal. iii. 13.* To this only Lord and Saviour then I would direct your views. To him I would send you in earnest prayer, that he would be pleased to bestow upon you the gift of his Holy Spirit, and to work in you repentance unto life, never to be repented of, *2 Cor. vii. 10.*

## F I N I S.

---

### E R R A T A.

Page 9. l. 36. read *at present*. P. 10. leave out the point after the word *auxilio*, and begin the word *and* with a small *a*.  
 P. 15. l. 14. for *is*, r. *it is*. P. 33. l. 28. for *sins*, r. *some sins*.  
 P. 50. the Reference [G] should be made to p. 12. & 17.



Just Published;

- I. **T**HE Finishing Stroke: Containing some strictures on Mr Fletcher's Book, intitled, *Logica Genevensis*, &c.
- II. Five Letters to the Reverend Mr Fletcher, intended chiefly for the Comfort of Mourning Backsliders, and such as have been distressed and perplexed by reading Mr Wesley's Minutes, or the Vindication of them. Second Edition, much enlarged, Price 9d.
- III. The Paris Conversation relative to the Minutes. Second Edition, Price 3d.
- IV. An Address to Persons of Fashion, relative to Balls, Plays, Cards, &c. in which is introduced the Character of Lucinda. The Sixth Edition, Price bound, 2s.

Also,

A New Edition, much enlarged, Price 2s.

O F

A Review of all the Doctrines taught by Mr John Wesley. Shewing that Gentleman's amazing inconsistency with himself. His difference from all the Protestant Churches, and his close Adherence to the Tenets of the Papists.—With Remarks on Mr Fletcher's *Third Check*, &c. annexed.

Which Remarks may be had separate, Price 3d.

Also,

Friendly Remarks on the Spirit and Doctrines of Mr Fletcher's Writings. By R. H. A. M. Price 1s.