
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>



S O M E
R E M A R K S

O N

Mr. *HILL*'s

FARRAGO DOUBLE-DISTILLED.

By JOHN WESLEY.

*If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably
with all men.* ROM. xii. 18.

B R I S T O L :
PRINTED BY WILLIAM PINE.

M.DCC.LXXIII.

Bl from Tregaskis



S O M E
R E M A R K S

O N

Mr. *H I L L*'s

FARRAGO DOUBLE-DISTILLED.

1. **I**T is far from my design to give a particular answer to every thing contained in Mr. Hill's late treatise. I intend only to offer to the impartial reader, a few cursory remarks, which may partly explain and partly confirm what I have already said upon the subject.

2. "Poor Mr. Wesley*," says Mr. Hill, opening his cause with native eloquence, "has published various tracts, out of which Mr. Hill collects "above an hundred gross contradictions. At this "Mr. W.'s temper is much ruffled;" (I believe not; I am not sensible of it;) "he primes, cocks,
A 2 "and

* Page 3. Quotations from Mr. Hill are marked with double, from the Remarks, with single comma's.

“ and fires at Calvinism: and there is smoke and
 “ fire in plenty. But if you can bear the stench,
 “ (which indeed is very nauseous) there is no danger
 “ of being wounded †. He calls this last cannon,
 “ or pop-gun, *Remarks on my review*. Men of sense
 “ say, it is quite unfit for duty: men of grace com-
 “ passionate the *caster* of it: men of pleasantry
 “ laugh heartily at it; but some good old women
 “ speak highly of it †.” I give this passage at some
 length, as a genuine specimen of Mr. Hill's man-
 ner of writing.

3. But “ as Mr. Hill did not chuse to prefix his
 “ his name, it *argued no great proof of Mr. W.'s*
 “ *politeneſs*, to address him in the personal manner
 “ he has done.” Which of us began? Was it not
 Mr. Hill? Did not he address me in a personal
 manner first? And some, beside the old women,
 are of opinion, he did not do it in the *politeſt* man-
 ner in the world.

4. “ Mr. W. would have us know, that his
 “ piece is written in much *love*. But what *love*?
 “ Love to his own inconsistencies; love of scold-
 “ ing, love of abuse. Let the reader find out any
 “ other sort of love through the whole perform-
 “ ance.” In order to judge whether I wrote in
 love or no, let any one read the words he has
 picked out of fifty-four pages, just as they stand
 connected with others in each page: it will then
 appear they are not contrary either to love or meek-
 ness.

5. But Mr. W. says, Mr. Hill “ is unworthy
 “ the name either of the gentleman or the Chris-
 “ tian: and is amazed, that Mr. Hill should lay
 “ claim to either of those titles*.” Not so. It is
 my belief, that Mr. Hill is both a gentleman and
 a Christian: though I still think, in his treatment
 of Mr. Fletcher and me, he has acted beneath his
 character.

† Page 4.

† Page 5.

* Page 6.

character. Yet it is very likely, " a friend of
 " yours § (not mine) might say, I wrote in *much*
 " *wrath.*" I wrote then in just as much wrath as
 I do now; though *your* friend might think other-
 wise.

6. Nay, but Mr. W. " gives || all the Calvinist
 " Ministers the most scurrilous, Billingsgate lan-
 " guage, while he is trumpeting forth his own
 " praises, in Mr. F.'s Second Check to Antinomi-
 " anism." A small mistake. I do not give Billings-
 gate language to any one: I have not so learned
 Christ. Every one of those hymns, out of which
 Mr. Hill culls the harshest expressions, are not
 mine, but my brother's. Neither do I " trumpet
 " forth my own praises." Mr. Hill's imagining I
 do, arises from an innocent mistake. He continu-
 ally takes for granted, that I read over and correct
 all Mr. F.'s books before they go to the press. So
 far from it, that the Fourth Check to Antinomian-
 ism I have not read over to this day. But Mr. W.
 " thinks himself to be *the greatest minister in the*
 " *world.*" Exceedingly far from it, I know many
 now in England, at whose feet I desire to be found
 in the day of the Lord Jesus.

7. To that question, Why does a man ' fall
 ' upon me, because another gave him a good beat-
 ' ing?' Mr. Hill answers, " If your trumpet had
 " not given the alarm, we should not have pre-
 " pared ourselves for the battle."* Nay truly, not
 mine, but Mr. Shirley's. I was sitting quietly in
 my study, on the other side of St. George's chan-
 nel, when *his* trumpet gave the alarm. Yet I say
 again, I am not *now* sorry for these disputes, though
 I *was* sorry. You say, truly, " Mr. W.'s temper
 " has been manifested" hereby. † Let all candid
 men judge between us. Whether Mr. F. and I on
 the one hand, or Mr. Hill on the other, has shewn

A 3

more

§ Page 7.

|| Page 8.

* Page 53.

† Page 56.

more "meekness and lowliness?" And which of us has expressed the greatest heat, and the most cordial contempt of his opponent.

Mr. H. adds, "Hereby Mr. Charles Wesley's Calvinism is exposed by Mr. John." Then that is exposed, which never existed, for he never was a Calvinist yet. And "hereby Mr. H. says, the Christian Library is given up as nothing." Mere finesse! Every one sees my meaning, but those that will not see it. It is *nothing to your purpose*: it *proves nothing of what it is brought to prove*. In the same sense I set the word *nothing*, over against the citations from Mr. Baxter, and Goodwin.

8. If Mr. Hill says, he *always was* a Calvinist, I have no right to contradict him. But I am sure he was of a widely different temper, from that he has shewn in his late writings. I allow much to his belief, That in exposing me to the utmost of his power, he is doing God service. Yet I must needs say, if I were writing against a Turk, or a Pagan, I durst not use him as Mr. Hill does me. And if I really am (which will one day appear) employing all my time, and labour, and talents, (such as they are) for this single end, That the kingdom of Christ may be set up on earth: Then he whom I serve in the gospel of his Son will not commend him for his present work.

9. But what makes Mr. Hill so warm against me? I still believe it is for this chiefly, because I am an Arminian, an Election-doubter. For, says he, the "good old preacher, places all election-doubters, (that is, those who are not clear in the belief of Absolute Predestination) among the numerous hosts of the Diabolonians. One of these, being brought before the Judge, the Judge tells him, he "must die."† That is plainly, he must die eternally for this damnable sin. I beg Mr. Hill to explain himself

† Review, Page 35.

himself on this head. Does he still subscribe to the substance of this *good, old preacher*? Are all election-doubters to be placed among the Diabolonians? Is the sentence irreversibly passed, That they must all die eternally? I must insist on Mr. Hill's answering this question: If not, silence gives consent.

10. Mr. H. farther affirms, "The only cement of Christian union is the love of God. And the foundation of that love must be laid, in believing *the truths of God*:" (that is, you *must believe* particular redemption, or it is impossible you should love God. For, to use "the words of Dr. Owen in his display of Arminianism," (see what *truths* Mr. Hill means!) "an agreement without truth is no peace, but a covenant with death, and a conspiracy against the kingdom of Christ."† Here again I beg an explicit answer. Will Mr. H. affirm this in cool blood? If he will, there needs no more to account for his enmity both to me and the minutes. "Nay, but the foundation is struck at by those wretched minutes."* True, the foundation of Calvinism. So I observed before. I know it well. If the minutes stand, Calvinism falls. But Mr. Hill says, "The doctrines of election and perseverance, are very little, indeed scarcely at all *dwelled on* in the Review." Now I think they are much dwelt on therein, and desire any that have eyes to judge.

11. We come now to the main question, Is the *Farrago* true or false? I aver it to be totally false; except in one single article, out of an hundred and one. I mean, Mr. Hill has not proved, that I contradict myself, except in that single instance. To come to particulars.

I. "There

† Review, Page 93.

* Page 52.

I.

“ There was an *everlasting covenant* between the Father and Son, concerning man’s redemption. (There never was such a covenant.)”

The former proposition is taken from the Christian Library : On which Mr. Hill says again, “ Mr. W. affirms, that the Christian Library is *all true, all agreeable to the word of God.*” I answered before, ‘ I do † not :’ My words are *Pref. p. 4*, ‘ I have *endeavoured* to extract such a collection of English Divinity, as I *believe* is all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God.’ I did *believe* and do believe every *tract* therein to be true and agreeable to the oracles of God. But I do not roundly affirm this ‘ of every sentence contained in the fifty volumes. I could not possibly affirm it for two reasons. 1. I was obliged to prepare most of those tracts for the press, just as I could snatch time in travelling; not transcribing them; (none expected it of me) but only marking the lines with my pen, and altering a few words here and there, as I had mentioned in the preface. 2. As it was not in my power to attend the press, that care necessarily devolved on others; through whose inattention an hundred passages were left in, which I had scratched out. It is probable too, that I myself might overlook some sentences which were not suitable to my own principles. It is certain, the correctors of the press did this in not a few instances. The plain inference is, if there are an hundred passages in the Christian Library, which contradict any or all of my doctrines, these are no proofs that I contradict myself. Be it observed once for all therefore, citations from the Christian Library prove nothing, but the carelessness of the correctors.’

12. Yet

† Remarks, Page 12.

12. Yet Mr. Hill, as if he had never seen a word of this, or had solidly refuted it, gravely tells us again "If Mr. W. may * be credited, the Farrago is all true: Part of it being taken out of his own Christian Library, in the preface of which he tells us, That the contents are *all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God.* Therefore every single word of it is *his own*, either by birth or adoption." No: I never adopted, I could not adopt every single word of the Christian Library. It was impossible I should have such a thought, for the reasons above mentioned.

But "there † is very great evasion," says Mr. Hill, "in Mr. W.'s 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, which are diametrically opposite to Mr. W.'s present tenets; particularly the treatises of Dr. Sibs, Dr. Preston, Bishop Beveridge, and Dr. Owen, on Indwelling Sin."

13. Just before Mr. H. affirmed, "*Every single word in the Christian Library is his own.*" Beaten out of this hold, he retreats to another: but it is as untenable as the former. "The matter," he says, "does not rest on a few sentences: whole treatises are diametrically opposite to his present tenets." He instances in the works of Dr. Sibs, Preston, Beveridge, and a treatise of Dr. Owen's.

I join issue with him on this point. Here I pin him down. The works of Dr. Preston, and Sibs, are in the ninth and tenth volumes of the Library: that treatise of Dr. Owen's in the seventeenth; that of Bishop Beveridge in the forty-seventh. Take which of them you please: suppose the last, Bishop Beveridge's *Thoughts upon Religion*. Is this whole

* Page 12.

† Page 16.

whole treatise. "diametrically opposite to my present tenets?" The *Resolutions* take up the greatest part of the book; every sentence of which exactly agrees with my present judgment; as do at least nine parts in ten of the preceding *Thoughts*, on which those *Resolutions* are formed. Now what could possibly induce a person of Mr. Hill's character, a man of a good understanding and of a generous temper, a well-bred gentleman and a serious Christian, to violate all the rules of justice and truth, which at other times he so earnestly defends, by positively, deliberately, roundly asserting so intire a falshood, merely to blacken one who loves his person, who esteems his character, and is ready to serve him in any thing within his power? What, but so violent an attachment to his opinion, as while that is in danger suspends all his faculties, so that he neither can *feel*, nor *think*, nor *speak* like himself?

14. In the ninth and tenth volumes are two treatises of Dr. Preston's, *The Breastplate of Faith and Love*, and *The New Covenant*. Is either of these "diametrically opposite to my present tenets?" By no means. If a few sentences here and there, (and this I only suppose, not grant,) were carelessly left in, though I had scratched them out, which seem (perhaps only seem) to contradict them; these are not the *whole tracts*; the general tenor of which I still heartily subscribe to.

The tenth volume likewise contains *Two Sermons* of Dr. Sibs, and his *Traet upon Solomon's Song*. Are any of these "diametrically opposite to my present tenets?" No more than those of Dr. Preston's. I as willingly as ever subscribe to these also.

Is Dr. Owen's tract, *Of the Remainder of Indwelling Sin in Believers*, "diametrically opposite to my present tenets?" So far from it, that a few years since I published a sermon on the very same subject.

subject. I hope there is no room to charge me with "quirk, quibble, artifice, evasion," on this head: (though I believe as much as on any other.) I use only plain, manly reasoning: and such logic I am not ashamed to avow before the whole learned world.

15. But "I will go farther still *," (says Mr. Hill.) "Let Mr. W. only bring me twenty lines together, out of the writings of those four eminent divines, as they stand in the Christian Library; and I will engage to prove, that he has twenty times contradicted them in some of his other publications." Agreed. I bring him the following twenty lines, with which Dr. Preston begins his treatise called *The New Covenant*. †

[These words of God to Abraham contain a precept of sincerity, or perfect walking with God, *Walk before me, and be thou perfect*; and also the motive thereunto, God's all-sufficiency, *I am God all-sufficient*. As if he should say, If there were any defect in me, if thou didst need or couldst desire any thing that were not to be had in me, and thou mightest have it elsewhere, perhaps thy heart might be imperfect in walking towards me. Thou mightest then step out from me, to take in advantages elsewhere. But seeing I am all-sufficient; since I have enough in me to fulfil all thy desires; since I am every way an adequate object, so that all thy soul can wish for thou mayst have in me; why then shouldst thou not consecrate thyself to me alone? Why then shouldst thou be uneven in thy ways, serving me sometimes, and sometimes the creature? For there is nothing in the creature, but thou mayst find in me. *I am all-sufficient: therefore walk before me, and be perfect!*]

Here are exactly twenty lines, neither more nor less, "as they stand in the Christian Library."

Now,

* Page 19.

† Vol. X. Page 47.

Now, fulfil your engagement : Prove that I “ have “ twenty times contradicted them in some other “ of my publications.” If you cannot, acknowledge you have done me wrong. In the heat of your resentment, you have undertaken what you are not able to perform. You have spoken rashly and unadvisedly. You have gone much too far, far beyond the bounds of wisdom as well as of love.

16. Nay, but “ I will go one step farther yet. “ I defy Mr. W. to bring me twenty lines out of “ the above tracts, by Preston, Sibs, Owen, and “ Beveridge, which he now believes.” Is it possible, that Mr. H. should believe himself, while he is talking at this rate? Or does he expect that any one else should believe him, unless he be drunk with passion or prejudice? Was ever any thing so wild? But I accept of this challenge, and that with more seriousness than it deserves. I will go no farther than the twenty lines cited above: All these I “ now believe.” And I believe, as I said before, not only the whole treatise from which those words are taken, but the tenor of the whole Christian Library.

Meantime it has been acknowledged again and again, that *several sentences* stand therein, which I had put out in my usual manner, by drawing my pen through them. Be it observed therefore once more, that those passages prove nothing but the carelessness of the correctors; consequently, all the pains bestowed to collect them together, whether by Mr. Hill or his coadjutors, is absolutely lost labour, and never can prove that I contradict myself.

17. The case is nearly the same with regard to those other tracts which I published many years ago, Mr. *Baxter's Aphorisms on Justification*, and *John Goodwin's Tract* on the subject. I have lately read them both over with all the attention I

am

am capable of; and I still believe they contain the true scripture-doctrine concerning justification by faith: but it does not follow, that I am accountable for every sentence contained in either of those treatises.

“ But does Mr. W. believe the doctrine therein contained, or does he not?” I do: and John Goodwin believed the doctrine contained in the sermon on *The Lord our Righteousness*: the sum of which is, ‘ We are justified, sanctified, and glorified, for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered for us.’ Nothing he asserts is inconsistent with this; though it may be inconsistent with *passages* left in the Christian Library: when therefore I write *nothing* against those passages, or the extracts from Goodwin, that contradict them, this does not prove, (as Mr. Hill archly says) that “ I have nothing to say,” but that all those passages and extracts put together are nothing to the purpose. For were it true, that John Goodwin and Richard Baxter contradicted all those passages, it is nothing to the point in hand: it never can prove, that I, John Wesley, contradict myself.

18. But to return to *the Everlasting Covenant*. “ Mr. W. himself, in his annotations on Gen. i. 1. “ calls the *Elohim*, a *covenant God*.” True, in covenant with man. But I say not one word of any covenant between the Father and the Son. But “ in his note on Isai. lv. 4. speaking of the covenant made between God and David, he says, “ *This David is Christ*.” Undoubtedly I do: but what is this brought to prove? My words are, ‘ * I have appointed, and will in due time give him— the David last-mentioned, even Christ—a witness —to declare the will of God concerning the duty and salvation of men, to bear witness to the truth, to confirm God’s promises, and among others,

B

‘ those

‘ those which respect the calling of the Gentiles :
 ‘ to be a witness to both parties of that covenant
 ‘ made *between God and man.*’ Yea, of the cove-
 nant made *between God and man!* Of a covenant *be-*
tween the Father and the Son here is not a word.

“ The only possible conclusion to be drawn from
 “ this defence of Mr. W.’s, is, That he became a
 “ commentator on the bible, before he could read
 “ the bible.” That is pity! If he could not read
 when he was three-score years old, I doubt he
 never will. See the candor, the good-nature of
 Mr. Hill! Is this *attic salt*, or wormwood?

What conclusion can be possibly drawn in fa-
 vour of Mr. Hill? The most favourable I can
 draw is this, That he never read the book which
 he quotes: that he took the word of some of his
 friends. But how shall we excuse them? I hope
 they trusted their memories, not their eyes. But
 what recompence can he make to *me*, for publish-
 ing so gross a falsehood; which nevertheless those
 who read *his tract*, and not mine, will take to be
 as true as the gospel?

II.

Of Election and Perseverance.

19. In entering upon this head, I observed *,
 ‘ Mr. Sellon has clearly shewn, that the seven-
 ‘ teenth article does not assert absolute predestina-
 ‘ tion. Therefore in denying this, I neither con-
 ‘ tradict that article nor myself.’

It lies therefore upon Mr. Hill, to answer Mr.
 Sellon before he witticizes upon *me*. Let him do
 this, and he talks to the purpose: otherwise all the
 pretty, lively things he says about Dr. Barøe, Bi-
 shop Wilkins; Dr. Clark, and George Best, are
 utterly thrown away.

As

* Page 13.

As to George Bell, Mr. Richard says, Mr. M. justly censures * the *enthusiam* and *credulity* of Mr. John, in paying so much attention to Bell's ridiculous reveries; in calling him a *sensible* man, and *entreating* him to continue in his society, on account of the great good he did. However Bell *refused* to remain in connexion with him, because of his *double dealings* and *unfaithful proceedings*: for he sometimes was full of Bell's praises; at other times he would warn the people against him. He also gives a particular narration of what he rightly calls the *Comet-Enthusiasm*. Mr. John preached *more than ten times* about the comet, which he *supposed* was to appear in 1758, to burn up all the produce of the earth, and lastly to execute its grand commission on the globe itself, causing the stars to fall from heaven."

What an heap of dirt is here raked together? I must not let it pass quite unnoticed. 1. He justly censures the *enthusiasm* and *credulity* of Mr. W. in paying so much attention to Bell's ridiculous reveries." Nay, so very little, that I checked them strongly, as soon as ever they came to my knowledge: particularly his whim about the end of the world, which I earnestly opposed both in private and public. 2. "Bragging of the many *miraculous* cures he had wrought." I *bragged* of, that is, simply related the case of Mary Special, and no other: in the close of which I said, 'Here are three plain facts, she was ill; she is well; she became so in a moment. Which of these can, with any modesty, be denied?' I still ask the same question. 3. That I ever called him a *sensible* man, is altogether false. A man of faith and love I then *knew* him to be; but I never thought him a man of sense. 4. That I *entreated* him,

B 2

him.

him to continue in the society, is likewise totally false: 5. Nor did I ever tell *him*, on that or any other occasion, of "the great good" he did. I know, he was an instrument in God's hand, of convincing and converting many sinners. But though I speak this now to all the world, I never spoke it to himself. 6. Neither did he ever *refuse* what never was asked, "to remain in connexion with me." 7. Least of all did he refuse it because of my *double dealings* or *unfaithful proceedings*. He never mentioned to me any such thing, nor had he any pretence so to do. 8. Nay, but you "was at some times full of Bell's praises"—Very moderately full:—"At other times"—that is, after he ran mad—"you warned the people against him." I warned them not to regard his prophecies; particularly with regard to the † 28th of February.

20. "He also gives us a particular narration of "what he rightly enough calls the *Comet-Enthusiasm*. "Mr. John preached *more than ten times* about the "Comet he supposed was to appear in 1758 and to "consume the globe." This is a foolish slander, as it is so easily confuted. A tract was published at that very time, intitled, "Serious thoughts occasioned by the earthquake at Lisbon." The thing which I then accidentally mentioned in preaching, (twice or thrice, it may be, four times) is there set down at large, much more at large than ever I mentioned it in any Sermon. The words are these.*

"Dr. Halley fixes the return of the Comet, "which appeared in 1682, in the year 1758." (Observe Dr. Halley does this, not I.) On which he adds, "But may the great, good God avert "such a shock or contact of such great bodies, "moving with such forces, (which however is by
" no

† Journal X. Page 99.

* Page 14, & seq.

“no means impossible) lest this most beautiful order of things be entirely destroyed, and reduced into its ancient chaos.”

‘But what if God should not avert this contact?

‘what would the consequence be?’—That consequence I afterwards describe.—‘Burning up all

‘the produce of the earth, and then the globe

‘itself.’ But do I affirm or *suppose*, that it *actually* will do this? I suppose, nay affirm, at the bottom of the same page, the direct contrary. ‘What

‘security is there against all this, on the *infidel* hy-

‘pothesis? But on the Christian there is *abundant*

‘*security*: for the prophecies are not yet fulfilled.’ †

21. So much for the *Comet-Enthusiasm*. We return now to the point of *unconditional election*.

“One would † imagine,” says Mr. Hill, “by Mr.

“W.’s quoting the thirty first article, in *contra-*

“*dition* to the seventeenth, that he thought the

“reformers as inconsistent as himself.” I did not

quote the 31st in *contradiction* to the 17th, but in

explication of it. The latter, the thirty-first can

bear but one meaning: therefore it fixes the sense

of the former. “Nay, this article speaks nothing

“of the *extent* of Christ’s death, but of its *all-suffi-*

“*ciency*.” ‡ Nothing of the extent! Why, it speaks

of nothing else: its all-sufficiency is out of the ques-

tion. The words are, “The offering of Christ. †

“once made, is that perfect redemption, propitia-

“tion and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole

“world, both original and actual.” It is here

affirmed, the death of Christ is a perfect satisfac-

tion for *all the sins of the whole world*. It would be

sufficient for a thousand worlds. But of this the

article says nothing.

But “even Bishop Burnet allows our reformers

“to have been zealous Calvinists.” He does not

allow them *all* to be such: He knew and you know

the contrary. You cannot but know, that Bishop Ridley, Hooper, and Latimer, to name no more, were firm Universalists.

22. But the contradictions! Where are the contradictions? "Why, sometimes you deny election: yet another time you say,

"From all eternity with love

"Unchangeable thou hast me view'd*."

I answered, 'I believe this is true, on the supposition of *faith foreseen*, not otherwise.'

Here is therefore no contradiction, unless on that supposition, which I do not allow.

But sometimes "you deny the perseverance of the saints." Yet in one place you say, 'I do not deny, that those eminently stiled the *elect shall* persevere.' I mean those that are *perfected in love*. So I was inclined to think for many years. But for ten or twelve years I have been fully convinced, that even these may *make shipwreck of the faith*.

23. But "several of Mr. Hill's quotations are from Mr. Charles Wesley's hymns, for which Mr. John says, he will not be answerable."

I will now explain myself upon this head. Though there are some expressions in my brother's hymns, which I do not use, as being very liable to be misconstrued: yet I am fully satisfied, that in the whole tenor of them, they thoroughly agree with mine, and with the bible: 2. That there is no jot of Calvinism therein; that not one hymn, not one verse of an hymn, maintains either unconditional election, or infallible perseverance. Therefore I can readily answer Mr. H.'s question, "How can Mr. W. answer it to his own conscience, to write prefaces and recommendations to
"hymns

“ hymns which he does not believe?” There is the mistake. I do believe them: although still I will not be answerable for *every expression* which may occur therein. But as to those expressions which you quote, in proof of final perseverance, they prove thus much, and no more, that the persons who use them have at that time *the full assurance of hope*. Hitherto then Mr. Hill has brought no proof, that I contradict myself.

III.

*Of Imputed Righteousness. **

24. “ Blessed be God, we are not among those who are so *dark* in their conceptions and expressions. We no more deny (says Mr. W.) the *phrase of imputed righteousness, than the thing.*” It is true: for I continually affirm, To them that believe, *faith is imputed for righteousness*. And I do not contradict this, in still denying that *phrase, the imputed righteousness of Christ*, to be in the bible; or in beseeching both Mr. Hervey and you, ‘ Not to dispute for *that particular phrase.*’

But “ since Mr. W. blesses God for enlightening him to receive the doctrine, and to adopt the phrase of imputed righteousness; how came he to think that *clear conceptions* of the doctrine were so unnecessary, and the phrase itself so useless, after having so *deeply lamented the dark conceptions* of those who rejected the term and the thing?”

It was neither this *term, The imputed righteousness of Christ*, nor the *thing* which Antinomians mean thereby, the rejection of which I supposed to argue any *darkness of conception*. But those I think *dark* in their conceptions, who reject even the

the *scripture-phrase*, *Faith imputed for Righteousness*, or the *thing* it means.

25. However, to prove his point, Mr. Hill goes on :

<p>“ This doctrine (of “ the imputed righteous- “ ness of Christ) I have “ constantly believed and “ taught for near eight “ and twenty years.”</p>	<p>The use of the term (the imputed righteous- ness of Christ) is not scriptural, it is not ne- cessary ; it has done im- mense hurt.</p>
---	---

“ It has done immense hurt, says Mr. W. but here is no contradiction. Whether there be or not, there is a plain concession from Mr. W. himself, that he has been *preaching a doctrine for eight and twenty years together, which has done immense hurt.*”

Let this (one instance out of an hundred) be a specimen of Mr. Hill's fairness! The whole strength of the argument depends on the artful jumbling of two sentences together, and inserting two or three little words into the latter of them.

My words are, ‘ || We no more deny the *phrase* (of imputed righteousness) than the thing.’

‘ § *This doctrine* I have believed and taught for near eight and twenty years.’

These distinct sentences Mr. Hill is pleased to thrust together into one, and to mend thus :

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

And here, says Mr. H. is a “ plain concession from Mr. W. himself, that he has been preaching a doctrine for 28 years together, which has done immense hurt.”

No, the doctrine which I believe has done immense hurt, is that of the imputed righteousness of Christ in the Antinomian sense. The doctrine which

which I have constantly held and preached is, that faith is imputed for righteousness.

And when I have either in that sermon or elsewhere said, that *the righteousness of Christ is imputed to every believer*, I mean, every believer is justified, for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered. Yet still I think, "There is no use in contending for that particular phrase." And I say still, 'I dare not insist upon it, because I cannot find it in the bible.'

To contradict this, Mr. H. cites these words, 'This is fully consistent with our being justified, through the imputation of Christ's righteousness.' Mr. W.'s notes on *Rom. iv. 9.* He adds, "These * two taken together, produce the following conclusion, that it is perfectly consistent to say, that we are justified by that, which cannot be found in the bible."

That note runs thus: 'Faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness. This is fully consistent with our being justified through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ; that is, our being pardoned and accepted of God, for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered. For though this, and this alone, be the meritorious cause of our acceptance with God, yet faith may be said to be imputed to us for righteousness, as it is the sole condition of our acceptance.'

Now is there any shadow of contradiction in this? Or of our being justified by that which cannot be found in the bible?

26. "Mr. W. frequently puts the expression, *imputed righteousness*, in the mouth of a whole congregation." Yet he says, 'I dare not require any to use it.' Hence Mr. Hill deduces these two conclusions:

1. "That

* Page 24.

1. "That Mr. W. gives out such doctrines, as he dares not require any others to believe." †

By what logic is this deduced? We are not speaking of doctrines at all, but simply of a particular expression. And that expression is not, *imputed righteousness*; but the *imputed righteousness of Christ*.

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

Well inferred again! But did I say, "A whole congregation had those words in their mouths?" I did not either say or suppose it: any more than that they were all silent.

"Will Mr. W. 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*?" I will. I did not write this in the fogs of Ireland, but in the clear air of Yorkshire.

27. The two next propositions Mr. Hill quotes, are, '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, in righteousness and true holiness.'

'The nice, metaphysical doctrine of imputed righteousness,' (if it is not carefully guarded) 'leads not to repentance, but to licentiousness. I have known a thousand instances of this.'

And where is the contradiction between these propositions? "It is just this *," says Mr. Hill, "That the doctrine of imputed righteousness makes those who believe it both holy and unholy."

Unfold the propositions a little more, and then let any man judge.

The first means just this, They whom God justifies, for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered, (whether they ever heard of that phrase, imputing

† Page 25.

* Page 26.

imputing the righteousness of Christ, or not) are sanctified by his Spirit; are renewed in the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness.

The second means, I have known very many, who so rested in the doctrine of the righteousness of Christ imputed to them, that they were quite satisfied without any holiness at all.

Now where is the contradiction?

But my inserting in my own sentence those explanatory words, 'I mean, who truly believe,' Mr. H. calls an *interpolation*, and supposes I "mean to make a distinction between faith in Christ, and faith in the righteousness of Christ." I mean just what I have said again and again, particularly in the note above-cited. And this is the very thing which John Goodwin means, as he declares over and over.

Mr. W. "winds up this point of *imputed righteousness* with a resolution which astonishes me, That 'he will never more use the phrase, *the imputed righteousness of Christ*, unless it occur to him in a hymn, or steal upon him unawares." This is my resolution. I repeat once more what I said in the Remarks, 'The *thing*, that we are justified merely for the sake of what Christ has *done* and *suffered*, I have constantly and earnestly maintained above four and thirty years. And I have frequently used the *phrase*, hoping thereby to *please* others for their good, to edification. But it has had a contrary effect, since so many improve it into an objection. Therefore I will use it no more, (I mean, the phrase *imputed righteousness*: That phrase, *the imputed righteousness of Christ*, I never did use.) I will endeavour to use only such phrases as are *strictly scriptural*.' And I will advise all my brethren, all who are in connexion with me throughout the three kingdoms, to lay aside that ambiguous, unscriptural phrase, (the *imputed*

‘ *imputed righteousness of Christ*) which is so liable to
 ‘ be misinterpreted, and speak in all instances, this
 ‘ in particular, *as the oracles of God.*’

IV.

Of a Two-fold Justification.†

My words cited as contradicting this, run thus.
 28. ‘ 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 justification is two-fold, the first
 ‘ in this life, the second at the last day, &c.—
 ‘ In opposition to this, I maintain, That *the jus-*
 ‘ *tification spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and*
 ‘ *in our articles, is not two-fold: it is one and no*
 ‘ *more.*’ True. And where do I contradict this?
 Where do I say, *the justification spoken of by St. Paul*
to the Romans, and in our articles, is any more than
 one? The question between them and me concern-
 ed *this justification, and this only, which I affirm-*
 ed to be but one. They averred, But there is a
 second justification at the last day: therefore justi-
 fication is not one only. Without entering into
 that question, I replied, ‘ *The justification whereof*
 ‘ *St. Paul, and our articles speak, is one only.*’ And
 so I say still. And yet I do not deny, that there
 is another justification (of which our Lord speaks)
 at the last day.

I do not therefore condemn the distinction of a
 two-fold justification, in saying, that *spoken of in our*
articles is but one. And this is the thing which I
 affirmed, “ in flat opposition to those men.”

29. But “ how is it possible to encounter such
 “ a man as this, without watching him through
 “ every

† Page 37.

‡ Page 38.

“ every line? And therefore I wish my readers
 “ would closely compare the Remarks with the
 “ Review itself:” (I desire no more. Whoever
 does this, will easily discern on which side the
 truth lies :) “ As it is impracticable to point out
 “ half the *little arts* of this kind which Mr. W.
 “ has stooped to.” That is, in civil terms, “ Sir,
 “ you are a knave.” Sir, I crave your mercy. I
 stoop to no art, but that of plain, sound reasoning.
 By this art, and by this alone, I am able to untwist
 truth from falsehood, how skilfully soever they are
 woven together. I dare use no other; for (whe-
 ther you know it or no) I fear God. And by his
 grace, in simplicity and godly sincerity I have my
 conversation in the world.

“ But how agrees this, with what Mr. W.
 “ tells us, that he has never contradicted himself
 “ with regard to justification, since the year
 “ 1738?”* Perfectly well, “ How long has
 “ he held, that justification is *fourfold*?” I have
 said nothing about it yet. “ And how will he
 “ reconcile this with its being two-fold, and with
 “ his preceding affirmation, that it is *one and no*
 “ *more*?” When time is, this mystery too may be
 cleared up.

V.

Of a Justified State. ||

30. Mr. W. says, “ The *state* of a *justified* per-
 “ son is inexpressibly great and glorious.”

Yet he asks elsewhere, “ Does not talking of a
 “ justified or sanctified state, tend to mislead men?”
 He answers, ‘ It *frequently* does mislead men,
 (namely, when it is spoken of in an *unguarded man-*
 ner) ‘ But where is the contradiction?’ “ What-
 C “ ever

* Page 39.

|| Page 34.

“ ever may be the contradiction, this is clearly the
 “ conclusion, That Mr. W. by his own confession,
 “ is a *misleader of men.*”

It is not quite clear yet. You have first to prove, that I use the phrase ‘ in an *unguarded manner.*’ I confess, when it is so used, it tends to mislead men : but I do not confess, that I use it so.

VI.

Are Works a Condition of Justification ?

31. “ Mr. W. says, ‘ No *good works* can be previous to justification.’ And yet in the same page he asserts, ‘ Whoever desire to find favour with God, should cease from evil, and learn to do well.’”

I answered, § ‘ Does not the bible say so? Who can deny it? Nay, but Mr. W. asks, If this be not in order to find favour, what does he do them for? And I ask it again. Let Mr. Hill, or any one else, give me an answer. So if there is any contradiction here, it is not I contradict myself, but Isaiah and our Lord that contradict St. Paul.’

Mr. Hill replies, “ Then a man may do works in order to find favour, and yet such works can not be called *good.*” You may call them so, if you please : but be not angry with me, if I do not. I still believe, no *good works* can be done before justification. Yet I believe, (and that without the least self-contradiction) that final salvation is ‘ by works as a condition.’ And let any one read over the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew, and deny it if he can.

VII. Is

§ Remarks, Page 22.

VII.

Is Justification by Faith *Articulus stantis vel cadentis*
Ecclesiæ ? ‡

32. In the beginning of the year 1738, I believed it was so. Soon after I found reason to doubt: Since that time I have not varied. " Nay, but in the year 1763 you say, ' This is the name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord our Righteousness*. ' A truth this, of which may be affirmed, (what Luther affirms of a truth nearly connected with it, justification by faith) it is *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*. It is certainly the pillar and ground of that faith of which alone cometh salvation."

I answered, † ' It is certain, here is a *seeming* contradiction; but it is not a *real* one: for these two opposite propositions do not speak of the *same thing*. The latter speaks of *justification by faith*: the former, of *trusting in the righteousness or merits of Christ*. (Justification by faith is only mentioned incidentally in a parenthesis.) Now although Mr. Law denied *justification by faith*, he might *trust in the merits of Christ*. It is this, and this only that I affirm (whatever Luther does) to be *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*.'

But Mr. Hill thinks " Justification by faith, and by trusting in the merits of Christ, are all one."* Be they or not, I still think, ' Some may doubt of justification by faith, and yet not perish everlastingly.' Does Mr. Hill judge, that such an one cannot be saved? That all Mystics (as well as Mr. Law) go to hell?

VIII.

Both Adam's Sin and Christ's Righteousness are imputed.

They are: the question is only, In what sense?

C 2

IX. Of

‡ Page 15.

† Remarks, Page 24.

* Page 16.

IX.

Of M E R I T. †

33. In the Minutes I say, ‘ We are rewarded according to our works, yea, because of our works, (Gen. xxii. 16, 17.) How differs this from *for the sake of our works*? And how differs this from *secundum merita operum*, or as our works deserve? Can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot.’ I say so still. Let Mr. Hill, if he can.

‘ And yet I still maintain,’ (so I added in the Remarks: so I firmly believe) ‘ there is no *merit*, taking the word strictly, but in the blood of Christ: That salvation is not by the *merit* of works; And that there is nothing we are, or have, or do, which can, strictly speaking, *deserve* the least thing at God’s hand.’

‘ And all this is no more than to say, Take the the word *merit* in a *strict* sense, and I utterly renounce it: take it in a *looser* sense, and though I never use it, (I mean, I never ascribe it to any man) yet I do not condemn it. Therefore with regard to the word *merit*, I do not contradict myself at all.’

“ You never use the word!” says Mr. Hill. “ What have we then been disputing about?” ‡ Why, about a straw: namely, Whether there be a sense in which *others* may use that word without blame.

But can Mr. Hill, or any one living, suppose me to mean, I do not use the word in the present question?

What Mr. Hill adds, is a mere play upon words. “ Does Mr. W. by this *looser merit*, mean a merit that does not *merit*?” Yes. By terming a work *meritorious* in this *improper* sense, I do not mean, that

† Page 35.

‡ Page 36.

that it *merits* or *deserves* a reward in the *proper* sense of the word. Instances of the word taken in this *improper* sense, occur all over the bible.

“ This is shamefully evasive.” No more than it is Greek. It is a plain, rational, solid distinction: and it holds with regard to numberless words in all languages, which may be taken either in a *proper* or *improper* sense.

When I say, ‘ I do not grant, that works are *meritorious*, even when accompanied by faith,’ I take that word in a *proper* sense. But others take it in an *improper*, as nearly equivalent with *rewardable*. Here therefore I no more contradict Mr. Fletcher, than I do myself. Least of all do I plead, as Mr. Hill roundly affirms, “ for justification by the *merit* of my own good works.” §

X.

Of MARRIAGE.*

34. “ Mr. W. says, his thoughts on a single life are just the same, they have been these thirty years.” (I mean with regard to the advantages which attend that state in general.) “ Why then did he marry?” I answered short, ‘ For reasons best known to himself.’ As much as to say, I judge it extremely impertinent, for any but a superior to ask me the question. So the harmless raillery which Mr. Hill pleases himself with upon the occasion, may stand just as it is. †

XI.

Concerning DRESS. †

35. “ Mr. W. advises his followers to wear *nothing of a glaring colour, nothing made in the height* of”

§ Page 52.

* Page 39.

† Page 49.

“ 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 dif-
“ fer from others, as to the shape and colour of
“ their apparel, is mere *superstition*.”

“ Yet he says, ‘ So I advise: but I do not
“ make it a *point of conscience*.’ It follows, 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*.”

I shall say more on this head than I otherwise
would, in order to shew every impartial reader,
by one instance in a thousand, the manner wherein
Mr. H. continually distorts and murders my
words.

In my advice to the people called Methodists, †
I say, ‘ I would not advise you to imitate the peo-
‘ ple called Quakers, in those particularities of
‘ dress, which can answer no end, but to distin-
‘ guish you from all other people. But I advise
‘ you to imitate them in plainness: 1. Let your
‘ apparel be cheap, not expensive; 2. Let it be
‘ grave, not gay or showy; not in the point of the
‘ fashion.’

‘ Would you have a farther rule? Then take
‘ one you may always carry in your bosom. *Do*
‘ *every thing with a single eye*, and this will direct
‘ you in every circumstance. Let a single inten-
‘ tion to please God prescribe, both what cloath-
‘ ing you shall buy, and the manner wherein it
‘ shall be made, and how you shall put on and
‘ wear it. In other words, Let all you do in this
‘ respect, be so done, that you may offer it to God,
‘ a sacrifice acceptable through Jesus Christ: so
‘ that

† Sermons, Vol. IV. Page 48 & seq. First Edit.

‘ that consequently it may increase your reward, and
‘ brighten your crown in heaven.’

Now is there any thing ridiculous in all this? I would appeal even to a rational deist, whether it be not, upon the Christian scheme, all agreeable to the highest reason?

36. “ But it is inconsistent with what you said
“ else-where, ‘ To make it a point of conscience,
“ to differ from others, as the Quakers do, in the
“ shape or colour of their apparel, is mere supersti-
“ tion.”

Not inconsistent at all. It is mere superstition to make wearing a broad brimmed hat, or a coat with four buttons, (the very thing I referred to in the preceding page) a point of conscience, that is a thing necessary to salvation.

Why then, says Mr. Hill, “ we are to increase
“ our reward, and brighten our crown in heaven,
“ by doing what is mere superstition, and without
“ acting from a point of conscience!”

Was ever such twisting of words? Has he not great reason to cry out, “ O rare *Logica Westiensis!*
Qui bene distinguit, bene docet!” I bless God, I can distinguish reason from sophistry; unkind, unjust, ungentle sophistry, used purely for this good end, to asperse, to blacken a fellow Christian—because he is not a Calvinist!

No, Sir: What I call superstition, and no point of conscience, is wearing a Quaker hat or coat; which is widely different from the plainness of dress that I recommended to the people called Methodists.

My logic therefore stands unimpeached, I wish your candor did so too.

I would engage to answer every objection of Mr. Hill’s, as fairly and fully, as this. But I cannot spare so much time. I am called to other employment.

And

And I should really think, Mr. Hill might spend his time better, than in throwing dirt at his quiet neighbours.

XII.

Of T E A. †

37. " Mr. W. published a tract against drinking tea, and told the tea-drinkers, he would set them an example in that piece of self-denial."

' I did set them an example for twelve years. Then at the close of a consumption, by Dr. Fothergill's direction, I used it again.'

" Why then did Mr. W. re-publish this tract, making the world believe it brought a paralytic disorder upon him?" Before I was twenty years old, it made my hand shake, so that I could hardly write. " Is it not strange then, that Dr. Fothergill should advise Mr. W. to use what had before thrown him into the *palsy*?" I did not say so: I never had the palsy yet: though my hand shook, which is a *paralytic disorder*. But be it strange or not, so Dr. F. advised: If you believe not *me*, you may enquire of himself. The low wit that follows, I do not meddle with: I leave it with the gentle reader.

XIII.

Of B A P T I S M. *

38. Mr. W. says, ' As there is no clear proof for *dipping* in scripture, so there is very probable proof to the contrary.'

" Why then did you at Savannah baptize all children by immersion, *unless the parents certified they were weak*?"

† Page 41.

* Page 42.

I answered, ' Not because I had any scruple,
' but in obedience to the rubric.'

Mr. Hill, according to custom, repeats the objection, without taking the least notice of the answer.

As to the story of half drowning Mrs. L. S. let her aver it to my face, and I shall say more. Only observe, Mr. Toplady is not " my friend." He is all *your own*; your friend, ally and fellow-soldier:

*Ut non 2 ferens
se & uisum me*

Compositi melius cum Bytho Bacchius!

You are in truth, *Duo fulmina belli*. It is not strange, if their thunder should quite drown the *2 equal* sound of my " poor pop-guns."

39. " But what surpasses every thing else is, " that Mr. W. cannot even speak of his contradictions, without contradicting himself afresh. " For he absolutely denies,* not only that he ever " was unsettled in his principles, but that he was " ever accused of being so, *either by friends or foes.*" *Either by friends or foes!* I will not rest the whole cause upon this. If this be true, I am out of my wits. If it be false, what is Mr. Hill? An honest, upright, sensible man; but a little too warm, and therefore not seeing so clearly in this as in other things.

My words are, ' My friends † have oftener accused me of being too stiff in my opinions, than ' too flexible. My enemies have accused me of ' both, and of every thing besides.' Is this " denying that ever I was accused of inconsistency " *either by friends or foes?*"

I do still deny, that Mr. Delamotte ‡ spoke to me, " of my wavering, unsettled disposition." But he " spoke to you, says Mr. Hill, of something else." 'Tis very likely he might.

40. Mr.

* Pages 38, 39. † Remarks, Page 39. ‡ Page 43.

40. Mr. W. is equally self-inconsistent, “with regard to the Mystics. § These he tells us he had once in great veneration;” (I had two or three and forty years ago) as the *best explainers of the gospel of Christ*, yet afterwards he declares he *looks upon them, as one great Antichrist*. I did look upon them as such thirty years ago. But in my Remarks I say, ‘I retract this. It is far too strong.’ But observe, I never contradicted it till now.

But how does this agree with Mr. W.’s saying, “I never was in the way of Mysticism at all!”

Perfectly well: I admire the mystic writers. But I never *was in their way*; leaving off the outward means.

“But why did Mr. W. let the expression stand, “*Solomon is the chief of the mystics?*” Perhaps because I thought it an harmless one, and capable of a good meaning. But I observe again: Mr. H. takes it for granted, that I have the correction of Mr. Fletcher’s books. This is a mistake: of some I have; of others, I have not.

41. Now comes the capital instance of self-inconsistency. “|| In 1770 Mr. W. esteems the Minutes the standard of orthodoxy. In 1771 he signs a paper, owning them to be *unguarded*. In 1772 he tells us, he does not know but it would have been better, not to have signed that paper at all!” Suppose all this true, what will it prove? Only, that I made a concession which was made an ill use of.

But “Mr. F.’s defence makes poor Mr. W. appear more and more inconsistent. Mr. W. declares the Minutes to be *unguarded*: (that is, *not enough guarded* against cavillers:) Mr. F. defends them, and strives to reconcile them with the Declaration. But then comes Mr. W. and tells us, He does not know but it had been better not

“ 10

“ to have signed it at all.” And what then? Why “ hereby he intimates, that he has fixed a “ different sense upon the Minutes from that which “ they originally bore.” No such thing: He intimates this and no more, That by that well-intended concession he had given occasion to those who sought occasion of offence against him.

So all this laboured charge vanishes into air, and no more proves inconsistency than high-treason.

42. We come now to the main point, *Perfection*; the objections to which spread almost throughout the book. But the question is not, Whether the doctrine be true or false? But whether I contradict myself concerning it?

As to what occurs in the fourth and fifth pages, it may therefore suffice to say, I do believe (as you observe) that *real Christians* (meaning those that are *perfected in love*) are freed from *evil or sinful thoughts*. And where do I contradict this?

P. 10. “ You say, I cannot prove the facts alleged against some professors of perfection. Indeed “ I can.” If you could, that would not prove that I contradict myself on this head.

“ But one at Worcester writes, ‘ I can send you “ an account of two or three shocking instances of “ bad behaviour among the professors of perfection “ here.” Perhaps so. But will that prove *my* inconsistency?”

43. A while since Mr. Ma——d related to me the whole story of Samuel Wi——n. I know not that I ever heard of it before, but only some imperfect fragments of it. The other story, of a “ preacher of perfection, who said, the Holy Ghost “ visibly descended on all true converts,” may be true for ought I know: but I question much, whether that madman was a preacher? It may likewise be true, that several wild expressions were uttered

at

at West-Street Chapel. Yet I think, all these put together will not prove that I contradict myself.

However, I am glad to read, "If I publish another edition of the *Review*, these instances shall all be omitted; and *personal vilifications* shall be left to the sole pen of Mr. W." Then you will reduce your *Farrago* to a page, and your *Review* to a penny pamphlet. But still *personal vilification* will not suit my pen. I have better employment for it.

44. You say, p. 26, "Let us now proceed to Mr. W.'s assertions on sinless perfection."

As I observed before, I am not now to dispute, whether they are right or wrong? I keep therefore to that single point, Do I herein contradict myself, or not?

When I said, 'If some of our hymns contradict others,' I did not allow, they do. I meant only, if it were so, this would not prove that I contradict myself. "But still it proves, the people must sing contradictions." Observe; that is, If—

In your account of perfection, blot out *No wandering thoughts*. None in the body are exempt from these. This we have declared over and over: particularly in the Sermon wrote upon that subject.

If in the Sermon on Eph. ii. 8. (not xi. 5. as your blunderer prints it) the words which I had struck out in the preceding edition, are inserted again, what will this prove? Only that the printer, in my absence, printed, not from the last, but from an uncorrected copy. However, you are hereby excused from unfairness, as to that quotation. But what excuse have you in the other instance, with regard to Enoch and Elijah? On which I asked, 'Why is Mr. Hill so careful to name the first edition? Because in the second the mistake is corrected. Did he know this? And could he avail himself

‘ himself of a mistake which he *knew* was removed
‘ before he wrote?’ *

It is now plain he *could!* Nay, instead of own-
ing his unfairness, he endeavours to turn the blame
upon me! “ You are as inconsistent in your cen-
“ sures as in your doctrines: You blame me for
“ quoting the *last* edition of your Sermon; whereas
“ you call me to account for quoting the *first* edi-
“ tion of your Notes, concerning Enoch and Eli-
“ jah: each of whom you have proved, by a pecu-
“ liar rule of *Foundery-Logic*, to be both in heaven
“ and out of heaven.” So without any remorse,
nay, being so totally unconcerned as even to break
jest on the occasion, you again ‘ avail yourself of
‘ a mistake which you *knew* was removed before
‘ you wrote.’

45. But Mr. W. “ hath both *struck out* some
“ words, and *put in* others, into the Sermon.”—
This is a common complaint with Mr. Hill; on
which therefore it is needful to explain.

I generally abridge what I answer; which can-
not be done without *striking out* all unessential
words. And I generally *put in* to quotations from
my own writings, such words as I judge will pre-
vent mistakes.

Now to the contradictions.

‘ If we say we have no sin *now remaining*, (I
‘ mean, after we are justified) we deceive our-
‘ selves.’

I believe this: and yet I believe

‘ Sin shall not *always* in our flesh *remain*.’

Again, ‘ Many *infirmities* do remain.’

This I believe: and I believe also

‘ He that is born of God, (and *keepeth himself*,
‘ 1 John v. 18.) *finneth not by infirmities*, whether
‘ in act, word, or thought.’

I believe likewise, that in those perfected in
love,

D

‘ No

* Remarks, Page 29.

+ ' No wrinkle of infirmity,
' No spot of sin remains.'

My Brother, at the bottom of the page, expressly says, ' No *sinful* infirmity.' So whether this be scriptural or not, here is no contradiction.

I have spoken so largely already concerning sins, of *surprize* and *infirmity*, that it is quite needless to add any more. I need only refer to the *Remarks*, at the thirty-fourth and following pages.

46. But to go on.

' I wrestle not now.'

This is an expression of my Brother's, which I do not subscribe to.

' We wrestle not with flesh and blood.'

" This he allows to be his own." *

Indeed I do not : although it is true, ' the *perpetual war* which I speak of in the note on Eph. vi. 13. is a *war with principalities and powers, but not with flesh and blood.*' " But 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."

Mr. John is not quite *stuck fast* yet : for this is a mistake from beginning to end. 1. I do not contradict my Brother in my *Remarks*. In saying, ' I do not subscribe to that expression,' I mean, I do not make it my own ; I do not undertake to defend it. Yet neither do I enter the lists against it : it is capable of a sound meaning. 2. I do not contradict myself in the *Note* ; let him prove it that can. 3. I contradict nobody in the *Hymn* ; for it is not mine.

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.' I add, and in a sense not warranted by the bible. And yet I believe, that ' *real Christians*,

* Page 31.

‘*tians*, I mean those perfected in love, are freed
‘ from evil or *sinful thoughts*.’

“ But is not a babe in Christ *born again* ? Is he
“ not a *real Christian* ?” He is doubtless born
again; and in some sense he is a real Christian : but
not in the sense above defined.

47. We come now to the additional contradic-
tions which Mr. Hill undertakes to find in my writ-
ings. They are already dwindled into one : And
I hope to shew quickly, this one is none at all.—
It stands thus.

‘ Most express are the words of St. John, *We*
‘ *know, that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not.*’

‘ Indeed it is said, this means only, He doth not
‘ commit sin *wilfully* or *habitually*.’

(Observe. I do not deny the text to mean this:
but I deny that it means *this only*.)

As a contradiction to this, Mr. Hill places these
words in the opposite column.

‘ The apostle John declares, Whosoever is born
‘ of God sinneth not, 1. By any habitual sin;
‘ nor, 2. by any *wilful* sin.’ True; but do I say,
the apostle means *this only* ? Otherwise here is no
contradiction. So although you have got the gal-
lows ready, you have not turned off *old Mordecai*
yet. As you so frequently give me that appellation,
I for once accept of your favour.

48. “ Before I quit this subject” (of perfection)
“ I cannot help expressing my astonishment, that
“ Mr. W. should deny his tenets on that point,
“ which exactly harmonize with those of the popish
“ church : Since all the decrees and books that
“ have been published by the Roman clergy, prove
“ this matter beyond a doubt.”

I believe, you have been told so. But you
should not assert it, unless from personal know-
ledge. “ Alexander Ross says so.” What is
Alexander Ross ? See with your own eyes. “ Mr.
“ Hervey

“ Hervey too gives an account of Lindenus and “ Andradius.” *Second-hand evidence* still. Have you seen them yourself? Otherwise you ought not to allow their testimony. “ As to that most “ excellent and evangelical work,” as you term it, the eleven letters ascribed to Mr. Hervey, Mr. Sellon has abundantly shewn, that they are most excellently virulent, scurrilous and abusive; and full as far from the evangelical spirit, as the Koran of Mahomet.

“ But Bishop Cowper”——I object to him, beside his being a *hot, bitter* Calvinist, that he is a dull, heavy, shallow writer. And let him be what he may, all you cite from him, is but second-hand authority.——“ Nay, I refer to the bishop’s own words.” But still you have only the words at second-hand. In order to know the tenets of the church of Rome, you must read the Romish authors themselves. Nay, it does not suffice to read their own private authors. They will disown any thing we charge them with, unless we can prove it, by recurring to their public and authentic records. Such are the “ *Lanones & Decreta Concilii Tridentini.*” Such the “ *Catechismes ad Parochos.*” Till you have read these at least, you should never undertake to determine what is, or what is not popery.

49. “ But as I am now on the subject of popery, “ * I must make a few animadversions on what “ Mr. W. affirms, ‘ I always thought the tenets of “ the church of Rome, were nearer by half to Mr. “ Hill’s tenets, than to Mr. W.’s.” Nay, give the honour of this to its true author; Mr. Hill goes to consult a Popish Friar at Paris, a Benedictine Monk, one Father Walsh, concerning the Minutes of the conference. Father Walsh (Mr. Hill says; and I see no reason to scruple his authority

thority here;) assures him, that the Minutes contain false doctrines: And that the tenets of the church of Rome are nearer by half to his (Mr. Hill's) tenets than they are to Mr. W.'s. (So Mr. Hill himself informs the world, in the Paris conversation, of famous memory: Which I really think, he would never have published, unless as the vulgar say, the devil had owed him a shame.) I add 'Truly I always thought so.' But I am the more confirmed therein, by the authority of so competent a judge: Especially when his judgment is publicly delivered by so unexceptionable a witness.

50. Nay, but "you know the principles of the Pope and of John Calvin are quite opposite to each other." I do not know, that they are opposite at all in this point. Many Popes have been either Dominicans or Benedictines. And many of the Benedictines, with all the Dominicans, are as firm Predestinarians as Calvin himself. Whether the present Pope is a Dominican, I cannot tell: If he is, he is far nearer your tenets than mine.

Let us make the trial with regard to your ten propositions.

1. "You deny election.

So does the Pope of Rome." I know not that. Probably he holds it.

2. "You deny perseverance.

So does the Pope of Rome." That is much to be doubted.

3. "You deny imputed righteousness.

The Pope of Rome does: but I assert it continually.

4. "You hold free-will." So does the Pope of Rome." No, not as I do (unless he is a predestinarian: otherwise) he ascribes it to nature, I to grace.

5. "You

5. " You hold, that *works* are a condition of justification.

If you mean *good works*, I do not.

6. " You hold a *two-fold justification*, one now, another at the last day.

So does the Pope of Rome." And so do all Protestants, if they believe the bible.

7. " You hold the doctrine of *merit*.

I do not. Neither does the Pope, if Father Walsh says true.

8. " You hold *sinless perfection*.

So does the Pope." I deny that. How do you prove it?

9. " You hold, that *sins* are only *infirmities*.

I hold no such thing. And you know it well.

10. " You distinguish between *venial* and *mortal sins*."

Not so: I abhor the distinction.

Now let every man of understanding judge, Whether Father Walsh did not speak the very truth?

51. " This pamphlet was finished,* when I was told, that Mr. W. had lately a very remarkable dream, which awakened him out of a sound sleep. This dream he communicated to his society. It was in substance as follows. A big, rough man came to him, and gave him a violent blow upon the arm with a red-hot iron."

" Now the interpretation thereof I conceive to be as follows:

1. " The *big, rough man*, is Mr. Hill:

2. " The *bar of iron* (red-hot!) is *Logica Welfleiensis*:

3. " The *blow* denotes the *shock* which Mr. John will receive by the said pamphlet:

4. " 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."

Pretty

Pretty and well devised ! And though it is true, I never had any such dream since I was born, yet I am obliged to the inventor of it; and that on many accounts.

I am obliged to him,

1. For sending against me only a *big, rough man*: it might have been a lion, or a bear :

2. For directing the *bar of iron* only to my arm; it might have been my poor scull :

3. For letting the *big man* give me only *one blow*: had he repeated it, I had been slain outright: and

4. For hoping I shall, some time or other, come to the right use of my spiritual faculties.

52. Perhaps Mr. Hill may expect, that I should make him some return for the favour of his heroic poem. But:

“ Certes I have, for many days-

“ Sent my poetic herd to graze.”

And had I not, I should have been utterly unable to present him with a parallel. Yet upon reflection, I believe I can, although, I own, it is rather of the lyric, than the heroic kind. And because possibly he may be inclined to write notes on this too, I will tell him the origin of it. One Sunday, immediately after sermon, my father's clerk said, with an audible voice, “ Let us sing to the praise and glory of God, An hymn of mine own composing.” It was short and sweet, and ran thus :

“ King William is come home, come home :

“ King William home is come !

“ Therefore let us together sing

“ The hymn that's call'd Te D'um !”

53. Before I conclude, I beg leave, in my turn, to give you a few advices.

And 1. *Be calm*. Do not venture into the field again, till you are master of your temper, You know, *the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness,* neither promotes the truths, of God.

2. Be

2. *Be good natured.* Passion is not commendable; but *ill-nature* still less. Even irrational anger is more excusable than *bitterness*; less offensive to God and man.

3. *Be courteous.* Shew good manners as well as good-nature, to your opponent of whatever kind. "But he is rude." You need not be so too. If you regard not him, "Reverence yourself."

Absolutely contrary to this, is the crying out at every turn, "Quirk, sophistry, evasion!" In controversy these exclamations go for nothing. This is neither better nor worse than *calling names*.

4. *Be merciful.* When you have gained an advantage over your opponent, do not press it to the uttermost. Remember the honest Quaker's advice to his friend a few years ago. "Art thou not content to lay John Wesley upon his back, but thou wilt tread his guts out?"

5. In writing do not consider yourself as a *man of fortune*, or take any liberty with others on that account. These distinctions weigh but little more in the literary world, than in the world of spirits. Men of sense simply consider, what is written; not whether the writer be a lord or a cobbler?

Lastly, Remember, *For every idle world men shall speak, they shall give an account in the day of judgment.* Remember, *by thy words shalt thou be justified; or by thy words shalt thou be condemned!*

BRISTOL, March 14,

1773.



F I N I S