
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>



A
S C O U R G E
T O
C A L U M N Y,
IN TWO PARTS.

Inscribed to RICHARD HILL, Esq;

PART THE FIRST, *Demonstrating the Absurdity of that
Gentleman's FARRAGO.*

PART THE SECOND, *Containing a full Answer to all
that is material in his FARRAGO DOUBLE-DISTILLED.*

By THOMAS OLIVERS.

Καὶ ὅπως πολλὰς ἂν τις ἐξέποι νόμων ἀτοπίας, μὴτὲ
τον λόγον ἔχων τῷ νομοθέτῃ, μήτε τὴν αἰτίαν συνείσ-
ῃκασι τῶν γεγραμμένων.

PLUTARCH

REBUKE, WITH ALL AUTHORITY.

LET NO MAN DESPISE THEE.

PAUL.

L O N D O N :

Printed by R. HAWES, (No. 34.) in Lamb-Street,
near Spital-Square. And sold by W. NICHOLLS,
(No. 51.) St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1774.

[Price 1s. 6d.]

E R R A T A.

P.	L.
13	19 <i>for</i> preceeding, <i>read</i> preceding
23	32 place a comma after <i>is</i>
24	12 ditto after literally
27	9 ditto ditto
37	27 <i>f.</i> operations, <i>r.</i> operation
43	13 <i>f.</i> marvelous, <i>r.</i> marvellous
49	2 <i>f.</i> where, <i>r.</i> whereas
51	12 <i>f</i> least, <i>r</i> left
54	35 <i>f</i> wil, <i>r</i> will
55	14 <i>leave out</i> heathen
67	28 <i>f</i> acknowleges <i>read</i> acknowledges
82	12 <i>f</i> marveloutly, <i>r</i> marvelloutly
95	Leave out the commas at the front of the 22, 23, 24, 25 & 26 lines
100	27 <i>f</i> received, <i>r</i> revived
104	36 leave out comma after <i>Ignatius</i>
108	33 set a comma after they, and another after <i>Manichees</i>
112	19 <i>f</i> Marfelius, <i>r</i> Marfilius
120	35 <i>f</i> OE, <i>r</i> OF
125	38 <i>f</i> of our <i>r</i> or our
142	→ <i>f</i> choppin, <i>r</i> chopin
144	39 <i>f</i> yon <i>r</i> you
145	7 <i>f</i> were, <i>r</i> was
164	36 <i>r</i> And then
168	11 place a semicolon after offered.



A

S C O U R G E

To CALUMNY, &c.

PART THE FIRST.

Honoured Sir,

MONDAY, February 15th, I attended the evening prayers at St. Paul's. The psalm for the day was the 78th. The sublime description of GOD's power and glory there given, as displayed in behalf of his people through all generations, much affected me. I was also much affected at the account the Royal Penman gave of himself. "He chose *David* also his "servant," said he, "and took him away from the "sheepfolds. As he was following the ewes great with "young ones, he took him: that he might feed *Jacob* "his people and *Israel* his inheritance."

In this account I scarce knew which to admire most, the Providence of GOD in raising a shepherd's boy to the dignity of so great a Monarch; or the piety of this renowned people in not rejecting or despising him; or his own amazing humility, at a time when he had reached the very summit of worldly glory, in trans-

B

mitting

mitting to future ages such an explicit account of his mean original. On these reflections, all within me cried out, Lord! shall I, shall any servant of thine, after this, be ashamed of an humble birth or of a mean employment? Forbid it, gracious GOD!

As I returned home I called at Mr. *Dilly's* for your "Farrago Double Distilled;" and on reading therein the contempt cast on my *insignificant* name, I adored that kind Providence which brought me so SEASONABLY under the sound of such a Scripture, and which impressed it so DEEPLY on my heart.

But, permit me to ask, Sir, by what laws are you authorized to INSULT a person who never injured you? Not by the laws of GOD: not by the precepts of Christianity. For these teach you, not to render *evil* FOR *evil*, or *railing* FOR *railing*. But your conduct, Sir, has been the *reverse* of this: For you have rendered evil to one, of whom you cannot say that *he* has injured *you* so much as in thought: You have RAILED on him, while he was *dumb and opened not his mouth*.—You know, Sir, who hath said, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." Now, have you done this, in the present case? Consider, honoured Sir, have you, in mentioning my name, been as careful not to load it with public contempt, as you would that I should be in mentioning your's?

Perhaps You will wonder that I animadvert so freely on the conduct of a person of *your* consequence, in making any use of *my name* which you think proper. But permit me to tell you, Sir, that *my name* is as sacred to *me*, as *your's* is to *you*: And permit me to tell you farther, that if the inequality which subsists between us was a thousand times greater than it is, you would have no more right to insult me, than I should have to insult you: And permit me to tell you once more, that if *you* were the greatest peer of the realm, and *I* the poorest peasant, the laws of GOD and of MY COUNTRY would authorize me to call you to an
account,

account, for every insult offered to my character either as a fellow-creature or as an ENGLISH-MAN.

The unscriptural treatment which I have received at your hands, brings to my mind an Old Testament parable. When *David* had transgressed in the matter of *Uriah*, *Nathan* the prophet came unto him and said, "There were two men in one city; the one RICH, and the other POOR. The rich man had exceeding many flocks and herds: But the poor man had nothing save one little ewe-lamb, which he had bought and nourished up.—And there came a traveller unto the rich man, and he spared to take of his own flock, and of his own herd, to dress for the way-faring man—but took the poor man's lamb, and dressed it for the way-faring man that was come unto him. And *David's* anger was greatly kindled against the man; and he said to *Nathan*, as the LORD liveth the man that hath done this thing shall surely die. And he shall restore the lamb fourfold, because he did this thing, and BECAUSE HE HAD NO PITY. And *Nathan* said unto *David*,"---and I say unto you, "Thou art the man."

For as to that reputation which arises from an honourable birth, an early education, a plentiful fortune, and a respectable employment, you are rich; you have flocks and herds in great abundance. But as for me, if I possess one scrap of credit in all the world, it is only as a single lamb, bought with my own industry, nursed at my own expence, and with much toil and patience: And which, after all, is so small and feeble, that it can scarce be seen or heard among all the mighty flocks which adorn your ample plains.

Now, Sir, what was the reason that you, a man of such abundance, should endeavour to rob me of my *little all*? What was the reason (to change the allusion) that you, who swim in such an ocean of reputation, could not suffer me to paddle, undisturbed, in my shallow stream? It certainly could not be envy; seeing there *can* be nothing in *me*, to raise such a passion in

you. Much less could it be, that you, the GREAT LEVIATHAN, who have slain *Goliath*, swallowed up all Oxford, and, even, with the very tip of your tail swept *St. Chad's* into the Severn! that you, Sir, should fear the attack of so small a *shrimp*. What then could your reason be? Why, *The Cause*, THE GOOD OLD CAUSE! which supposeth GOD to be the author of Sin; which supposeth him to reprobate the far greater part of his helpless creatures; and which supposeth him to say to a filthy adulterer (while in the act of adultery) "Thou art all fair, my love, I will behold no spot in thee." THIS CAUSE, so sacred to *Calvin*, *Crisp* and *You*, being in danger, must be defended at any rate: And what method so proper in the defence of such a *dung-hill Cause!* (excuse me, Sir, for I cannot call it by a more delicate name) as to throw dirt at every one, small and great, who is striving to remove it out of the way. It is therefore, in conformity with this plan of operation (a plan which a friend of your's told a friend of mine, your party INTENDED as its *last resource*) that you have mentioned my name in such manner, as to make me appear contemptible; well knowing this would be sufficient to secure your partial admirers against all endeavours of mine.

As to my name, honoured Sir, permit me to observe, with all proper respect, that you have no more authority, either from REASON or RELIGION, to call me *Tom* than I have to call you *Dick*. And as to my former occupation, if I was really now what you say I am, I should, in this respect, certainly be on a level (I do not say with you only, but) with those who, in more valuable and more important respects, were a THOUSAND degrees your superiors. You need not be told, Sir, that the greatest characters which ever adorned the earth, such as Patriarchs, Kings, Prophets, Priests and Apostles (not to speak of the SAVIOUR himself) were humble plebeians and plain mechanics. Nor need you be told, that in those ages when the sacred annals were composing, annals on which the glory of GOD and the salvation of the world depended,

infinite

infinite Wisdom saw fit to give the LEAD, even in those LITERARY employments, unto ILLITERATE men.

Now, if things are in this respect altered, if infinite Wisdom has absolutely, and for ever excluded such persons from qualifying themselves for, and from being employed in affairs of this nature, I shall be glad to know in what memorable period such an act of exclusion was passed. And if such an act has ever been passed in reality, I shall be glad to know, how so many of these now discarded animals were suffered to intrude themselves into the established church; and, in particular, how a certain preacher of YOUR gospel, who, five or six years ago, was arrayed in the sable uniform of a coal pit, was permitted to exchange this vulgar, un sanctified sable, not only for that of a gown and cassock, but also for the honourable SCARF of your Right Honourable Patroness. I don't mention this as the only instance of the contemptible to be found among those whose cause you are pleading; nor do I wish to be under a necessity of being more explicit on this and some other disagreeable heads.

That you should *bedew* my insignificant name with low contempt, ceases to be a wonder, when we consider in what manner you have *bedeluged* Mr. Wesley's.

He has long been looked on, both by the nation in general and by the Universities in particular, as an honest man, a man of sense, a scholar, a good writer, and a very extraordinary labourer: This, not only Arminians, so called, have acknowledged; but thousands of Calvinists have done it, above twice ten thousand times.

I have been credibly informed, that some years ago when Mr. Wesley was supposed to be dying, a messenger was sent to *Bristol* to inform Mr. *Whitefield* of it: That he, on receiving the intelligence, told his congregation, "I cannot preach here to-morrow as I intended; for I hear that my dear brother, Mr. *John Wesley* is supposed to be dying in *London*, and

“ I am determined to set off immediately, and, if possible, to see him before he dies:” That then he lifted up his hands and voice, and with a shower of tears cried out, “ O *England! England! England!* “ when he is gone thou canst not find his fellow.” And a few years ago Mrs. G. of *Edinburgh* told me, That, on hearing Mr. *Wesley* was just come to that city, she went into Mr. *Whitefield*’s room, (for he then lodged in her house) and said, “ Who, Sir, do you think is come to “ *Edinburgh?*” He answered, “ I cannot tell.” She said, “ Mr. *John Wesley.*” To which Mr. *Whitefield*, after a short pause answered, “ Then, madam, one of “ the greatest men is come to your city, that ever was “ in it.”

And these testimonies from Mr. *Whitefield* are not to be wondered at; seeing he had, for so many years, known Mr. *Wesley* and his communication.—While they were in the University together, Mr. *Whitefield* was an eye-witness of Mr. *Wesley*’s courage in opposing the follies of the place; of his unwearied labours, late and early, and in all possible ways, to promote learning and religion among those about him. And when they left the University, Mr. *Whitefield* saw Mr. *Wesley*’s resolution and steadiness in exposing himself to the dangers of the sea, the inclemency of the weather, the insults and outrages of the most furious and savage mobs: He saw, admired, and confessed Mr. *Wesley*’s mighty labours, by night and by day, winter and summer, in sickness and in health; and, therefore, the difference in opinion which subsisted between them, made no considerable impression on Mr. *Whitefield*’s conduct with regard to Mr. *Wesley*.

And not only Mr. *Whitefield*, but thousands besides have seen and admired Mr. *Wesley*’s conduct. I, for one, who have known him considerably more than twenty years, and have beheld him narrowly, late and early, can testify (and am ready to testify on oath, if called to it) that I have never seen, or expect to see in this world, an example so worthy of a gospel minister as that of Mr. *John Wesley*. And I solemnly declare

clare that I know no five men under the heavens who do that work for GOD that he does.

When I cast my eyes on an hundred volumes which he has published; when I think of about five thousand miles which he has yearly travelled; of about a thousand discourses he has yearly delivered; of a thousand sick beds he has yearly visited; and, perhaps of twice the number of letters he has yearly answered: When I see him now, between Seventy and Eighty years of age, refusing, absolutely refusing to abate any thing of all these mighty labours, (unless it be that he has been prevailed on not to ride so much on horseback;) when I see him, at this very time, with his silver locks about his ears, and with a meagre, worn-out, skeleton body, SMILING at storms and tempests, at such labours and fatigues, at such difficulties and dangers, as I believe would be absolutely intolerable to YOU, Sir, in conjunction with any four of YOUR MOST FLAMING ministers; in short, when I still see with my own eyes, what I have constantly seen ever since I was acquainted with Mr. *Wesley*, how lavish he is of his strength, time, money and influence; for the relief of the poor, the support of the weak, the prosperity of the church, the conversion of sinners and the glory of GOD, I am ashamed of myself and of all about me. To the honour of GOD, and to the credit of his servant, I mention it, That although Mr. *Wesley* is connected with between Thirty and Forty thousand of as holy people as any in the land; of which number Five or Six Hundred are preachers, of one kind or another, yet I do not know one single person, either preacher or hearer, who does not almost despair of imitating his astonishing example.

Now, Sir, if this is Mr. *Wesley's* real character, what are we to think of the treatment he has received from one of those celebrated ministers, of whom you make honourable mention, but who, by one of his neighbours, was lately addressed in the following words. "Is it consistent with a redeemer of time," said the honest man, "to spend so much precious time as you
" have

“ have this winter at CARDS, Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, till Twelve at night, for one half-penny per game? YOU WELL KNOW WHERE.” Now, Sir, is not this a pretty gentleman to combat and correct Mr. *Wesley*? Is not this a worthy champion for you to stand back to back with, and to *serve* as great auxiliary, in so laudable an encounter? As to Mr. *Wesley*, though I doubt not but he abhors suicide as much as any man living, yet, I verily believe, he would almost as soon cast himself head-long into the bottom of the sea, as live on earth for any purpose so truly contemptible!

But as to that *Hercules*, some future period may produce a more explicit account of him; and therefore, leaving him for the present, I ask, have you, Sir, treated Mr. *Wesley* as you ought? If the above account be true, but in any tolerable degree, he certainly ought to be treated RESPECTFULLY, TENDERLY and SERIOUSLY; but whether it be true or false, he has a right to JUSTICE: Yea, if he was as bad as Lucifer himself, he would have a right to this; for you know, that, according to the old proverb, you ought to give the very devil his due.

Now, the question is, have you done this by Mr. *Wesley*? Have you, in your Farragos, represented him FAIRLY and JUSTLY? I affirm, YOU HAVE NOT. I affirm that the accounts you have given of his inconsistencies and contradictions are so HIGHLY IMPROBABLE, that we cannot suppose them to be true, without supposing, also, that Mr. *Wesley* is one of the greatest fools that ever lived.

For instance, take the following account as it stands in the conclusion of your Farrago, p. 143, second edition. “ To follow Mr. *Wesley* in the exact order in which he publishes and sells his contradictions,” you say, “ would not be an easy matter. I shall, therefore, only observe, in general, that his extract from Bishop *Beveridge*’s thoughts on religion is FLATLY contradicted, for TWO HUNDRED PAGES TOGETHER, in his edition of *John Goodwin*’s treatise on justification. “ Again,

“ Again, this treatise is **FLATLY** *contradicted* by his
 “ sermon on *Jer. 23. 6.* And this again is *contradicted*
 “ by his letter to Mr. *Hervey*, in his *preservative*
 “ *against unsettled notions in religion, &c.* This *preser-*
 “ *vative* is itself *contradicted, over and OVER, and OVER*
 “ again, in his abstract from Dr. *Preston's breast plate*
 “ *of faith and love.* And this abstract from Dr. *Preston*
 “ is **FLATLY** *contradicted* by his edition of *Baxter's*
 “ *aphorisms*; and these *aphorisms* are **FLATLY** *contra-*
 “ *dicted* by what he has published from *Bishop Bewe-*
 “ *ridge's* private thoughts on religion; and these
 “ thoughts of *Bishop Beveridge* are **AGAIN FLATLY**
 “ *contradicted* by Mr. *Wesley's* own thoughts on im-
 “ puted righteousness.—Thus the wheel runs round
 “ and round again.”

Now, Sir, I aver, that if Mr. *Wesley* has only **ONE**
GRAIN of **COMMON SENSE**, there cannot be **ONE GRAIN**
OF PROBABILITY in this account: And, therefore, it
 must be concluded, That either *he* is an **ABSOLUTE**
FOOL; or else, that *you* have **ABSOLUTELY MISREPRE-**
SENTED him.

Again, in your *Farrago Double Distilled*, p. 19. you
 say, “ But I will go farther still; and since Mr. *Wes-*
 “ *ley* has published, prefaced, recommended and sold
 “ some treatises of Dr. *Owen* (particularly that excel-
 “ lent tract on indwelling sin in believers) *Bishop Be-*
 “ *veridge, 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.” Candid reader—but
 stop! I will not trouble thee. **UNCANDID** reader!
 Bigoted, Antinomian reader! Thou who art almost
cater up with prejudice against Mr. *Wesley*! Dost not
 THOU, even THOU, cry out, “ This account **CANNOT**
 “ be **TRUE**: There is **NO LIKELIHOOD** of it: It is
 “ **ABSURD TO THE LAST DEGREE** to suppose any such
 “ thing.” Now this, Sir, in my judgment, is really
 true. And, therefore, I believe, that if you were to
 search

search all the writings, reveries and scribbles of a thousand years, those of ideots and lunaticks not excepted, you would scarce be able to produce such instances of absurdities and contradictions, as these you have attributed to Mr. *Wesley*. And yet, as if this was not enough, you add, "I must go one step further yet"—one step farther yet, do you say! why really, Sir, if I may speak freely, I am afraid you have gone so far already, as to leave the fear of GOD behind. But since you *must* go one step farther yet, pray let us see the length of it. Well, "I defy Mr. *Wesley*"—you say, "to bring me TWENTY LINES out of the above tracts by *Owen*, *Beveridge*, *Sibbs* or *Preston*, which he *now* believes." Why really Sir, if you were not a person of so respectable a character, I would not hesitate a moment to say, Fie! Fie! on you, for talking at SUCH A RATE. For, unless your admirers are as drunk with party rage, as, I fear, you are yourself, I believe I may "defy" you to bring ONE PERSON of them, who for ONE MOMENT believes ONE WORD of this improbable, incredible account. Yea, I could almost "defy" you to say (suppose your fury to be but a little abated) that you "*now*" believe one word of it yourself. And, to imitate your steps, *not in length!* but in number, "I must go one step farther yet," and say, That of all the accusers of the brethren you can mention, *Satan* himself not excepted, I "defy" you to shew that *any of these* have gone SO FAR in accusing *any one*, as you *have done* in accusing Mr. *Wesley*.

As to inconsistencies and contradictions, when it is considered, 1. How *numerous* his writings are, 2. That they consist, partly of tracts written by himself, and partly of extracts from and abridgments of the writings of very different authors: And, 3. That at the times they were published, his various avocations prevented his attending on things of less importance in a manner he otherwise might have done; I say, when all these things are considered, it will be no wonder if, 1. A few *real* inconsistencies should be found in an hundred volumes, published under such circumstances: And 2, That

That there should be a greater number of such SEEMING ONES, as incapacity, (for CLOSE DISTINCTION) inattention or prejudice, might make a handle of.

Whether your performance, Sir, owes its existence to either of these, or to all of them put together, I shall not now determine. But as to the method you have adopted in composing it, this I must say, is most amazingly absurd, unjust, and disingenuous. For,

I. In proof of Mr. *Wesley's* inconsistencies and contradictions, you have opposed HIS WORDS to the words of ANOTHER.

II. You have opposed the words which, in one place, he spake as a poet, and which he intended to be understood with a large measure of poetic licence, to the same words, in another place, where he intended to be understood as a grammarian or logician.

III. When both sides of your contrasts are in prose, you have opposed such expressions as, in one place, he intended to be understood literally, to the same expressions, in another place, where he intended them to be understood figuratively.

IV. You have opposed expressions which were used in one sense, to one sort of people; to the same expressions, used in another sense, to another sort of people.

V. You have opposed such words as were inserted through mistake in one edition, and acknowledged to be so by being left out of the other editions, unto such words as he still retains and owns.

VI. You have contrasted two passages to shew that Mr. *Wesley* contradicts himself, neither of which are his words.

That you have transgressed in the manner laid down in these six propositions, I undertake to demonstrate. And

And that I may do it FAIRLY and FULLY, I shall not imitate your example, in throwing dust into the air; that is, in throwing about a huge group of random words, in such manner as tends to *blind*, rather than *enlighten* the reader. Instead of this, I shall first lay down each proposition regularly, and then produce its proof.

PROPOSITION I.

You have opposed the words of Mr. *Wesley* to the words of *another*.

DEMONSTRATION FIRST.

You have opposed the words of Mr. *John Wesley* to the words of Mr. *Charles Wesley*. To prevent all cavils, and to let the reader see I do you no injustice, I shall insert at large, every passage I make use of.

For

“ Sinless Perfection.”

“ Wilt thou lop the boughs
“ of sin,
“ Leaving still the stock
“ behind!
“ No, thy love shall work
“ within,
“ Quite expel the CAR-
“ NAL MIND.
“ Root and branch destroy
“ my foe,
“ I believe it shall be so.
“ *Ibid.* Vol. II. p. 149.”
Farrago, page 113. Second
edition.

Against

“ Sinless Perfection.”

“ As this position, that
“ there is no sin in a believ-
“ er, NO CARNAL MIND,
“ no bent to back sliding,
“ is contrary to the word
“ of GOD, so it is to the
“ experience of his chil-
“ dren. These continu-
“ ally feel an heart bent to
“ back-sliding, a natural
“ tendency to evil, a prone-
“ ness to depart from GOD,
“ and cleave to the things
“ of earth. *Ibid.*”

The

The words you have here brought to shew what is said "Against sinless perfection," (which, by the bye, do not speak a syllable either *against it* or *for it!*) are certainly Mr. *John Wesley's*; and, as you have very justly referred us, are to be found in his "*Serm. on 2 Cor. v. 17.*" p. 9. *first edition.* But the opposite passage which you have brought "For sinless perfection," is Mr. *Charles Wesley's ONLY*, and is found *only* in a volume of his, which does not so much as bear Mr. *John Wesley's* name: See *Hymns and Sac. Poems* by *Charles Wesley*. vol. II. p. 149. *second edition.* I, therefore conclude, that you have opposed the words of Mr. *John Wesley* to the words of *another.*

But, before I go any further, I am under the disagreeable necessity of charging you with WILFUL UNTRUTH. This is a HEAVY CHARGE, I confess; and, therefore, must be *clearly* and *distinctly* proved.

And, First, I charge you with UNTRUTH. The passage immediately preceeding the last, and which ends with the following line, "Christ in a pure and sinless heart," is taken from *Hymns and Sac. Poems*, by *John* AND *Charles Wesley*, vol. II. p. 287. *fifth edition.* But the next passage is taken out of *Hymns and Sac. Poems*, by *Charles Wesley ONLY*, as I have observed above. Yet the reference, by which you direct, or rather *impose* upon your reader, is "*Ibid.*" *the same.* Now I have demonstrated above, that THEY ARE NOT THE SAME: The first passage being taken out of a volume by *John* and *Charles Wesley*, IN CONJUNCTION; but the other, out of a volume by *Charles Wesley* ALONE. Neither is this all; for in your note at the bottom of this page you say, "I do not indeed pretend to say "which of these hymns were composed by Mr. *John* " and which by Mr. *Charles Wesley*; however, as *their* " names stand JOINTLY prefixed to the volumes, (two of " which were printed at *London*, two at *Bristol*,) we " are warranted to suppose that they contain their joint " sentiments." I answer; Their names DO NOT stand jointly prefixed to the volumes: Mr. *John Wesley's* name never was at any edition of one of the volumes you refer to. This, therefore, IS AN UNTRUTH.

C

But

But, secondly, this untruth is WILFUL. For when you wrote "*ibid.*" the same, YOU KNEW they were not the same: When you said, "Their names stand jointly prefixed to the volumes," YOU COULD NOT BUT KNOW THE CONTRARY. To make this fully appear, let it be observed, that the names of the authors stand *only* in the title-pages. Now that you have *very carefully* searched the title-page of this volume of Mr. Charles Wesley, appears from hence, That you have told us the *title* of the volume is "*Ibid.*" that is, *the same* as that above-mentioned, which is, "Hymns and Sac. Poems:" That it is, "vol. II." That it was printed "at Bristol:" And, also (as you have told us in the note above-mentioned) that you have examined "the DATES prefixed to the books quoted;" all which circumstances are found only in the title-page. Now, Sir, I positively affirm that you could not survey this title-page, so accurately; yea and transcribe almost every word of it in the manner you have done, without SEEING, in the very middle of it, the following words, "By CHARLES WESLEY, M. A. late STUDENT of Christ-Church, OXFORD." And as (notwithstanding this) you have declared, "Their names stand jointly prefixed to the volumes," I conclude, That You have been guilty of a WILFUL VIOLATION OF TRUTH.—The great Searcher of Hearts sees, that it is with tears in my eyes, as well as with a HEAVY heart, that I bring SUCH a charge against YOU: and that nothing but the cause of truth, of justice, and of injured merit, could ever prevail on me to do it.

DEMONSTRATION SECOND.

You have opposed the words of Mr. Wesley, to the words of Mr. Fletcher.

<p>"That Mr. Wesley " holds Free-will."</p>	}	<p>"That Mr. Wesley " wonders how a man " can hold Free-will."</p>
<p>"Mr. F—r tells Mr. " Shirley, (2 Check, p. 37) " that</p>	}	<p>"I wonder as much at " the doctrine some men " have</p>

“ that when he maintain-
 “ ed the freedom of the
 “ will, JESUS CHRIST and
 “ the Gospel were on his
 “ side, &c. &c.”

“ To this also Mr. *Wes-*
 “ *ley* gives his imprimatur.
 “ In the mean while his
 “ Sermons and Christian
 “ Library continue upon
 “ sale, and bear their joint
 “ testimony against the
 “ author of the *Preserva-*
 “ *tive*, and against the
 “ *Vindicator*; as what
 “ stands on the opposite side
 “ plainly demonstrates.”

See page 135.

“ have advanced concern
 “ ing *free-will*, as at
 “ that which others have
 “ broached in favour of
 “ good works, &c. And
 “ this my faith is not
 “ grounded on a roving
 “ fancy, but on the most
 “ solid reasons. For as-
 “ much as of ourselves,
 “ we are not able in our
 “ understandings to dis-
 “ cern the evil from the
 “ good; much less then
 “ are we able in our wills
 “ to prefer the good be-
 “ fore the evil, the will
 “ never settling upon any
 “ thing but what the
 “ judgment discovers to it.
 “ *Christ. Lib.* vol. *xlvi.*
 “ p. 57.

“ Again, such is the
 “ freedom of man’s will,
 “ free only to evil, free to
 “ drink in iniquity like
 “ water, *Serm.* on *Rom.*
 “ *viii.* 15.”

The passage you have brought out of the Sermon on *Rom.* *viii.* 15. to shew what is said against *free-will*, is certainly Mr. *Wesley*’s: And (notwithstanding what he has said to the contrary) I will allow, for argument’s sake, that the passage out of the Christian Library is his also. But the passage you have brought out of Mr. *Fletcher*’s Check, to shew what is said for *free-will*, is not Mr. *Wesley*’s, but properly, yea, and in every sense of the word, Mr. *Fletcher*’s. But you say, “ To this also, Mr. *Wesley* gives his imprimatur.” How does he do this? I believe not in such manner as will answer

C 2

your

your end. For before Mr. *Fletcher's* words (set in opposition to Mr. *Wesley's*) will prove that Mr. *Wesley* contradicts himself, you must prove that he has (*fully*) made them his own. And before you can do this, you must prove, 1. That he has *read* them all. 2. That Mr. *Fletcher* gave him an unlimited authority to *put in and out*, ALL he pleased. And, 3. That Mr. *Wesley* has actually MADE SO FREE with Mr. *Fletcher* as to do it. Now, if I was under a necessity of proving a negative, I would undertake to prove the reverse of these particulars. But there is no need: It will be quite enough to observe that Mr. *Wesley* has read OVER *some* of Mr. *Fletcher's* tracts, before they went to the press; that *others* of them he has read *in part*; and that *one*, at least, he had not read, either *before* or *after*, at the time he dated his last address to you. Take his own words: "He" (Mr. *Hill*) "continually 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 Antinomianism I have not read over to "THIS DAY." *Remarks on Mr. Hill's Farrago Double Distilled*, page 5.

It is, therefore, certain, notwithstanding any supposed imprimatur, that the words in question, are not Mr. *Wesley's*, but Mr. *Fletcher's*. And therefore it follows, upon the whole, that you have in this instance also, opposed the words of Mr. *Wesley* to the words of *another*.

Before I proceed, I must beg leave to observe, that there is no contradiction, concerning free-will, in the passages under consideration. For Mr. *Fletcher* speaks of the will, not as *naturally* free, but as *made* free by that *general* grace (or as you would call it, *common* grace) which is given to all men; but Mr. *Wesley*, in the other passage, speaks of the will, not as thus *made free by grace*, but as NATURALLY FREE: that is, as FREE OF ITSELF, (NOTWITHSTANDING THE FALL) WITHOUT ANY HELP FROM GOD.

But, though they do not contradict each other, they both contradict *you*, suppose you are a consistent Predestinarian. For, according to that hypothesis, you believe

believe that there is no will in any creature, either GOOD OR EVIL, but what WAS UNCHANGEABLY DECREED FROM ETERNITY, should, UNCONDITIONALLY and IRRESISTIBLY be in him. And, therefore, according to this notion, you believe, if you are consistent, that when *David*, for instance, WILLED to commit adultery with *Bathsheba*, and, then, to murder *Uriah*, it was not an act of FREE-WILL; seeing his will was laid under an *irresistible necessity* of WILLING just *what*, and *as* it did. So, on the other hand, when he WILLED to compose the fifty-first psalm, it was not an act of any FREE-will; for neither in this was his will FREE, OR AT LIBERTY, *to will or not to will it*, but was, in the manner above-mentioned, *constrained* to it, by the same IRRESISTIBLE NECESSITY.

Now, Mr. *Wesley* and Mr. *Fletcher* believe, that this notion of the will, 1. Destroys the distinction between voluntary agents and stocks and stones. 2. That it makes GOD the author of sin, by supposing that HIS DECREE NECESSITATES THE WILLS of angels and men, in *all* their VOLITIONS, both GOOD and EVIL. And, 3. That it supposeth the bible to be a most ridiculous book, on account of its addressing such agents as are absolutely involuntary, in the manner it ought to address them, suppose they were absolutely free. For these, and the like considerations, these gentlemen have not yet subscribed your creed; and unless better reasons are given than any they have yet seen, I expect they never will.

PROPOSITION II.

You have opposed the words which, in one place, Mr. *Wesley* spake as a poet, and which he intended to be understood with a large measure of poetic licence, to the same words, in another place, where he intended to be understood as a grammarian or logician.

DEMONSTRATION FIRST.

“ For Election and
“ Perseverance.”

“ Sav'd BEYOND THE
“ DREAD OF FALLING,
“ Let us rise,
“ To the prize
“ Of our glorious calling.
“ *Mr. Wesley's Hymns and*
“ *Spiritual Songs, published*
“ *in 1771. p. 6.*” See Re-
view, p. 107.

“ Against Election
“ and Perseverance.”

“ Those who live by
“ faith may yet FALL
“ FROM GOD, and perish
“ everlastingly.
“ *Wesley's serious thoughts*
“ *on the perseverance of the*
“ *saints.*”

The first thing I here object to, is, the VAGUE TITLE of this head: “ For election and perseverance”—“ Against election and perseverance.” According to this, a man may be both *for* and *against* election and perseverance, without the LEAST contradiction: That is, he may be FOR THEM, as they are CONDITIONAL, and AGAINST THEM as they are UNCONDITIONAL; which is Mr. *Wesley's* case. If, therefore, you had stated the objection with *accuracy* and *precision*, you would have said, FOR CONDITIONAL election and perseverance: Against CONDITIONAL election and perseverance.

However, as to the passage brought to shew what Mr. *Wesley* has said against election and perseverance, I acknowledge it does properly shew what is said against *unconditional* perseverance: I say *properly* shew, seeing it is taken out of a logical discourse, wrote professedly on that subject. But as to the contrasted passage, I observe, first, that I cannot find it by your reference; secondly, that I believe it is not taken from Mr. *John Wesley's* works, but from his brother's. But, thirdly, suppose the words were Mr. *John Wesley's*, I assert, they are

are not *sufficient* to contrast with A LOGICAL CONCLUSION, so as to PROVE a CONTRADICTION. The reason is this, these words, "sav'd beyond the dread of falling," which you intend as your POINT OF CONTRAST, are a poetic verse. Now, as it is ESSENTIAL to a good poem to be enriched with *tropes* and *figures*, (a great latitude in the use of which, being that which is meant by *poetic licence*) how absurd is it to contrast such *tropical* and *figurative* expressions, and as used in a nervous poem, with that which is said in a logical dispute; where (in order to clear investigation and conclusive reasoning) it is essential that the terms be applied according to their most literal and grammatical import!

DEMONSTRATION SECOND.

" We clap our hands, ex-
 " ulting
 " In thine Almighty fa-
 " vour,
 " The love divine,
 " That made us thine,
 " Shall keep us thine for-
 " ever.
 " *Select Hymns, with tunes*
 " *annexed, p. 120.*" Re-
 view, p. 108.

" I have loved thee with
 " an everlasting love; there-
 " fore with loving-kindness
 " have I drawn thee. Do
 " these words assert, that no
 " righteous man ever turn-
 " ed away from his righte-
 " ousness? No such thing.
 " Again, he who is a
 " child of GOD to-day,
 " may be a child of the
 " devil to-morrow.
 " *Thoughts on the perse-*
 " *verance of the saints.*"

The passage in the right-hand column I allow to be in point; seeing it is part of a logical dispute on the subject. But the contrasted passage is not in point; seeing it is poetic and figurative. And, I would observe, that the figure made use of, in the last of the following lines,

" The love divine, which made us thine,
 " Shall keep us thine for ever,"

is the ELLIPSIS, a part being left out, *in the expression*, but *implied* in the sense; or else the SYNECDOCHE, a part, which is *expressed*, being put for the whole of that which is both *implied* and *expressed*. So that if the matter had been expressed at large, in plain prose, or laid down in a logical proposition, it would have been to this effect, *That GOD* whose love has made us his own, will keep us such for ever, IF we endure to the end, *Mark* xiii. 13, IF we confess him before men, *Luke* xii. 8, IF we keep his commandments, *John* xv. 10, IF we mortify the deeds of the body, *Rom.* viii. 13, IF we sow to the spirit, *Gal.* vi. 8, IF we do these things, *2 Pet.* i. 10, and IF we are faithful unto death, *Rev.* ii. 10.

DEMONSTRATION THIRD.

<p>“ Our glorified head, “ His Spirit hath shed, “ With his people to “ stay, “ And NEVER again will “ he take him away. “ <i>Hymns and spiritual songs,</i> “ p. 7. <i>Ibid.</i>”</p>	<p>“ Those who have been “ made partakers of the “ Holy Ghost, of the wit- “ ness, and the fruits of “ the spirit, may never- “ theless so fall from GOD, “ as to perish everlastingly. “ <i>Thoughts on the perseve- “ rance of the saints.</i>”</p>
---	---

Here again I observe, that the passage on the right hand *fairly* shews what is said (not “ against election and perseverance,” as you call it, but) against *unconditional* perseverance; seeing it is taken out of a logical dispute on that subject. But, as to the other passage, it is quite foreign on two accounts: First, it is poetical; secondly, it speaks of a quite different thing; namely, of Christ sending his Spirit INTO THE CHURCH in general, and that he will never take him OUT OF THE CHURCH again.—Now, does not every one see a wide difference between taking the Spirit out of the univer-
sal

sal church, and taking him from an individual person, who has *grieved* and QUENCHED him?

DEMONSTRATION FOURTH.

“ He will perform the
 “ work begun,
 “ Jesus, the sinner’s friend;
 “ Jesus, the lover of his
 “ own,
 “ Will love me to the end.
 “ *Hymns and sacred poems,*
 “ Vol. II. p. 178.”

“ *Having loved his own,*
 “ namely, THE APOSTLES,
 “ as the very next words,
 “ *which were in the world,*
 “ evidently shew, he loved
 “ THEM unto the end of
 “ his life. See Mr. *Wes-*
 “ *ley’s note on John xiii. 1.*
 “ *and thoughts on the persev.*
 “ *of saints.*”

Here, again, that which is said, synecdochically, by the poet, is contrasted with that which is said, without a figure, by the commentator and logician. And yet, notwithstanding this, there is not a shadow of a contradiction. For though the one passage speaks of Christ loving his apostles to the end, it does not speak a word of his not so loving others; and though the opposite passage speaks of his loving others to the end, there is not a syllable against his not so loving the apostles.

If you say, the contradiction is IMPLIED in the passage on the right hand; then, I say, the answer is equally IMPLIED in that on the left. For instance, if you say, when Mr. *Wesley* asserted that Christ loved his apostles to the end of his life, he *intended* an opposition to the calvinian comment on the place, which is, that every one whom Christ loves at all, he loves them *unconditionally*, to the end of their life; then I say, on the other hand, that when Mr. *Wesley* said, “ Jesus will love ME to the end,” he *meant*, IF I keep his commandments, and am faithful unto death. You, therefore, see, that if, instead of PLAYING ON WORDS, you had considered the MEANING of both passages, there would not have been so much as A SHADOW of a contradiction.

Now,

Now, besides these FOUR demonstrations, which I have insisted on, there are TWENTY FOUR more, of the same sort, in your Farrago. But these four are *more* than sufficient: And, therefore, the TRUTH of this proposition is UNDENIABLE.

PROPOSITION III.

When both sides of your contrasts are in prose, you have opposed such expressions as, in one place, Mr. *Wesley* intended to be understood *literally*, to the same expression, in another place, where he intended them to be understood *figuratively*.

DEMONSTRATION FIRST.

“ For Imputed
“ Righteousness.”

“ The righteousness of
“ Christ is imputed to eve-
“ ry one that believes, as
“ soon as he believes: For
“ if he believes according
“ to the scripture, he be-
“ lieves in the righteous-
“ ness of Christ. *Sermon*
“ on Jer. xxiii. 6.” Re-
view, p. 126.

“ Against Imputed
“ Righteousness.”

“ Therefore believers are
“ not the men that have
“ any such righteousness
“ imputed to them. *Ibid.*”
That is, *Treatise on Justifi-*
fication.

As to these words, “ The righteousness of Christ is imputed to every one that believes, ” It is certain that they are intended to be understood “ IMPROPERLY, ” as *Goodwin* expresseth it; that is, in a FIGURATIVE, or, (as he explains it,) in a “ LESS PROPER SENSE. ” This is evident from the following words, in that Sermon, where Mr. *Wesley* has declared his own sentiments in the words of *Goodwin*. “ This ” (what he

he means by the righteousness of Christ being imputed) “ is more fully, largely, and particularly express’d in the *Treatise on Justification* which I published last year. If we take the phrase of *imputing Christ’s righteousness*, (IMPROPERLY, viz. ” so it is in the *Treatise*) “ for the bestowing (as it were) the righteousness of Christ, including his obedience, as well passive as active, IN THE RETURN OF IT ; that is IN THE PRIVILEGES, BLESSINGS AND BENEFITS PURCHASED BY IT : SO a believer may be said to be justified BY THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST IMPUTED. THE MEANING IS, GOD JUSTIFIES THE BELIEVER FOR THE SAKE OF CHRIST’S RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND NOT FOR THE SAKE OF HIS OWN.” —

Reader observe it well ; Mr. *Wesley* has here told us what he means (in the sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6.) by the righteousness of Christ being imputed : I repeat it again : That “ GOD justifies the believer FOR THE SAKE OF CHRIST’S RIGHTEOUSNESS, and not for the sake of his own.” It is therefore certain, that whenever such phrases, as the imputed righteousness of Christ, are made use of in this Sermon, Mr. *Wesley* intends them to be understood, NOT according to the STRICT, LITERAL signification of the words ; but rather, in a FIGURATIVE OF QUALIFIED sense.

As to the opposite passage, it speaks only of THAT IMPUTATION of Christ’s righteousness, which *Goodwin* had been OPPOSING. Now, what that is, we are told in the following words, “ The question IN PRECISE TERMS IS THIS, whether the *faith* of him that truly believes in Christ, or the *righteousness of Christ himself*, that is his obedience to the moral law, be that which GOD imputes to a believer for righteousness, in his justification : So that he that believes is constituted and made as perfectly, as legally righteous as Christ himself is ; the JUSTIFIED, and the JUSTIFIER, both being righteous with the SAME RIGHTEOUSNESS, only the JUSTIFIED wears it by IMPUTATION, the JUSTIFIER by INHERENCY. That the scriptures no where countenance any such
“ imputation

“ imputation of the righteousness of Christ, I trust, (the Spirit of Truth assisting) to make manifest in “ this discourse. ” It is therefore certain, that when Mr. *Wesley* said, (out of *Goodwin*) “ Believers are not “ the men that have any such righteousness imputed “ to them, ” he intended to be understood, NOT in that FIGURATIVE OF QUALIFIED sense mentioned above; but, rather, according to the STRICT, *grammatical* import of the expressions.

It is therefore evident, from hence, that you have contrasted such expressions in one place, which Mr. *Wesley* intended to be understood *literally* to those which, in another place, he intended to be understood *figuratively*.

DEMONSTRATION SECOND.

<p>“ I no more DENY the “ righteousness of Christ, “ than I deny the God- “ head of Christ. Nei- “ ther do I DENY IMPU- “ TED RIGHTEOUSNESS.— “ This is another unkind “ and unjust accusation., “ <i>Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.</i>”</p>	<p>“ You see one main “ reason why we DENY “ THE IMPUTATION OF “ CHRIST’S RIGHTEOUS- “ NESS. <i>Treatise on Justi- “ fication.</i>”</p>
--	--

When Mr. *Wesley* says (out of *Goodwin*) “ We deny “ the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, ” he means, We deny it in the sense above-mentioned: That is, we deny “ That the believer is constituted and made “ as PERFECTLY, AS LEGALLY RIGHTEOUS AS CHRIST “ HIMSELF is—and with the SELF-SAME *righteousness*, “ only the JUSTIFIED wears it by IMPUTATION, the “ JUSTIFIER by *inherency*. ” In other words, he means, We deny that the righteousness of Christ, consisting of all his thoughts, intentions, tempers, desires, words and actions, is so LITERALLY IMPUTED to a believer, as to become HIS OWN, as STRICTLY and PROPERLY as it was Christ’s. Now, as THIS is the PROPER Pre-destinarian

destinarian and Antinomian doctrine of imputed righteousness, so it is this, and THIS ONLY, which is here denied. It is, therefore, certain, that this passage speaks of imputed righteousness, *not* FIGURATIVELY, but according to THE STRICT, GRAMMATICAL sense of the words.

But as to the other passage, where Mr. *Wesley* says, "Neither do I deny imputed righteousness," if he intended the righteousness of Christ, and not the righteousness of faith, "THE MEANING IS, GOD justifies a believer FOR THE SAKE OF Christ's righteousness, and NOT FOR THE SAKE OF his own." (see the Sermon on *Jer.* xxiii. 6. p. 14.) It is, therefore, certain, that the expressions are here to be understood not STRICTLY and GRAMMATICALLY; but, rather, in a FIGURATIVE SENSE.

DEMONSTRATION THIRD.

"The first thing then which admits of no dispute among reasonable men is this: To all believers, the righteousness of Christ is imputed. *Serm.* on *Jer.* xxiii. 6."

"Thus have we at last fully answered all those arguments, which to my knowledge have yet been insisted upon for the imputation of Christ's righteousness. *Treatise on Just.* p. 207."

When Mr. *Wesley* (out of *Goodwin*) says, "To all believers the righteousness of Christ is imputed," — "THE MEANING IS," (to repeat his own words once more) "GOD justifies a believer, FOR THE SAKE OF Christ's righteousness."

To set this matter in a clear light, let it be observed, *first*, That (according to Mr. *Wesley*) the righteousness of Christ consists of his whole Obedience, while on earth. That, *secondly*, in this obedience there is a *worth* or *value*, which, from the notion of one person making amends to another for an injury committed, is called his SATISFACTION; and, from the notion of a

D

person

person purchasing a favour or benefit by laying down an equivalent, is called his MERIT. That *thirdly*, GOD, on account of (or, FOR THE SAKE OF) this satisfaction or merit, justifies all who believe. That, *fourthly*, his doing this, FOR THE SAKE OF this satisfaction or merit, Mr. *Wesley* SOMETIMES calls *imputing* the righteousness of Christ; which, certainly, is not the *literal*, but *figurative import* of the word *impute*.

To impute, strictly and properly speaking, is, 1. To *reckon* ONE THING *instead* of ANOTHER, in order to some end. In this sense, St. Paul, the ANTI-ENT FATHERS, *Luther*, *Goodwin*, *Baxter*, and Mr. *Wesley* say, that FAITH is *imputed* instead of UNSINNING OBEDIENCE, in order to justification. 2. It signifies, that THAT which is the REAL PROPERTY of ONE PERSON is RECKONED or ACCOUNTED the REAL PROPERTY of another. Now, this is the calvinian and antinomian doctrine of imputation. For, as to the sin of *Adam*, they say, That the identical act of eating the forbidden fruit, is so imputed to his posterity, that we are all accounted eaters of that fruit, as *truly* and *literally* as he was himself. So, again, when the sins of the people were imputed to the scape-goat, the DUMB animal was looked on as being *literally* guilty of all the evil words and actions which were imputed to it. Again farther; according to them, all the evil tempers and desires, words and actions of men, women and children were so imputed to Christ, as to become his own sins, and that too, as strictly, and literally as they are our's.—On the other hand, they say, That Christ's acts of inward and outward righteousness are so imputed to us, as to become our own acts, as strictly, truly, and literally as they were the actions of Christ.

Now, it is according to this last notion of imputed righteousness, that Mr. *Wesley* speaks against it, in the passage brought out of the Treatise on Justification. This is evident from hence, That the passage contains only the author's declaration that he had answered all the arguments which were brought in support of the doctrine he had been opposing: Which was, that

“ He

“ He that believes, is constituted and made as perfectly, as legally righteous, as Christ himself is ;—both “ being righteous with the self-same righteousness.” Now it is certain, that this is imputation, not according to the figurative import of the word ; but according to its most strict and literal interpretation. And therefore, it is evident, That you have opposed such expressions, as, in one place, Mr. *Wesley* intended to be understood *literally* to the same expressions, in another place, where he intended them to be understood *figuratively*.

Many more demonstrations of this proposition might be produced ; but these are sufficient : And therefore, I shall conclude this head with observing, That according to your *loose* and *indeterminate* manner of stating *this* point of imputed righteousness also, Mr. *Wesley*, or any one, may ASSERT and DENY it a thousand times over, and yet not be guilty of one real contradiction.—Surely, you Sir, who are a “ MASTER OF ARTS, of “ the University of OXFORD,” and at the same time, so great an adept in divinity, cannot but know, that there is great *ambiguity* in the phrase, imputed righteousness : Seeing the term *righteousness*, may be understood either of the righteousness or obedience of Christ, as in Rom. v. 18. or else it may be understood of *Faith* in Christ, which is called “ The righteousness of faith,” chap. iv. 13. And besides these, there are various other acceptations of that term.—And as to the term, *impute*, this (as I have observed before) may be understood either *literally* or *figuratively*. It is certain therefore that a person may use this phrase, in one sense, and reject it in the other, without the least contradiction ; which is Mr. *Wesley*’s case. For, speaking of *Faith* being COUNTED, (Rom. iv. 3. 5.) RECKONED, [ver. 4. 9, 10.] IMPUTED, [ver. 22, 23, 24.] he asserts imputed righteousness, according to the STRICT and PROPER sense of the words. And speaking of the *righteousness of Christ*, he asserts the imputation of this, in that *figurative* or *qualified* sense mentioned above ; but speaking of the imputation of *it*, according

to the *calvinian* and *antinomian* notion, that is, according to the STRICT, LITERAL, GRAMMATICAL import of the term *impute*, he *denies* it.

Dear Sir, if you have studied this subject so as to understand what you are writing about, it is a pity that you have not been so ingenuous as to make these necessary distinctions; but if, in reality, you have not studied it so as to understand it, (which I believe is the case) then it is a pity that you should pretend to write on a subject you do not understand.

PROPOSITION IV.

You have opposed expressions which were used in one sense, to one sort of people; to the same expressions, used in another sense, to another sort of people.

DEMONSTRATION.

“ For
“ Sinless Perfection.”

“ The Son hath made
“ them who are thus born
“ of GOD free from that
“ great root of sin and bit-
“ terness, PRIDE. *Preface*
“ *to Hymns and Sacred*
“ *Poems*, vol. I. p. 159,
“ *printed at London, 1756.*”

“ Against
“ Sinless Perfection.”

“ They (the children
“ of GOD) are daily sen-
“ sible of sin remaining in
“ their hearts; pride, &c.
“ Mr. *Wesley's sermon on*
“ *2 Cor. v. 17. entitled, In-*
“ *dwelling Sin.*”

The passage you have quoted in the first column is, as you say, a proof that Mr. *Wesley* holds, what you call, “ Sinless perfection.” For it is the sole business of that preface to describe those who are *now*, IN THIS LIFE, born of GOD, that is, CHANGED IN THE HIGHEST DEGREE. This is evident from the words which follow those you have quoted: “ They are free from
“ self-will

“ self-will; as desiring nothing, no, not for a moment
 “ (for PERFECT LOVE casteth out all desire) but the holy
 “ and perfect will of GOD.” Again, “ They are freed
 “ from evil thoughts, so that they cannot enter into
 “ them, no not for an instant. Afore-time, 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 FUEL OF GOD.”
 So again, “ Not that every one is a child of the devil
 “ (as some have rashly asserted, who know not what
 “ they speak, nor whereof they affirm) ’till he is in
 “ THIS FULL SENSE, BORN OF GOD:” That
 is, ’till he is FULLY and PERFECTLY CHANGED. You
 are, therefore, INFALLIBLY RIGHT in the passage you
 have brought in proof of his holding what *you* call sin-
 less (but Mr. Wesley, *Christian*) perfection.

But I cannot say this of the contrasted passage: In
 this you are INFALLIBLY WRONG. For the sermon on
 2 Cor. v. 17. entitled, *Sin in believers*, does NOT speak
 of PERFECTION, or any such thing: It speaks ONLY
 of BABES in Christ, and not of fathers: That is, it
 speaks of those who are justified, but not WHOLLY sanc-
 tified.

That this is really the case, appears from the follow-
 ing passages in that sermon. The very first words, af-
 ter the text, are as follow, “ Is there then no sin in
 “ him that is in Christ? Does sin no longer remain in
 “ one that believes in him?” Observe, the question is
 not concerning sin being in one who is PERFECT; but
 in one who is simply IN CHRIST BY FAITH, as every
 babe in Christ is.

That there is sin remaining in *such*, he says, “ I do
 “ not know that ever it was controverted in the primi-
 “ tive church. Indeed there was no room for dispu-
 “ ting concerning it, as all Christians were agreed” —
 “ And herein our own church” — “ exactly copies after
 “ the primitive, declaring (in her ninth article) original
 “ sin is the corruption of the nature of every man” —
 “ and this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them
 “ that are regenerated” — “ The same testimony is
 D 3 “ given

“ given by all other churches: not only by the *Greck*
 “ and *Romish* church, but by every reformed church
 “ in *Europe*, of whatever denomination. Indeed some
 “ of these seem to carry the thing too far: So describ-
 “ ing the corruption of the heart in a believer, as scarce
 “ to allow that he has dominion over it, but rather is
 “ in bondage thereto. And by this means they leave
 “ hardly any distinction between” (observe it well;
 not between one who is PERFECT, and any one else;
 but between) “ a BELIEVER and an UNBE-
 “ LIEVER.”

“ To avoid this extreme, many well-meaning men,
 “ particularly those under the direction of the late
 “ Count *Zinzendorf*, ran into another; affirming, That
 “ all TRUE” (NOT PERFECT) “ believers are not only
 “ saved from the *dominion* of sin, but from the being
 “ of inward as well as outward sin, so that it no longer
 “ remains in them. And from them, about Twenty
 “ years ago, many of our countrymen imbibed the same
 “ opinion, That even the corruption of nature is no
 “ more in those” (he does not say, who are PERFECT;
 but in those) “ who BELIEVE IN CHRIST.”

“ It is true,” (adds Mr. *Wesley*) “ that when the
 “ *Germans* were pressed on this head, they soon allowed,
 “ (many of them at least) *that sin did still remain IN*
 “ THE FLESH, *but not in THE HEART of a believer.*
 “ And after a time, when the absurdity of this was
 “ fully shewn, they fairly gave up the point: allow-
 “ ing, That *sin did still remain*, though not *reign* in him
 “ that is born of GOD.”

“ But the *English* who had received it from them”
 —“ were not so easily prevailed upon to part with a
 “ favourite opinion. And even when the generality
 “ of them were convinced it was utterly indefensible,
 “ a few could not be persuaded to give it up, but
 “ maintain it to this day.” Sermon on *Sin in Be-*
lievers, p. 4.

And of the number of those who would not give it
 up, were two preachers in connexion with Mr. *Wesley*,
 Mr. *J. C.* and Mr. *J. H.* These asserted, both from
 the

the pulpit and the press, that in the *first moment* any one believed in Christ, he was saved from ALL SIN; not only from the *guilt* and *power* of sin, but also from the very NATURE of it. Now, as many serious persons under Mr. *Wesley's* care began to be infected by this doctrine, and as there was visible danger of the spreading of this evil, Mr. *Wesley* preached and published this sermon; first, to restore those who were already led astray, and, also, as a preservative to others.

And, in the prosecution of this design, he saith, [p. 4.] “For the sake of those who really fear GOD and desire to know *the Truth as it is in Jesus*, it may not be amiss to consider the point with calmness and impartiality. In doing this, I use indifferently the words” (not SINLESS PERFECTION; but) “*regenerate, justified, or believers*: Since though they have not precisely the same meaning”—“yet they come to one and the same thing, as every one that believes is both justified and born of GOD.”

He then (p. 5.) states the question, at large, in the following words. “The question is not, concerning *outward sin*: Whether a child of GOD *commits sin* or no? We all agree and earnestly maintain, *He that committeth sin is of the devil*. We agree, *Whoever is born of GOD doth not commit sin*. NEITHER DO WE [NOW] ENQUIRE WHETHER INWARD SIN WILL ALWAYS REMAIN IN THE CHILDREN OF GOD? WHETHER SIN WILL CONTINUE IN THE SOUL AS LONG AS IT CONTINUES IN THE BODY? Nor yet do we enquire, whether a justified person, may relapse either into inward or outward sin? BUT SIMPLY THIS, IS A JUSTIFIED OR REGENERATE MAN, FREE FROM ALL SIN, AS SOON AS HE IS JUSTIFIED? IS THERE THEN NO SIN IN HIS HEART?”

Now, Sir, I am really astonished, that, after such precision in introducing and stating the business of this sermon, you should be capable of bringing ONE passage

face out of it to shew what he has said, "against sinless perfection." But it astonishes me almost beyond measure, that you should be capable of doing this, yea, and with a very good grace too! not less than FOURTEEN times.

That the reader who has not your Farrago by him, may see, without farther trouble, the truth of what I here assert, I shall, for once, be at the pains to transcribe these passages at large, as they stand therein. And that they may all appear in one view, I shall repeat that which I have already mentioned.

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

Passages out of Mr. *Wesley's* sermon on Sin in Believers, (which sermon asserts nothing but that there is sin in BABES IN CHRIST, at the time they are first justified) BROUGHT TO PROVE THAT HE ASSERTS, There is sin in ADULT BELIEVERS, who are called FATHERS IN CHRIST. By *Richard Hill*, Esq; Justice of Peace for the County of Salop, and "Master of Arts, of the University of Oxford!"

P A S S A G E I.

"AGAINST SINLESS PERFECTION!"

"They (the children of GOD) are daily sensible of sin remaining in their hearts; PRIDE, &c. &c. Mr. *Wesley's* sermon on 2 Cor. 5. 17. entitled, *Indwelling Sin.*"

P A S S A G E II.

"It is the constant experience of the children of GOD," (that is, of babes in Christ) "that they feel a WILL not wholly resigned to the WILL OF GOD. *Ibid.*"

P A S S A G E

P A S S A G E III.

“ God’s children”—(observe, he does not say, THOSE WHO ARE PERFECT) “ are daily sensible of sin remaining in their hearts, PRIDE, SELF-WILL, &c. Mr. Wesley’s sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17. entitled, *Indwelling Sin.*”

P A S S A G E IV.

“ St. Paul is speaking to believers, and describing the state” (not of such believers as are PERFECT; but) “ of believers in general, when he says, *The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other. No-thing can be more express: the Apostle here directly affirms that the flesh, the evil nature opposes the Spirit even in believers. Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17.*” Observe, he does not say, in *adult* or *perfect* believers.

P A S S A G E V.

“ This doctrine (of believers being without sin) is wholly new, never heard of in the church of Christ, from the time of his coming into the world till the time of Count Zinzendorf. I do not remember to have seen the least intimation of it, either in any antient or modern writer, unless, perhaps, in some of the wild RANTING ANTINOMIANS. *Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17.*”

P A S S A G E VI.

“ That there are two contrary principles in BELIEVERS,” (he does not say, in those who are PERFECT) “ nature and grace, the flesh and the Spirit, runs through all the epistles of St. Paul, yea, through all the holy scriptures. *Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17.*”

P A S S A G E

P A S S A G E VII.

“ As this position, that there is no sin in a BELIEVER,” (a *common believer*) “ NO CARNAL MIND, no bent to back-sliding, is contrary to the word of GOD, so it is to the experience of his children. These continually ” (while they are babes in Christ) “ feel an heart bent to back-sliding, a natural tendency to evil, a proneness to depart from GOD, and to cleave to the things of earth. *Ibid.*”

P A S S A G E VIII.

“ This doctrine (that there is no sin in the regenerate) is attended with the most fatal consequences. It cuts off all watching against our evil nature, against the *Delilah* which we are told is gone, though she is still lying in our bosom. It tears away the shield of WEAK BELIEVERS,” (for it is of *these only* he is speaking all along) “ deprives them of their faith, and so leaves them exposed to all the assaults of the world, the flesh, and the devil. *Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17.*”

P A S S A G E IX.

“ The flesh, the evil nature, still remains (though subdued) and wars against the Spirit. So much the more let us use all diligence in *fighting* the good fight of faith. So much the more let us watch and pray against THE ENEMY WITHIN; the more earnestly let us take to ourselves and put on the whole armour of GOD, that although WE WRESTLE BOTH WITH FLESH AND BLOOD, and principalities and powers, and wicked spirits in high places, we may be able to stand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. *Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17.*”

P A S S A G E

P A S S A G E X.

“ We must not so interpret the Apostle’s words (*old things are past away; all things are become new*) as to make him contradict himself; and if we will make him consistent with himself, the plain meaning of the words is this: His old judgment (concerning justification, holiness, happiness; indeed, concerning the things of GOD in general) is now past away; so are all his old desires, designs, affections, tempers and conversation; all these are undeniably become new, greatly changed from what they were: and yet though they are new, they are not wholly new; still he feels, to his sorrow and shame, REMAINS of the old man. *Ibid.*” Observe, Mr. *Wesley* is not speaking of one who is PERFECT, but of a BABE IN CHRIST, of a WEAK BELIEVER.

P A S S A G E XI.

“ But they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts; they have so; yet it remains in them still,” (in them who are BABES IN CHRIST) “ and often struggles to break from the cross. *Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17.*”

P A S S A G E XII.

“ But, (you object) a man cannot be clean, sanctified, holy,” (the objector means, a man cannot be so in the sense St. Paul said the whole church of Corinth was) “ and at the same time unclean, un sanctified, unholy: Indeed he may; so the Corinthians were. Ye are washed, says the apostle, ye are sanctified; and yet at the same time, in another sense of the word they were un sanctified; they were not washed, nor inwardly cleansed from envy, evil-suspecting, partiality. *Ibid.*”

P A S S A G E

P A S S A G E XIII.

“ But sure they had not a new heart, and an old heart together. It is most sure they had. But could they be unholy while they were temples of the Holy Ghost? ” These objections were made by those persons who held, That we are saved from all sin AS SOON AS WE ARE JUSTIFIED. To which Mr. *Wesley* answers, “ Yes; that they are temples of the Holy Ghost is certain; and it is equally certain, they were in some degree carnal, that is, unholy.” *Ibid.*

P A S S A G E XIV.

“ Certainly a man cannot be a new creature, and an old creature at once ” — says the objector; to whom Mr. *Wesley* answers, “ Yes, he may; he may be partly renewed, which was the very case of those at Corinth. *Ibid.* ”

Now, Sir, these are the passages you have brought out of the sermon on Sin in believers; the business of which is “ SIMPLY THIS,” to enquire, “ IS A JUSTIFIED OR REGENERATE MAN FREE FROM ALL SIN AS SOON AS HE IS JUSTIFIED? ” “ IS THERE THEN NO SIN IN HIS HEART? ”

I say, these are the passages which you have brought out of this sermon, to shew the world what Mr. *Wesley* has said “ Against sinless perfection,” in a discourse which DOES NOT SAY ANY THING ABOUT IT! O, Sir! Where is your HONOUR?—Where is your CONSCIENCE?—Or, (at the VERY LEAST,) I ask, Where are YOUR EYES?

But these FOURTEEN passages, out of this sermon are not all. For there are ELEVEN more, equally foreign, which you have brought out of other tracts: Five out of the sermon on Rom. viii. 1. Two out of that on Eph. ii. 8. One out of that on Mark i. 15. One out of the 35 vol. Christian Library. One out of the note on 2 Cor. v. 4. And one out of Hymns and Spiritual Songs.

That

That the reader may see, with his own eyes, a farther proof of the JUSTICE which Mr. *Wesley* has met with from the hand of an HONOURABLE, LEARNED, CHRISTIAN MAGISTRATE! I shall consider these passages also at large.

And, first, let us consider the *First* passages you have brought out of the sermon on *Rom. viii. 1.* to shew what Mr. *Wesley* has said "Against Sinless Perfection."

P A S S A G E I.

"Believers in Christ" (observe, he does not say, Those who are perfect) "feel more or less of pride, or self-will stealing in, and mixing with their best duties," (while they are babes in Christ: For it is of these *only* he is speaking,) "even in THEIR MORE IMMEDIATE INTERCOURSE WITH GOD, when they assemble themselves in the great congregation, and when they pour out their souls in secret to him who seeth all the thoughts and intents of their hearts. They are continually ashamed of their WANDERING THOUGHTS, of the deadness and dulness of their affections. *Wesley's Sermon on Rom. viii. 1.*"

That he is here speaking of *common believers*, or *babes in Christ*, is evident, *First*, from the *Title* of the sermon. It is called, "THE FIRST FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT." As if he had said, This discourse *does not* treat of the LAST or HIGHEST operations of the Spirit, which is experienced by ADULT or PERFECT Christians; it treats only of the FIRST DEGREE of grace, as experienced by COMMON Christians. This is evident, *Secondly*, from the Text itself: *There is therefore now no condemnation to them* (it does not say, who are PERFECT; but to them) "*who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.*" This is evident, *Thirdly*, from the first sentence of the sermon. Where we are told who they are who are intended in this discourse. "By them which are in
E Christ

“ Christ Jesus, St. *Paul* evidently means, Those who have TRULY BELIEVED in him: Those” (he does not say, who are PERFECT; but) “ who *being* JUSTIFIED by faith have peace with GOD, through our Lord Jesus Christ.” It is therefore evident, that what is said in this discourse concerns JUSTIFICATION, and not “ sinless perfection,” as you call it.

P A S S A G E II.

“ That the corruption of nature doth still remain even in those” (he does not say, who are PERFECT; but) “ WHO ARE THE CHILDREN OF GOD BY FAITH, that THEY have in them the seeds of PRIDE AND VANITY, OF ANGER LUST AND EVIL DESIRE, YEA, SIN OF EVERY KIND, is too plain to be denied, being matter of daily experience. *Sermon on Rom. viii. 1.*”

That Mr. *Wesley* is not speaking of those who are PERFECT; but ONLY of COMMON BELIEVERS, the words immediately following infallibly shew.—“ And on this account it is, that St. *Paul* SPEAKING TO THOSE, whom he had before witnessed to be IN CHRIST JESUS, to have been called of GOD to the fellowship (or participation) of his Son Jesus Christ, yet declares, Brethren, I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual; but as unto carnal; even as unto babes in Christ (1 *Cor.* iii. 1.) *Babes in Christ*—So we see they were in Christ; THEY WERE BELIEVERS” (observe it well) “ IN A LOW DEGREE. And yet how much sin remained in them? Of that *carnal mind which is not subject to the law of GOD.*”

Now, as this paragraph consists only of four sentences; and as you have been so exact in transcribing the second of them into your Farrago, I conclude that you have read the whole paragraph. And, if you have, what an instance is here of WILFUL PERVERSION! Mr. *Wesley* says, “ The corruption of nature doth still remain even in those who are the children of GOD.” Who he means by children
“ of

of GOD, he tells you in the same paragraph, and almost in the same sentence: They are "BABES IN CHRIST"—"BELIEVERS IN A LOW DEGREE." This you *certainly saw* with your own eyes. And yet you have represented the passage, as speaking of FATHERS IN CHRIST: Of *Believers in the HIGHEST DEGREE*: That is, you have represented it as speaking of "Sinless perfection."—If such perversion, such glaring, wilful, premeditated perversion, is any part of the gentleman, the man of honour, the scholar or the Christian; may I be neither for ever! O, Sir! whatever I AM or HAVE besides, I thank GOD, I have a soul within me, incapable of such unfair, unjust—and ungenerous proceedings.

P A S S A G E III.

"Believers in Christ" (he does not say, those who are PERFECT) "are conscious of not fulfilling THE PERFECT LAW, either in thoughts, or words, or works. *Serm. on Rom. viii. 1.*"

P A S S A G E IV.

"They (believers) know they DO NOT LOVE THE LORD THEIR GOD WITH ALL THEIR HEART, AND MIND, AND SOUL, AND STRENGTH. *Serm. on Rom. viii. 1.*" It is certain that "Babes in Christ"—that "Believers in a LOW DEGREE" know they do not thus love him; and it is of these *only* that Mr. *Wesley* is speaking.

P A S S A G E V.

"That believers" (not those who are PERFECT) "are delivered from the *guilt* of sin we allow, that
 E 2 "they"

“they” (babes in Christ— “believers in a LOW DEGREE,” as it is above) are delivered from the BEING of it we deny. *Ibid.*”

Thus we see, Sir, with what *dexterity*, TRUTH and JUSTICE you have brought five passages, which speak *only* against SINLESS JUSTIFICATION, to shew what is said “Against SINLESS PERFECTION!”

We will next consider the *two* passages brought out of the sermon on *Eph. ii. 8.*

P A S S A G E I.

“How naturally do those who have experienced such a change” (as is passed in *justification*) “imagine that all sin is gone; that it is utterly rooted out of their hearts, and has no more any place therein? How easily do they draw that inference, I *feel* no sin, therefore I *have* none; it does not *stir*, therefore it does not *exist*; it has no MOTION, therefore it has no being? But it is seldom long before they are undeceived, finding sin was only suspended, not destroyed. *Serm. on Eph. ii. 8.*”

That Mr. *Wesley* is not here speaking of “Sinless Perfection,” but rather of what we experience at the time we are first justified, appears from the preceding words: “And AT THE SAME TIME THAT WE ARE JUSTIFIED, YEA, IN THAT VERY MOMENT, SANCTIFICATION BEGINS. IN THAT INSTANT we are *born again, born from above, born of the Spirit.* There is a *real* as well as a *relative* change.”—

Now, Sir, it is of this “*real* change;” this “SANCTIFICATION” which “BEGINS” — “AT THE SAME TIME THAT WE ARE JUSTIFIED, yea, and IN THAT VERY MOMENT,” that Mr. *Wesley* speaks in the words here cited: And, therefore, he no more opposes “Sinless Perfection” therein, than he commands you to make a sinful quotation.

P A S S A G E

P A S S A G E II.

“ If we say we have no sin now remaining, we deceive ourselves. *Many* INFIRMITIES *do* remain, *whereby* we are daily subject to what we call sins of infirmity; and DOUBTLESS THEY ARE IN SOME SENSE SINS, as being transgressions of the perfect law; and with regard to these, it may be said of us all our lives, that in many things we offend all. *The same sermon on Eph. ii. 8. next page.*”

On this passage I would observe, that in the two editions of the sermon which I have by me, there are no such words. And you acknowledge, in a note, that “ Since this was written, I have seen another edition of this sermon, wherein this gross contradiction is expunged; though, in that I have in my possession, it stands exactly as I have transcribed it; and it is to be found in those lately printed, and now exposed to sale near the chapel in *West-street.*”

Now, suppose this passage is really found in any late edition of the sermon, which has been printed by *itself*, seeing it is not in the *last* editions of the volumes, all that can be inferred is, That (THROUGH MISTAKE) a copy which had not been corrected was sent to the printer, for a new edition: This, Sir, you could not but see. I therefore leave every candid reader to judge, if it is not very ungenerous; if it is not very unfair; if it is not meer quibbling to bring a passage which you know, and acknowledge, *Mr. Wesley has disowned*, to prove that he now *contradicts himself!*

But you say, “ Since this” (the above contrast) “ was written, I have seen another edition of the sermon, wherein this gross contradiction was expunged.” — “ Since this was written!” I hope you do’nt intend this as an apology for *printing* and *publishing* a FIRST and SECOND EDITION of SUCH A QUIBBLE, *That YOU HAD ONCE WRITTEN IT!* What, Sir, are the *rough draughts* of your blunders of such importance! that,

that, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, they cannot be reversed?

But suppose the passage in question was now owned by Mr. *Wesley*, and suppose it contradicted a thousand other passages, yet it would not answer your purpose. You set it down to shew what he says "Against sinless perfection;" but it does not speak a word either *for* or *against* it: The whole passage speaks of justification, and its immediate consequences. This is evident from the following words. "This then is the salvation which is through faith, even in this present world: A salvation from sin, and the consequences of sin, both often expressed in the word JUSTIFICATION."—"So that he who is THUS JUSTIFIED OR SAVED BY FAITH, is indeed *born again*."

It is, therefore, certain that the two passages you have brought out of the sermon on Eph. ii, 8. do not speak one word "Against sinless Perfection:" And, therefore, they do not prove that Mr. *Wesley* has contradicted himself on that head.

We will now consider the passage you have brought from the sermon on Mark i. 15.

THE PASSAGE.

"Though we readily acknowledge he that believeth is born of GOD, and that he that is born of GOD doth not commit sin; yet we cannot allow *that he does not feel it within him*. Sermon on Mark i. 15."

That Mr. *Wesley* is not here speaking of "Sinless perfection," but of the experience of a babe in Christ, is evident from the preceding words. "WHEN" (Observe, he does not say, when we are PERFECT; but when) "WE FIRST FIND REDEMPTION in the blood of Jesus"—"it is natural to suppose that we are no longer sinners, that our sins are not only covered but destroyed."—"Nay some well-meaning men have"—"persuaded themselves, that *when they were justified* they were entirely sanctified."—"These sincerely believe and earnestly maintain, that all sin is destroyed
" *when*

“ *when we are justified*, and that there is no sin in the heart of a believer; but that it is altogether clean from that moment.” Then follow the words, which you have quoted: But “though we readily acknowledge,” &c. It is, therefore, undeniably clear, that this passage speaks nothing ABOUT sinless perfection; and, of consequence, cannot be supposed to speak any thing AGAINST it.

As to these expressions, Born again, Born of GOD, every man of learning knows that they are figurative; and that in plain language they signify, TO BE CHANGED. These also know that this change is, first *relative*; and, secondly, *real* or *moral*. They also know that this real or moral change consists of *various degrees*, such as those experienced by *babes*, *young men*, and *fathers* in Christ.

Now, Mr. *Wesley* (in general) calls that first degree of it, which is experienced when we are justified, the new birth; but sometimes, especially in poetry, he calls the highest degree of it by that name. An instance of the first we have in the words you have most absurdly quoted in your column “Against Sinless Perfection:” And an instance of the second we have in the following words of Mr. *Charles Wesley*, which you have inserted in your opposite column,

“ While one evil thought can rise
“ I AM NOT BORN AGAIN.”

It is certain that the poet meant, I am not FULLY and PERFECTLY changed: And it is also certain that you understood him in this sense, or else you could not, without an instance of absurdity, even, greater than *your own*, set down these words in the column “For sinless perfection.”

But is it not truly marvelous (if any thing that is absurd can be called marvellous in *you*) that you should set these words to shew what Mr. *Wesley* has said, “For sinless perfection;” and then refer us to the following note: “We see by this, and several other expressions, that the author of these hymns did not, AT THE TIME
“ OF

“ OF WRITING THEM, allow any one could be a believer, even IN THE LOWEST SENSE of the word, “ while he found the least stirring of sin.” What, Sir! was this Mr. *Wesley*’s meaning, AT THE TIME HE WROTE THESE WORDS? How came you, then, to put a quite different meaning on them, AT THE TIME YOU WROTE YOUR FARRAGO? if he WROTE them to shew what he thought of those who are “ believers IN THE “ LOWEST SENSE, ” how came you to QUOTE them to shew what he has said of those who are believers *in the HIGHEST SENSE!* to shew what he has said, “ For sinless perfection ”? ”

Let us next consider the passage you have brought out of the Christian Library.

THE PASSAGE

“ AGAINST SINLESS PERFECTION.”

“ Purified Christians are they that are most sensible of their impurity. Therefore, I called *not* this AN UNIVERSAL FREEDOM FROM POLLUTION, but an universal detestation of it. *Christian Library, XXXV. p. 19.* ”

That this is no proof of Mr. *Wesley*’s inconsistency on the head of perfection, appears from hence, That he is not speaking of the highest degree of purity, in opposition to the lowest degree thereof: but of purity, simply considered, in opposition to absolute impurity. This is evident, first, from the foregoing words.— “ This purity that true wisdom works, is contrary to “ all pollution: ” The meaning, certainly, is, that *this kind* of purity is contrary to *all kinds* of pollution. “ We know then in some measure WHAT IT IS. ” Observe, it is not said, we know what it is *in its most perfect degree*; but we know WHAT IT IS, that is, WHAT THE NATURE THEREOF IS. “ It rests to enquire where “ it is ? ” where TRUE and GENUINE (*not perfect*) purity is: “ Look upon the greatest part of mankind, and “ you may know at first sight that purity is not to be “ looked

“ looked for among them.”—“ If you come to the
 “ mere moralist”—“ he will tell you he hath cleansed
 “ his heart, but believe him not.”—“ But if you chance
 “ to take notice of some well-skilled hypocrite, every
 “ thing you meet with makes you almost confident
 “ that there is purity,” (that is, *purity* IN KIND, as op-
 posed to impurity.) “ Yet if he be strictly put to it,
 “ he”—“ dare not say he hath made clean his heart,
 “ it troubles his peace to be asked the question. After
 “ these there are a few despised melancholy persons
 “ (at least as to outward appearance)”—“ and—such
 “ purity ” (that is such KIND of purity as is here be-
 low) “ will either be found to lodge among these, or
 “ no where.” It is therefore evident from hence, that
 the author is speaking of the NATURE of true purity,
 and not of its DEGREES.

And this is still more plain, if possible, from the
 following words in the next paragraph: “ This is the
 “ condition of those that are TRULY, THO’ NOT YET
 “ FULLY cleansed from the pollution of the world.”
 —“ And though its BEGINNINGS BE SMALL, doubt
 “ not, it shall in the end be victorious.” It is there-
 fore certain, that by “ Purified Christians ” is meant,
 Christians who are purified in the LOWEST degree;
 and of consequence, that this is no proof of Mr.
Wesley’s contradiction on the article of “ Sinless Per-
 fection.”

Let us next examine the passage you have brought
 out of the note on 2 *Cor.* v. 4.

T H E P A S S A G E

“ AGAINST SINLESS PERFECTION ! ”

“ We groan, being burdened with numberless in-
 “ firmities, temptations and sins. Mr. *Wesley’s* note
 “ *on the same text.*”

Now, it is certain that Mr. *Wesley* does not speak
 here of those who either *profess* or *possess* SINLESS PER-
 FECTION; but of Christians IN GENERAL. It is
 equally

equally certain that the contrasted passage does not speak of Christians in general; but of "The *best of men*:" Therefore, here is no contradiction *on the head of* "Sinless Perfection." Nevertheless, I will allow that there is a *seeming*, if not a *real* inconsistency, in the two expositions of the text: and I doubt not but it will be corrected in the next edition.

Once more: Let us consider the passage out of *Hymns and Sac. Poems*, which you have brought to shew what is said, "Against Sinless Perfection."

THE PASSAGE.

" I am all unrighteousness;
 " False and full of sin I am.
 " *Mr. Wesley's Hymns.*"

That Mr. *Wesley* is not here speaking of "Sinless Perfection," but of the experience of Christians in general, is evident from the words immediately following:

" Plenteous grace with thee is found,
 " Grace to cover ALL MY SIN;
 " Let the HEALING streams abound,
 " MAKE and KEEP me PURE WITHIN."

And that this does not so much as *imply* a denial of perfection, appears, first, from his professing to believe that there is such plenteous grace in Christ as is sufficient to cover all his sin: secondly, from his *praying* that this grace would, first, MAKE, and, secondly, KEEP him PURE WITHIN; that is, that it might *make* and *keep* him perfect. This passage, therefore, does not speak "Against Sinless Perfection: Of consequence it does not prove any contradiction on this head.

From all that has been said it follows, That NOT ONE of the TWENTY-FIVE passages you have brought, to shew what Mr. *Wesley* has said "AGAINST
 " Sinless

“ Sinless Perfection,” is to the purpose; but that EVERY ONE of them speaks of a quite different thing: And, therefore, allowing that every one of those brought “ For Sinless Perfection,” (as you call it) is to the purpose, yet you have not proved so much as ONE SINGLE contradiction on this head.

Thus, Sir, I have gone quite through one head of your Farrago; and one which contains near a fourth part of it: by which means the impartial reader may form some idea of what might be done on the other heads, suppose it was judged necessary.

P R O P O S I T I O N V.

You have opposed such words as were inserted through mistake in one edition, and acknowledged to be so, by being left out of the other editions, unto such words as he still retains and owns.

D E M O N S T R A T I O N F I R S T.

“ For Imputed
“ Righteousness.”

“ This is fully consistent
“ with our being justified
“ through the imputation
“ of Christ’s righteousness:
“ *Ibid.*” notes “ on Rom.
“ iv. 9.”

“ Against Imputed
“ Righteousness.”

“ A third reason against
“ the imputation of Christ’s
“ righteousness, is, there
“ is no necessity or occasion
“ for it. *Treatise on Justifi-*
“ *fication.*”

The words on the right-hand ARE NOW Mr. Wesley’s own: But those which stand in contrast with them, ARE NOT NOW his own. I acknowledge they are found in the FIRST edition of his notes. But that edition has been corrected, and the words you have quoted are left out of the other editions: At least out of the *third* and *fourth*. In these the passage is as follows:

“ Faith

“ Faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness—This is fully consistent with our being justified, that is, pardoned and accepted by GOD upon our believing, for the sake of what *Christ* hath done and suffered. For though this and this alone may be said to 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, it is evident, First, that the words you have cited, were inserted through mistake in the first edition. Secondly, that Mr. *Wesley* has acknowledged this, by leaving them out of the other editions: And, of consequence, that you have erred in the manner laid down in this proposition.

DEMONSTRATION SECOND.

“ That Enoch and Elijah are in Heaven.”

“ ENOCH and Elijah entered at once into the highest degree of Glory, without first waiting in Paradise. *Notes on the New Test.* John iii. 13, *first edit. published an. 1755.*”

“ That Enoch and Elijah are not in Heaven.”

“ ENOCH and Elijah are not in Heaven, but only in Paradise. *Note on Rev. 19, 20.*”

The words on the right-hand are Mr. *Wesley's* own words, which he now retains and owns. The opposite words are such as were inserted through mistake, in the first edition, and left out of the other editions. That the reader may see that this is really the case, and, that what ever contradiction there was in the first edition, it is now corrected, at least in the *two last editions*, I shall lay both passages before him, as they stand in these editions.

Note

Note on *John* iii. 13. *For no one*—“ For here
 “ you must rely on my single testimony, where there
 “ you have a cloud of witnesses: *Hath gone up to Hea-*
 “ *ven, but he that came down from Heaven. Who is in*
 “ *Heaven*—Therefore he is omnipresent; else he
 “ could not be in heaven and earth at once. This
 “ is a plain instance of what is usually termed the
 “ communication of properties between the divine
 “ and human nature; whereby what is proper to the
 “ Divine Nature is spoken concerning the Human,
 “ and what is proper to the human is, as here, spoken
 “ of the Divine.”

That part of the note on *Rev.* 19. 20. which is
 now in question, runs thus: “ It may be, *Enoch* and
 “ *Elijah* entered at once into glory, without first
 “ waiting in paradise.” — It is evident, from
 hence, that the words in the right-hand column,
 “ *Enoch* and *Elijah* are not in Heaven, but only in
 “ Paradise,” are disowned in the last editions of the
 Notes: And, therefore, it is undeniably evident,
 That in this instance also, you have opposed words
 which were inserted through mistake in one edition,
 and acknowledged to be such, by being left out of the
 other editions, unto such words as he still retains and
 owns.

Now, Sir, I appeal to your own heart, and to the
 heart of every candid man, if it is not exceeding un-
 fair to tell the world that Mr. *Wesley* here contradicts
 himself; and to offer in proof of that assertion, a pas-
 sage out of the *first edition* of a work, which has passed
 through FOUR editions; which passage has been left
 out and disowned in the *two last*, if not in the *three*
last editions.

It is certain that in this you have not done as you
 would be done by. For, in the first edition of your
Farrago, (page 140.) you say, “ As I am informed,
 “ that Mr. *F—r.* is writing against my Five Letters,
 “ I hope he will suit his answer to the *second edition* of
 “ those Letters, otherwise I shall not look upon it as

F

“ ANY

“ ANY ANSWER AT ALL.” Now, Sir, has not Mr. *Wesley* the same right to expect you to make use either of the *Second*, or *THIRD*, or *FOURTH* edition of his notes? and as you have not done this, has he not an equal right to reject your *Farrago*?

Indeed Sir, if I durst use a kind of holy legerdemain! If I durst flourish away at the expence of candour, I would say, first, There is no such note on *John* iii. 13. as that set down in your first column: And, secondly, that there is no such note on *Rev.* xix. 20. as that set down in the opposite column. Now, had I a desire to follow a certain unworthy example lately given, what an opportunity is this of throwing dust in the eyes of unlearned and inattentive readers? what an opportunity of raising the hue and cry about fraud! false quotations! perversion! &c. &c. But the truth of the matter is this, you have been so precipitate in arraigning Mr. *Wesley*, that you have not taken so much time and pains as to avoid calling your false witnesses by false names! For that which you call the note on *John* iii. 13. is the note on *Rev.* xix. 20. and that which you call the note on *Rev.* xix. 20. is the note on *John* iii. 13. I am persuaded, Sir, that when you sit on THE BENCH, you are not thus inattentive to the evidence brought against the most petty offenders, or thus precipitate in passing the most inconsiderable sentence on *them*: Why, then, should you be less cautious in arraigning and condemning an old, learned, laborious minister of Christ?

PROPOSITION VI.

You have contrasted two passages to shew that Mr. *Wesley* contradicts himself, neither of which are his words.

D E M O N -

DEMONSTRATION.

“ That Mr. *Wesley*
 “ does not approve
 “ the expression, *why*
 “ *me.*”

“ That Mr. *Wesley*
 “ does approve the
 “ expression, *why me.*”

“ Mr. *Fletcher* affirms,
 “ Vind. p. 16. (and Mr.
 “ *Wesley* gives his impri-
 “ matur) that he never
 “ heard Mr. *Wesley* make
 “ use of that expression,
 “ *why me?* least he should
 “ be wise above what is
 “ written; and because
 “ Mr. *Wesley* doubts whe-
 “ ther he can say, Why
 “ me? why me? without
 “ a secret touch of the self-
 “ applause that tickles the
 “ pharisee’s heart, &c. and
 “ therefore he leaves the
 “ fashionable exclamation
 “ to others.”

“ *Why* hast thou to thy
 “ people join’d
 “ *Me*, the vilest of man-
 “ kind,
 “ In cordial charity?
 “ *Why* hast thou heard the
 “ Spirit’s groans,
 “ Intreating in thy chosen
 “ ones,
 “ For *me*, O GOD, for
 “ *me?*”

“ *Mr. Wesley’s Hymns*, vol.
 “ I. p. 190.”

The words in the first column, you yourself have told us, are Mr. *Fletcher’s*. And as to those in the opposite column, they are taken out of Mr. *Charles Wesley’s* first volume: A volume which his Brother has nothing to do with; and unto which his name was never fixt. It is therefore certain, that you have here contrasted two passages, to shew Mr. *Wesley’s* self-contradictions, neither of which are his words.

And here I cannot but observe how truly marvellous your mode of reasoning is: 1. Mr. *Charles Wesley* says, *Why me?* 2. Mr. *Fletcher* affirms he never heard Mr. *John Wesley* make use of that expression.—

THEREFORE, 3. Mr. *John Wesley*, you say, IN THIS, contradicts himself!

Before I conclude this point, permit me to ask, How came you to call the words in the second column Mr. *Wesley's*? Did you, or did you not intend to impose on your readers? Did you not denominate the passage, "*Mr. Wesley's Hymns,*" instead of, *Mr. Charles Wesley's Hymns*, on purpose to make your readers believe, they are the words of the *former*. And I appeal to every candid man, if on reading those words with your reference, he did not understand you as speaking of Mr. *John Wesley's Hymns*? and I appeal to your own conscience, if you did not INTEND to be so understood.

You, Sir, who have so long been acquainted with all the formalities of genteel address, need not be told, that Mr. *Wesley*, and Mr. CHARLES *Wesley*, are not the same persons.—Besides, there was an absolute necessity of your making this distinction, seeing there are *first* and *second* volumes by *John AND Charles Wesley*; and *first* and *second* volumes by *Charles Wesley ALONE*: All which are called, "*Hymns and sacred Poems.*" O Sir, after THIS and the like instances, how ill it becomes you to exclaim against false quotations, wilful perversions, &c!

Thus, as I proposed, I have FAIRLY and FULLY demonstrated the TRUTH of the SIX PROPOSITIONS: And, by so doing, have FAIRLY and FULLY demonstrated the ABSURDITY (yea, and INJUSTICE too) of your CELEBRATED Farrago!

I shall conclude this part with the words of *Plutarch* inserted in my Title-page, "*Any one would easily find* "MANY ABSURDITIES IN LAWS, WHO DOTH NOT CONSIDER THE INTENTION of the legislator, or THE GROUND of what he requires."

A





A

S C O U R G E

To CALUMNY, &c.

PART THE SECOND.

*Redoubled RANCOUR to distil,
Who is so exquisite as HILL.†*

Honoured Sir,

YOU begin your first Farrago with a passage out of the 17th article of the church of England, to shew what Mr. Wesley has said "For Election and Perseverance;" and with one out of his sermon on Rom. viii. 32. to shew what he has said "Against Election and Perseverance." The passages are these which follow.

" For Election and
" Perseverance."

" The godly confide-
" ration of predestination
" and our election in Christ,
" is full of sweetness, pleasant,
" and unspeakable COMFORT.
" They that be endued
" with so excellent a be-
" nefit walk religiously in
" GOOD WORKS."

" Against Election and
" Perseverance."

" The horrible blasphe-
" mous doctrine of predesti-
" nation and election is
" not of GOD, for it makes
" him worse than the devil.
" It is an UNCOMFORTA-
" BLE doctrine. It directly
" tends to destroy our zeal
" for GOOD WORKS."

As

As to the first of these passages, you say, in a note, "This article Mr. *Wesley* subscribes *ex animo*, from his heart, declaring, that he believes it to be agreeable to the word of GOD, Can. 36."

That Mr. *Wesley* did subscribe this article *ex animo*, declaring that he believed it to be agreeable to the word of GOD, I allow. But that he understood it in your sense, I do not allow. You understand it as speaking of UNCONDITIONAL predestination and election; but there is not a word in all the article about this. Therefore, Mr. *Wesley* was at liberty to understand and subscribe it, as speaking, according to his own notions of CONDITIONAL predestination and election.

And indeed if we, 1. Consider the former part of this article, in connexion with the latter; and, 2. Consider the whole article in connexion with the other articles which relate to this subject; and, 3. all these articles in connexion with the homilies; and, 4. These articles and homilies, in connexion with the liturgy; and, 5. These articles, homilies, and liturgy, in connexion with several corroborating circumstances; we shall find that Mr. *Wesley*, and the clergy in general, have much more reason to understand it as speaking of conditional predestination and election, than as speaking of them as they are supposed to be unconditional.

And, 1. Let us consider (very briefly) the former part of this article, in connexion with its latter part. "Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of GOD, whereby before the foundations of the world were laid he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour."

We will briefly paraphrase this account. "Predestination" — fore-appointment — "to life" — eternal — "is the everlasting purpose of GOD" — what he, from everlasting, intended and resolved on — "whereby" — according to which intention and resolution — "before the foundation of the world was laid" — of consequence,

sequence, before man was created—"he" GOD—"constantly"—without any variation—"decreed"—so determined as to make it as a law to himself—"by his counsel"—not in an arbitrary manner without any regard to justice and mercy; but by exercising his infinite wisdom so as to discover what was best to be done—"secret to us"—the *manner* of which *exercise and discovery* not being revealed—"to deliver from curse"—in time—"and damnation"—in eternity—"those whom he hath chosen"—to be his people—"in Christ"—as made his people, not by the decree of unconditional election; but by the merit of Christ, and by believing in and obeying him—"out of mankind"—those who from among Jews, Mahometans, Heathens and Pagans, shall believe in his merit and obey his law—"and to bring them by Christ"—and his gospel, as opposed to all modes of false worship—"to everlasting salvation"—in heaven—"as vessels made"—in time, and not before; and by Christ and the gospel, and not by any other means—"to honour"—to the honourable service of GOD's temple, in the new *Jerusalem*.

That this account of the former part of the article is true, appears from the following words with which it concludes: "Furthermore, we must receive GOD's promises in such wise, AS THEY BE GENERALLY set forth to us in holy Scripture. And in our doings, that will of GOD is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of GOD."

Now, Sir, if "We *must* receive GOD's promises in such wise as they be GENERALLY set forth to us in holy Scripture," we *must* receive them as **CONDITIONAL**: For it is certain that, in general, they are set forth there *conditionally*.

A promise is conditional, when the performance of the thing promised is suspended on the performance of something required of him to whom the promise is made. And that the promises of GOD are thus conditional, you may see from the following specimen.

I. Exod.

I. EXOD. xi. 26, 27. "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse: A blessing, IF ye obey the commandments of the Lord your GOD." The promise is, I set before you this day, a blessing. The condition is, IF ye obey the commandments of the Lord your GOD.

II. EXOD. xix. 5. "IF ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people." The promise is, Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people. The condition is, IF ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant.

III. LEV. xxvi. 40. "IF they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespasss, which they have trespassed against me;— IF then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity; then will I remember my covenant with *Jacob*, and also my covenant with *Isaac*, and also my covenant with *Abraham* will I remember; and I will remember the land." The promise is, I will remember my covenant with *Jacob*, &c. &c. The condition is, IF they shall confess their iniquity, &c. &c.

IV. DEUT. iv. 30, 31. "IF thou turn to the Lord thy GOD, and shall be obedient to his voice—he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers, which he swore unto them." The promise is, The Lord will not forsake thee, &c. The condition is, IF thou turn to him, and shall be obedient to his voice.

V. DEUT. vii. 12. "It shall come to pass, IF ye hearken unto these judgments, and keep and do them, that the Lord thy GOD shall keep unto thee the covenant which he swore unto thy fathers." The promise is, The Lord thy GOD shall keep unto thee the
covenant

venant which he sware unto thy fathers. The condition is, IF ye hearken unto these judgments, and keep and do them.

VI. DEUT. xxx. 2, 3. "IF thou shalt return unto the Lord thy GOD, and shalt obey his voice,—with all thy heart, and with all thy soul; then the Lord thy GOD will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations whither the Lord thy GOD hath scattered thee." The promise is, The Lord will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, &c. The condition is, IF thou shalt return unto the Lord thy GOD, and shalt obey his voice—with all thy heart, and with all thy soul.

VII. I SAM. xii. 14. "IF ye will fear the Lord, and serve him, and obey his voice, and not rebel against the commandment of the Lord, then shall both ye, and also the king that reigneth over you, continue following the Lord your GOD." The promise is, Both ye, and the king that reigneth over you, shall continue following the Lord your GOD. The condition is, IF ye will fear the Lord and serve him, &c.

VIII. I CHRON. xxviii. 9. "IF thou seek him, he will be found of thee." The promise is, He will be found of thee. The condition is, IF thou seek him.

IX. 2 CHRON. vii. 14. "IF my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin." The promise in this place is, I will hear from heaven and will forgive their sin. The condition is, IF my people shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways.

X. 2 CHRON.

X. 2 CHRON. xv. 2. " IF ye seek him, he will be found of you." The promise is, He will be found of you. The condition is, IF ye seek him.

XI. 1 CHRON. xxii. 13. " Then shalt thou prosper, IF thou takest heed to fulfil the statutes and the judgments which the Lord charged *Moses* with concerning *Israel*." The promise is, Thou shalt prosper. The condition is, IF thou takest heed to fulfil the statutes, &c.

XII. 2 CHRON. xxx. 9. " The Lord your GOD is gracious and merciful, and will not turn away his face from you, IF ye return unto him." The promise is, The Lord will not turn away his face from you. The condition is, IF ye return unto him.

XIII. JOB. xxii. 23. " IF thou wilt return to the Almighty, thou shalt be built up." The promise is, Thou shalt be built up. The condition is, IF thou wilt return unto the Almighty.

XIV. JOB. xxxiii. 27, 28. " IF any say, I have sinned, and perverted that which is right, and it profited me not; he" (GOD) " will deliver his soul from going into the pit, and his life shall see the light." The promise is, GOD will deliver his soul from going into the pit, and his life shall see the light. The condition is, IF any say I have sinned, &c.

XV. JOB. xxxvi. 11. " IF they obey and serve him, they shall spend their days in prosperity, and their years in pleasure." The promise is, They shall spend their days in prosperity and their years in pleasure. The condition is, IF they obey and serve GOD.

XVI. ISA. i. 19. " IF ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land." The promise is, ye

ye shall eat the good of the land. The condition is, IF ye be willing and obedient.

XVII. ISA. lviii. 10. " IF thou draw out thy soul
 " to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted soul; then shall
 " thy light rise in obscurity, and thy darkness be as the
 " noon-day." The promise is, Thy light shall rise in
 obscurity, and thy darkness be as the noon-day. The
 condition is, IF thou draw out thy soul to the hungry,
 and satisfy the afflicted soul.

XVIII. ISA. lviii. 13, 14. " IF thou turn away
 " thy feet from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure
 " on my holy day, and call the sabbath a delight,
 " the holy of the Lord, honourable, and shalt honour
 " him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine
 " own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then
 " shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will
 " cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth,
 " and feed thee with the heritage of *Jacob* thy fa-
 " ther." The promise is, Thou shalt delight thyself
 in the Lord, &c. The condition is, IF thou turn
 away thy feet from the sabbath, &c.

XIX. JER. xv. 19. " IF thou return, then will I
 " bring thee again, and thou shalt stand before me:
 " And IF thou take the precious from the vile, thou
 " shalt be as my mouth." The promise is, I will
 bring thee again, and thou shalt stand before me, and
 shalt be as my mouth. The condition is, IF thou re-
 turn: And IF thou take forth the precious from the
 vile.

XX. JER. xviii. 8. " IF that nation against whom
 " I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will
 " repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them."
 Here the promise is, I will repent of the evil I thought
 to do unto them. The condition is, IF they turn
 from their evil.

XXI. PROV.

XXI. PROV. ii. 3, 4, 5. " IF thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; IF thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasure; then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of GOD." The promise is, Thou shalt understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of GOD. The condition is, IF thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; and IF thou seek her as silver, &c.

XXII. EZEK. xviii. 21. " IF the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die." The promise is, The wicked shall surely live, he shall not die. The condition is, IF he will turn from all his sins, keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right.

XXIII. EZEK. xxxiii. 15. IF the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he hath robbed, walk in the statutes of life without committing iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die." The promise is, The wicked shall surely live, he shall not die. The condition is, IF he restore the pledge, give back that he hath robbed, and walk in the statutes of life without committing iniquity.

XXIV. EZEK. xxxiii. 19. " IF the wicked turn from his wickedness, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby." The promise is, The wicked shall live. The condition is, IF he turn from his wickedness, and do that which is lawful and right.

XXV. MATT. vi. 14. . " IF ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you." The promise is, your heavenly Father will
will

will forgive you. The condition is, IF ye forgive men their trespasses.

XXVI. JOHN vii. 17. "IF any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of GOD, or whether I speak of myself." The promise is, The person spoken of shall know of the doctrine whether it be of GOD, &c. The condition is, IF he do the will of GOD.

XXVII. JOHN xiv. 14. "IF ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it." The promise is, I will do it. The condition is, IF ye shall ask it.

XXVIII. JOHN xv. 10. "IF ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love." The promise is, Ye shall abide in my love. The condition is, IF ye keep my commandments.

XXIX. JOHN viii. 51. "IF a man keep my sayings, he shall never see death." The promise is, He shall never see death. The condition is, IF he keep my sayings.

XXX. DEUT. iv. 29. "IF thou shalt seek the Lord thy GOD, thou shalt find him; IF thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul." The promise is, Thou shalt find the Lord thy GOD. The condition is, IF thou shalt seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul.

XXXI. ROM. x. 9. "IF thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that GOD hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." The promise is, Thou shalt be saved. The condition is, IF thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart, &c.

G

XXXII.

XXXII. ROM. viii. 13. " IF ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." The promise is, Ye shall live. The condition is, IF ye mortify the deeds of the body.

XXXIII. GAL. vi. 9. " Let us not be weary in well-doing; for in due season we shall reap, IF we faint not." The promise is, We shall reap. The condition is, IF we are not weary or faint in well-doing.

XXXIV. 2 TIM. ii. 12. " IF we suffer, we shall also reign with him." The promise is, We shall also reign with him. The condition is, IF we suffer.

XXXV. 2 TIM. ii. 21. " IF a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work." The promise is, He shall be a vessel unto honour, &c. The condition is, IF he purge himself from these; that is, from the evils before-mentioned.

XXXVI. JOHN xv. 7. " IF ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." The promise is, Ye shall [*have liberty to*] ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. The condition is, IF ye abide (*continue to believe*) in me, and [*suffer*] my words to abide in you.

XXXVII. 1 JOHN i. 9. " IF we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." The promise, which is here implied, is, GOD will forgive us our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness. The condition is, IF we confess our sins.

XXXVIII,

XXXVIII. 1 JOHN ii. 24. " IF that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye shall also continue in the Son, and in the Father." The promise is, Ye shall continue in the Son, and in the Father. The condition is, IF that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you.

XXXIX. 2 PET. i. 10. " IF ye do these things, ye shall never fall." The promise is, Ye shall never fall. The condition is, IF ye do these things above-mentioned.

XL. REV. iii. 20. " IF any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in unto him and sup with him, and he with me." The promise is, I will come in unto him, and will sup with him, and he with me. The condition is, IF he hear my voice and open the door.

Now, from these FORTY passages which I have produced, we learn, that *so many* of the promises are (as the Church saith,) "set forth in Scripture" **CONDITIONALLY**. And, if the promises in general do not contradict these Forty particulars, we learn, that they be *generally* set forth in Scripture **CONDITIONALLY**. And, therefore, if (according to the last clause of the article) we are to receive these promises **ONLY** as they be set forth in Scripture, if there is any connexion between the beginning, and the end of this article, we must receive the promises which relate to that predestination and election mentioned in the beginning of it, **ONLY AS CONDITIONAL**.

2. Let us next consider this whole article in connexion with the other articles which relate to this subject.

Article Second. "Christ"—"truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us." Us? Who? Why, **ALL THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND**, who then were, now are, or ever shall be, members of that church. That this is the true interpretation of

the word, appears from hence : That at the time this article was made, it was intended, 1. That all the people of *England* (Jews excepted) should be members of the established Church ; and 2. That EVERY member of that church, should receive this article, as an article of HIS religion.

Again, *Article Seventh*. “ For both in the Old and “ New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind.” Observe ; it is NOT FORCED ON particular persons ; but OFFERED OR TENDERED TO MANKIND : That is, to the whole number of creatures of THAT KIND, as opposed to creatures of all other kinds.

Again, *Article Fifteenth*. “ He (Christ) came to be “ a Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of himself “ once made, should take away the sins of the world.”

Once more, *Article Thirty-first*. “ That offering of “ Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction FOR ALL THE SINS “ OF THE WHOLE WORLD.”

On the two last mentioned Articles I would observe, first, that Christ came into the world a Lamb without spot : secondly, that while he was in the world, he, once for all, made a sacrifice or offering of himself : thirdly, that he thereby made perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for sin : and fourthly, that he did this FOR ALL THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD.—Now, let the whole *seventeenth* article be expounded in connexion with these other four articles, and it will be impossible to understand it as speaking of the unconditional election of a small number.

3. Let us consider these articles in connexion with the *Homilies*. Let two or three passages suffice for the present. “ GOD receiveth the learned and un- “ learned, and CASTETH AWAY NONE, BUT “ IS INDIFFERENT TO ALL.” *Hom. of holy Scrip.* Again, “ That as in *Adam* ALL MEN UNI- “ VERSALLY sinned ; so in *Adam* all men receive the reward of sin, that is to say, became mortal and “ subject to death, having in themselves nothing but “ everlasting

“ everlasting condemnation, both of body and soul ;
 “ that MAN” (that is, mankind, or ALL MEN UNI-
 VERSALLY, as it is said above) “ being in this
 “ wretched case, it pleased GOD to make a new co-
 “ venant with him ; namely, that he would send a
 “ Mediator or Messias into the world which should make
 “ intercession, and put himself as a stay between both
 “ parties”—between GOD, and ALL MEN UNI-
 VERSALLY, “ to pacify wrath and indignation
 “ conceived against sin, and to deliver man”—ALL
 MEN UNIVERSALLY, “ out of the miserable curse
 “ and cursed misery, whereinto he was fallen head-
 “ long by disobeying the will and commandment of
 “ the only Lord and Maker.” *Hom. of the Nativity.*
 And in the same Homily we are told that Christ came
 into the world “ To deliver MANKIND from the bitter
 curse of the law, and make perfect satisfaction by his
 “ death for the sins of ALL PEOPLE.”

And that these homilies do not contain the doctrine
 of UNCONDITIONAL predestination, election and perse-
 verance, is evident from hence, That there is a whole
 homily (ON FALLING FROM GOD) which supposeth
 that true believers may so fall as to perish for ever :
 which supposition is absolutely inconsistent with the
 notion of unconditional predestination, election, and
 perseverance.

* In the second part thereof we have the follow-
 ing words: “ In the former part of this homily, you
 “ have learned how many manners of ways men fall
 “ from GOD”—“ Ye have also learned in what
 “ misery that man is which is gone from GOD ; and
 “ how that GOD yet of his infinite goodness to call
 “ again man from that misery, useth first gentle ad-
 “ monition by his preachers ; after he layeth on terri-
 “ ble threatnings. Now if this gentle monition and
 “ threatning together do not serve, then GOD will
 “ shew his terrible countenance upon us, he will pour
 “ intolerable plagues upon our heads, and after he
 “ will take away from US ALL HIS AID AND ASSIST-
 “ ANCE wherewith before he did defend us.”—Again,

“ If WE WHO ARE THE CHOSEN VINEYARD OF
 “ GOD, bring not forth good grapes”—“ but rather
 “ bring forth wild grapes”—“ THEN WILL HE PLUCK
 “ AWAY ALL DEFENCE”—“ he will let us lie waste,
 “ he will give us over, he will turn away from us”—
 “ he will let us alone, and suffer us to bring forth even
 “ such fruit as we will, to bring forth brambles, briers
 “ and thorns, all naughtiness, all vice, and that so
 “ abundantly, that they shall clean over-grow, choke
 “ strangle and UTTERLY DESTROY US.”

“ As long as a man doth prune his vines, doth dig
 “ at the root, and lay fresh earth to them, he hath a
 “ mind to them, he perceiveth some token of fruitfulness
 “ that *may be recovered in them*; but when he will
 “ bestow no more such cost and labour about them,
 “ it is a sign HE THINKS THEY WILL NEVER BE
 “ GOOD. And the father AS LONG as he LOVETH
 “ his child, he looketh angrily, he correcteth him
 “ when he doth amiss; but when”—“ he ceaseth
 “ from correction of him”—“ it is a sign he intendeth
 “ to DISINHERIT HIM, AND CAST HIM AWAY FOR
 “ EVER”—Again, “ What deadly grief can a man
 “ suppose it is to be under the wrath of GOD, to be
 “ FORSAKEN *of him*, to have his Holy Spirit the
 “ author of all goodness, to be TAKEN FROM HIM;
 “ to be brought to so vile a condition, that he shall
 “ be left meet for no better purpose than to be FOR
 “ EVER CONDEMNED TO HELL.”—“ Again,
 “ *They shall be* NO LONGER HIS KINGDOM, *they shall be*
 “ NO LONGER GOVERNED BY HIS HOLY SPIRIT, they
 “ shall be *put from the* GRACE AND BENEFITS THEY
 “ HAD, and EVER MIGHT HAVE ENJOYED
 “ THROUGH CHRIST; *they shall be deprived of*
 “ *the heavenly light and life which* THEY HAD in
 “ *Christ while they* ABODE IN HIM; they shall be (as
 “ they were once) *without* GOD in this world, or
 “ rather in a WORSE taking. And to be short, THEY
 “ SHALL BE GIVEN INTO THE POWER OF THE DEVIL,
 “ *which beareth the rule of all men which* BE CAST AWAY
 “ FROM GOD.”

From

From what has been said it is evident, first, that the persons spoken of in this homily, were genuine Christians; for they had *grace* "WHICH THEY EVER MIGHT HAVE ENJOYED THROUGH CHRIST." Secondly, that notwithstanding this, the homily supposes them to be liable "TO BE FOR EVER CONDEMNED TO HELL:" Which is absolutely inconsistent with the doctrine of Unconditional Perseverance; and, of consequence, with that of Unconditional Election.

4. Let us next consider these articles and homilies in connexion with the *Liturgy*. And here let it be observed, that as all the people of *England* (Jews excepted) were supposed to be members of the established church, at the time this liturgy was drawn up; the liturgy must be supposed to be intended for the use of all the people of this land; those only above-mentioned excepted. Let us, therefore, attend to that which is said in this liturgy *of, for and by* every member of this church, in all their states and conditions, FROM THE WOMB (at least, from the FONT) TO THE GRAVE, and we shall have no reason to believe she intended any predestination and election which is not the common privilege of all men.

The *first* notice the church takes of her members is in BAPTISM; in which she not only receives ALL children she baptizes within the visible pale, but acknowledges them as SPIRITUAL MEMBERS of the invisible church. Hence the minister renders thanks to GOD, in the following words, FOR EVERY ONE whom he baptizes; "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to REGENERATE THIS INFANT WITH THY HOLY SPIRIT, TO RECEIVE HIM FOR THY OWN CHILD BY ADOPTION, AND TO INCORPORATE HIM INTO THY HOLY CHURCH." Now, if the church believed that a small number only were unconditionally elected, and that all the rest were unconditionally reprobated, is it not very unaccountable, that she should speak thus of ALL without exception.

exception. And is it not equally unaccountable that she should, *secondly*, teach EVERY CHILD to say in its CATECHISM, " I heartily thank our heavenly Father, that he hath called ME TO THIS STATE OF SALVATION, through Jesus Christ our Saviour;" and " I believe in GOD the Son, who hath redeemed ME, AND ALL MANKIND. Thirdly, in GOD the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth ME and all the elect people of GOD:" That is, *me* and all who are brought into the church by baptism, who perform their baptismal vow, and, are THEREBY elected or chosen to be the people of GOD. And if the church intended to maintain the unconditional election of a small number only, it is very surprising, *Thirdly*, that, in CONFIRMATION, the bishop should in the following manner pray for ALL WHOM HE CONFIRMS: " Almighty and everlasting GOD, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate THESE THY SERVANTS by water AND THE HOLY GHOST, and hast given unto THEM the FORGIVENESS OF ALL THEIR SINS." — Again, *Fourthly*, ALL being baptized, catechised and confirmed, they are expected to come to the Lord's Supper; and when they come, the minister says to EVERY ONE, " The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which WAS GIVEN FOR THEE preserve THY BODY AND SOUL UNTO EVERLASTING LIFE. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ DIED FOR THEE, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." — Again, " The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for THEE, preserve THY body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed FOR THEE, and be thankful." — *Fifthly*, let us observe how the church proceeds in her common worship. In the absolution she saith, GOD " DESIRETH NOT THE DEATH OF A SINNER, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live." In the prayer for the clergy and people, she prays, " Send down upon our bishops and curates, and ALL CONGREGATIONS committed to their charge, the health-
" ful

"ful spirit of thy grace." In the lityany she prays,
 "O GOD the Son redeemer of the WORLD," &c.
 —"That it may please thee to have MERCY UPON
 "ALL MEN." In the collect for *Asb-wednesday* she
 prays, "Almighty and everlasting GOD, who HA-
 "TEST NOTHING THAT THOU HAST
 "MADE," &c. Again, "O merciful GOD, who
 "hast made all men, and HATEST NOTHING
 "THAT THOU HAST MADE, nor wouldest
 "the death of a sinner, but rather that he should
 "be converted, and live; Have mercy upon ALL
 "Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Hereticks; and take from
 "them all ignorance, hardness of heart and contempt
 "of thy word; and so fetch them home, blessed
 "Lord, to thy flock, THAT THEY MAY BE SAVED
 "AMONG THE REMNANT OF TRUE ISRAELITES."
See the Collect for Good Friday. Again, "Almighty and
 "everlasting GOD, who by thy holy apostle has taught
 "us to make *prayers and supplications*, and to *give thanks*
 "for ALL MEN." *Prayer for the church militant.*—Again,
 "O most mighty GOD and merciful Father, who
 "hast compassion upon ALL MEN, and HATEST
 "NOTHING THAT THOU HAST MADE,
 "who WOULDST NOT THE DEATH OF A SINNER."
Communion Office. Once more: "O most mighty and
 "gracious, good GOD, thy MERCY is over ALL
 "THY WORKS." *After a storm at sea.*—*Sixthly*;
 in The form of solemnizing matrimony she blesses, in
 the following manner, ALL whom she unites to-
 gether in holy wedlock: "The Lord mercifully with
 "his FAVOUR look upon you, and so FILL YOU WITH
 "ALL SPIRITUAL BÉNEDICTION AND
 "GRACE, that ye may so live together in this life,
 "that in the world to come YE MAY HAVE LIFE
 "EVERLASTING."—*Seventhly*, in the Order for
 the visitation of the sick she prays, as follows, for
 ALL without exception, "O Lord look down from
 "heaven, behold, visit and relieve THIS THY SER-
 "VANT. Look upon him with the eyes of thy mer-
 "cy; *give him* COMFORT and SURE CONFIDENCE *in*
 "thee;

“ *thee* ; defend him from the danger of the enemy,
 “ and keep him in perpetual peace and safety, through
 “ Jesus Christ our Lord.”—*Eighthly*, in her burial
 office she says over ALL, “ Forasmuch as it hath
 “ pleased Almighty God, of his GREAT MERCY to take
 “ UNTO HIMSELF THE SOUL OF OUR DEAR
 “ BROTHER, (or SISTER) we commit his (or
 “ her) body to the ground ”—“ in SURE AND
 “ CERTAIN HOPE OF THE RESURREC-
 “ TION TO LIFE ETERNAL.”—Now if the
 church really intended to maintain the unconditional
 election of a small number, and the unconditional
 reprobation of all the rest, it is astonishingly unac-
 countable that she should, in ALL her services, speak
 thus of ALL her MEMBERS, consisting of a whole
 nation of people in general!

5. Let us consider the articles, homilies and litur-
 gy, in connexion with several corroborating circum-
 stances.

And *First*, if the reformers intended that the church
 of *England* should believe the doctrines of uncondi-
 tional election and reprobation, is it not very unaccount-
 able that they should adopt three creeds, and expect
 the whole church to receive them, as containing the
 sum of the christian religion, which have not one single
 sentence about sovereignty, decrees, election, reprobation,
 perseverance, &c. &c. &c. as asserted in the acts
 of the synod of Dort, in the Assembly's Catechism, and
 as held by you and other Calvinists?

Secondly, if the Reformers intended unconditional
 election, &c. to be the doctrine of the church of *Eng-
 land*, how came the paraphrase of *Erasmus* to be set
 up, in all the churches by public authority? If they
 had intended unconditional predestination to be the
 doctrine of the church, would they not have ordered
Luther's exposition of the epistle to the *Galatians*, or
Calvin's Institutes, to have been set up in the church-
 es; and not the Paraphrase of *Erasmus*, who had writ-
 ten professedly against *Luther's* predestination.

Concerning

Concerning this Paraphrase, it was ordered by the authority of King *Edward* the Sixth, and by the advice of Lord Protector *Somerſet* and the privy council, - 1. " That they ſhould provide in ſome moſt
 " convenient and open place of every church, one
 " great Bible in English, with the Paraphraſe of *Eraſ-*
 " *mus* in English, that the people might reverently,
 " without any let, read and hear the ſame."— 2.
 " That every. prieſt under the degree of a Batchelor
 " of Divinity, ſhould have of his own, one New
 " Teſtament in English and Latin, with the para-
 " phraſe of *Eraſmus* upon the ſame, and ſhould dili-
 " gently read and ſtudy thereupon." Accordingly a
 great Bible and the paraphraſe of *Eraſmus* were ſet up
 in the churches, in many of which they are to be ſeen
 at this day.

Now, in this paraphraſe, we have the following
 note on *John* 1ſt, " This Lamb is ſo far from being
 " ſubject to any kind of ſin, that he alone is able to
 " take away ALL THE SINS OF ALL THE WORLD."
 Again, on chap. iii. " And leſt ANY BODY PERI-
 " SHING WILFULLY ſhould have whereby to exerciſe
 " his own malice, THERE IS GIVEN TO ALL FOLKS
 " AN EASY ENTRANCE TO SALVATION."—" But
 " whoſoever condemning ſo great charity of GOD
 " towards him, and putting from himſelf the SALVA-
 " TION THAT WAS SO FREELY OFFERED, doth not
 " believe the goſpel, he hath no need to be judged of
 " any body, forasmuch as he doth openly CONDEMN
 " HIMSELF; AND REJECTING THE THING WHEREBY
 " HE MIGHT OBTAIN EVERLASTING LIFE,
 " maketh himſelf guilty of eternal pain."

To this it is objected, " That the book of Mar-
 tyrs, which was written by *John Fox*, a Calvinist, was
 alſo ſet up in churehes, with the Bible and *Eraſmus's*
 Paraphraſe." To this I anſwer; the book of Mar-
 tyrs was not ſet up as a DOCTRINAL treatiſe,
 but as a HISTORY of the perſecutions of the church;
 but the paraphraſe of *Eraſmus* was ſet up to teach, both
 PRIESTS AND PEOPLE, THE TRUE MEANING of the
 word of GOD,

Thirdly

Thirdly, and lastly, if the reformers intended that the doctrines of unconditional predestination and election should be the doctrines of the church, it is very unaccountable that such passages, as these which follow, should be found in their private writings.

Latimer saith, "If they must be damned, the fault IS NOT IN GOD, BUT IN THEMSELVES: For it is written" — "GOD would have all men should be saved: But THEY THEMSELVES PROCURE THEIR OWN DAMNATION." *Serm. on Septu. p. 213.*

Again, "CHRIST SHED AS MUCH BLOOD FOR JUDAS AS FOR PETER." *Ibid.* Again, "We learn that the preaching of the gospel is universal." — "Now seeing that the gospel is universal, it APPEARETH that he would have ALL MANKIND TO BE SAVED; that the fault is not IN HIM if they are damned."

Ibid. Again, "Such men are the cause of THEIR OWN DAMNATION; for GOD would have them saved, but THEY REFUSE IT, like Judas the traitor WHOM CHRIST WOULD HAVE HAD TO BE SAVED, BUT HE REFUSED HIS SALVATION." *Ibid.*

John Bradford saith, "I believe that Christ" — "did oppose himself to the judgment of GOD, as a mediator, paying the ransom and price of redemption for Adam and his WHOLE POSTERITY." See *Acts and Monu. p. 1505.* Again, "Our own wilfulness, sin, and contemning of Christ, are the cause of reprobation." See a discourse entitled, *The sum of the doctrine of predestination and reprobation.*

Bishop Hooper saith, "Cain was no more excluded from the promise of Christ, TILL HE EXCLUDED HIMSELF, than Abel; Saul than David; Judas than Peter: Esau than Jacob." See *preface to his exposition of the Ten Commandments.* Again, "It is not a christian man's part" — "to make GOD the AUTHOR OF ILL AND DAMNATION, with the Manichee; nor yet to say, that GOD HATH WRITTEN FATAL LAWS, and with NECESSITY OF DESTINY, VIOLENTLY PULLETH THE ONE BY THE HAIR INTO HEAVEN, and THRUSTETH THE OTHER HEADLONG INTO HELL." *Ibid.*

From

From all that has been said it follows, either that the predestination and election mentioned in the seventeenth article is **CONDITIONAL**; or else, that the church of *England* is one of the most inconsistent and self-contradictory churches that ever existed. But this last proposition cannot be allowed: Therefore, I conclude, that it is **CONDITIONAL** predestination and election which is here intended.

What Mr. *Wesley* says, in his sermon on *Rom. viii. 32.* is against *unconditional* predestination and election: And, therefore, there is no contradiction between the passage you have brought out of the seventeenth article, “For Election and Perseverance,” and that which you have brought out of this sermon, “Against Election and Perseverance.”

In the 54th page of your *Farrago Double-distilled* you say, Mr. *Wesley* cannot shew that,

“The godly consideration of Predestination and our Election in Christ, is

“Full of sweet, pleasant,
“and unspeakable COM-
“FORT.

“That it is according to
“the everlasting purpose
“of GOD.

“That it draws up our
“mind to high and hea-
“venly things.

“That it doth greatly
“establish and confirm our
“faith.

“That they who are pre-
“destinated, walk religi-
“ously in **GOOD WORKS.**”

“— And yet — an UN-
“COMFORTABLE doctrine.

“— And yet — not of
“GOD.

“And yet—Is horrible
“and blasphemous.

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

“—And yet—That the
“belief of predestination
“tends directly to destroy
“all zeal for **GOODWORKS.**”

It is very true: Mr. *Wesley* cannot shew this of the **GODLY** consideration of predestination and our elec-
H
tion

tion in Christ. And, it is equally true, that he never pretended to shew it.

But he can shew, and with very great ease too,

That the **GODLY** consideration of **CONDITIONAL** election in Christ is full of sweet pleasant and unspeakable **COMFORT**.

That **THIS** is according to the everlasting purpose of **GOD**.

That **THIS** draws up our mind to high and heavenly things.

That **THIS** doth greatly establish and confirm our faith.

That **THIS** consideration of election has a natural tendency to cause us to walk religiously in **GOOD WORKS**.

ALL THIS Mr. *Wesley*, as a good son of the church of *England* believes.

And that the **UNGODLY** consideration of **UNCONDITIONAL** election is an **UNCOMFORTABLE** doctrine.

And that **THIS** is not of **GOD**.

And that **THIS** is horrible and blasphemous.

And that **THIS** tends to obstruct, if not destroy this great work of the Holy Ghost (assurance of faith).

And that **THIS** consideration of election tends to destroy all zeal for **GOOD WORKS**.

And **ALL THIS** Mr. *Wesley*, as a good son of the church of *England* believes.

In a note at the bottom of this page you say, "One would imagine by Mr. *Wesley's* quoting the authority of our 31st article (p. 14.) in contradiction to the 17th, 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*." Now this, Sir, I absolutely deny. The words of the article are, "That offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction **FOR ALL THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD, BOTH ORIGINAL AND ACTUAL,**" What! "is redemption, propitiation

tion and satisfaction FOR ALL THE SINS OF THE
 "WHOLE WORLD" "NOTHING OF THE DESIGN
 "and EXTENT of Christ's death?" I allow that
 where the article calls it "PERFECT redemption," it
 speaks of the all-sufficiency of it; but when it says
 that this redemption was made "FOR ALL THE SINS
 "OF THE WHOLE WORLD," it certainly speaks of the
 DESIGN and EXTENT of it, and of NOTHING ELSE.

In your Farrago Double-distilled (p. 4.) you repre-
 sent Mr. *Wesley* as saying, no one is a christian believer
 who has one evil thought, or is capable of one. In
 support of this position you mangle a passage out of his
 sermon on *Phillip. iii. 12.* entitled, "Christian Per-
 "fection." The whole passage, as it stands in that
 sermon, is as follows, "This," (not to commit sin)
 "is the glorious privilege of every christian, yea,
 "though he be but a *babe* in Christ. But it is only of
 "those who *are strong* in the Lord" (observe well, it is
 of THOSE ONLY, and not of *every christian*, of *every*
believer, that he is speaking) "and have overcome
 "the wicked one, or rather of those who have known
 "him that is from the beginning, that it can be
 "affirmed they are in such a sense perfect; as, secondly,
 "to be free from evil thoughts and evil tempers.
 "First, from evil or sinful thoughts. But here let
 "it be observed, that thoughts concerning evil, are
 "not always evil thoughts."—"A man, for instance,
 "may think of murder which another has committed,
 "and yet this is no evil or sinful thought. So our
 "Blessed Lord himself, doubtless thought of, or under-
 "stood the thing spoken by the Devil, when he said,
 "All this will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and
 "worship me. Yet had he no evil or sinful thought,
 "nor indeed was capable of having any. And even
 "hence it follows, that neither have real christians."—
 By *real christians* he certainly means, such as are con-
 tra-distinguished above from *Babes in Christ*, by their
 being so *strong* in the Lord as to have overcome the
 wicked one, or rather, such as have "known him who
 "is from the beginning." This is evident from the

words immediately following, "For every one that is PERFECT is as his master (Luke vi. 40.) therefore, if he was free from evil or sinful thoughts, so are they" (who are PERFECT) "likewise."

Thus, Sir, stands the passage in Mr. Wesley's sermon. Let us now see how you quote and apply it. "Our Blessed Lord had no evil or sinful thoughts, nor indeed was capable of having them; 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. John Wesley's sermon on Phillip. iii. 12. In other words; no man is a real christian (consequently not a believer) who has one sinful thought."

From this mangled extract it is evident, you want the world to believe, that what Mr. Wesley says of ADULT believers, of PERFECT christians, he says of Babes in Christ. — To this end you conceal from your readers that the sermon treats professedly on "Christian Perfection;" you also leave OUT OF THE SENTENCE the following words, which shew that he was speaking of perfect christians only: ("For every one that is PERFECT is as his master.") And as a farther means of obtaining your fraudulent end, you play upon the phrase "real christians;" and represent it as including all christians, as contra-distinguished from unbelievers, who are no christians. Therefore you say, his meaning is, "No man is a real christian" — ("consequently not a believer) who has one sinful thought:" Whereas it is evident, first, from the whole sentence; secondly, from the whole paragraph; and, thirdly, from the whole sermon, that he intended those christians ONLY who are really perfect.

Now, from what has been said, we learn how to answer the following questions. 1st. "How differs this from that expression of Mr. Charles Wesley, While one evil thought can rise I am not born again." I answer: There is no difference between them; seeing that by real christians Mr. J. Wesley means, those who are really perfect: and that by being born again, Mr. C.

Wesley

Wesley means, changed IN THE HIGHEST degree. 2. You ask, "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*?" Not in the sense you want the world to believe. For you represent him as speaking of ALL christians; but he intended only those who are PERFECT. 3. "Do you, or do you not recant this extract from your own sermon?" He does not recant it; because he sees no reason for so doing. 4. You ask, "Why, do you, give up your brother for saying, While one evil thought can rise I am not born again?" He does not give up *the sentiment* of his brother; he only says, that his brother took the words, "born again" in too high a sense: That is, considering that the words are commonly understood of being changed in the *first degree*, he does not justify the poetic liberty his brother took in applying them to the *highest degree* of it; because, by so doing, he has given occasion of clamouring to bigoted, prejudiced and perverse persons. "But whatever be the difference between Mr. J. and C. Wesley," you say, "herein plainly consists the difference between Mr. J. and St. Paul (Rom. vii.) in their ideas of *adult believers*." This is the first time I ever heard that St. Paul was speaking of *adult believers* in the 7th to the Romans. I have often heard it affirmed that the persons there intended were not believers, even, in the lowest sense; but, rather, such as saw their need of faith, and who groaned to possess it. And I have heard others affirm that they were *true*, though not *perfect* believers; but I never before, either heard or read that they were *adult christians*. I therefore believe, this discovery may be called an original; and I have no objection, Sir, to your enjoying the honour of it.

But you proceed, "Mr. J. Wesley believes that the higher they advance in spirituals, the less they feel of the evil of their own hearts." By *spirituals*, you must mean, The graces of the Spirit, such as the love of GOD and of our neighbour, meekness, dead-

ness to the world, &c. By *advancing higher* in these spirituals you must mean, possessing them in an higher degree. Now I apprehend that the more a man possesses of these spirituals, the less will he possess of those tempers, &c. which are contrary to them. For instance, the more humility a man possesses the less pride he *will* and *must*, of consequence possess. So again, the more a man possesses of the Love of GOD, the less will he possess of the love of sin. Now, Sir, suppose this to BE your own case; and that you behold it just AS IT IS, and not AS IT IS NOT, I shall be glad to know where is the evil of this? If a man *increases* in spirituals, and, at the same time, *believes* that he *decreases* therein, there is no doubt but he *believes a lie*. But "St. Paul," you say, "is of opinion, that in proportion as they increase in light and self-knowledge they discern more of their hidden corruptions." I hope that increasing in *light* and *self-knowledge* is not all that you mean by *advancing in spirituals*? If it is, then there is a plain difference between you and St. Paul. For he desired that the *Ephesians* might grow up in him (Christ) in ALL THINGS, *Eph. iv. 15*. And he told the *Thessalonians* that their FAITH grew exceedingly, *2 Thes. i. 3*. And he prayed that they might *increase* and *abound* in LOVE. *1 Thes. iii. 12*. St. Peter also differed from you: For he exhorted the people to grow in GRACE and in the knowledge of our Lord.—*Knowledge*, you see, was not the only thing that he wished them to increase in; but in all HOLINESS and HAPPINESS also. If you say, you do not understand light and self-knowledge as opposed to Love and Holiness; but as connected with these, and as increasing with them; then I say, 1. St. Paul is of opinion, that in proportion as they increase in light and self-knowledge, they increase in love and holiness. And, 2. That of consequence they cannot discern more of their corruptions. The reason is this; the more they increase in love and holiness, the less they have of the corruption which is opposed thereto; and if they see things AS THEY ARE, and NOT AS THEY ARE

ARE NOT, they must see a decrease of their corruptions: That is, if they love GOD more and the world less; if they see this as it really is, they must see, not that they love GOD less and the world more, but that they love GOD more and the world less. It therefore follows, that "the difference is not between Mr. *John* "and St. *Paul*;" but between (I will not say, Mr. *Richard*! but between) Mr. *Hill* and St. *Paul*.

In the same page you say, "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." I am certain, Sir, that it argues far less politeness in you, to address Mr. *Wesley* in the personal manner you have done. For, waving the EMPTY considerations of BLOOD and MONEY, which add no real worth to their boasted possessor, certain it is that Mr. *Wesley* is not a whit your inferior.

So far from it, that almost in every valuable and useful respect he must be looked upon as vastly your superior. For, 1. If age has any title to respect, Mr. *Wesley* has the preference. 2. If various and deep learning has any intrinsic worth in it, the whole Nation in general, and the Universities in particular, will certainly declare FOR Mr. *Wesley*, AGAINST you. 3. If academic preferment is to be viewed in an honorable light, here, also, Mr. *Wesley* takes the right hand of you: He having been a Fellow of a College, an elevation which you never reached. 4. If long and mighty labours for the glory of GOD, and the good of men, can lay any claim to an honorable regard, you, Sir, must not be mentioned on the same day with Mr. *Wesley*. For he can certainly say, not only to you, as an individual, but to you in conjunction with any HALF DOZEN of your MOST FLAMING CHAMPIONS, I have, (and for forty years together) laboured more abundantly than you all. 5. If real usefulness to the bodies and souls of men is truly valuable in itself, and really honourable in the eyes of GOD, angels, and men, your diminutive taper is totally eclipsed by Mr. *Wesley's* superior Lustre.

Now,

Now, Sir, so polite have you been, that without any ceremony, you have made use of his name in the most illiberal manner; descending so low, as even to call him *John* and *JACK*! and yet all this while you are to be viewed as a most polite gentleman! But because Mr. *Wesley* has addressed you by your proper name, calling you, "Mr. *Hill*," this you say, "argued no great proof of Mr. *Wesley's* politeness."

Page 7. "Mr. *Hill* affirms, that Mr. *Fletcher* has introduced false quotations, and that Mr. *Wesley* has long THOUGHT forgeries of this kind no crime." And does Mr. *Hill* affirm this? Particularly, this that he hath said of Mr. *Wesley*? Then I assert, that (unless Mr. *Hill* be a judge of Mr. *Wesley's* THOUGHTS, or unless Mr. *Wesley* himself has told Mr. *Hill* what his THOUGHTS are) Mr. *Hill* here affirms what he neither DOES NOR CAN know. But "In proof of this" (assertion) "he appeals to the Instances alledged by Mr. *Hervey* and Mr. *Toplady*." But who made them Judges of Mr. *Wesley's* THOUGHTS? Can they any more than you, read the heart? If not, did Mr. *Wesley* tell them what he thought on this head? If he did not, whatever they may affirm, they know no more of the matter than you do.

Now, Sir, in my judgment you make quite too much noise about false quotation, inconsistency, self-contradiction, &c. &c. You say more than does service even to your own cause. For before a man can receive the testimony you (in almost every page) give of your opponents, he must look upon them as doing little more than writing sentences on purpose to have them to contradict! and as doing the same in writing pages and volumes! He must also conceive of them as not possessing one single grain of conscience; seeing they will lie, and forge quotations, almost as fast as they can count their fingers! Indeed, Sir, I have often wondered you did not see that the ABSOLUTE IMPROBABILITY of these accounts must destroy their success.

Concerning false quotations, as you call them, the truth of the matter is this: Mr. *Wesley* and Mr. *Fletcher*,

iber, (like other writers) sometimes find that the passage they intend to quote is encumbered with that which is not to their purpose; or that the whole sentiment of the original author may be comprized in a smaller Number of HIS OWN words. In this case they think it necessary, (for brevity's sake) to abridge the quotation. At other times, various mistakes happen: And these are sometimes owing to the hurry of the author; sometimes to the carelessness of a transcriber, or corrector of the press. Add to these circumstances, that sometimes it is necessary to add a word or two to connect or explain what otherwise would be un-grammatical, incoherent or unintelligible.

Now, I believe, Sir, that I am full as well acquainted with the writings of Mr. *Wesley* and Mr. *Fletcher* as you are; and to the best of my knowledge, there is no other false quotations, &c. as you call them, in all the writings of these gentlemen. And if these are sufficient to justify such hideous outcries, and violent exclamations as you have made! You, yourself, Sir, are as deeply involved in this condemnation as either Mr. *Wesley* or Mr. *Fletcher*. For, if it was worth while, I would undertake to produce, perhaps, not less than an *hundred such* false quotations and forgeries, even in the FEW SMALL pamphlets which you have published. Believe me, Sir, I do not talk at random: I have seen in your performances, especially in your *Farragos*, many proofs of what I say.

I cannot dismiss this head without one observation more. Mr. *Wesley* has on various occasions published abridgments of the works of DIFFERENT authors. In doing which, he naturally left out what he did not approve of. On this you make a dreadful outcry, and charge him with mangling and perverting such authors. Surely, Sir, you do not expect him to make ABRIDGMENTS and leave out NOTHING! Or if you will permit him to leave something out, I hope it must not be what you or another, but rather what he himself disapproves of! I cannot say but Mr. *Wesley's* fate is very hard, in having to do with one whom it is so hard

to please. Sometimes you violently condemn him for not leaving out ENOUGH; this you say, is the case in the Christian Library, and in the tracts he has published from *Baxter* and *Goodwin*: By which means, you say, he falls into such inconsistencies and contradictions. At other times you find fault because he leaves out quite TOO MUCH; this you say he has done in the extract from *Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, &c.* Now, Sir, what can he do to satisfy you? I believe there is only one way: Let him commence an Antinomian-Calvinist, and then all will be well; and then all he shall say and do will be marvelously great and excellent.

In the 25th page of Mr. *Wesley's* answer to your *Farrago*, he gives the following reason for not striking out of Mr. *Fletcher's* manuscript some honourable expressions concerning himself, "Because he" (Mr. *Wesley*) "thought them a proper counter-balance to the contumelious expressions of Mr. *Hill*." In answer to this, you say, (p. 8.) "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 stream of this controversy ran backwards, and that the muddied waters of the *Second Check* had received their defilement from a cause which had then no existence." It is certain that the *Second Check* "was actually published, as you say, several months before Mr. *Hill's Review* saw the light." But let me ask, Sir, was it actually published before the Circular Letter which you had so great a hand in? and before the publication of the Paris-conversation? and before your Five Letters? Now, it was of the contumelious expressions used in these that Mr. *Wesley* spake. Therefore, if "The poor Review" (as you call it) will

will “adopt the language of the Lamb in the Fable,
 “and” — “say that it never could have offended Mr.
 “Wesley by any such CONTUMELIOUS EXPRESSIONS, as
 “it was not then born,” it must expect Mr. Wesley or
 somebody else to say, Hold thy BLEATING, THOU
 BRAINLESS BRAT! for, it is not thee, but thy SHEEP
 HEADED predecessors who are here intended.

You proceed: “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 compli-
 “ments relative to himself out of Mr. Fletcher’s book.”
 It appears from what has been said above, that Mr.
 Wesley’s reason is not proved (unless it be in YOUR
 way!) to be no reason at all: And I believe that at
 the time you were here flourishing away, you knew in
 your conscience, that Mr. Wesley intended the contume-
 lious expressions contained in the Circular Letter, the
 Paris-conversation, and your Five Letters; and not
 those contained in the Review: Now, if this is really
 the case, you must know that you cannot possibly
 prove, what you have said is “plainly proved.”

Page 10, you say, “If I live to publish another
 “edition of the Review, they” (the personal vilifi-
 cations mentioned above) “shall be intirely omitted,
 “and the honesty of personal vilifications shall be
 “left to the sole pen of Mr. Wesley.” Now, Sir, from
 hence we learn, 1. That personal vilification is DIS-
 HONESTY. 2. That this dishonesty is actually found
 in the first and second editions of YOUR REVIEW; other-
 wise you could not, (as you have here promised) leave
 it out in your next edition. Seeing then, that this
 is the case, be admonished, 1. To repent of this
 dishonesty. And, 2. To fulfil your promise, in be-
 ing thus dishonest no more! — But, alas! how true
 is it, that “saying and doing are two things.” For,
 in the very next sentence (after you had promised to
 have done with the dishonesty of personal vilification)
 you tell us a long story of Mr. W——n, (who is still
 living)

living) concerning his being denied the sacrament, on account of his being caught in bed with a woman. O! Sir, what a sad proof is this, that you honestly intended what you so plainly promised in the preceding sentence!

But the instance of Mr. *W——n* is not the the only proof of this matter: The personal vilifications cast upon Mr. *Wesley*, *Fletcher*, *Bell*, *Baxter*, *Goodwin*, and *myself*, &c. &c. &c. in so many of the ensuing pages of this same pamphlet, demonstrate that, what ever you may do in the next edition of your Review, you are not yet convinced of the necessity of abandoning this dishonesty. May GOD help you to know, more fully, that “NOW is the accepted time.”

You tell Mr. *Wesley* (page 11.) “ You cannot deny “ that when you administered the sacrament to the per- “ fect society in West-Street Chapel. ”—“ 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.” What he means, by saving time, is simply this: About fifteen or twenty People, who earn their bread by their daily labour, desired that they might, once a week, spend the dinner-hour together, in singing, prayer and religious conversation. When Mr. *Wesley* was in town they desired the favour of his company as often as he could; and when he attended they desired him to conclude the meeting with the Lord’s supper. Now, as the space of time allotted for *this* meeting was only a single hour; and as the principal design was singing, prayer, and mutual conversation; and as, in administering the Lord’s supper, Mr. *Wesley* makes use of the form appointed by the Church of *England*, he must be allowed to abridge that form on such private occasions, or else omit the ordinance. Now, as no form, merely human, is essential to a right participation of the Ordinance, he thinks he may occasionally, with a few of his friends, commemorate his Saviour’s death, suppose there is not TIME to repeat one tenth part of the estab-
lished

blished Form. And as it happened that the day your informer was present, the *confession*, among other particulars, was omitted, what an hubbub, have you raised on that account! And, among other things have gravely asked Mr. *Wesley*, "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 on the church." What! by omitting (*occasionally*) the form of confession, in spending a spare quarter of an hour (or, at the most, twenty minutes) in administering the Lord's supper to about twenty persons! I am surprized, Sir, that you can once imagine that such straining of matters will be of any service to your cause.

Page 12. You say, "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 perfect in love, are moved from their steadfastness, and fallen from Grace." From this account the reader is unavoidably led to believe, that Mr. *Wesley* has, *in the same tract*, and within the compass of A VERY FEW PAGES, asserted these different propositions. But, the truth is this, what Mr. *Wesley* said concerning the infallible perseverance of those who are perfect, is found (as you yourself tell us) in his "Journal from September 1741 to Octo. 1743" (Review, page 108. second edition.) The other passage, which asserts that some of those who were perfect were afterwards moved from their own steadfastness, is found in his first answer to you, (page 51.) which bears date, Sept. 9. 1773. So that whatever number of PAGES may be between the two sentences, (which you say are "BUT A FEW!") it is certain that there is a space of about thirty years between the times of his writing them!

That the reader may be able to judge aright concerning these passages, it will be necessary to observe,
I
that,

that, formerly Mr. *Wesley* believed that such as were perfect in love could not fall; but, for a considerable number of years, he has changed his sentiment on this head. That this is the true state of the case, appears from his own words, in answer to your following objection: "In one place you say, *I do not deny, that those eminently fitted the elect shall persevere.*" To this he replies; "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 their Faith." *Remarks on your Farrago Double Distill'd,* page 18.

Now, as you have intimated that these passages are written in the same tract, yea, and within a "FEW PAGES" of each other, I appeal to every candid man, if this is not another incontestible proof of your perversion and misrepresentation.

Ibid. You say, Mr. *Wesley* asks, "is that scurrilous hotch-potch, Mr. *Hill* calls a *Farrago*, true or false?" To which you reply, "If Mr. *Wesley* may be credited, it is all true as the gospel; part of it being taken out of his own Christian Library"—"Part out of his extract from *John Goodwin's* Treatise on Justification"—"Part out of *Baxter's* Aphorisms"—"But the greatest part out of his own Hymns, Sermons and, other writings." It is very true; most of the WORDS which compose that "scurrilous hotch-potch," are taken from the tracts you mention. But, I ask, have you taken Mr. *Wesley's* MEANING along with his WORDS? or, rather, have you not taken HIS WORDS, and then fixt a meaning of YOUR OWN on them; and one which is as contrary to what Mr. *Wesley* intended, as heaven is contrary to hell? Now, I affirm, *you have done this*; and for proof of this affirmation, I refer the reader to the Demonstrations in the First part of this tract: There (among many other particulars) he will see it demonstrated, that you have quoted near THIRTY passages to shew what Mr. *Wesley* has said "Against sinless perfection,"
and

and that not so much as ONE SINGLE PASSAGE of them, is to the purpose. You add, "If therefore I believe the Farrago to be false, I must believe Mr. Wesley to be a false teacher." No, Sir, there is no need of that: Only believe yourself to be A FALSE-QUOTER, A FALSE-INTERPRETER, and A FALSE REPRESENTER, and you will hit the nail on the very head.

Ibid. "I find it just as easy," you say, "to catch an eel by the tail," (how ELEGANT and LEARNED the illustration!) "as to lay hold of Mr. Wesley for one single moment." Indeed, Sir, I am inclined to think that you will be always exposed to this difficulty, till you are *able* and *willing* to PROPOSE *more* FAIRLY; to DEFINE *more* CLOSELY; and to REASON *more* CONCLUSIVELY.

"Oh! what quirks, quibbles, and evasions," (you say) "does this gentleman descend to, in order to shift off his own inconsistencies." Remember, Sir, that these general charges prove nothing: No; not though you usher them in with *ten thousand* AHS! and OHS! "And how amazing" you say, "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."—And do you stand to it, that he has published "MORE than ONE HUNDRED POINT BLANK contradictions?" Then I assert that this is (excuse me, Sir, *ceremony* you know, must give place to TRUTH and JUSTICE) a point-blank VIOLATION OF TRUTH! a point-blank SLANDERING of Mr. Wesley! and a point-blank IMPOSITION ON YOUR READERS! And for the TRUTH of this *point-blank* ASSERTION, I appeal again to the demonstrations above-mentioned. But you say, "OUT OF MORE than one hundred point-blank contradictions"—"HE CAN REDUCE them all to one."—*Out of more*—he can reduce them all to one! Pray take down your grammar, Sir, and see whether this be *sense* or NONSENSE.

Page 13. "In the first place then," you say, "the minutes are esteemed the standard of orthodoxy by

“ Mr. *Wesley*, at the conference of 1770.” That is, on a page or two, at the end of those minutes, there are three or four doctrinal questions, with such answers as then appeared to be unexceptionable. Now, does not every one see how you strain this circumstance, by saying, these minutes were then esteemed *the standard* of orthodoxy? But you proceed, “ In the year 1771, he signs a *Declaration*, acknowledging that these minutes are *unguarded*.” He did so; and an *unguarded* action it was, considering what kind of persons he had to deal with. But, even, the signing of this Declaration will be easily excused, by every candid man, when he is told how it came to pass.

The case was this: Mr. *Shirley*, at the head of your party, having published a very formal declaration of war against Mr. *Wesley*, sends for forces from all parts, to come to his assistance. The time and place of action was fixt (by *your party*) to be in *August*, at our Conference, in *Bristol*. The day appointed being come, and all things made ready for the encounter, ere we had well began “ To prime, cock, and fire,” (as you say to Mr. *Wesley* on another occasion) your commander in chief began to cry out for quarters: That is, after the debate was opened on both sides, and a few things were urged by one of Mr. *Wesley*'s friends, Mr. *Shirley* (foreseeing how it would turn out, if the debate went on) instead of replying to what had been said, **BEGGED FOR GOD'S SAKE, AND FOR PEACE'S SAKE**, that, instead of urging matters to their extremity, we would meet them as far as we could: . And so earnest, in his entreaties, was this *good man*, that (seeing LOGIC was like to fail) with tears in his eyes, he employed all his mighty powers of RHETORIC! By this means Mr. *Wesley*, and many of those about him were much *softened*; and declared that they were willing to meet them as far as ever they could with a good conscience. Mr. *Shirley* then requested them to sign a declaration which he had in his hand, and said, that if they did this, he would ask no more.—Mr. *Wesley* just looked it over, altered a very

a very few words, and said he was willing to sign it; and so said many more. But I protested against it, and told Mr. *Wesley* and my brethren, that if they signed it, they would repent of it another day. But Mr. *Sbirley's* ENTREATIES AND TEARS so wrought on Mr. *Wesley*, (whose charity thinketh no evil) that what I said was over-ruled—and the declaration was signed.

When this account, Sir, is added to your present conduct, we see how hard Mr. *Wesley's* fate is, in having to do with those who with PRAYERS and TEARS allure him into a snare; and then, with all possible severity, upbraid and condemn him for his compliance. O, how like the accuser of the brethren is this! Again, "in the year 1772, he published a book," you say, "in which he tells us, he does not know but it " would have been better not to have signed that paper " at all." He means, it might have been better to have made no concessions, little or great, to persons capable of making such use of them.

Page 15. "No less than four times" (why not FOUR HUNDRED 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 ecclesie*, *The doctrine by which* " *a church stands or falls.*" To this Mr. *Wesley* answers: "In the beginning of the year 1738, I believed " it was so. Soon after I saw cause to doubt. Since " that time I have not varied." See *Remarks on* " *Mr. Hill's Farrago Double Distilled* (p. 27.) where his " whole flourish on this head is answered at large.

Page 21. "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 " is not answerable. But, 1. 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?" I answer: There are four " volumes, (besides several pamphlets) of Mr. *Charles*

Wesley's hymns which have neither the name of Mr. John Wesley, nor so much as one word of any preface or recommendation written by him, either prefixed or annexed to them. " 2. 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?" This interrogation certainly implies, that they are ALL bound up together promiscuously. But it is not true: Mr. Charles Wesley's four volumes are always bound up by themselves. " 3. Can it be otherwise, but that if some of these hymns maintain election and perseverance, and others deny these doctrines, the people must frequently sing lies, as two opposites cannot both be true?" If these gentlemen are allowed the common use of language, in the same manner that Homer, Virgil, Milton, Pope, Young, &c. were; I believe you cannot find one stanza, no nor so much as one verse, in all their hymns, which maintain either unconditional election or perseverance. But if you are allowed to wrest and torture their expressions, by giving a literal interpretation to those they intended to be understood figuratively; and to give a figurative interpretation to those they intended to be understood literally, in this case, indeed, you may make them mean what you please.

" 4. If Mr. Charles's hymns," you say, " are to be 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?" Mr. John (as you call him) cannot discard them on account of their Calvinism, unless he will do it on account of that which never existed.

All that he has done is this; when you quote his Brother's words to PROVE how he (Mr. John Wesley) contradicts himself, he tells you, 1. That this IS NO PROOF: Seeing that the words of Charles Wesley are not the words of John Wesley. 2. He says, " There are some expressions in my Brother's Hymns which I do not use, as being very liable to be misconstrued:" He means, liable to be misconstrued by

by PREJUDICED PERSONS---who are NO JUDGES of POETIC BEAUTIES. But this cautiousness of Mr. *John Wesley*, in not using such expressions in common, is no objection to his Brother's compositions: Seeing, that the *greatest beauties* of works of *this nature* are often most liable to be misconstrued. For instance: How easily may a person who is NO JUDGE of *poetry*, turn a most beautiful and striking CONTRAST, into a deformed and ridiculous CONTRADICTION? Whoever wants instances, proofs and illustrations of this, may turn to your celebrated *Farragos*, where he will find them in great abundance.

Ibid. You inform us that "Mr. *Wesley* says in his "Hymns,

"From all eternity with love

"Unchangeable thou hast me viewed."

You also add, "I believe (says Mr. *Wesley*) this is "true on faith foreseen, not otherwise." On this you ask, "But how could GOD foresee this faith, unless "he were determined to give it?" I answer, he has determined to give it, in Mr. *Wesley's* sense, though not in yours.

When you (as a Calvinist) tell us that faith is *given of GOD*, you mean, That he, by an IRRESISTIBLE DECREE FORCETH the elect to believe. But Mr. *Wesley* thinks, that according to this notion, it is very absurd to COMMAND and EXHORT men to believe, and to give them PROMISES of reward if they will believe, and THREATNINGS of punishment if they will not: This appears to him as absurd, as if you were to make use of the *same means* to cause a STONE to rise or fall!

When he saith that faith is the gift of GOD, he means, That GOD has *given Christ* to be the *object* of it; and that he has given all necessary means, (not to FORCE us, but) to PUT IT INTO OUR POWER to believe, if we chuse to do it. These means are, the *Word* and the *Spirit*: The first of which is, to INSTRUCT OUR REASON, and the other to EXCITE (not

FORCE

FORCE) our HEART. Now Mr. *Wesley* believes that if we will hearken to the Word, and *pray for*, and *obey* the motions of the Spirit, we shall be enabled to believe; and then, by believing, be brought into the number of those whom GOD (according to the hymn) from all eternity has viewed with delight. But, on the other hand, he believes, that if we REFUSE to *hearken* unto the word, and to *pray for*, and to *obey* the motions of the Spirit, we shall not be enabled to believe; and, of consequence, we shall not be numbered among those whom GOD, from eternity has so viewed with delight.

Page 23. "But if as you" (Mr. *Wesley*) "say, all "are dark in their conceptions, who deny that phrase," (imputed righteousness) "how came you to beseech "Mr. *Hervey* for Christ's sake, not to dispute for it?" —The phrase *Imputed Righteousness*, when applied to Faith, which *S. Paul* says is imputed to us for righteousness, is scriptural. Therefore, Mr. *Wesley*, with great propriety said, these are dark in their conceptions who deny it. But the phrase, the *Imputed Righteousness* OF CHRIST, is not scriptural; add to this, that the Antinomian idea annexed to it by Mr. *Hervey* is very dangerous: Therefore Mr. *Wesley* might with great propriety beseech him not to use that unscriptural, and (as used by Mr. *Hervey*) dangerous phrase. It has been shewn in the preceding pages, that the calvinian and antinomian idea annexed to this phrase, is, That the righteousness of Christ, (consisting of his thoughts, intentions, tempers, desires, words and actions) is accounted ours, as STRICTLY AND PROPERLY as it is CHRIST'S. Now it is of this phrase, THUS understood, that Mr. *Wesley* speaks to Mr. *Hervey*.

You add, "It has done immense hurt, says Mr. " *Wesley* (page 15.) But here is no contradiction." To this you answer, "Whether there be or not, there is "a plain concession from Mr. *Wesley* himself, that he "has been preaching a doctrine for eight and twenty "years together which has done immense hurt." I believe he never so much as once in all his life, preached the doctrine of imputed righteousness, as it is stated above, and as maintained by Mr. *Hervey* and you.—That this is
the

the doctrine which he says has done immense hurt ; and that he has not at any time, either held or preached this doctrine, he tells you, in his answer on this head : “ The doctrine which I believe has done immense hurt, is that of the imputed righteousness of Christ IN THE ANTINOMIAN SENSE. The doctrine which I have constantly held and preached is, that Faith is imputed for righteousness.” *Rem. on Farrago Double Distilled*, page 20. But you will say, Mr. Wesley has frequently used the phrase, *The imputed righteousness of CHRIST*. I allow it ; and Mr. Wesley allows it also. But we will not allow that he has ever used it in your sense. You take the term *impute*, literally, when applied to the righteousness of Christ ; but he takes it in a figurative and qualified sense. This is evident, 1. From the demonstrations of this point which I have given in the first part of this tract. 2. From the following words in his last answer to you. “ Wherever 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.”

From what has been said it appears, 1. That the phrase IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS is very ambiguous, 2. That you frequently use it without taking the least notice of its ambiguity. 3. That by this means you raise such a dust concerning Mr. Wesley's contradicting himself on this head ; when in reality there is no contradiction at all.

Page 26. “ Where is the contradiction, says Mr. Wesley between these propositions—Truly,” you say, “ the contradiction is just this ;”—“ That the doctrine of imputed righteousness, makes those who believe it both holy and unholy.” The doctrine (or rather doctrines) of imputed righteousness have certainly a tendency to make those who believe them, both *holy* AND *unholy* : St. Paul's doctrine of imputed righteousness has a tendency to make those holy who believe it : Dr. Crisp's doctrine of imputed righteousness has an equal tendency to make those *unholy* who believe it. Now, “ Truly,” Sir, I see no contradiction

contradiction here, unless it be such as those you have mentioned above; an HUNDRED of which you can discover in a trice!

Page 30. "I must now," you say, "beg to treat him (Mr. *Wesley*) with two DIRECT CONTRARY interpretations of the same text, which he has given us in two of his own sermons."

Page 31. "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 are no such words in the text; nor in that 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."

JOHN V. 18. The Apostle *John* declares, that whatsoever is born of GOD, sinneth not.

1. By any HABITUAL sin.
Nor,
2. By any WILFUL sin."

At the foot of the second column, you say, "As I do not choose to interfere between two such intimate friends" (as Mr. *Wesley* and old *Mordecai*, that is between Mr. *Wesley* and himself.) "I leave it to others to determine which of them has the best of
" the

“ the argument.” I answer, if there is any strife between them, you of of all men living, ought to interfere, seeing they were in perfect amity before they fell in your way. And, as goodluck would have it, they are in amity still; notwithstanding all you have done to set them by the ears. For old *Mordecai*, whom you have set on the one hand, says, “ Whatsoever is born of GOD, sinneth not. 1. By any habitual sin. Nor, 2. By any wilful sin.” Mr. *Wesley*, whom you have set on the other hand, allows this; but adds, that “ this is not the ONLY meaning.” And is this, Sir, what you call “ TWO DIRECT CONTRARY interpretations?” What an argument is here of your skill in the doctrine of *direct contraries*!

Ibid. “ Before I quit the subject of *Perfection*,” you say “ 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.” Pray, Sir, how do you know that? HAVE YOU READ ALL these decrees, books, sermons, &c. Have you read ONE HALF of them? Have you read ONE IN FIVE HUNDRED of them? If you have not, see, 1. What a random talker you are. And, 2. How little, as a writer, you are to be depended on.

Page 33. You say, “ As I am now on the subject of Popery, I must beg to make a few animadversions on what Mr. *Wesley* affirms, (page 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.*” To this you answer, “ Now, Sir, permit me to say that you have here asserted what I am confident you yourself don't believe.” Nay, Sir, how can you be confident of this? For has he not the JOINT testimony of *Father Walsh* and Mr. *Richard Hill* for the Truth of what he asserts? *Father Walsh* told Mr. *Hill*, their doctrine (the doctrine of the Papists) was a great deal nearer that of the Protestants. By Protestants, doubtless *Father Walsh* meant,

meant, “ *Real Protestants* ;” and who these are, a late Circular Letter has informed the world. Now let it be well observed, that Father *Walsh* declared that *his popish doctrine* is, 1. *Nearer* : 2. *A deal nearer* : 3. *A great deal nearer* to the doctrine of *these protestants*, than to Mr. *Wesley's*. Now, Sir, if he believes these accounts which are given by *Father Walsh and You*, I insist on it, that he must believe all he has here asserted.

- You proceed: “ 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*.” Pray, Sir, what Pope of *Rome* do you mean? You know there have been many Popes in *Rome*, in the space of near two thousand years; and I expect you also know that they have not always been of one mind. Be pleased then to inform Mr. *Wesley* which Pope you mean; whether the present Pope? or one of his predecessors? or whether it be not all of them jumbled together? You must satisfy Mr. *Wesley* in this, or it will be impossible for him to know how the principles of *John Calvin* and of that Pope, either agree or differ. But I expect it is no matter with you what Pope it is; seeing the very name of POPE is quite enough to answer your ends; which are, to blacken Mr. *Wesley*, and to prejudice the ignorant against him.

But if you should intend any thing particular by the name *Pope*, it is very likely that (by a figure, where a part is put for the whole) you intend “ The Romish “ Church” in general, as consisting of Popes, Councils, Cardinals, Saints, Clergy, &c. &c. &c. Now, if this is your meaning, Dr. *Tucker*, the present Dean of *Gloucester*, has demonstrated the truth of what you say, viz. “ That the principles of the Pope of *Rome* “ and *John Calvin* are as opposite to each other, as “ those of *John Wesley* and the *Pope of the Foundery* :” That is, that on the article of predestination, THEY ARE NOT OPPOSITE AT ALL.

Now

Now, you know, Sir, that *Augustine*, who flourished in the end of the fourth century, was a celebrated *Saint* of the church of *Rome*. And of this same *St. Augustine* the learned Dean says, that he “laid down the following positions; and got several of them to be ESTABLISHED AS FUNDAMENTAL doctrines by SYNODS and COUNCILS.”—Two of these positions were, “That GOD had decreed not to impart”—“sufficient and saving grace to all men in general, but only to a select few, whom he had predestinated to salvation:—That the rest of mankind must therefore inevitably perish.”—“Such were the doctrines of the great *St. Augustine*.” And so zealous was he for these doctrines, and of consequence, for those connected with them, that “he and his followers, for the best part of two centuries, caused SYNOD AFTER SYNOD, and COUNCIL AFTER COUNCIL to be held, in order to extirpate both the *Pelagian*, and *Semi-pelagian* heresy, root and branch; so that NOTHING MIGHT REMAIN TO BE BELIEVED IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, BUT HIS OWN NOVEL DOCTRINE OF ABSOLUTE DECREES, AND IRRESISTIBLE GRACE.” And that these doctrines of *St. Augustine* were confirmed by SYNODS and COUNCILS, the Dean proves from the testimony of *Cardinal Norris* and the learned *Vossius*. His words are, “They both agree THAT THE PRINCIPLES OF ABSOLUTE, UNCONDITIONAL PREDESTINATION, AND OF THE IRRESISTIBILITY OF DIVINE GRACE WERE ESTABLISHED IN A VARIETY OF SYNODS AND COUNCILS (*Vossius reckons up FIFTEEN in all*); and the CONTRARY DOCTRINES WERE CONDEMNED, as impious and heretical.”

And so confirmed, by these means, were the doctrines of predestination, &c. that, (as the aforementioned author has observed) “we scarce hear of any other doctrine being taught in the Western church:” That is, in the “POPISH CHURCH” for several centuries. Nay, “when *Peter Lombard*,” (another champion

champion of the Romish church) “ in the 12th century composed or rather collected, his *Summa Sententiarum*, he grafted St. *Augustine*’s notions into his body of divinity, forming them into questions for scholastic disputation.”—And (continues the Dean) “ It is a most undoubted fact, that this book of *Peter Lombard* was in such vogue, for several ages, as to eclipse the scriptures themselves. For proof of which, see *Mosheim*’s History, vol. i. English edit. page 598, and the note of page 600; and therefore we can be at no loss to know what doctrines prevailed in those times, in the schools of christian divines.”

The passages referred to by the learned Dean are these which follow: “ But none,” says *Mosheim*, “ acquired such a shining reputation by his labours”——“ as *Peter*, bishop of *Paris*, surnamed *Lombard*, from the country which gave him birth. The *Four Books of Sentences* of this eminent prelate which appeared in the year 1172, were not only received with UNIVERSAL APPLAUSE, but acquired also such a high degree of authority, as induced THE MOST LEARNED DOCTORS IN ALL PLACES to employ their labours in illustrating and expounding them. Scarcely was there any divine of note that did not undertake this popular task”——“ so that *Lombard*, who was commonly called *Master of the Sentences*, on account of the famous work now mentioned, became truly a classic author in divinity.” *Mosheim*’s History, vol. ii. p. 425. Second edition.

The other passage referred to by the Dean is as follows, “ The *Book of Sentences* seemed to be at this time in much greater repute, than the holy scriptures, and the compilations of *Peter Lombard* were preferred to the doctrines and precepts of *Jesus Christ*.” For proof of this *Mosheim* refers us to a passage in *Roger Bacon*, who lived in the following age. See vol. ii. p. 428. Second edition. (Dr. *Tucker* quotes the other edition.)

The

The next champion of the Romish cause mentioned by the Dean, is *Aquinas*, the great founder of their school divinity. "When *Thomas Aquinas the Dominican*," (says he) "proceeded on the same plan, in a greater work, about a century afterwards, he not only kept close to his renowned master, *St. Augustine*, but even improved upon him."

"Those who have a mind to examine more precisely whether the angelic doctor, as *Aquinas* is called by the church of *Rome*, was a *Calvinist*, or not, as to the predestinarian controversy, and what he himself says"—"may consult his works, viz. *Prima Pars, Questio tertia*, and particularly the 2d, 4th, and 5th articles of this question. See also his *Prima Secunda, Questio 113*, where particular notice ought to be taken of the concluding paragraph of the 3d. article, and the whole of the 7th. and 10th. articles."

The learned Dean having proved that Predestination was the prevailing doctrine of the church of *Rome* from the time of *St. Augustine*, who flourished towards the latter end of the fourth century, till the time of *Aquinas*, who flourished in the thirteenth, he next takes notice of *Duns Scotus* who wrote in the fourteenth century. "Here" (says the Dean) "we find the celebrated *Duns Scotus* planning a new, subtle, and laborious work in order to rival the same, and, if possible, to eclipse the growing greatness of the angelic doctor *Thomas Aquinas*. Here, therefore, if any where, we may expect to find, the doctrine of *St. Augustine* contradicted, and the Semi-pelagian set up in its stead. But even *Scotus*, who was certainly moved with a desire of putting himself at the head of a new sect, by contradicting *Thomas Aquinas* in every thing, FOUND THE DOCTRINES OF THE ABSOLUTE DECREES SO STRONGLY ENTRENCHED BEHIND A RAMPART OF SYNODS AND COUNCILS, AND THE BULLS OF POPES AND OF IMPERIAL CONSTITUTIONS, that he dared not attack it.

K 2

" Nay,

" Nay, so far was the church of *Rome*, even at
 " and some time after, the reformation, from rece-
 " ding from these principles, that, THE FOUNDER OF
 " THE JESUITS, *Ignatius Loyola*, made it a part of his
 " foundation statutes, to initiate his disciples in the
 " doctrine and divinity of *Thomas Aquinas*. Now
 " these statutes were APPROVED OF AND CONFIRM-
 " ED BY SEVERAL POPES; and IT IS A FACT
 " WELL KNOWN AMONG THE LEARNED, that BEL-
 " LARMINE HIMSELF, SUAREZ, and the first flight of
 " *Jesuits* WERE ALL PREDESTINARIANS.
 " Therefore, as the Jesuits both took upon themselves,
 " and are esteemed by others (Papists, as well as Pro-
 " testants) to be the Popes *Genus d'Armes*, or body-
 " guard, IT IS EVIDENT TO A DEMONSTRATION,
 " that had the church of *Rome* been OTHERWISE
 " THAN CALVINISTICAL at that period, the Pope's
 " life-guard men would have been sent to some
 " other magazine, than that of *Thomas Aquinas*, for
 " arms and accoutrements."

From these and other considerations, the Dean con-
 cludes as follows, " I lay it down as a *most solemn*
 " truth, notwithstanding the SENSELESS cry of
 " Popery and Arminianism;—a cry which was first in-
 " vented by ANGRY MEN, BENT ON REVENGE in turbu-
 " lent times, and then retained by an herd of ignorant
 " zealots, and is now received by the author of the
 " Confessional:" (yea, Sir, and by some other authors,
 whom you are well acquainted with) " I say, I lay it
 " down as a *most solemn Truth*, that at the time just pre-
 " ceding the reformation, the church of *Rome*, in
 " respect to predestination, grace, free-will, and per-
 " severance, was *truly calvinistical*." See the Rev.
 Dr. *Tucker's* Second Letter to the Rev. Dr. *Kippis*. —
 To these testimonies, I shall only add the following.

In the 9th. century *Godeschalvus* an " eminent ec-
 " clesiastic," as *Mosheim* calls him, " maintained a
 " two-fold predestination, one to everlasting life, and
 " the

" the other to everlasting death. He held also that
 " GOD did not desire or will the salvation of all
 " mankind, but that of the elect only; and that
 " Christ did not suffer death for the whole human race,
 " but for that part of it only, whom GOD has pre-
 " destinated to eternal salvation." *Rabanus Maurus*
 opposed him with all his might, and got him condemn-
 ed in a council held at *Mentz* in the year 848. *Hinc-*
mar also got him condemned at a council held at *Quercy*
 A.D. 849. But "*Ratramn*, Monk of *Corbey*, *Pru-*
 " *dentius*, bishop of *Troyes*, *Loup*, or *Lupus*, Abbot of
 " *Ferrieres*, *Florus*, Deacon of *Lyons*, *Remigius*, Arch-
 " bishop of the same city, with his whole church,
 " ALL THESE eminent and illustrious ecclesiastics, with
 " MANY OTHERS WHOM IT WOULD BE TEDIOUS TO
 " MENTION, PLEADED WITH THE UTMOST ZEAL AND
 " VEHEMENCE, BOTH IN THEIR WRITINGS AND IN
 " THEIR DISCOURSES, the cause of this unhappy
 " Monk, AND OF HIS CONDEMNED OPI-
 " NIONS." And at a council held at *Valence* in *Dau-*
phiney, in the year 855, both he and his predestina-
 rian doctrine were defended. " This council was
 " composed, of the clergy of three provinces, *Lyons*,
 " *Vienne*, and *Arles*, with *Remigius*, Archbp. of *Lyons*,
 " at their head, and its decrees" (in favour of *Godes-*
chalcus and his predestination) " were confirmed in the
 " year 859, by the council of *Langres*, in which the
 " same clergy were assembled, and in 860, by the
 " council of *Toufy*, in which the bishops of FOUR-
 " TEEN PROVINCES supported the cause" (the
 predestinarian cause) " of the persecuted Monk." See
Mosheim's History, vol. ii. from page 156 to page 159.
 " The cause of *Godeschalcus*," says my historian,
 " has been very learnedly defended by the celebrated
 " *Maguin*:"—" Cardinal *Norris* maintained also the
 " cause of the predestinarian Monk."—" ALL the
 " *Benedictines*, *Jansenists*, and *Augustine Monks* main-
 " tain, almost without exception, that *Godeschalcus*
 " was most unjustly persecuted and oppressed by *Ra-*
 " *banus Maurus*." See note [q] page 160.

Now if this account be true, (and I believe, Sir, you have more regard for your reputation than to venture to deny it,) we learn, 1. That the principles of the Pope of *Rome* and of *John Calvin* are the same on the article of predestination. 2. That a great part of the parallel you draw between the principles of Mr. *Wesley* and of the Pope of *Rome* is most amazingly absurd and false.

For instance, you tell Mr. *Wesley*,

“ You deny Election.”
If you mean *unconditional* election, he does.

“ So does the Pope of
“ *Rome*.” Not if the above
account be true.

“ You deny perfev-
“ rance.” If you mean
unconditional perseverance,
he does.

“ So does the Pope of
“ *Rome*.” Not if the a-
bove account be true.

“ You deny imputed
“ righteousness.” He does
in the calvinian sense.

“ So does the Pope of
“ *Rome*.” Not if the a-
bove account be true.

“ You hold free-will.”
He holds that GOD hath
given freedom of will unto
every man.

“ So does the Pope of
“ *Rome*.” Not if the above
account be true.

“ You hold that works
“ are a condition of justifi-
“ cation.” He holds that
Faith is the condition of
present justification; and
that evangelical obedience
is the condition of *final*
justification.

“ So does the Pope of
“ *Rome*.” Not unless he
has renounced Calvinism,
or else like you is incon-
sistent.

“ You hold a two-fold
“ Justification.” He does,
and so does the Bible.

“ So does the Pope of
“ *Rome*.” Not unless he
has renounced Calvinism,
or else like you is incon-
sistent. “ So

“ You

“ You hold the doctrine
“ of merit.” He only
holds that acts of gospel
obedience are rewardable,
BECAUSE GOD HATH PROMISED
TO reward them.

“ You hold sinless per-
“ fection ; and that a jus-
“ tified man can keep the
“ law.” He holds that a
justified man can *love GOD*
with all his heart, and his
neighbour as himself : And
that he who doth this, ful-
fills the law.

“ You hold that sins
“ are only infirmities.”
HE DOES NO SUCH THING :
Whatever is properly a
transgression of the law, he
calls sin.

“ You make distinctions
“ between sins that do,
“ and sins that do not
“ bring the soul under
“ condemnation, in o-
“ ther words, between ve-
“ nial and mortal sins.”
By bringing the soul
under condemnation he
means, bringing it under
the sentence of eternal
death. Now he does al-
low that a believer may,
by *surprize*, be overtaken
in a fault, and not be con-
demned to eternal death.

“ So does the Pope of
“ Rome.” But in a sense
quite different from Mr.
Wesley.

“ So does the Pope of
“ Rome.” Not unless he
has renounced the doctrine
of predestination ; yea, and
that of purgatory too.

“ So does the Pope of
“ Rome.” Can you prove
this ? If not, Are you
doing well in flandering
even the Pope of Rome ?

“ So does the Pope of
“ Rome.” Then that is
more than you do. For
you insist that NO SIN will
bring the soul of a belie-
ver *thus* under condemna-
tion : No, not even MUR-
DER AND ADULTERY :
This you have insisted on
at large in your Five Let-
ters. You therefore be-
lieve that, in fact, all the
sins of believers are *venial*.

Page 34. You say, "Since he" (Mr. Wesley) "says, "be 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." This assertion has in general, been made good already: And as to particulars, I accept your challenge on Mr. Wesley's behalf.

But, before we proceed, it is necessary to observe, that the term Popery must be understood *properly*, according to the ORIGINAL use of it, when it FIRST became a term of reproach. Now it is certain that *Luther*, and the rest of the Reformers did not thus apply the term to the church of *Rome*, as existing *before the time of St. Augustine*; much less could they apply it to the state thereof, as existing *SINCE* the Reformation; seeing this state did not then exist: Add to this, that the Reformation has occasioned several (at least doctrinal) alterations to be made, even, *in that church itself*: For seeing, *Luther*, *Calvin*, and some others of the Reformers pressed the Papists so hard with their own doctrine of predestination, &c. Several of the Popish orders gave it up; yea, and by way of self-defence, at last declared against it. If therefore, we would use the term (Popery) *properly*, and apply it in the same *sense* that the first Reformers did, we must apply it to that MOST CORRUPT state of the Popish church, which began about the time of *Augustine*; and continued for about eleven hundred years, and in which it was found *at and about* the time of the Reformation.

Now in this MOST CORRUPT state of the Romish church, its doctrinal tenets were Predestination, and such other doctrines as are connected with it. I say predestination AND SUCH OTHER DOCTRINES AS ARE CONNECTED WITH IT: For, however it may now be with *you*, and *others*, we cannot suppose that such profound scholars as *Aquinas*, *Scotus*, *Suarcz*, *Ignatius*, *Loyola*, *Bellarmino*, &c. &c. would ASSERT one part of the predestinarian hypothesis; and DENY the other parts, which are INSEPARABLY connected with it.

I therefore conclude, that at the times above-mentioned, some of the tenets of the church of *Rome* were as follow:

1. That

1. That there is such sovereignty in GOD, that he has an equal right to make use of *good* or *evil*, to promote his own glory.

This tenet is nearer Mr. Hill's than Mr. Wesley's.

2. That all things whether *good* or *evil*, *little* or *great*, were unchangeably decreed from eternity.

This tenet is nearer Mr. Hill's than Mr. Wesley's.

3. That GOD hath unconditionally elected a small number to everlasting life.

This tenet is nearer Mr. Hill's than Mr. Wesley's.

4. That GOD hath unconditionally reprobated the rest.

This tenet is nearer Mr. Hill's than Mr. Wesley's.

5. That Christ died only for the elect.

This tenet is nearer Mr. Hill's than Mr. Wesley's.

6. That the grace of Christ is *sufficient* for all, but not *effectual* for all.

This tenet is nearer Mr. Hill's than Mr. Wesley's.

7. That there is no free-will in the creature.

This tenet is nearer Mr. Hill's than Mr. Wesley's.

8. That there are two wills in GOD, a secret and a revealed will, and that these often contradict each other.

This tenet is nearer Mr. Hill's than Mr. Wesley's.

9. That all grace is irresistible.

This tenet is nearer Mr. Hill's than Mr. Wesley's.

10. That all true believers must infallibly persevere.

This tenet is nearer Mr. Hill's than Mr. Wesley's.
That

That this predestination in general, not only was the doctrine of that church, but that it still remains in it, is too notorious to require proof; and therefore I shall only add a few testimonies from *Balthazar Mentzer*.

“Several of the Papists,” (says he) “treat concerning the *divine Providence*, that GOD by his decree *physically* PREDETERMINES his creatures to good or evil, whereby they impiously and absurdly make GOD THE AUTHOR OF SIN; and that neither man nor evil angel COULD abstain from any sin, which they have at any time committed, or do now commit.” See his *Vindication of the Lutheran Religion, from the charge of Popery*, p. 101.

Again he says, “*Adrian Van Wyck*, Archpresbyter of *Delfland*, Apostolical Protonotary, and Rector of the convent of *Calcar*, near *Cleve*, does not indeed approve of this physical predetermination, but affirms, that however *he will not blame it*, but leave it HARMLESS to its authors, and free from all censure, BECAUSE IT OUGHT TO REMAIN UNCONDEMNED, ACCORDING TO THE APOSTOLICAL DECREE OF PAUL V.”

You see, Sir, that *Paul V.* a POPE OF ROME, DECREED that the physical predestination which makes GOD the author of sin, OUGHT NOT to be CONDEMNED.

Ibid. He tells us that *BELLARMINE* “contends, that GOD doth not only permit wicked men to do many evil things, but that he IMPELS, INCLINES, TURNS and BINDS their evil wills, by working upon them IN AN INVISIBLE MANNER.”

Page 118. He says, “among the Papists are several, especially the *Jansenists*, who treat concerning *Predestination* and *Reprobation*, that GOD WOULD NOT HAVE ALL MEN TO BE SAVED; that Christ DIED NOT FOR ALL MEN, but only for the elect and Predestinate.”—“They contend that Christ hath purchased for them that are ABSOLUTELY THE ELECT, such a grace as is IRRESISTIBLE.”

Page 119. He tells us that “*BELLARMINE* in his 2d *Book of Grace and Free-will*, plainly writes
“thus.

“ thus. WE BELIEVE, that GOD by his absolute
 “ will would have many to be saved, both infants and
 “ adult persons, and that by his absolute will, he
 “ would not have others, both INFANTS and adult
 “ persons to be SAVED.”—“ Chap. xv. He” (BELLARMINE) “ argues that GOD does REPROBATE a man in as much as HE WILL NOT restore such an one from the bondage of sin.”

Page 120. “ Chap. xvi. He” (BELLARMINE) “ declares, that GOD is NOT WILLING to save them (the reprobate) and that on man’s part no reason could be assigned; and that to make some vessels to dishonour must be”—“ to form men such as corrupt nature requires, and to add nothing to them; and that this sounds somewhat negatively, and belongs to the former act of Reprobation.”—“ In like manner he” (BELLARMINE) “ supposes WITH THE MODERN Jansenists, that powerful grace is IRRESISTIBLE;” for says he, “ *Lib. i. de Grat. cap ii.* if there is no grace but powerful grace, the consequence is, that THERE IS NO GRACE, WHICH MAY IN ANY WISE BE RESISTED.”

Again “ He” (BELLARMINE) “ opposes the external and internal will of GOD to each other, and teaches that by the external will, [*voluntas signi*] POPISH DIVINES understand those precepts and prohibitions, whereby GOD may signify what he would or what he would not have us to do, that the internal will, [*voluntas bene placiti*] is that whereby GOD would absolutely have every thing to be done, and that this is such as may alway be fulfilled, and that NO EXTERNAL FORCE CAN HINDER IT. *Lib. i. de bonis operibus in particulari, cap. 6.*”

Thus, Sir, Mr. Wesley’s assertion, (“ That Mr. Hill’s tenets are nearer Popery than his own”) is made good; and therefore he needs not “ Blush,” as you say, “ for having asserted such a notorious falsehood, for no other end in the world, but to impose on his credulous readers.”

From all that hath been said we learn, That if believing some points in common with the church of
 Rome

Rome is sufficient to bring a man under the denomination of A PAPIST, then YOU, yourself, Sir, (in consequence of believing predestination) fall under that denomination. Nor is this all; for, according to this mode of reasoning, I can prove that you are also an HERETIC. "The Heretics of old" (says Dr. *Whitby*) "used many of the same texts of scripture, to the same purpose, as the patrons of these doctrines do at present."—Again; The *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, *Basilidians*, *Manichees*, *Priscillianists*, and other Heretics were condemned by the antient champions of the church upon the same account, and from the same scriptures and reasons which we now use against the Decretalists." *Preface to Whitby's Discourse on the Five Points*, p. 6.

The blasphemy of GOD's being the author of sin was first asserted in express terms by *Florinus of Rome*, about the year 180. *Ireneus* encountered him in a book entitled, GOD IS NOT THE AUTHOR OF SIN. *Hist. Eccl. Euseb. l. 5. c. 14, and 19*. About the year 273, the doctrine of *Florinus* was asserted with a little variation by *Manes a Persian*, who was founder of the sect of the *Manichees*. "This Wretch" (as Dr. *Helyn* calls him) "considering how unsuccessfully *Florinus* had sped before in making GOD"—"to be the Author of sin, did first excogitate two gods, the one good and the other evil;"—"ascribing all pious actions to the one, all sins and vices to the other: Which ground so laid, HE UTTERLY DEPRIVED THE WILL OF MAN OF THAT NATURAL LIBERTY of which it is by GOD invested; and therefore said, that in man there was no ability of resisting sin."—"Nor did they" the *Manichees* "only leave man's will in a disability of hindering or resisting the incursions of sin, but they left it also under an incapability of acting any thing in order to the works of Righteousness"—"making no difference in this case betwixt a living man and a stock or stone."

"Others there were" (continues the Dr.) "who not daring to ascribe all their sins and wickedness to
GOD

“ GOD himself, imputed the whole blame thereof
 “ to the stars and destinies, the powerful influence of
 “ the one and the irresistible decrees of the other,
 “ necessitating men to those wicked actions which they
 “ so frequently commit.”

“ Thus we are told of *Bardesanes, quod fato conver-*
 “ *sationes hominum ascriberet*, that he ascribed all things
 “ to the power of fate. And thus it is affirmed of
 “ *Priscillianus; fatalibus astris homines aligatos*, that
 “ men were thrall'd by the stars.” See Dr. *Heylyn's*
historia quinqu-articularis, p. 2, 3, 4, 5.

Now, I would observe concerning these antient Heretics, that we cannot suppose they held these doctrines without holding also their *preccdent, concomitant* and *consequent* ones; and therefore we must conclude, that there is at least, a *general agreement* between you and these antient Heretics: And, of consequence, according to your own manner of reasoning, that you are, not only a PAPIST, but also an HERETIC.

Nor is this all: For if your manner of reasoning be just, you are a MAHOMETAN.—It is an undoubted fact that the Mahometans are fatalists or predestinarians. Dr. *Goal* (in his disputation concerning necessity and contingency) says, “ It is a great point
 “ in the TURKISH DIVINITY THIS DAY,
 “ THAT ALL THINGS ARE DONE UN-
 “ AVOIDABLY, and they with our opposites make
 “ GOD's will to be the cause of this *unavoidableness*;
 “ and therefore they judge of GOD's pleasure or dis-
 “ pleasure by the events.”——“ It is too apparent
 “ therefore, that albeit our adversaries are true Chris-
 “ tians, yet in this point their opinion is guilty by
 “ reason of its consequence, both of *Stoicism* and
 “ *Turkism*.” See a book entitled, *An Appeal to the Gospel*,
 p. 365. And *Monf. Coetlogou*, in his *Universal Hist.*
 vol. ii. p. 373, observes that, “ Some authors will
 “ have it that the word *Mussulman* signifies saved, that
 “ is predestinated; and that the Mahometans give
 “ themselves the appellation BELIEVING THEY ARE
 “ ALL PREDESTINATED TO SALVATION.” And that

L

these

these authors are not mistaken, is evident from the Mahometan CREED; the sixth article of which runs as follows: "GOOD and EVIL ONLY happen, BECAUSE " GOD hath FORE-ORDAINED them, having writ " on a table FROM ALL ETERNITY, things that are, " and are to be." See *Turner's History of all Religions*, p. 628.

Once more: If your reasoning be conclusive, then it follows, by the same kind of reasoning, that you are an HEATHEN.

The Stoic-heathens, you know, Sir, were *Fatalists*, that is, *Predestinarians*. So *Seneca*, "*Omnia certa, & " in æternum dicta lege decurrunt:*" *All things follow by a certain law established from eternity.*

"*Om̄n̄ constitutum est quid gaudeas quid fleas:*" It is ordained of old at what we shall rejoice or weep. *De Provid. Cap. v.* Again, "*Fata nos ducunt:*" We are all led by Fate.

"The first law of Fate," says a learned author, "is this, *Stare decretis*, that GOD will stand to his " decree, and not be moved from it by prayers or sa- " crifices; if any man doth profitably use them, *Id " ipsum quoq; in fato est*, it is also HIS FATE TO " USE THEM." Now that there is a general agree- ment between this fate of the heathens, and your pre- destination, is too notorious to be denied.

Thus, Sir, by the same kind of reasoning that you endeavour to fix the charge of popery on Mr. *Wesley*, I have infallibly proved that you, yourself, are, 1. A Papist: 2. An Heretic: 3. A Mahometan: and 4. An Heathen!

Now, honoured Sir, what influence have these rea- sonings and conclusions on your mind? I must not sup- pose that so perfect a master of his temper! feels any unholy perturbation. Perhaps you only *smile*. Wonder not then, that others *smile* at you, and at your treatment of Mr. *Wesley*. But if you should happen to break out into a warm exclamation and say, The rea- soning is fallacious! the conclusions are unjust! and the censures are too severe! expect others, (and for better

better reasons) *thus* to exclaim against yourself. For I have demonstrated from SUFFICIENT authorities, that you hold some of the fundamental tenets, of Papists, Heretics, Mahometans, and Heathens; but you have not so much as CHARGED Mr. *Wesley* with those fundamental principles of Popery, which were protested against at the Reformation. These were, 1. The Popes supremacy. 2. His Infallibility. 3. Transubstantiation. 4. Refusing the cup in the Lord's supper. 5. Confession to Priests. 6. Invocation of Saints and Angels. 7. Worshipping of Images. 8. Forbidding Priests to marry. 9. Indulgencies. 10. Pilgrimages. 11. *Present* Justification by the merit of works. 12. Extreme Unction. 13. Purgatory. 14. Prayers for the dead, &c. &c. &c.

Now had you, from UNDOUBTED EVIDENCE, shewn that Mr. *Wesley* maintains ALL or MOST of these leading principles of popery, you would have wrote like a SCHOLAR, and a man of SENSE. And then, though your conclusions might have been *unmerciful*, yet some of them, in all probability, would have been *just*; and though your reflections might have been BITTER, they would have been more excusable. But to do this you knew was impossible; and therefore, being determined to carry your point, when argument failed, you descended so low (INTO THE ILLIBERAL) as to have recourse to unmeaning noise and clamour; and hence, instead of defining your terms and stating your questions properly, you have rung us so many hideous peals (must I say, with your WOODEN clapper) on Papist, Pope, and Popery!

Page 35. "On the head of *merit*, (Page 26.) "Mr. *Wesley*," you say, "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 his *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.”

Indeed, Sir, if making distinctions was a crime, there would be few writers more innocent in this respect, than yourself. This I have constantly observed in all your tracts which I have seen; but more especially in these celebrated Farragos.

One incontestable proof of your incapacity for distinction, (good, necessary, proper distinction,) is the passage before us. From which it is as clear as the shining of the Sun, that unless you *dishonestly* conceal your knowledge, (which I will not suppose) you know nothing of any distinction in the doctrine of merit.

And, this demonstrates farther, that though you may have STUDIED WELL the writings of Bishop Cowper, John Bunyan, &c. &c. you have not so much as SEEN what is said on the doctrine of merit, by Augustine, Aquinas, Suarez, Scotus, Eckius, Marselius, Bellarmine, Durandus, Bradwardine, Soto, Bonaventure, S. Clara, Cassander, Vasquez, Grotius, Erasmus, Bucer, Calvin, Davenport, Baxter, &c. No nor so much as is said on this head, even in DYCHE'S DICTIONARY! Had you consulted any of these, you would have seen that (with Mr. Wesley) they have distinguished between PROPER and IMPROPER merit. So Baxter, “ Meritum is sometimes taken LESS PROPERLY for any dueness.” Again, “ To merit of a mere benefactor is no more than not to be INCAPABLE OF HIS GIFT, which is IMPROPERLY called merit.” Again, he tells us of those who hold “ A SUBORDINATE merit.”

From hence it is evident that Mr. Wesley is not the only person who has distinguished merit into PROPER and IMPROPER, DIRECT and INDIRECT, or SUBORDINATE. It is true, these are not the terms of distinction generally made use of on this occasion.

The Schoolmen, and others made use of the terms *congruity* and *condignity*. Hence we find them frequently

quently disputing *for* and *against* merit of congruity and merit of condignity.

“ Tho. Waldensis and some others” (says Baxter) “ deny all merit FITLY so called.” That is, STRICTLY, or PROPERLY, as Mr. Wesley hath it. “ *De Sacram. tit. 1. Eckius, Marfilius and Bellarmine, saith S. Clara deny all merit of congruity. Greg. Arim. 1. d. 17. q. 1. a. 2. saith that there is no merit of Blessedness by condignity. Durandus 1. d. 27. q. 2. saith there is no merit of condignity with GOD, nisi largo modo. So Marfilius in 2. d. 27. Burgensis in Psal. 33. Eckius in Cent de Prædest. Cusanus, Stapleton and others, of whom S. Clara referreth you to Suarez in 3 Tho. disp. 10. sect. 7. q. 3. Bradwardine c. 39. fol. 336. laboureth to prove that the increase of grace and glory is not merited de condigno, but de congruo, and that all catholics so hold. And next denieth merit de congruo, and all by reasons which S. Clara taketh to be valid. Soto a Thomist, denieth all merit de congruo, and saith the Fathers held it not. 4. d. 14. q. 2. a. 5 & l. 2. de Nat. & Grat. c. 4.” See *Catholic Theology*, 2. B. p. 270.*

I have made this quotation from *this author* for the following ends: 1. To *shew* you, Sir, that other learned men, as well as Mr. Wesley, have distinguished on the doctrine of merit. 2. That these distinctions have formerly been matter of much dispute in the learned world. 3. That these distinctions and disputes (at least, extracts from them) have been published in your own mother tongue. And, 4. that you are therefore absolutely inexcusable in NOT KNOWING SOMETHING of his doctrine, before you presumed to censure what has been said by an old, learned divine.

That you may no longer be absolutely in the dark concerning this matter, permit *me* to offer you a little explanation of those distinctions which have been commonly made in treating this subject.

The Dean of Gloucester says, The schoolmen and doctors of the *Romish* church taught that, “ The good works of an Heathen, acting on Heathen principles,

“ had in them a merit of *congruity*; and that the good
 “ works of a christian, acting on christian principles,
 “ a merit of *condignity*. Which technical and scholastic
 “ terms have been thus well and familiarly explained”
 —“ Suppose you want to buy an estate, you offer
 “ the full value of it in *unstamped* bullion, alias in
 “ *merit of congruity*, a merit which is of such a real
 “ worth as in reason and equity ought to be considered
 “ as equivalent to the estate to be purchased; never-
 “ theless you cannot actually purchase it, because the
 “ present proprietor hath not promised that he is dis-
 “ posed to part with it. Suppose again, that you and
 “ the proprietor have had a *previous convention* on the
 “ subject, in which he voluntarily engaged that he
 “ would part with it on a proper consideration: Then
 “ you offer him the full value in *current and lawful*
 “ *coin*, alias in *merit of condignity*;—and in consequence
 “ thereof, as you have now made him a *legal tender*,
 “ you have the estate made over to you by a double
 “ title, the one *ex congruo*, and the other *ex pacto*, or
 “ in plain ENGLISH, the one according to equity, and
 “ the other by lawful conveyance.” Second Letter to
 Dr. Kippis, p. 88.

Now, here I beg leave to observe, that this account
 of merit, of *congruity* and *condignity* does, in effect,
 destroy the distinction, as it has been commonly made
 by Papists and Protestants; and resolves these different
 kinds of merit into one, viz. into merit of *condignity*:
 The only difference being this, that the FULL VALUE
 is offered in *unstamped bullion* for an estate which the
 proprietor has NOT PROMISED to sell; and the other,
 that he gives the FULL VALUE in *current coin* for the
 estate which the proprietor HAS PROMISED to sell for
 so much: So that, according to this account, both sorts
 of merit are FULL VALUE.

That this is the meaning of the learned Dean, ap-
 pears from what he says in the next paragraph. “ All
 “ the first Protestants to a man understood them” (the
 papists) “ to have literally asserted, as I have explained
 “ it, viz. that there is a *truc* and *proper* merit in good
 “ works;

“ works; — even such a merit as is an adequate purchase for the favour and happiness which GOD has to bestow in another world. And truly *Bellarmino* himself, cautious as he was, gave too much countenance to this very notion. For he says, that the ratio between human merit and eternal life is in a just and fair proportion. But that nevertheless, GOD would not have been obliged to have made over eternal life from this consideration, had he not bound himself over by covenant so to do. Though the merit in itself be fully adequate to the reward: *Quamvis PAR et ÆQUALE mercedi.*”

It is true, that according to the etymology of the terms, *congruus*, and *condignus*, their meaning is not very different; the former signifying, *agreeing, or according with, suiting*; and the latter, *WORTHY, befitting*. But in the use and application of them in this controversy, they are generally annexed to very different ideas.

As to merit of *congruity*, *Baxter* tells us that the council of *Trent* “ mean the same thing ” — “ which *Mr. Rogers, Bolton, Hooker, and the rest, call PREPARATION for Christ or conversion* ” — “ which maketh a man a more congruous receiver of grace than the unprepared.” And this is the sense of the expression in the 13th *Art. of the Church of England*. “ Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his spirit, are not pleasant to GOD ” — “ neither do they make men MEET to receive grace, or (as the school authors say) deserve grace of *congruity*.” You see that, according to our reformers, by grace of *congruity*, the school authors meant, that which makes us MEET to receive grace.

As I have formerly mentioned *Dyche's Dictionary*, permit me to shew what he has said of this matter, on the word *merit*. “ The school divines, in their disputes, have distinguished two sorts of merit, and call one by the name of merit of *congruity*, which is, when there is *no proportion* between the reward and the action, but the goodness and liberality of
“ the

“ the bestower makes up, and accepts of the deficiency
 “ of the action; the other they call the merit of *con-*
 “ *dignity*, and that is, when the action and the reward
 “ are *proportionable*, as a servant’s wages and his work.”

Now, here are THREE DIFFERENT accounts of merit of *congruity* and *condignity*, yea, and as held by the schoolmen! But, perhaps, there is some truth in each of them: Some of the schoolmen holding the *first* opinion, others the *second*, and others the *third*.

Mr. *Baxter*, in distinguishing on this head, instead of making use of the expressions, *merit of congruity*, and *merit of condignity*, calls it “ Meriting SIMPLY
 “ and COMPARATIVELY.” This last sort of meriting he, in another place calls, “ SUBORDINATE,
 “ COMPARATIVE merit.” And he observes, that
 “ This comparative merit, is but such as a thankful
 “ child hath toward his father, who giveth him a
 “ purse of gold on condition that he put off his hat,
 “ and say, I thank you, who deserveth it in compari-
 “ son of his brother, who disdainfully or neglectfully
 “ refuseth it. This last being *absolutely* said to *deserve*
 “ to be without it; but the former, only *comparatively*
 “ said to *deserve to have it AS A FREE GIFT.*”

Now whether Mr. *Dyche* has properly applied the terms, *congruity* and *condignity*, I will not say; but it is evident that the distinction itself, is the same as that which *Baxter* means by “ meriting *simply* and *comparatively*.” And it is evident farther, that both these are the same with what Mr. *Wesley* calls meriting in a STRICT sense, and meriting in a LOOSER sense; or in a PROPER and an IMPROPER sense. Therefore, by meriting *properly* and *strictly*, Mr. *Wesley* means, The giving of a FULL VALUE for a thing; as when a man gives *exactly* TEN THOUSAND POUNDS for an estate, *exactly* WORTH SO MUCH: And by meriting in a *looser*, or in an *improper* sense, he means, the obtaining of a thing by giving LESS for it than its FULL VALUE; as when a man obtains an estate which is worth TEN
 THOUSAND.

THOUSAND POUNDS, by giving A SINGLE PARYING for it.

For the better understanding of this matter, I shall explain it a little more at large.

When GOD made man in the beginning, he entered into COVENANT with him. In this covenant GOD, 1. ENGAGED himself, by promise, to bestow certain favours on man: But, in order to the real attainment of these favours, he 2. REQUIRED of man certain obedience, as the condition on man's part. Man failed in the performance of his part of the covenant; thereby the covenant was broken; and the promises thereof were forfeited. Now, as it was the absolute and sovereign will of GOD, that man should stand related to his Maker in a covenant way, it was an act of rebellion to break that covenant; by which rebellion, he not only forfeited all the promises and privileges of that covenant, but also rendered himself incapable of standing again in such a relation to GOD, till FULL SATISFACTION was made for the breach of the first covenant: Or which is the same, till something was done, *by way of PURCHASE*, which should be of EQUAL VALUE unto such a new covenant as the state or condition of man required. Now the state or condition of man (as a guilty, unholy, miserable, helpless creature) required a covenant which PROMISED MUCH and REQUIRED but LITTLE: That is, which promised a *large degree* of pardon, holiness, and happiness; and which required but small obedience: Small I mean in comparison of the value and importance of the favours to be received in this new covenant; and small in comparison of that unflinching obedience, which was the condition of the first covenant.

Now, such a covenant must be *purchased* for man, or he must remain in his fallen condition for ever. And as no creature, or number of creatures, were capable of making SUCH A PURCHASE, GOD, in infinite compassion, gave his only begotten Son to do it for us. To this end, the Son of GOD took our nature upon him; lived, died, rose again, ascended into Heaven, and

and made intercession there on our behalf; and, by the *intrinsic* WORTH OR MERIT of this whole obedience, he paid the FULL VALUE FOR, and thereby PURCHASED the new covenant: Or, to use Mr. *Wesley's* expressions, he merited it "STRICTLY and PROPERLY," after the SAME MANNER that an estate worth TEN THOUSAND POUNDS is purchased by having TEN THOUSAND POUNDS given for it: So that here we may safely say, The *Ratio* between this merit and the new covenant, is, AT LEAST, in a just and fair proportion.

Now, in purchasing this covenant; the Son of GOD not only purchased the *promises* thereof, but, also, its CONDITIONS. And, in purchasing the conditions, he hath purchased, 1. That they should be such as depraved sinners are capable of, and such as are suitable to their state and condition. Hence it is, that repentance, faith, &c. and not unfinning obedience, are the conditions of the new covenant. 2. That we should have all necessary ASSISTANCE (such as the *word* and *Spirit*, TENDERED unto us) to perform these conditions. And, 3. That there should be such SUBORDINATE WORTH, VALUE or MERIT in the performance of these conditions, as should give the performers thereof a COVENANT RIGHT, CLAIM or TITLE to the covenanted, or promised blessings. Now, this subordinate worth, value, &c. is what Mr. *Wesley* means by merit in a *loose* or *improper* sense; and is of the *same kind* with that, whereby the value of A FARTHING purchases an estate WORTH TEN THOUSAND POUNDS.

That there is a *possibility*, even, of FALLEN CREATURES making *such a covenant purchase* AS THIS, is easy to be conceived. For Instance: Suppose, Sir, that your honourable Father sustains from a covenanted servant damages to the full value of ten-thousand pounds, and that the nature of the offence is such that thereby the covenant between them is dissolved: Suppose again, that it is not consistent with your father's *honour* to forgive the offender, and to ENTER INTO A NEW COVENANT WITH HIM till FULL SATISFACTION is made for the violation of the former covenant?

covenant : It is certainly POSSIBLE that there should be such *compassion* and *bounty* in your father, as to propose *you* for a mediator, to make satisfaction for this poor offender. It is also POSSIBLE that there should be in *you* such *duty* to your father, and such *pity* and *bounty* towards the supposed offender, as to cause you to *undertake* and *execute* this business. This being done, it is POSSIBLE that your father (whose *pity* and *bounty*, first, gave *you* as a mediator) should secondly, *on account of your mediation*, enter into A NEW COVENANT with this same offender ; and that the terms on both sides should be as follow : — If thou wilt give me ONE FARTHING (which I will first bestow on thee) then I will give thee an estate worth TEN THOUSAND POUNDS.

Now this covenant being PROPERLY MADE, AND YOUR FATHER HAVING ENGAGED HIMSELF BY SOLEMN PROMISE AND CONTRACT, TO PART WITH THIS ESTATE FOR THIS FARTHING, the FARTHING becomes the PURCHASE PRICE of this possession, as *really* as if it were TEN THOUSAND POUNDS. But then, it must be well observed, the farthing does not purchase the estate by its own INTRINSIC VALUE AS A FARTHING ; but *by the value* WHICH YOUR FATHER HAS (for YOUR SAKE) PUT UPON it, in making it the term of agreement on the part of his poor servant.

Now such a covenant as this is not only *possible* with GOD, but, blessed be his name, BY HIS GRACE, it does actually exist between him and us. For when we by breaking the first covenant had so slighted his favour, insulted his majesty, and dishonoured his name, that without a full satisfaction for that offence he could not stand in a covenant relation with us any more, his *pity* and *bounty* proposed his only begotten Son to become Mediator ; and *his zeal* for his Father's honour, and his *pity* and *bounty* towards us sinners caused him to undertake and execute our business effectually. On this account our heavenly Father has again entered into covenant with us : The terms of which are, I will give you pardon, holiness and eternal life, if you will
repent

repent and believe the gospel : And as you are not able without my assistance to do even this, I will *give* you, (That is, OFFER you, not FORCE upon you) my assistance. Now this covenant being made, and GOD having by covenant and promise engaged himself to fulfil these promises on condition of repentance and faith; this repentance and faith become (NOT BY THEIR OWN INTRINSIC WORTH; but by the value which GOD, FOR CHRIST'S SAKE, has put upon them IN MAKING THEM THE TERMS OF THE COVENANT) the purchase price of these promises; and that as truly and properly as if they were intrinsically of equal worth.

Now on this ground human actions are, in Scripture, said, 1. TO BUY OR PURCHASE. 2. To be WORTHY. And, 3. To be REWARDED.

And, 1. They are said to BUY OR PURCHASE. So Isa. lv. 1. "BUY wine and milk."—*Rev.* iii. 18. "BUY of me gold tried in the fire that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed." 1. *Tim.* iii. 13. "FOR THEY THAT HAVE USED THE OFFICE OF A DEACON WELL, PURCHASE TO THEMSELVES A GOOD DEGREE."

2. Human actions are said to be WORTHY. So *Matt.* x. 11. "Enquire who in the house is WORTHY." verse 13. "If the house be WORTHY, let your peace remain. If it be not WORTHY, let it return." verse 37. "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not WORTHY of me." *Luke* xx. 35. We are said to be "ACCOUNTED WORTHY TO OBTAIN THAT WORLD." *Chap.* xxi. 36: We are said to be "counted WORTHY to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man." 2 *Theff.* i. 5. "That ye may be counted WORTHY OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD."

3. Human actions are said to be REWARDED. *Matt.* v. 12. "Great is your REWARD in heaven." *Chap.* vi. 1. "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them; other wise ye have no REWARD of your father which is in heaven."

Verse

Verse 6. " Pray to thy Father which is in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret shall REWARD thee openly." Chap. x. 41.—" Ye shall receive a prophet's REWARD." And, " Ye shall receive a righteous man's REWARD." Verse 42. " Whosoever shall give to drink"—" a cup of cold water only"—" he shall in no wise lose his REWARD." Chap. xvi. 27. " The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then shall he REWARD every man ACCORDING TO HIS WORKS." Luke vi. 35. " But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again: And your REWARD shall be great." I Cor. ix. 17. " For if I do this thing willingly, I have a REWARD." Col. iii. 24. " Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the REWARD of the inheritance." Heb. x. 35. " Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompence of REWARD." Chap. xi. 26. " For he" [*Moses*] " had respect unto the recompence of REWARD." Rev. xxii 12. " And behold, I come quickly; and my REWARD is with me, to give every man ACCORDING AS HIS WORK SHALL BE."

Now as to the expressions, *buy, purchase, worthy, worthiness*, they are so exactly of the same signification with the word *merit*, that it is impossible to fix any other idea to them, than that which properly belongs to the term. Hence it is (as every man of learning knows) that the original words $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma$ and $\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\alpha$, *worthy* and *worthiness*, may with equal truth and propriety be rendered, DESERVING OR MERIT: And on this account it was (as *Baxter* tells us,) that " All the ancient teachers and Fathers of the church since the Apostles"—" familiarly apply these names $\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\alpha$ and *meritum* to believers."

As to the term REWARD, this must be understood as IMPLYING DESERT OR MERIT: Its grammatical definition being, " RECOMPENCE GIVEN FOR GOOD." And this account distinguishes *reward* from *free gift*. A *free gift* is AN UNDESERVED FAVOUR; that is, a favour conferred

M

without

without any valuable consideration given by the receiver. As for instance: when you meet a man in distress and relieve him on no other consideration, but that of his necessity. But in the case of *reward* you say If thou wilt, carry a cup of water to that friend of mine, then, on that consideration, I will give thee this purse of gold. In consequence of your promise, he carries the water to your friend; and in consequence of what he has done, you give him the purse of gold. And that you give it him as a reward, appears from hence, 1. You give it him ON ACCOUNT of having done what you required. And, 2. If he HAD NOT done this, you WOULD NOT have given it him.

To apply this: GOD saw us in distress on account of our Sins; he then gave his Son to help us: (And in various other respects he does good to all, causing the Sun to shine, for instance, and the rain to fall both on the just and on the unjust.) But neither of these can be called a REWARD; because nothing good or valuable in us was the cause of his giving us these favours. But on the other hand he says, repent, believe, and love, and I will give you eternal life. We do repent, believe and love, and in consequence, he does give us eternal life. That this is given AS A REWARD, appears from hence; it is GIVEN ON ACCOUNT OF, OR BECAUSE OF the performance of the above-mentioned duties; and WITHOUT WHICH PERFORMANCE IT WOULD NOT BE GIVEN: Eternal life, then, in this case, is certainly given as a REWARD.

The sum of all that has been said on merit, is this: 1. The PITY and BOUNTY of GOD gave Christ to die for us. 2. Christ, by the MERIT of his death (which is DIRECT and PROPER merit) purchased the NEW COVENANT in general and the PROMISES, thereof in particular. 3. This covenant, and these promises proceeding *directly* from the PROPER MERIT of Christ, and *remotely* from the PITY and BOUNTY of GOD, give an INDIRECT or SUBORDINATE WORTH, VALUE, or MERIT to GOSPEL OBEDIENCE.

4. This

4. This WORTH, VALUE OR MERIT, gives an **INDIRECT** or **SUBORDINATE** RIGHT to the REWARD. And, 5. By that RIGHT we obtain it AS A REWARD.

By what has been said we are enabled, 1. To understand how the same blessings may be a *reward*, and yet a *free gift*. For instance; Christ says, "Whosoever shall give to drink"—a cup of cold water only, "in the name of a disciple"—shall in no wise lose his reward." Now the blessing here promised is a reward, and when it is given, it is given AS a reward; that is, as A **DESERVED GOOD**. But how may this same blessing be called, a *free gift*? On the following accounts: 1. The *water* itself, 2. The *power* (not **COMPULSIVE FORCE**, but **ASSISTANCE**) to give it, 3. The *desert* which is in the gift of this water, and, 4. The *benefit* annexed to, or given as a reward of that *desert*, all these are freely given *immediately* by the *merit* of Christ; and *remotely* by the *pity* and *bounty* of his Father: And **THUS** it is that the gospel reward, is a **REWARD OF GRACE**.

2. By all that has been said, we are enabled to give a distinct answer to each part of your Query. "By this looser sort of meriting," you ask, "does Mr. *Wesley* mean a *merit* that does not *merit*?" I answer, he means a merit that **DOES** and that **DOES NOT** merit! Nay, I will go farther; as Mr. *Wesley* believes that there are two sorts of merit, a *proper* and an *improper* one, he believes that **EACH** of these **DOES** and **DOES NOT** merit! O, Sir, what pity that these propositions were not to be found in Mr. *Wesley's* writings! For if they had, certainly you, **AND YOUR ASSISTANTS**, would have found them out; and then what a noble figure would they have cut in your farrago!—But lest you should take *my* words also without my meaning, and so write a third farrago, and that **TREBLE DISTILLED**! I will tell you what I mean. As to *proper* merit, Mr. *Wesley* believes that it **DOES** merit **PROPERLY**; and that it **DOES NOT** merit **IMPROPERLY**. And as to *improper* merit, he believes that it **DOES** merit **IMPROPERLY**;

M 2

and

and that it DOES NOT merit PROPERLY. All therefore, that you say concerning his distinction falling to nothing; and that it is no distinction at all; and shamefully evasive, only shews that you are SHAMEFULLY unacquainted with the subject on which you write.

Page 36. You charge Mr. *Wesley* with saying, he never uses the word merit. On which you ask, "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?" You *must* know, Sir, that Mr. *Wesley* does not mean, that he never uses the word merit in this dispute; but that he does not, in writing, preaching or prayer, make use of it, to explain any sentiment which he enforces, either as a duty or a privilege. And I am certain it is not in your power to produce one instance of his using it thus.

Ibid. You quote a passage where Mr. *Wesley* says, "I do not grant that works are *meritorious*, even when accompanied with faith." On this you say, "Surely if this be not a *check* upon the *checker*," (Mr. *Fletcher*) "for all he has written on the *meritoriousness* of works, nothing will." I answer, when Mr. *Wesley* DENIES works to be *meritorious*, he means that there is no *strict* or *proper* merit in them. When Mr. *Fletcher* speaks in behalf of merit, it is of *indirect*, *improper* or *subordinate* merit. Therefore here is not a shadow of contradiction between Mr. *Wesley* and Mr. *Fletcher*.

You conclude this subject by saying, "This (Mr. *Wesley*) is the identical gentleman, whose opinion in this matter, has been so very steady for upwards of eight and twenty years."—(yes, for eight and fifty years, for any proof of the contrary that you have brought!) "and, who, as a farther 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 operum*, according

“ according to the merit of our works.” In the year 1767, he asserted, that, taking the word merit, in a *strict* and *proper* sense, works are not meritorious. In the year 1770, he affirmed, that, taking the word merit in an *improper* sense, we are rewarded; *secundum merita operum*, according to the merit of our works. Here, then, is nothing but harmony in perfection.

Page 37. You say, “ Still more evasive is the manner in which (page 21.) you attempt to slide over the point-blank contradiction of justification being *two-fold*, and yet one and no more.” Mr. Wesley’s answer to this charge you have given us follows:— “ It is most true (say you) that the justification spoken of by St. Paul” (TO THE ROMANS, you should have said) “ 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*.” To this you reply, “ By the text referred 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.” I answer, it has very little reference to it, if any at all. This is evident from the whole passage, as it stands in the journal. “ In the afternoon I was informed how many wise and learned men”—“ explain JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. They say, 1. Justification is two-fold; the first, in this life, the second at the last day. 2. Both these are by faith alone, that is, by *objective* faith, or by the merits of Christ, which are the objects of our faith. And this, they say, IS ALL THAT ST. PAUL AND THE CHURCH mean by, we are justified by faith only.”—“ In flat opposition to this, I cannot but maintain, (at least, till I have clearer light) 1. That THE JUSTIFICATION WHICH IS SPOKEN OF BY ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS, AND IN OUR ARTICLES IS NOT TWO-FOLD. It is one and no more. It is the PRESENT remission of our sins, of our FIRST ACCEPTANCE WITH GOD.”

On this I would observe, that although the distinction between present and final justification is mentioned, yet this is not the matter in dispute; but rather, in what SENSE THAT JUSTIFICATION MENTIONED BY ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS, and in the ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH, is BY FAITH. This is evident, 1. From hence: "I was informed" (says Mr. Wesley) "how many wise and learned men explain" (he does not say, the *different sorts* of justification, but) "justification BY FAITH." 2. It is evident from these expressions which declare, that the justification in question is that which is mentioned by St. Paul to the Romans and in the articles of our church. Now it is certain, that though present and final justification are either expressly mentioned, or else implied in many parts of the scripture, as well as in our liturgy and homilies, yet in the epistle to the Romans, and in the articles of the church there is no mention made but of present justification, which is by faith; and, therefore, whatever the dispute was, it must be about *this and this only*. 3. This is evident farther from the manner in which Mr. Wesley explains that justification of which he speaks. "It is" (says he) "the PRESENT remission of sins, or our FIRST acceptance with GOD." Now by calling it the PRESENT remission of our sins, he intimates (though this is not the present matter of dispute) that there is a future remission of them; and by calling it our FIRST acceptance, he intimates that there is a *second*, distinct from that under present consideration: And, therefore, it is impossible for him to mean, (in the sense you represent him) that justification is one and no more. 4. That the dispute was not concerning the DIFFERENT SORTS of justification; but concerning THE SENSE in which JUSTIFICATION IS BY FAITH, appears from the nature of the dispute. For a right understanding of which, we must suppose (what the scope of the argument makes natural to suppose) that these wise and learned men SAID, *The justification mentioned by St. Paul to the Romans and in our articles, is two-fold.*

This

This being SUPPOSED, we must observe that they affirmed, this two-fold justification was by faith alone *objectively*, and that *both* were by *faith and works* as the conditions. To which Mr. *Wesley* answers, "That the justification which is spoken of by *St. Paul* to the *Romans*, and in our articles, is not two-fold. It is one and no more." And then he says, that this one justification is not by *faith AND works*, but by *faith ALONE*. It is therefore certain, the whole dispute was concerning the manner of present justification by faith; and, therefore, it can have "no reference to justification at the last day."

"In the extract alluded to from your journal," you tell Mr. *Wesley*, "you absolutely condemn the distinction of a two-fold justification." No: What he condemns is, The saying that there is a two-fold justification mentioned by *St. Paul* TO THE ROMANS, AND IN OUR ARTICLES.

Page 38. You say, "Now from the whole scope of this passage, as it stands in your journal, your words 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"—"If it were not to gainsay 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?" Only conceive, 1. That although *St. Paul* and our church do not *deny* a two-fold justification; yet in the epistle to the *Romans*, and in the Articles, they treat only of present justification. 2. That they speak of *this*, not as by faith and works; but as by *faith alone*. Then, 3. Conceive that these wise and learned men asserted, that, according to *St. Paul* to the *Romans*, and according to our articles, justification is THERE two-fold. 4. That *both* these are by *faith and works*. Then, 5. Conceive that Mr. *Wesley* asserts, that, according to *St. Paul* to the *Romans*, and according to our Articles, justification is THERE one and

no

no more. 6. That this is not by *faith* and *works*; but by *faith alone*; I say, only conceive these particulars, and you will see not only sense and meaning, but likewise flat opposition to the heterodoxy of these wise and learned men.

Page 39. "Mr. *Wesley*," (you inform us) "says, page 26. his thoughts upon 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. Being then asked how 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." Your consequence, Sir, is no consequence at all, till you *show* that he has condemned ALL marriage. Indeed you have frequently intimated that he has done this. But that this intimation is not true, appears from the following extracts from the *Thoughts on a single life*.

"The *forbidding to marry*, as it is well known the Church of *Rome* does"—"is number'd by the great apostle among the doctrine of devils. And among the same, we need not scruple to number, the *despising and condemning marriage*."—"The Holy Ghost says, *Marriage* is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled. Nor can it be doubted, that persons can be as holy in a married, as it is possible to be in single state."—"And yet we must not forget what the apostle subjoins in the following verses. *I say to the unmarried and widows: It is good for them if they abide even as I. (v. 8.) Art thou bound to a wife? seek not to be loosed: Art thou loosed from a wife? SEEK NOT A WIFE.*" Here let it be well observed, that St. *Paul* forbids marriage, as well as Mr. *Wesley*; and, I add, in the same sense too. He (Mr. *Wesley*) adds, "But though it is good for a man not to touch a woman (v. 1.) YET THIS IS NOT
"AN

“ AN UNIVERSAL RULE. I would indeed,
 “ says the apostle, THAT ALL MEN WERE
 “ EVEN AS MYSELF, (v. 7.) But this cannot
 “ be. For every man hath his proper gift of GOD.”—
 “ If then they cannot contain, let them marry, for it is bet-
 “ ter to marry than to burn. (v. 9.) To forbid fornication,
 “ let every man have his own wife, and let every woman
 “ have her own husband. Exactly agreeable to this are
 “ the words of our Lord. When the apostles said,
 “ if the case be so, it is good not to marry: He said to
 “ them, ALL MEN CANNOT RECEIVE THIS
 “ SAYING, but they to whom it is given. For there
 “ are some eunuchs, who were so born from their mother’s
 “ womb; there are some, who were made eunuchs by
 “ men; and there are eunuchs who have made themselves
 “ eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven’s sake. HE
 “ THAT IS ABLE TO RECEIVE IT; LET
 “ HIM RECEIVE IT. Matt. xix. 11, 12.”—“ To
 “ this happy FEW” (he does not say TO ALL; but to
 “ this happy FEW) “ I say, 1. Know the ad-
 “ vantages you enjoy,” &c.

The sum of all is this: JESUS CHRIST, St. Paul
 and Mr. Wesley, say, 1. That the generality of men
 cannot abstain from marriage. 2. That some (at least
 a FEW, as Mr. Wesley says) can. 3. Those who can-
 not abstain from it, they advise to marry. 4. Those
 “ FEW” who can, they advise not to marry. Now,
 Sir, what an amazing logician must you be, to draw
 the following conclusions from these premises! —

“ It is therefore certain, that these reasons which
 “ induced Mr. Wesley to taste of the nuptial felicity
 “ must have preponderated against those given against
 “ marriage.” There is not one reason given in that
 treatise against any man’s marrying who is under a
 necessity of so doing. There is not one reason given
 why any who CANNOT receive that saying SHOULD re-
 ceive it: Why any one should burn rather than marry.
 “ Consequently,” you say, “ his thoughts on a single
 “ life cannot be the same for these thirty years.”
 Your argument exactly resembles that which follows:

A physician

A physician says, Whoever is not ill of a fever, let him not take such a medicine ; if he is quite free from that disorder, he had better be without it. But this same physician himself is in a short time seized with a fever, and then he takes this medicine ; “ *consequently,*” you say, “ his thoughts cannot be the same, they “ once were.” O rare CONSEQUENCE ! You add, “ If this” [CONSEQUENCE] “ be denied, “ we can no otherwise solve the difficulty, why Mr. “ *Wesley* should write so strongly against wedlock” (not one tittle stronger than JESUS CHRIST and St. *Paul* did) “ and declare that his thoughts on this subject “ have been the same for these thirty years ; and that “ they MUST be the same, unless he give up the “ Bible ; but by supposing, either that Mr. *Wesley* “ has REALLY given up the Bible, or else that he en- “ tered into the connubial state, when he had not his “ thoughts about him.” Indeed, Sir, there is a more easy and natural way of solving this difficulty ; and that is, by OBSERVING, 1. That he recommends a single life ONLY to those [FEW] who are under no necessity of marrying : And then, 2. By SUPPOSING that he himself, (at the time of marriage) was not of that number : When you have taken notice of these two circumstances, instead of saying, “ This conclusion is as much deducible from Mr. *Wesley*’s own “ words, as that *two and two make four,*” you will rather say, *as that two and two make SEVEN HUNDRED !*

In a note in your first Farrago, (p. 142. second edition) you say, “ Mr. *Wesley*, in these thoughts” — “ gives the following reason for celibacy, That we “ may employ every hour in what we judge the most “ excellent way ; but if we are married, we must ask “ leave of our companion, otherwise what complaints “ or disputes will follow?” And so, Sir, you very gravely mention this as one of Mr. *Wesley*’s faults! — Why truly, one would almost think you never saw that old book wherein it is said, “ I would have you “ without carefulness. He that is unmarried, careth
“ for

“ for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may
 “ please the Lord : But he that is married, careth
 “ for the things that are of the world, how he may
 “ please his wife.”—“ The unmarried woman careth
 “ for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy
 “ both in body and in spirit : But she that is married,
 “ careth for the things of the world, how she may
 “ please her husband.”—“ And this I speak for your
 “ own profit”—“ That you may attend upon the
 “ Lord without distraction.” 1 Cor. vii. 32—35.

Again, you say, “ He exhorts the married to prize
 “ the advantages they enjoy.” And so does St. Paul
 in effect. “ *I would*” (says he) “ *that all men were*
 “ *even as myself.*”—“ *It is good for them if they abide*
 “ *even as I.*”—“ *But she is happier if she so abide, after*
 “ *my judgment.*”—“ He concludes,” you say, “ with,
 “ Blessed are they who have made themselves eunuchs
 “ for the kingdom of heaven’s sake.” And does not
 our Lord himself say, “ There be eunuchs which
 “ have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of
 “ heaven’s sake.” And that he did not look upon
 it as a curse, but rather as a blessing, appears, 1.
 From the foregoing verse, where he intimates that
 they had received this saying as a command from
 GOD, or, rather, that they had received power from
 GOD to do what they did. 2. This appears from the
 following words : “ He that is able to receive it,”
 (this word) “ let him receive it.” Matt. xix. 12.—
 Now had it not been a blessing to receive this saying,
 our Lord would not have spoken thus.

But be this as it will : The reader will think Mr.
Wesley fully justified in saying, “ BLESSED are they
 “ who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of
 “ heaven’s sake,” when he is told that he (*Mr. Wesley*)
 thus explains himself in the words immediately fol-
 lowing :—“ Who abstain from things lawful in them-
 “ selves in order to be more devoted to GOD.”

From what has been said, I appeal to every candid
 man, if here is not another instance of such *unnatural*
straining

Straining of Mr. Wesley's words; of such *perverting* of his real meaning; and of such *sophistical*, and yet *unlearned* reasoning, as is totally inconsistent with your *real* character, as a GENTLEMAN, and a SCHOLAR.

Page 40. You say, "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 and colour of your apparel, is mere superstition."

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

On this I must observe that Mr. Wesley is too generous: He allows you more than he need. For though it be true that he DOES ADVISE his followers to wear nothing of a glaring colour, and nothing made in the height of the fashion; yet he does not advise them to go to the other extreme as the Quakers do. A Quaker makes it a point of conscience, not to wear a button on his hat; and, rather than do it, to ROT IN JAIL. Now this, Mr. Wesley says, is mere superstition. But though he calls it superstition to lay such stress on a button, he may, nevertheless, very consistently advise against wearing a hat with a GOLD-LACE AND A FEATHER. Again, a Quaker makes it a point of conscience not to wear a pocket and a flap on his side; and rather than do this, to endure the greatest hardship. Now, though Mr. Wesley calls this mere superstition, he may, nevertheless, advise against wearing an embroidered coat made of crimson velvet. Once more, the Quakers make the COLOUR of their apparel, as well as its shape, a matter of conscience,

for

for they will not wear black or blue, &c. &c. Now though Mr. *Wesley* calls this superstition, he may, very consistently advise, not to imitate the most empty and vain part of mankind, who are ever running after the very height of the fashion. The truth of the matter is this : In dress there are two extremes. Mr. *Wesley* condemns them both, and desires his followers to steer the middle course, and dress like REASONABLE PERSONS PROFESSING GODLINESS. Here then is no contradiction on the article of dress : — I wish I could also add, that here is no unchristian dealing in you, in straining and perverting these passages also.

Ibid. “ 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 direc- “ tion. Why then did Mr. *Wesley* suffer his tract “ against tea to be republished only two or three years “ ago.” Because, 1. Neither Doctor *Fothergill*, or any other Physician, has told Mr. *Wesley*’s readers that they all need it as a medicine : And because, 2. Mr. *Wesley* himself knows, it is not the *cheapest* or the most *wholesom* food that they [in general] can make use of. You add, “ Is it not very strange, that a physician of Doc- “ tor *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 a palsey ?” That is as much as to say, Mr. *Wesley*, you lie : Doctor *Fothergill* did not advise you to the use of it : Or if he did, you gave him a false account of your case. Genteelly said ! But as Doctor *Fothergill* is still living, and as Mr. *Wesley* says, “ If you believe not *me*, you may inquire “ of himself,” we will take it for granted that Doctor *Fothergill* did give this advice ; and, as it is a fact that the Doctor constantly attended Mr. *Wesley* in this illness, we will take it for granted also, that the advice he gave was from his own personal knowledge ; and, therefore, if there must be lying in the case, it must fall to the lot of him who denies Mr. *Wesley*’s account.

However,

N

“ However, I greatly commend Mr. *Wesley*'s prudence
 “ on this head,” you say, “ 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.” That is, in
 other words, Mr. *Wesley* has NO CONSCIENCE ! and Dr.
Fothergill has NO BRAINS ! or, the first is a *knave* ;
 and the second is a *fool*. O, Mr. *Hill* ! how full are
 you of that charity, *that thinketh no evil ; that believeth*
and hopeth all things !

Once more : “ I here wave,” you say, “ 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.”—By looking over the letter,
 I discover the reason of your waving this ; viz. Be-
 cause nothing of the kind can be found in that letter !
 And for the same *good* reason, you don't extract from it
 what is said of tea-drinking, as if it grieved the Spirit
 of GOD. It is true he says, “ I fear, by not stand-
 “ ing your ground, by easiness, cowardice and false
 “ shame, you have grieved the Spirit of GOD, and
 “ thereby lost your conviction and desire at once,”
 p. 14. Now how perverse is it to explain this as you
 do ? “ The drinking of it “ [tea]” grieves the
 “ Spirit of GOD !”

Once more : “ Nor shall I make any remarks,” you
 say, “ on his having recorded to posterity Mr. *Charles*
 “ *Wesley*'s fall in drinking a cup of tea one night for
 “ fear of offence.” Recorded to posterity, Mr. *Charles*
Wesley's fall, in drinking a cup of tea one night, do
 you say ! H^o, Sir, can you, either in honour or
 conscience, affirm this ? An objector said, “ I saw
 “ your brother drink tea, which he said was for fear
 “ of giving offence.” To this Mr. *Wesley* answers,
 “ Learn from hence to follow neither his, nor my
 “ practice implicitly : But weigh the reason of each,
 “ and then follow reason, wheresoever it stands,” p. 11.
 And do you call this, recording to posterity — Mr.
Charles Wesley's fall—in drinking a cup of tea one
 night ? Reader, see with thy own eyes, in what
 manner

manner Mr. Hill strains almost every thing Mr. Wesley says ; and how cruelly he is misrepresented by this honourable gentleman.

Page 41. " On the article of Baptism," you say, " Mr. Wesley is equally inconsistent. He publishes a treatise in defence of Infant Baptism by sprinkling. However, he tells us, that the word *Baptizo* is of dubious meaning ; he further insists on the propriety of letting the person, if an adult, chuse for himself, or 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* and not *dipped*." The case was this : Mr. Wesley's private judgement is, That if a person is baptized WITH WATER, AND IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, SON AND HOLY GHOST, the mode of applying the water is not essential.

So he says, " Baptism is performed by *washing*, *dipping* or *sprinkling* the person, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost."—" I say by *washing*, *dipping*, or *sprinkling* ; because it is not determined in Scripture, in which of these ways it shall be done, neither by any express precept, nor by any such example as clearly proves it ; nor by the force or meaning of the word, *Baptize*." *Preservative*, p. 144. Again, " To sum up all," (says Mr. Wesley) " The MANNER of baptizing (whether by *dipping* or *sprinkling*) is not determined in Scripture. There is no command for one rather than the other. There is no example from which we can conclude for *dipping* rather than *sprinkling*. There are probable examples of both ; and both are equally contained in the natural meaning of the word." p. 146.

" How came he then," you say, " to refuse *sprinkling* Mr. Parker's child at *Savannah* ? He answers : " Not because I had any scruples, but in obedience to the RUBRIC."—Here observe, that at the time Mr. Wesley was at *Savannah*, he was in the closest connexion with the church ; and thought it his DUTY ab-

solutely to conform to her, not only in all *lawful*, but also, in all **INDIFFERENT** things. Now, it is certain that *the Rubric requires dipping*, if the child is able to endure it: For so it runs: "And then naming it" [the child] "after them (if that they shall certify him" [the minister] "that the child may well endure it) **HESHALL "DIP IT IN WATER."** Now Mrs. *Parker* did certify Mr. *Wesley* that the child could well endure it. For she said, "The child is not weak; but I **AM RESOLVED** it "shall not be dipped." Now though Mr. *Wesley* (according to his private judgement) could have baptized the child by sprinkling; yet according to the Rubric, he could' not: And therefore he "went home," as he says, "and the child was baptized by another "person."

From what has been said, it follows, 1. That, on this head, there is no contradiction. And, 2. That here also, Mr. *Wesley* is shamefully misrepresented. A farther proof of this last observation, we have in the following words of Mr. *Toplady* (which you have *quoted*, and **MADE YOUR OWN.**) "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!" For the **TRUTH!** of what you here **BOTH** assert, I shall only repeat one sentence from Mr. *Wesley's* Thoughts on Infant baptism. "Bap- "tism," says he, "is performed by **WASHING, DIP-** "PING or **SPRINKLING** the person, in the name "of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." What a worthy **PAIR** are you, into whose hands Mr. *Wesley* is fallen!

Page 42. "But what surpasses every thing else, is," you say, "That Mr. *Wesley* cannot even speak of "his own contradictions, without contradicting him- "self afresh. For in his *remarks*, p. 38, 39. he abso- "lutely denies, not only that he ever was unsettled "in his principles, but that he ever was accused of be- "ing so **EITHER** by *friends or foes.*" He does not deny this. What he denies is, that he was ever accused of it by **FRIENDS AND FOES.** Your words, in your Re- view,

view, are, " And he himself cannot but acknowledge, " that both his *friends* AND *foes*, whether *German* or "*English*, have accused him of his unsettled principles " in religion: " p. 149. Second Edit.

Mr. *Wesley* answers: " My *Friends* have oftener accused me of being TOO STIFF in my opinions, than " *too flexible*. My *Enemies* have accused me of BOTH." Remarks, p. 39. In answer to this you say, " He " absolutely denies"—" that he ever was accused of " being so, either by *friends* OR *foes*." Pray, Sir, by what rule of grammar do you make these phrases, "*friends* AND *foes*"—and, "*friends* OR *foes*," to be synonymous? But by what rule soever it be done, do it you must, before you can prove " What" (you say) " surpasses every thing else"—" that Mr. *Wesley* cannot even speak of his contradictions, without contradicting himself afresh:" And when you have proved this, you will, by the same medium prove, that Mr. *Wesley* cannot so much as *open his mouth*, to take in a little fresh air, no, nor so much as MOVE EVEN ONE of his lips, without contradicting himself!

As I have (for the sake of clearing up of this point) been FORCED TO DISTINGUISH between *friend* AND *foes*, and between *friend* OR *foes*, I hope you will not say of me what you have said of Mr. *Wesley*; viz. " I find it " just as easy to catch an eel by the tail, as to lay hold " on Mr. *Olivers* for a single moment. Oh! what " quirks, quibbles, and evasions does this gentleman descend to, in order to shift of his" [Mr. *Wesley's*] " inconsistencies, and how AMAZING must his " SKILL be"—TO BE ABLE to shew that "*friends* " AND *foes*," and "*friends* OR *foes*," are not expressive of the same idea!

From page 46, to page 51, you entertain the world " with an Heroic Poem in praise of Mr. *John Wesley*." But you are not the first, by many thousands, who have thus celebrated his praise. No: MULTITUDES of *Cornish Tanners*; of *New-castle, Kingswood, and Staffordshire Colliers*; with MYRIADS of PORTERS, CARMEN,

OYSTER-WOMEN, GIN-DRINKERS, GAMBLERS, PICK-POCKETS, &c. have praised him in YOUR WAY; and very nearly in YOUR LANGUAGE.

When he (before you was born) first turned his back on the world; on ease, honours, friends and every other worldly prospect, and went (WITH HIS LIFE IN HIS HAND) to the most *wretched* and *savage* parts of these kingdoms to call sinners to repentance; abundance of SUCH PRAISE as your's, rang in his ears from every quarter; while showers of *dirt* and *stones* applied it, in the most NERVOUS MANNER, to his HEAD and FACE, as well as TO EVERY OTHER PART of his body. You therefore are in no wise the only person who have favoured Mr. *Wesley* with SUCH praises: — NO; in this you have renowned predecessors, and illustrious coadjutors in great abundance!

Concerning this Poem you say, “ Thus, Sir, I have given you a few hobbling rhymes in the EXACT LANGUAGE of the authors of the *sacred poems*.” If you mean, in the exact SCURRILOUS or abusive language, then I say, produce a parallel out of these authors. But before you attempt this, know what a parallel is. Your poem consists of FOUR SCORE AND SIXTEEN LINES; EVERY ONE OF WHICH, is PERSONAL ABUSE “ OF MR. JOHN WESLEY,” BY NAME: In which you all along, and in some of the coarsest language of *Billinggate*, compare him to a Quack-doctor—you call one of his friends TOM, and himself, JACK—and, which to me is worse than all the rest, you reflect (in a very indelicate manner) and to the disadvantage of Mrs. *Wesley*, on his marriage connexion with that lady.—To shew the reader I do not misrepresent you I refer him to the following lines.

- “ Would’st thou be free? thyself of *thoughts*
 “ For woman-kind divest:
 “ Or would’st thou groan with strife and care?
 “ Marry—*Probatum est*.”

And

And that the unlearned reader may not be at a loss to understand you FULLY, you are careful to inform him that *Probatum est* signifies, "Tried or proved."

Now, Sir, as the Hymns and Sacred Poems, of Mr. John and Charles Wesley, consist of about ten volumes, and as you have asserted that your poem is "In the EXACT LANGUAGE" of these authors: I call on you to vindicate the TRUTH of this assertion, by producing out of them a poem of FOUR SCORE AND SIXTEEN LINES, of SUCH PERSONAL ABUSE. If you cannot do this, produce ONE of SIXTEEN LINES, and I will forgive you the four score! If you cannot produce sixteen lines, produce ONE of SIX LINES, and I will excuse the four score and ten. And if *six lines* are too much, take the whole TEN VOLUMES, and produce out of them only a SINGLE LINE of SUCH PERSONAL ABUSE, and I will give up the other four score and fifteen: Nay, I will go farther; only produce *one single* WORD of SUCH PERSONAL *abuse*, or so much as *a single* SYLLABLE of ANY personal abuse, and your VERACITY shall stand unimpeached.

Should you say, That by "the *exact language* of "the authors of the sacred poems," you mean, that your *numbers* are equally POETICAL, HARMONIOUS and ELEGANT; that your style is equally SMOOTH and LOFTY, I must beg leave to be of another mind. In my judgment, there is as much resemblance between a DUNG-HILL and the SUN, as between YOUR *language*, and that of the Sacred Poems. That the reader may in this also judge for himself, I shall set down the first two verses of Mr. Wesley's hymns, which occur to my mind; and compare them with the two first verses of your Heroic Poem.

And the verses I this moment recollect, are the following.

"Thou standest in the holiest place

"As now for guilty sinners slain;

"Thy blood of sprinkling speaks, and prays

"All prevalent for helpless man,

"Thy

“ Thy blood is still our ransom found,
 “ And spreads salvation all around.

“ The smock of thy atonement here
 “ Darken’d the Sun and rent the veil,
 “ Made the new way to heaven appear,
 “ And shew’d the great invifible;
 “ Well pleas’d in thee our GOD look’d down,
 “ And call’d his rebels to a crown.”

Mr. Wesley's hymns on the Lord's Supper, p. 68. fifth edit.

Let us now compare these with the two first verses of your “ Heroic Poem.”

“ Hither ye weak and sickly *tribe* :
 “ I've welcome news to tell;
 “ Whate'er your pains or grieis may be,
 “ My dose can fuit you well.

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

Now I really think, Sir, that these lines are so far from being written “ In the exact language of the authors of the sacred poems,” that you will scarce find so much as a faint resemblance of them in any one worthy the name of an author. That which comes nearest to you, both in loftiness of thought and in sublimity of expression, is found in a volume of sacred poems, by the Reverend Mr. *John Berridge* M. A. Vicar of *Everton* in *Bedfordshire*. Now as he is, 1. A man of learning and character, And, 2. As UNCHANGEABLE as the MOON, and as FIRM as a WEATHERCOCK in his belief of *your* orthodoxy ! And, 3. As serious (I must not say, AS DEATH, but, on the authority of a late publication, entitled, “ The religious world unmasked, COME AND PEEP,” I *will* venture to say) as the MOTLEY gentlemen who exhibit at *Sadlers-wells*,

ON

Tower-bill, &c. And, add to all this, that, 4. He is one of your great auxiliaries in the present encounter, on all these accounts it must be highly acceptable to you, to have your learned productions compared with his.—Well then,

Ye sacred *Nine*, in rapt'rous wonder see,
'The LOFTY numbers SWEETLY glide along !

- “ The BLACKSMITH spends another groat,
- “ Because a SPARK IS IN HIS THROAT.
- “ The BUTCHER swears and swears again,
- “ Because the BULLOCKS are so lean.
- “ The Rake is WENCHING all night long,
- “ Because his passions are so strong.
- “ The Vicar quarrels with his parish,
- “ Because their TURNIPS have no relish.”

Now, Sir, it cannot be denied that there is a considerable resemblance between you and this learned gentleman ; yet in justice to him I am forced to say, the resemblance is not at all complet. For in Mr. *Berridges's* performance, there is TRUTH and RHIME and REASON too, such as it is ! but in your's there is neither. However, you certainly have one advantage over him, for though we may read his, and meditate thereon for our great edification, yet he says, “ It is not to be sung ; ” (alas, what pity is this !)—but you, Sir, to your honour be it spoken, have not cut us off from so great a privilege : No ; could we but find a proper tune, we may sing your's or do any thing else with it our hearts can wish.—And, indeed, if you and your orthodox brethren should chuse to CHAUNT forth YOUR praises of Mr. *Wesley*, I would, for several weighty reasons, recommend to you the tune of *Chevy-Chase*. 1. Because, the MEASURE and RHYME, in both poems, are EXACTLY the same. 2. Because the song of *Chevy-Chase* may, with equal propriety, be called “ An HEROIC Poem.” And, 3. Because, was the great *Addison* to rise again from the dead, he would certainly discover as much of NATURE (only of a different

different kind !) in YOUR composition, as he formerly discovered in the othe;

Permit me to mention one performance more, which I think is no bad resemblance, of your own. ——— When I was last in *Scotland*, a Clergyman told me that the following epitaph was actually made, by four *Baillies* or ALDERMEN, for *Provost Wilkinson* of *D—n—ce*, all five worthy *magistrates* like your self. These gentlemen having deposited the remains of their worshipful brother in the silent grave, retired to a public-house, that over the bottle and choppin [the quart] they might deplore the loss of so worthy a magistrate. And now being deeply drowned in—ALE AND WHISKY, one of them observed, that, according to his judgment, they ought to perpetuate the memory of this worthy man, by procuring a PROPER epitaph. To this it was objected, That they had no poets in *D—n—ce*, and that to send to *Edinburgh* would cost thirty pund Scots, that is, [fifty shillings sterling.] They then agreed to make one themselves: And as they wished to have it quite compleat, and knowing that FOUR HEADS are better than *one*, they agreed that each *Baillie* should make a line; by which means, the WHOLE GENIUS of this respectable body would be engaged on the solemn occasion. Accordingly, each *Baillie*, with the choppin in his hand, and the white of his eyes turned up to the ceiling, supplied his line in the following delightful manner!

- B. 1. “ Here lies *Wilkinson* !
 B. 2. “ Provost of *D—n—ce* !
 B. 3. “ Here lies *Wilkinson* !
 B. 4. “ Here lies he !”

Now, in justice to you and your four worshipful and poetic brethren, I acknowledge, that each of you have your NATIVE beauties: You, certainly, are far more NERVOUS [alias ABUSIVE;] but they quite excel you in RHYME: So, that upon the whole, it is not easy to determine to which of you the LAWREL is

is due. Indeed there is this to say in your favour; that they were FOUR, and (so far as I know) you are but ONE; and four to one, we all know, is great odds. But as to *length*, they have no share with you; for your "Heroic poem" consists of not one less than Ninety-six lines, but their elegiac performance only of four lines: So that, upon the whole, though you must not be mentioned (as a poet) in the same day, no, nor even in the same CENTURY, with the authors of the *sacred poems*, yet it must be confessed, you are pretty near on a level with these four worshipful gentlemen.

Page 51. You tell Mr. *Wesley*, "I do assure you, "I have only presented you with these *pious sneers*, "and *miid 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 writ- "ing, as of the uncommon patience of the free-grace "preachers of the gospel, who without the least pro- "vocation, and without making any reply, have been "constantly vilified for so many years, in the various "editions of the *sacred poems*, and in that shocking "medley of gross misrepresentation intituled, Hymns "on GOD's everlasting love." To this I answer: Shew me *one line*, or ONE WORD, or even, ONE SYLLABLE of PERSONAL ABUSE in all the volumes of *sacred poems*, and I will allow that you only intended Mr. *Wesley* should examine the feelings of his own heart, on a return of the same kind of treatment he gave to others. But you know, Sir, that if it were to save the world, you cannot shew so much as a single instance of this, in all the *sacred poems*. And, therefore, I positively assert, that this neither WAS nor COULD BE your reason for writing this poem: Add to this, that the improbability of what you say, shews it is only a vain pretext.

Had Mr. *Wesley*, in any degree done as you say; and had you been at the pains of returning him HALF A DOZEN, or even HALF A SCORE lines in his own way,
your

your plea would have been *probable*. But that you should write a poem of ninety-six lines; with between THIRTY and FORTY notes and references; many of which are of such length, that the poem, together with your learned commentaries, fill up about SIX OCTAVO PAGES, IN A SMALL TYPE AND WELL CROWDED: I say, when all these circumstances are put together, it renders your account incredible and your reason absurd.

Ibid. Conscious of your need of an apology, you add, "If I had done it from ANY OTHER MOTIVE than that of shewing you YOUR OWN PICTURE,"—"I should MOST HEARTILY CONDEMN MYSELF." I answer: Tell us the man that Mr. *Wesley* has treated in this manner; mention his name as plainly as you have mentioned "Mr. *John Wesley*;" tell us the words (or the single word) in which Mr. *Wesley* has thus treated him; and mention the book, the page, the verse, where it may be found: And so you do but give us this information, give it in a news-paper, a magazine, or in any other way you think proper; (only let it be open and above board) and we will give you sincere thanks.—But if you cannot do this; THEN GO, AND CONDEMN YOURSELF MOST HEARTILY.

But whether you can do it or not, you ought to condemn yourself.——For, you say, "If I *had done* it from any other *motive* than that of "shewing you your own picture,"—"I should most heartily condemn myself;" and I say, if you *have done* it even for the end you mention, you ought thus to condemn yourself; seeing (according to your own confession) you have been "DOING EVIL THAT GOOD MAY COME."

Page 52. "Mr. *Wesley* will have it," you say, "that it is nothing but love, to what he calls *the dear decree of reprobation*, which causes the Calvinists to disapprove his Minutes." (Mr. *Wesley* means, that dear decree of which reprobation is a part) "But this," you say, "is a great mistake, for the true reason is, that the Calvinists *now* believe that the foundation

" is

“ is struck at, by those wretched Minutes, and by the “ subsequent vindications of them.” *Now* believe, do you say? Pray did you never believe this till *now*? But what do you mean by, “ *The* foundation?” From this mode of expression, you seem as if you thought the foundation of the Arminian and Calvinistical systems were but *one*. And in this preposterous absurdity you are not alone. For it is very common, now-a-days, to hear people say, There is no material difference between us. We are all agreed as to fundamentals. We all build on the same foundation. To this I answer: If by foundation you mean, That first principle, or rather those first principles, on which the whole of the system depends, we are not agreed as to fundamentals: We do not build on the same foundation.

To make this fully appear, let us consider what foundation or first principles each system is built upon:— And, first, as to the ARMINIAN system. The foundation of this is, 1. That GOD is a Being separated from all evil; from the evil of *sin* and from the evil of *sorrow*; commonly called, *moral* and *natural* evil: Or, in other words, that GOD is *holy* and *happy*. 2. That whatever he has *done*, or *decreed to do* has been according to what HE IS, in himself, and not according to what HE IS NOT. 3. That of consequence, he has not, made or decreed to make, any creature (who is capable of holiness and happiness) for any other end but to be holy and happy. 4. That as the being and well-being of such creatures proceed from, and depend upon him, the harmony of his perfections requires that he assert his sovereign authority, by demanding their obedience; and that he return such a reward as is justly due unto such obedience: In other words: The harmony of the Divine perfections requires, That SUCH CREATURES stand in a COVENANT RELATION to their Creator; and that both the Creator and creature behave toward each other, ACCORDING TO SUCH A RELATION. 5. His love, mercy, and compassion require, that if these creatures act in a manner unfuitable to their

O

their character, (as creatures standing in a covenant-relation to their Creator; that is, if they fail in performing the duties which are the conditions of the covenant, and thereby forfeit the benefits thereof,) that means be afforded to forgive what is past, and also to bring them again into a covenant-relation, suppose it can be done consistently; that is, without a violation of truth or justice: This obligation does not flow from any *stipulated* or *covenanted* relation; that is, from any compact or agreement which subsists between the parties; but from the RELATION which subsists between A FATHER and a CHILD, between such *a being* and *his author*; or between the CREATOR and his CREATURE. 6. All the perfections of the Divine nature in harmony require, that this new-covenant be (in all respects) suitable to the state and conditions of the creatures to whom it is given: That is, that the promises be, in *quality* and *quantity*, according to the necessities of the creatures; and that the duties, terms or conditions thereof, be such as they (by the abilities they have, *as reasonable creatures*, and by *other assistances which are or shall be given them*) shall be ABLE TO PERFORM.

Now, this Sir, is the foundation of the Arminian system, as it is maintained by Mr. *Wesley*. And certain it is, that there is nothing in those "wretched minutes," as you call them, any more than in "The subsequent vindications of them," by Mr. *Fletcher*, which strike at *this*.

Let us, in the *second* place enquire, what is the foundation of the CALVINIAN hypothesis. And, to begin with the first stone of this *Babel*, it is, 1. A supposed UNLIMITED SOVEREIGNTY in GOD, which swallows up all his other attributes, just as *Pharaoh's* lean and JLL-FAVOURED kine swallowed up the rest! That is, this scheme is built on a supposed sovereignty which is NOT LIMITED either by JUSTICE or MERCY. 2. The next stone in this building is, THE DECREES. GOD being SUCH A SOVEREIGN, he is said to have decreed from all eternity, not in such manner as *justice* and *mercy* dictate,

dictate, but merely according to the dictates of *this unlimited sovereignty*, abstractedly considered. And it is on this supposition, the *Westminster Divines* tell us (in their Catechism,) the decree of GOD is, That he hath “Unchangeably fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass:” So that, according to these learned men, whatsoever comes to pass in heaven, earth and hell, whether it be wisdom or folly, sin or holiness, happiness or misery, GOD hath from eternity (yea, and for his own glory too!) unchangeably fore-ordained it. 3. The next stone inseparably connected with the two former is, UNCONDITIONAL ELECTION AND REPROBATION. That GOD, who, by his sovereignty, has decreed all things univerversally, has, in particular, decreed how to dispose of men and angels. Accordingly he has decreed to elect (unconditionally) a small number to everlasting life; and, (unconditionally) to reprobate all the rest. 4. In order to these ends, he has decreed certain means, and that these should operate so powerfully and irresistibly that no creature, or any number of creatures, shall be able to resist their motion or prevent their success.

Now this is the foundation of the Calvinian delusion; and which, I confess, is “Now”—“struck at by those wretched minutes,” as you call them, “and by the subsequent vindications of them.”

And the reasons why these minutes and their vindication, strike at this foundation, are, 1. Because it supposes the most blessed GOD to be (in an inconceivable degree) the most dreadful, and most detestable tyrant that ever existed: That is, it supposes him to be, AN INFINITE SOVEREIGN—WITHOUT JUSTICE OR MERCY! 2. Because, by supposing him to decree *all things*, it supposeth him to decree sin; and, by that means, it makes him the author of all the wickedness that ever *was* or ever *will be* committed. 3. Because it supposes GOD to DECREE and FORBID the same things. 4. Because it supposes that there is no difference (as to ability for action) between intelligent agents and stocks and stones. 5. Because it supposes

that GOD VIEWS men as involuntary agents, and yet DEALS WITH THEM as if they were absolutely free: That is, it supposes that he gives rational instructions, commands, promises, threatenings, invitations, &c. &c. unto absolute machines. 6. Because it supposes the blessed GOD to resemble (or rather to be INFINITELY WORSE than) a supposed father, who desires to have *ten children* for the following purposes, viz. That he may have the PLEASURE and HONOUR of heaping favours, absolutely undeserved, on *one* of them; and that he may have the same HONOUR and PLEASURE of tearing the other *nine* to pieces, BIT BY BIT, with RED-HOT PINCERS. I am persuaded, Sir, that if such an incarnate devil, double distilled! was found on earth, the most unnatural, savage and barbarous sinners would rise up against him; and with one united voice, CURSE HIM TO HIS OWN PLACE; while *satan* himself would be almost ready to curse him back again, as too infernal even for hell it-self! And yet all the unnatural, unheard of wickedness of this supposed monster is nothing, when compared to what your doctrine of election and reprobation attributes to the MOST HOLY, THE MOST MERCIFUL, AND THE MOST BLESSED GOD.

Page 57. You say, “ I cannot 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, without the least favour of grace, or experience upon their hearts. *The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life*”—“ 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.”

That

That the reader may see with what propriety you clamour against absurdity and contradiction, I shall present him with a few brief animadversions on this, and several other passages.

And first, you say, " I heartily concur with Mr. *Fletcher* in thinking, that there is a manifest departing in TOO MANY professors from the practical part of genuine Christianity." Too many, do you say! This is impossible on the Predestinarian supposition, viz. That " GOD hath, for his own glory, unchangeably fore-ordained WHATSOEVER COMES TO PASS:" Unless you will say, 1. That GOD, hath, for his own glory, unchangeably fore-ordained TOO MANY to do this: Or else, 2. That there are some who do it, notwithstanding this unchangeable fore-ordination or decree to the contrary.

Again, you tell Mr. *Fletcher* that you concur with him in saying, " 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, without the least favour of grace and experience on their hearts." To this I answer: If GOD, for his own glory, hath unchangeably fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass, then it follows, 1. That all who are resting their poor souls on a dry system of doctrines, &c. were (for the glory of GOD) unchangeably fore-ordained to do it. And then it follows, 2. That you are AFRAID those things are come to pass, which GOD has unchangeably fore-ordained for his own glory.

You proceed: " The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life"—" are not sufficiently watched against, but too much pleaded for by many who sit under clear gospel ordinances." If all things are decreed in the manner specified above, it follows, 1. That the lust of the flesh, &c. are watched against as much as GOD, for his own glory, decreed they should be: And then, 2. It follows, that if what you say is true, either the evils mentioned are sufficiently watched against; or else that it is not sufficient to watch against them in the manner which GOD, for his own glory, has unchangeably fore-ordained.

You add: "The duties of mortification, self-denial, deadness to the world, taking up the cross, watchfulness and prayer" are "to little attended to." I answer: All these *are* or *are not* attended to in such manner as GOD has decreed. If they are not; then he has not unchangeably fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass, as your scheme supposes. If they are, then either they are sufficiently attended to; or else, it is not sufficient to attend to them in such manner as GOD, for his own glory, has unchangeably fore-ordained.

"And yet" you say, "this manifest departure in too many professors from the practical part of Christianity"—"this resting their poor souls upon a system of dry doctrines," &c. "is not owing to the doctrines they hear; but to their own deceitful and desperately wicked hearts, which turn the most wholesome food into poison." (p. 58.) I answer: If your doctrine be true, it is not *originally* owing either to the doctrine they hear, or to their desperately wicked hearts; but to the decree, by which it was unchangeably fixt, that all these things should be just as they are, and not otherwise: This *desperately wicked heart*, and this **DESPERATELY WICKED DOCTRINE**, were equally decreed to accomplish the whole of this *desperately wicked effect*.

"And indeed," you say, "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;"—"to see the dreadful effects of *their system*." As to the tenets and lives of these gentlemen, the effects thereof, and our looking at them; (all these, according to *Calvin* and *you*) were unchangeably fore-ordained, from eternity, and that too, for the glory of GOD.

You go on: "If, therefore Mr. Fletcher had made the noble stand for holiness upon gospel principles, which he has done upon rotten and legal principles, and which can therefore never effect his design; and had he avoided all unkind censures against his brethren; instead of taking up my pen against him, I would

“ 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 whol-
 “ some words might not only be treasured in the heart,
 “ but brought forth in the life of his most affectionate
 “ friend, for Christ’s sake, R. H.”—On this I ask :
 If GOD, for his own glory, “ hath unchangeably
 “ fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass,” could Mr.
Fletcher possibly have made any other stand for holiness
 than that which he has done? If it was decreed that
 he should make this stand on rotten and legal principles,
 could he possibly make it on gospel principles, and
 not on rotten and legal ones? And if it was unchange-
 ably fore-ordained that he should labour, and not have
 his design effected, could he possibly labour so as to
 have it effected? And as to his avoiding unkind cen-
 sures against his brethren, if it was unchangeably
 fore-ordained that he should not avoid them, was there
 a possibility of his avoiding them? But you say; had
 “ he avoided them, “ 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.”
 But was it not unchangeably fore-ordained, (yea, and
 for the glory of GOD too!) that the church should be
 Laodicean in this day? And was it not, in like manner,
 decreed that Mr. *Fletcher* should not do it the eminent
 service you speak of? And that you should not thank
 him for that eminent service; but on the other hand,
 take up your pen against him; and that too, in the
 same futile manner you have done? And as to its be-
 ing your sincere prayer, that his wholesome words
 might be treasured up in your mind and brought forth
 in your life, I hope you would not thus pray, whether
 you were decreed to do it or not? And I hope you would
 not so much as desire that those words should be whol-
 some, which GOD for his own glory, hath decreed to
 be unwholesome! And as to their being treasured up
 in your heart, and brought forth in your life I hope
 you

You would not pray to have it so whether GOD had decreed it or not!—O Sir, what a miserable hotch-potch is here! What a jumble of light and darkness, of Arminianism and Calvinism, have you blended together! You adopt a scheme of doctrines which supposes that all effects and causes (from the most minute to the most material) were unchangeably decreed from eternity; and that this decree operates irresistibly in causing these causes to produce these effects. You then very gravely tell us, you fear such an effect will or will not happen; that such a cause will or will not produce it. You express great sorrow that one thing has happened one way, and that another has happened the other. You tell mankind how praiseworthy they will be, if they will but go to the right-hand; and how blame-worthy they will be, if they go to the left. And then you come with your most earnest, solemn, and pathetic warnings, against doing one thing, and against leaving the other undone; though both the one and the other are immutably fixt, by an eternal decree, to be just what they are, and no otherwise. How astonishing is it, that neither you, Sir, nor any of your party see, that such observations and reflexions have nothing to do with the calvinian hypothesis; that on this supposition they are absurd to the last degree!

A most remarkable instance of this absurdity, is the arminian Postscript with which you conclude this calvinian piece. — This Postscript consists of five warnings, cautions and advices given to those “Who have little or no concern about their souls.”—“To such,” you say, “I beg to offer a few words before we part.”

That these “WORDS” are not calvinistical, but rather, genuine Arminianism, I shall demonstrate by shewing, 1. Their absolute absurdity when taken in connexion with the fundamental principles of the former hypothesis; and, 2. Their great propriety, when connected with the fundamental principles of the latter.

And

And, 1. Let us consider these words, remarks and advices, in connexion with the fundamental principles of Calvinism: Particularly with that of the eternal, unchangeable and unconditional decree.

And, " 1st, Take care," you say, " how you draw any conclusions against religion in general, because you see disputes among the professors of it." That is, Though it was unchangeably decreed from eternity, 1. That there should be such disputes: And, 2. That you should see them, and draw the very conclusion you do; yet I earnestly advise and beseech you not to draw them!—" Rather suppose it to be more lovely and desirable on that account." That is, though it should be that most of you are unalterably decreed to suppose it *less* lovely and desirable on that account; yet I advise you ALL to suppose it to be *more* so.—" 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.*" That is, if thou art one of those reprobates, who were eternally decreed not to buy this gold; then I advise *thee*, in particular, to buy it without fail! Or if thou art one of the elect, and, as such, under an irresistible necessity of buying it; then I advise thee not to fail in doing it: And I give THEE this advice, because it is as necessary, as to advise fire to be hot, or ice to be cold! " And think no labour too great to search for the pearl of great price." That is, those of you who are *decreed to find it*, and of consequence, CAN NOT BUT FIND IT; you I advise to search in earnest for it, lest you SHOULD NOT be able to find it! And as to the reprobate, who are absolutely decreed never to find it, and consequently, cannot possibly find it, (search for it as they will;) these I advise to search for it till they find it! And though it be decreed what each of you shall think of the labour of searching for this pearl; that most of you shall think it too much, and that the rest of you shall think otherwise; yet I entreat you, one and all, not to think it too much!

" 2dly.

“ 2dly, Examine what your heart is most set upon:” That is, Though it should be eternally decreed that you shall not examine your heart; yet, notwithstanding this decree, take my advice and examine it!— “ Try whether the love of Christ, or the love of the “ world, has the chief seat in your affections.” That is, though it is decreed from eternity that most of you (the reprobates) shall not thus try yourselves; yet I advise you all to do it without fail: And let every one of you be sure to take my most necessary and consistent advice!—“ And remember” (whether you are decreed to remember it or not!) “ that *there is no serving “ God and Mammon.*”——And though it should be decreed that you shall not “ Think seriously how “ short a time you have to stay below;” yet I advise you to think seriously of this matter, notwithstanding the almighty decree to the contrary!

“ 3dly, Be careful how you silence the voice of “ conscience.” That is, though it was decreed from everlasting that most of you should not be careful in this respect; but rather that a great majority of you should silence the voice of conscience; yet I advise every one of you, *first*, not to silence the voice of conscience; and that you may not, I advise you, *secondly*, to take care!——“ 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.” That is, IF those of you put off these remonstrances, who are unchangeably decreed not to put them off; and IF you say with *Felix*, what was eternally decreed you should never say, viz. I will hear thee at a more convenient season; it is MUCH to be FEARED that such a season will never come, though it was eternally and unchangeably decreed to come! For every one MUST SEE that there is MUCH REASON TO FEAR, the failing of *such* a decree! On the other hand, IF those of you put off these remonstrances who were unchangeably fore-ordained to do it, and that too, for the glory of GOD; and if you say, with *Felix*, what GOD, for his

his own glory, unchangeably decreed you should say, viz. I will hear thee at a more convenient season; it is MUCH to be FEARED that such a season will never come: And every one sees, at first view, the amazing WISDOM and PIETY of being MUCH AFRAID, lest THAT should come to pass, which GOD has decreed for his own glory!

“ 4thly, Be careful how you harbour prejudices against pure undefiled religion, and against the professors of it.” That is, let those of you who are under an irresistible necessity of not harbouring these prejudices, be CAREFUL not to harbour them! That is to say, Let them be CAREFUL not to perform an impossibility! And as to all the rest, though it was eternally and irreversibly decreed that you should be prejudiced against religion and its professors, and not be careful to avoid it; yet I, in the most orthodox, earnest and consistent manner advise you, be so careful as to avoid it!—“ Consider that real piety continues the same, whether you approve or disapprove of it.” That is, Let those of you who are compelled by the decree to consider this, be prevailed on, by my most necessary advice, to consider this! And as to those who are irresistibly compelled, by the decree of GOD, not to consider this; let my advice prevail on them to consider it! —“ If these are not the words of truth and soberness reject them,” That is, if you are decreed to reject them, and cannot but reject them; let my most necessary and seasonable advice influence you to reject them! And as to those of you who are decreed not to reject them, be sure to reject them according to my advice! “ If they are ” the words of truth and soberness, “ does it not well behove you to pay attention to them; ” yea, though it should be absolutely decreed that you shall not do it?

“ 5thly, Would you be truly happy in life, and would you find comfort in death? then do not mistake the shadow for the substance any longer.” That is, would those of you who are elected, enjoy that which you cannot but enjoy, and would those of you

you who are reprobated enjoy what there is no possibility of your enjoying! then I advise you one and all, "Do not mistake the shadow for the substance:"— That is to say, Let those of you who cannot possibly mistake it, be very *careful* not to mistake it! and let those of you who are decreed to mistake it, be sure not to mistake it!—"It is true, the law of GOD finds "you guilty, and sin lieth at your door." That is, Though GOD hath, for his own glory, unchangeably fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass; and though your sins among other things, are come to pass of unavoidable necessity, by virtue of this decree; yet you yourselves are guilty, in having done what an Almighty decree laid you under an unavoidable necessity of doing: And on account of your having done this, sin lieth at your door; and that too, as truly, as justly, and as properly, as the sin of scorching lieth at the door of the sun! the sin of drowning at the door of the sea! and as the sin of falling at the door of a stone, when cast from a lofty tower!—"But the gospel brings you relief." That is, you, indiscriminately, *you elect*, and *you reprobates*; for what I now say, I say unto all into whose hands this farrago may "possibly" fall. And to all these I say, 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." That is, Though GOD, from all eternity decreed that Christ should die only for the elect; yet the gospel brings you relief, (*you elect*, and *you reprobate*,) by "telling you that Christ hath "put away sin," the sin of YOU ALL: A glorious and consistent truth, on the calvinian supposition! If it should be said, the meaning is, that Christ hath put away the sin of the *elect* ONLY; the gospel, by declaring this, brings *wonderful* relief to the reprobates!—"To this only Lord and Saviour then I would direct "your views;" yea, though it should be eternally decreed that your views shall not be directed that way! "To him would I send you in earnest prayer, that he "would

“ would be pleased to bestow upon you the gift of his Holy Spirit, to work in you repentance unto life, never to be repented of.” That is, though GOD has for his own glory, unchangeably fore-ordained, that most of you shall not have life, nor repentance unto life, nor the gift of the Holy Spirit to work that repentance; nor go by earnest prayer unto this only Lord and Saviour for this gift; yet, in opposition to the whole of this Almighty and unchangeable decree, to him would I send you all—by this prayer—for this assistance, repentance, and life!

And this would I do, yea, and all these instructions, cautions and advices I give you, because it was decreed from everlasting, that I should exist in time, on purpose, 1. To *persuade* those to be wise and virtuous, who cannot possibly be otherwise! and, 2. To *persuade* all the rest not to be foolish and wicked, who are under an irresistible necessity of being so! That is, It was decreed from eternity, that I should exist in time, 1. On the one hand, to persuade Light, *not* to be Darkness! a Circle *not* to be a Square! and Matter at rest, *not* to set itself in motion! And, 2. On the other hand, to persuade Darkness to *be* Light! a Square to *be* a Circle! and Matter in motion to give itself rest! Thus Sir, you see (if you are candid enough to see) that your instructions, cautions, advices, &c. are most astonishingly ridiculous, when expounded in connexion with the fundamental principles of your calvinian hypothesis.

2. Let us next consider these warnings, advices, &c. in connexion with the fundamental principles of the Arminian system, and see if we cannot find a little better sense, and more consistent meaning in them on this supposition, than we have been able to do on the former.

The sum of the Arminian principles is this, 1. GOD hath made all men to be holy and happy, in time and eternity. 2. He hath afforded sufficient means to all men, for the attainment of these ends. 3. He hath so far restored all men from the fall, that if they *choose*, they may use these means in such manner, as to attain these ends. 4. If they will employ the

the ability which GOD has given, and in a right manner, use the means which he has afforded them, they shall attain these ends ; but if they refuse to do this, they shall not attain them. 5. That they may be influenced as reasonable creatures to employ *that* power—in using *these* means—so as to attain these ends—GOD has given them rational instructions, warnings, advices, exhortations, &c. That is, he hath given them such admonitions as these contained in your Postscript.—Now these Sir, being some of the leading principles of the Arminian system, let us consider your advices, &c. in connexion with THEM.

And, “ 1st, Take care how you draw any conclusions against religion in general, because you see “ disputes among the professors of it.” That is, As these disputes are not necessitated by the great author of our holy religion ; and as you are not necessitated to draw conclusions against religion, on account of them ; it is in your power not to draw them. Be advised, therefore, to take care of your own, free, voluntary conduct ; that you may not (for want of that care) draw such conclusions.

“ 2dly, Examine what your heart is most set upon.” It is in your power to do this or not to do it. Therefore, do not reject my seasonable advice.—“ Try whether the love of Christ, or the love of the world, “ has the chief seat in your affections.” The love of Christ certainly ought to have the chief seat therein, and not the love of the world. And as GOD has not necessitated either the love of Christ or the love of the world to have the chief seat there ; but has put it into your power to set your affections on either ; or which is the same, to give the chief seat therein to which you please ; if you should give it to the world, the fault will certainly be your own. And as it is a fault of such an heinous nature, you ought to try whether it be in you or not ; that if it is, you may put it away immediately. And let none of you say, I cannot try myself unless I am one of those whom GOD has decreed *shall* do it ; and to whom he has decreed to give power

power for that end ; for this is a vain excuse. It is GOD's will that you should all try yourselves ; and he has given to all, power to do it : Therefore, let all take my advice, and do it without fail, and without delay.

“ 3dly, Be careful how you silence the voice of “ conscience.” You are under no necessity either of silencing it, or of not silencing it : You have it in your power to do either. I therefore advise you to be careful how you silence it.—“ When you are “ alone, you have often misgivings that all is not “ right between GOD and your souls ;” and this is a demonstration, that every thing which exists between GOD and your soul, was not unchangeably fore-ordained, for the glory of GOD : Had this been the case, then whatever subsists between GOD and your soul must be infallibly right. I therefore advise you all to attend to these secret admonitions. For “ If “ you put off these remonstrances,” a thing which you may or may not do, and say, “ like *Felix*,” what you may either say or not say, “ that you will “ hear them at a more convenient season, it is much “ to be feared that such a season will never come.” GOD has given to every one of you the present season that you may improve it. Therefore, do not neglect it in hopes of some future one, which shall be more effectual, by means of an irresistible decree. Should you do this, it is MUCH TO BE FEARED that you will be disappointed. I say, IT IS MUCH TO BE FEARED— For as such a disappointment is not decreed for the glory of GOD, as some VAINLY imagine, it *must* be as contrary to his will, as it is to your eternal advantage.

“ 4thly, Be careful how you harbour prejudices “ against pure and undefiled religion, and against the “ professors of it.” That is, As you are not necessitated to harbour these prejudices, you may avoid them, if you will. It depends on yourselves whether you harbour them or not. Therefore, I say, BE CAREFUL how you harbour them.—“ If these are not the

“ words of truth and soberness, reject them ; if they
 “ are, does it not well behove you to pay a tention to
 “ them ?” That is, as you are free agents, have you
 not power either to attend to them, or else to reject
 them, according as you see them to be right or
 wrong? If therefore they appear to you, not to
 be the words of truth and soberness, you have my
 leave to reject them ; but if they appear to you in a
 quite different light, does it not behove you to employ
 your free powers in attending 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.” By the
 shadow, I mean, the empty enjoyments of *sinful* or
worldly things. By the substance, I mean, the solid
 and substantial power of religion. Now, as nothing
 but this can make you happy in life and death ; and
 as you are not necessitated to mistake the shadow for
 this substance ; I seriously advise you, to exert your
 free powers, in rejecting the shadow, and in embracing
 the substance.—“ It is true, the law of GOD
 “ finds you” (every one of you) “ guilty, and sin
 “ lies at your door.” That is, the law finds you
 made guilty, not by the decree of GOD, but by your
 own wilful folly. Had his decree made you guilty,
 sin would lie at HIS door ; but as you have made
 yourselves so, I say it again “ sin lies at YOUR” OWN
 “ DOOR.—But the gospel brings you” (every one of
 you) “ relief, by telling you” (every one of you)
 “ that Christ hath redeemed us” (every one of us)
 “ from the curse of the law, being made a curse
 “ for us :” Which glorious declaration is a great re-
 lief to us ; that is, to every soul of us.—“ To this
 “ only Lord and Saviour then I would direct your
 “ views.” That is, as I believe none of your views
 are decreed to point one way, any more than another ;
 but that each of you has power to direct them which
 way you please ; I say, as I verily believe this, I
 would fain direct them to this only Lord and Saviour.
 —“ To him I would send you in earnest prayer, that
 “ he would be pleased to bestow upon you the gift of
 “ his

“ his Holy Spirit, to work in you repentance unto life, never to be repented of.” That is, As I know that each of you is capable of life, and of repentance unto life ; and as I know that GOD may be prevailed on (by earnest prayer) to bestow on you the gift of his Holy Spirit, to work this repentance unto life in you ; for these reasons I would send you all to him. And instead of dreaming that your doom is unalterably fixt ; that is, instead of dreaming, that if you are decreed to have these blessings, you SHALL and MUST have them ; and that if you are decreed not to have them, you never SHALL or CAN have them, do what you will ; I say, instead of indulging such vain unscriptural, and uncomfortable notions, I advise you to go to GOD in earnest prayer, that [thereby] you may prevail on him to bestow these favours upon you.

Thus, Sir, you see, that though your pious admonitions are absolute nonsense, when taken in connexion with the calvinian hypothesis, yet when taken in connexion with the principles of Arminianism, they are as good, strong, manly sense, as if they had been written by Mr. *Wesley* himself.—And from what has been said it follows, that, if Arminianism be an error, you yourself, Sir, (notwithstanding your violent exclamations, and hideous out-cries) are almost as deep in the mud, as Mr. *Wesley* is in the mire.

I say, almost—For it is certain you are not quite so deep. For Mr. *Wesley* adopts the whole Arminian system ; but you adopt the deformed fundamentals of Calvinism ; and then you adopt so much of the Arminian system as you judge shall be necessary to hide that deformity. Mr. *Wesley*, in this, resembles Him who went down into the valley of dry bones, and who by covering *human bones* with *human flesh* and *skin*, brought forth *human* creatures, in all their just proportions and lovely appearances. But you, on the other hand, resemble one who collects together the bones of asses, bears, serpents, and crocodiles ; and then, by covering THESE with human flesh and skin, expects to bring forth creatures MORE than human !

but which in reality, are only ill-shaped, and frightful monsters. That is, in plain words; Mr. *Wesley* lays down a skeleton of Arminian principles, which supposes that men are free agents; and then covers it with the flesh and skin of Arminian instructions, commands, invitations, warnings, threatnings, promises, &c. But you lay down (or, at least, as a Calvinist, you ought to lay down) a calvinian Skeleton, consisting of absolute sovereignty, of eternal and unchangeable decrees, of unconditional election and reprobation, of irresistible grace, on the one hand, and of irresistible sin, on the other; and this calvinian skeleton you cover with the flesh and skin of the Arminian instructions, commands, invitations, promises and threatnings before mentioned: By which means you conceal the monstrous deformity of your principles, and by so doing, deceive the hearts of the simple.

Nor are you, Sir, the only person who is thus amazingly absurd, who is thus most ridiculously inconsistent. For, I remember, that two or three years ago, I went to hear a celebrated Predestinarian (still living) preach in one of the most celebrated Predestinarian congregations in *London*. This gentleman spent about an hour in assuring us, that all who *are* saved, are saved by an eternal, unchangeable, unconditional and irresistible decree. The elect, therefore, had it rung in their ears, perhaps not less than forty times over, and, if possible, with a FORTY-FOLD emphasis! I WILL be your GOD! and ye SHALL be my people! And after he had screamed out these WILLS and SHALLS, 'till, to all appearance, he had made his throat and lungs as raw as the back and shoulders of a hackney chaise-horse! he cried out in his application, OH, that he may be the GOD OF EVERY ONE OF YOU! OH, THAT YE MAY ALL BE HIS PEOPLE! OH, PRAY, my brethren, THAT he may be YOUR GOD! OH, LABOUR! that you may be his people! OH, that not one of you may rest 'till you are of the happy number, &c. &c. &c.

To

To this MOST PIOUS, and MOST NONSENSICAL, exhortation, not only the poor, simple-hearted people, but the gentry, yea, and (if I mistake not) the nobility also, joined their hearty "AMEN!" but as for me (a poor blind arminian!) I was among those "who" (according to St. Paul,) "occupy the "room of the unlearned;" and, therefore, I knew not what to say: For I was not able to comprehend the propriety of this arminian application of the calvinian doctrines asserted just before so peremptorily and dogmatically.

Nor are you two the only persons who have adopted this proposterous method of instruction: No; it is that which now generally prevails among those whom you call the most celebrated and orthodox ministers of Christ in this land.

Whoever doubts the truth of this, (if he is capable of judging what is, and what is not, the proper application of a principle, or what is, and what is not; the proper conclusion which belongs to the premises) let him recollect what are the fundamental principles on which the Calvinian fabric is built. If he cannot recollect them of himself, let him consult the best systematical writers on this subject; such as *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Zanchy*, *Bishop Usher*, *Dr. Owen*, *Dr. Edwards*, and *Dr. Gill*: Or, if he would rather consult more public authorities, let him consider the determinations of the *Synod of Dort*, the *Assembly's Catechism*, and the *Lambeth articles*. Then (if he does not chuse to trust his memory,) let him write an abstract of these principles; and with this abstract in his hand, let him go and hear the most learned and celebrated of these orthodox gentlemen. And while he hears, let him not only attend to the several doctrines laid down; BUT BE VERY CAREFUL IN OBSERVING, WHAT SUPPOSITIONS THEY ARE GROUNDED UPON. Let him observe how these doctrines are APPLIED both unto *saints* and *sinners*; and let him be VERY EXACT in comparing (sentence by sentence) these doctrines and these applications, and in observing how they cohere and agree with each

each other. Now I am fully persuaded, that whoever makes the experiment in this manner, will find (about ninety seven times in an hundred) the connexion will be as great as that which subsists between the north and the south; the zenith and the nadir; darkness and light; sin and holiness; heaven and hell; or (which is the same) between your calvinian principles, and the postscript of your Farrago!

Now if this should be the case, but in any tolerable degree, how marvellous is it that you, Sir, or any of your party should have so much front as to write Farragos? that it should ever enter into your heads to find fault with inconsistencies, contradictions or absurdities? As to myself, I most solemnly declare, that though I have at times (for between thirty and forty years) heard predestinarian discourses, in *England and Wales, Scotland and Ireland*; and delivered not only by the unlearned, but also by many of the most learned of that persuasion; yet I do not remember to have heard so much as a single discourse which was not shamefully contradictory. That is, I do not remember ever to have heard one single Calvinian discourse without an Arminian application, and without arminian observations, &c. either in the beginning, middle, or end. And as to what I believe of this matter, I will tell you very freely, viz. That if all the inconsistencies, contradictions, incoherencies, &c. were committed to writing, with which your party has, for these last Forty years so greatly edified the world, I will not say, The whole world could not contain the books; but that a large fleet of Men of War might find some difficulty in doing it. Since then, good Sir, you are so fond of detecting absurdities, &c. &c. &c. be admonished, for the future to begin at home. First of all, Physician heal THYSELF: Then, Secondly, extend your care to your own dear brethren: Then, Thirdly, if you should (by living *far* beyond the age of *Methuselah*, and by employing *all* your powers, through *all* that mighty period!) have the good fortune to rectify one half of their absurdities, your undertaking to correct your neighbours, will then be far more excusable.

T H E

THE CONCLUSION.

As to Mr. *Wesley*, Sir, he is either a wise man or he is not—he is either an honest man, or he is not—he is a servant of GOD, or he is not—and GOD has owned his labours, or he has not. Now let us suppose the very worst we can; and let us express ourselves in as strong words as you can desire: That is, let us suppose him to be a fool; a knave; an enemy to GOD; a servant of Satan; a perverter of the gospel; and a deceiver of the people! Now, even, on this supposition I ask, Have you treated him as you ought? Does the word of GOD justify your manner of doing it? I aver, IT DOES NOT. For, 1. You have (in the most severe and cruel manner) exposed such foibles as are unavoidable in the greatest characters while they see only “as through a glass darkly.” 2. You have laid to his charge a multitude of evils he knows nothing of. 3. You have accused him of these above an hundred times over; and that too, in the most public manner. 4. In support of these accusations, you have most shamefully wrested his words; by putting a meaning on them he never intended. 5. By these means you have exposed him to the contempt and ridicule both of saints and sinners. And, 6. That nothing might be wanting to cause all men to laugh him to scorn, and have him in derision, you have shewn them the way by your own example, which you have largely given both in prose and in verse!

Now it is certain, this was not the way the holy men of old treated the most abominable liars and impostors with whom they had to do. No: *Moses* did not thus treat the magicians of *Egypt*—*Elijah* did not thus treat the priests of *Baal*—*Peter* did not thus treat *Simon Magus*—*Paul* did not thus treat *Elymas* the forcerer—Nor did Christ thus treat the devil when he was tempted of him in the wilderness—neither did *Michael* the Arch-angel thus treat that apostate spirit when they contended about the body of *Mosis*. *Michael* the Arch-

Arch-angel was so far from ACTUALLY BRINGING a LYING accusation against the devil, that he DURST not bring so much as a RAILING one against him: That is, he was *afraid* of dishonouring GOD, by going so far as to use *severe* or *reproachful* language, in telling that unhappy spirit of his *real* faults. But you, honoured Sir, devoid of THIS FEAR, have *dared*, have VENTURED, to bring MANY FALSE, as well as UNKIND accusations against Mr. *Wesley*: And in so doing, you have shewn him *less mercy*, and done him LESS JUSTICE, than that which your betters have shewn and done, even, to the devil himself!

But suppose, Sir, that after all, Mr. *Wesley* should be found to be a person of a quite different character? That is, suppose he should be found to be a person of a clear judgment and strong understanding—of various and deep learning—a nervous and consistent writer—an almost unparalleled labourer—a person who has been instrumental in setting on foot one of the greatest revivals of religion ever known in this land: One who has directly and indirectly, been instrumental in turning, perhaps, not less than half a million of souls from the evil of their way—and one who, on these accounts, is as dear to GOD as the apple of his eye? I say, suppose this should be the case (which you yourself, Sir, must allow is *more* than possible) then in the name of heaven, I ask, how will you meet him before the judgment seat of Christ, and then look him and his Lord in the face!

And should it then appear, that partly through the temptations of the devil, partly through the insinuations of designing men (who because you are a man of fortune, have laboured to prejudice you against Mr. *Wesley*, that they may secure you to themselves!) and partly through the impetuosity of your own spirit, which has hurried you forward faster, much faster, than it ought; I say should it then, in the great day of accounts appear, that by these or other means, you have quite mistaken Mr. *Wesley's* character, what will you then think of the CIRCULAR LETTER you had so great a hand in? what will you then think of your
PARISIAN

PARISIAN CONVERSATION? of your REVIEW of Mr. *Wesley's* doctrine? of your FARRAGOS, both single and double-distilled? and in particular what will you then think of your HEROIC POEM! As to this versified, doggerel contempt, do you expect it to be a reviving cordial, or the contrary, to your dying heart in the agonies of death?—and do you expect it to be your GLORY or your SHAME when called to “give an account of the things done in the body?”

O Sir, I feel the awful subject! and therefore permit me to tell you, that these DYING PANGS will soon arrest you; and that this DAY OF RECKONING will soon be here.—And when these awful moments are come, are you SURE it will not then appear, that you have mistaken Mr. *Wesley's* character, and misrepresented his conduct? Are you SURE it will not then appear, that you have represented him as exceedingly faulty, (yea and that too in an hundred instances) where there is no fault at all? and are you SURE it will not then appear, you have represented a small number of inconsiderable mistakes, as an huge multitude of enormous crimes?

When we consider, that he who touches the meanest member of GOD's family, touches the very apple of his eye, we ought to be very certain that we are not mistaken concerning them, yea, and that all our springs of action are right, before we venture to reproach even the very least of them. But we ought to be exceeding certain before we do this by any one who has the smallest appearance of being an eminent servant of his: To RAIL at RANDOM at such a character, is a dreadful argument that we know but little of its importance; and that we know less of the fear of GOD.—Are you then very certain that you have done right in reviling Mr. *Wesley*? Can you stake YOUR REPUTATION on it, that the reproaches wherewith you have reproached *him* will not fall on GOD? Can you venture YOUR LIFE on it, that you have not wounded the MASTER through his SERVANT's side? And can you STAKE YOUR SALVATION ON IT, that the Son of GOD will never say, even to YOU, “FORASMUCH

“ A

“ AS THOU HAST DONE IT UNTO THIS MY SER-
 VANT, THOU HAST DONE IT UNTO ME.

And as to the principles you have acted from, can you lift up your hand to heaven and say, Thou GOD knowest that I have not been influenced by bigotry or party-rage; by pride, envy or impatience; by an inconsiderate or an impetuous spirit? Can you say, Let GOD, angels and men bear witness if I have DESIRED to find faults in Mr. *Wesley*; if I have WISHED for an opportunity of blackening him; if I have been GLAD when such an opportunity has offered if in this respect, I have rejoiced in iniquity? Let these bear witness if I have not prayed, wept, feared, and trembled, lest I should dishonour GOD—wound his church—injure his servant—strengthen the hands of sinners—and cause the enemy to blaspheme.

Whatever the gay, volatile world may think of this antiquated mode of address, I believe that you, Sir, see its propriety; yea, and confess the importance of making the above inquiries.—I therefore, with all the deference—with all the love—with all the respect—due to every part of your exalted character, beseech you to enter into your closet, to fall down before the great Searcher of hearts, and to intreat him (“with strong cryings and tears”) to shew you wherein you have wander’d from the ways of JUSTICE—TRUTH—AND LOVE.

And if, by these means, you should find that you have acted uncautiously—precipitately—and unchristianly—seeing what is DONE cannot be UNDONE, be admonished to make the only satisfaction in your power: That is, be admonished, to rise superior to all IGNOBLE and UNMANLY pride; and, in spite of all principles of FALSE HONOUR, to confess before GOD and man, the whole of your complicated transgression.

Do, dear Sir,—Suffer yourself to be entreated by one who is so MUCH your inferior. Condescend so far, as to let his EARNEST and WELL-MEANT remonstrance be heard. O be prevailed on to do THAT NOW, which will be matter of THANKFULNESS to YOU ANOTHER DAY!

F I N I S.



Digitized by Google

RECORD OF TREATMENT, EXTRA

Shelfmark: RB 23a 9472

S&P Ref No.

Microfilm No.

Date	Particulars	
6/02	pH Before or Existing	pH
	3.99	6
	<p>Deacidification</p> <p style="text-align: center;">$MgCO_3$</p> <p>Adhesives</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Wheatstarch Animal Glue</p> <p>Lined / Laminated</p> <p>Chemicals / Solvents</p> <p>Cover Treatment</p> <p>Other Remarks</p>	

