



DELHI UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

THE GIFT OF  
THE FORD FOUNDATION

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No. 9613w L03

G1.4

~~AC. NO. 10000~~ 85836

Date of release for loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 5 Paise will be collected for each day the book is kept overtime.

4 DEC 1968



**THE LETTERS OF  
THE REV. JOHN WESLEY, A.M.**



CHARLES WISLEY

# THE LETTERS

OF THE REV.

# JOHN WESLEY, A.M.

SOMETIME FELLOW OF LINCOLN COLLEGE, OXFORD

EDITED BY

JOHN TELFORD, B.A.

VOL. IV

JANUARY 16, 1738, TO FEBRUARY 28, 1766



LONDON : THE EPWORTH PRESS

THE EPWORTH PRESS  
(Book Steward: FRANK H. CUMBERS)  
25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

*All rights reserved*  
*This edition first published July 1931*  
*Reprinted 1960*

285836

Q6:3w L03

G1'A

## CONTENTS

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| CORRESPONDENCE IN THIS VOLUME . . . . . | PAGE<br>vii |
|---|-------------|

### GROWING RESPONSIBILITIES (*continued*)

1758-1759

|  |   |
|--|---|
| LETTERS—JANUARY 16, 1758, TO NOVEMBER 24, 1759 . . . . . | 3 |
|--|---|

### TRIALS AND BLESSINGS

1760-1763

|  |    |
|--|----|
| PRINCIPAL EVENTS . . . . .                               | 81 |
| INTRODUCTORY NOTE . . . . .                              | 82 |
| LETTERS—JANUARY 24, 1760, TO DECEMBER 15, 1763 . . . . . | 83 |

### PEACEFUL AND STEADY PROGRESS

1764-1766

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| PRINCIPAL EVENTS . . . . .                               | 227 |
| INTRODUCTORY NOTE . . . . .                              | 228 |
| LETTERS—JANUARY 14, 1764, TO FEBRUARY 28, 1766 . . . . . | 229 |

### CONTROVERSIAL LETTERS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| I. TO JOHN DOWNES . . . . .                          | 325 |
| II. TO DR. WARBURTON, BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER . . . . . | 338 |





## CORRESPONDENCE IN THIS VOLUME

- Alwood, William, 54, 60  
 Bennis, Mrs., 220  
 Berridge, John, 91  
 Blackwell, Ebenezer, 20, 22, 52, 53, 58, 86, 94, 95, 159, 161, 184, 255  
 Booth, Elizabeth, 154  
 Bristol, Mayor and Corporation of, 279  
 Bristol, Societies at, 271  
 Brooke, Henry, 171  
 Brown, Abigail, 111  
 Carthy, Clayton, 65  
 Clergymen, Various, 235  
 Coates, Alexander, 157  
 Crosby, Sarah, 132, 312  
 Dale, Peggy, 304, 307, 314, 319, 321  
 Dartmouth, Earl of, 146, 258  
 Downes, John, 78, 325  
 Downing, George, 145  
 Errington, Matthew, 246  
 Erskine, Dr. John, 293  
 Foard, Ann, 213, 264, 268  
 Free, Dr. John, 15, 24  
 Freeman, Jonah, 197  
 Freeman, Mrs., 231  
 Friend, A., 208  
 Furly, Dorothy, 5, 14, 50, 55, 70, 97, 132, 188, 220, 225, 245  
 Furly, Samuel, 7, 14, 19, 24, 33, 50, 68, 79, 84, 98, 104, 118, 162, 168, 181, 185, 189, 191, 197, 204, 229, 231, 256, 266  
 Gardiner, Lady Frances, 223  
 Gentleman, A., 253  
 Gidley, George, 316  
 Glascott, Cradock, 242  
 Green, Dr. John, 144  
 Hall, Martha, 156  
 Hardy, Elizabeth, 10, 20, 167  
 Hart, Richard, 219  
 Hartley, Thomas, 233  
 Hervey, James, 46  
 Hopper, Christopher, 141, 168, 171, 183, 222, 224, 266, 314, 318  
 Horne, Dr. George, 172  
 Hosmer, John, 154  
 Huntingdon, Countess of, 57, 205, 239, 243  
 Johnson, Miss, 59  
 Jones, Mr., 71  
 Knox, James, 302  
 Leaders and Stewards, 306  
 Lee, Jenny, 182, 184, 213  
 Lewen, Margaret, 247  
*Lloyd's Evening Post*, 73, 83, 109, 112, 115, 124, 205  
*London Chronicle*, 105, 127, 135, 200, 202, 207  
*London Magazine*, 119, 133, 281  
 Lowes, Matthew, 56, 163, 164, 169, 170, 180  
 Lowther, Sir James, 62, 65  
 Maitland, Mrs., 212  
 March, Miss, 85, 90, 100, 109, 124, 157, 170, 180, 190, 208, 251, 270, 310, 313  
 Maxfield, Thomas, 191, 201  
 Maxwell, Lady, 250, 252, 260, 263, 300, 308, 316  
 Merryweather, George, 3, 83, 156, 222, 241, 321  
 Moon, Emma, 195  
 Moore, Sarah, 45, 141, 252, 278  
*Morning Chronicle*, 78  
 Miss C——, 68  
 Miss ——, 51, 59  
 Mr. ——, 48, 69, 211, 235  
 Mrs. ——, 207  
 Newall, Thomas, 241  
 Newton, John, 292, 296  
 Okeley, Francis, 33  
 Olivers, Thomas, 153  
 Orpe, William, 315, 317  
 Potter, Mr., 37  
 Preachers, Six, 290  
 Pritchard, Jonathan, 9  
 Rankin, Thomas, 170, 180, 262, 274, 275, 278, 288, 289, 291, 306, 309, 311, 315, 320  
 Rawdon, Lady, 87  
 Rawdon, Lord, 96  
 Rouquet, James, 142  
 Ryan, Mrs., 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 45, 165, 232, 239  
*St. James' Chronicle*, 270, 288, 289  
 Taylor, Dr. John, 66  
 Thomas ——, 37  
 Tompson, Richard, 72  
 Toplady, Augustus M., 47  
 Trembath, John, 102  
 Valton, John, 229  
 Venn, Henry, 214  
 Walsh, Richard, 311  
 Walton, Grace, 164  
 Warburton, Bishop, 196, 338  
 Wesley, Charles, 99, 107, 108, 161, 166, 187, 196, 198, 199, 201, 203, 230, 245, 275, 280, 287, 322  
 Wesley, Mrs. John, 36, 49, 61, 74, 79, 89, 101, 152  
*Westminster Journal*, 128  
 Woodhouse, Mrs., 240  
 Wright, Duncan, 218  
 Wyndowe, Mrs., 319



**GROWING RESPONSIBILITIES**

*(Continued)*

**JANUARY 16, 1758, TO NOVEMBER 24, 1759**



# JOHN WESLEY'S LETTERS

## GROWING RESPONSIBILITIES

(Continued)

JANUARY 16, 1758, TO NOVEMBER 24, 1759

*To George Merryweather*

Wesley first preached at Yarm in 1748. George Merryweather, a leading merchant of the town, was his host. The preaching-place was for some time above his stables. In 1763 a new house was opened by Peter Jaco, Wesley's opinion of which may be found in the *Journal* for April 29, 1766. See *Journal*, iii. 367, iv. 329; Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 408.

Mrs. Mary Robinson used to tell how, at Wesley's wish, she was placed on a form to help him on with his cassock. He said she would remember it in later years. When she had done, he put his hand on her head and gave her his benediction: 'God bless the little maid.' See *Methodist Recorder*, November 21, 1901.

LONDON, January 16, 1758.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—If the work of God does so increase at Yarm, we must not let the opportunity slip. Therefore let the travelling preacher be there either every Sunday evening, or at least every other Sunday.

No person must be allowed to preach or exhort among our people whose life is not holy and unblameable, nor any who asserts anything contrary to the gospel which we have received. And if he does not own his fault and amend it, he cannot be a leader any longer.

Peace be with you all.—I am Your affectionate brother.

*To Mrs. Ryan*

LONDON, January 20, 1758.

MY DEAR SISTER,—How did you feel yourself under your late trial? Did you find no stirring of resentment, no

remains of your own will, no desire or wish that things should be otherwise?<sup>1</sup> In one sense you do desire it, because you desire that God should be glorified in all things. But did not the falling short of that desire lessen your happiness? Had you still the same degree of communion with God, the same joy in the Holy Ghost? I never saw you so much moved as you appeared to be that evening. Your soul was then greatly troubled, and a variety of conflicting passions—love, sorrow, desire, with a kind of despair—were easy to be read in your countenance. And was not your heart unhinged at all? Was it not ruffled or discomposed? Was your soul all the time calmly stayed on God, waiting upon Him without distraction? Perhaps one end of this close trial was to give you a deeper knowledge of yourself and of God, of His power to save, and of the salvation He hath wrought in you.

Most of the trials you have lately met with have been of another kind; but it is expedient for you to go through both evil and good report. The conversing with you, either by speaking or writing, is an unspeakable blessing to me. I cannot think of you without thinking of God. Others often lead me to Him; but it is, as it were, going round about: you bring me straight into His presence.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, whoever warns me against trusting you, I cannot refrain, as I am clearly convinced He calls me to it.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

To Mrs. Ryan

LONDON, January 27, 1758.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Last Friday,<sup>3</sup> after many severe words, my wife left me, vowing she would see me no more. As I had wrote to you the same morning, I began to reason with myself, till I almost doubted whether I had done well in writing or whether I ought to write to you at all. After prayer that doubt was taken away. Yet I was almost sorry

<sup>1</sup> He had been at Kingswood School on Jan 4

<sup>2</sup> Miss Bosanquet had the same feeling: 'The more I conversed with Mrs Ryan, the more I discovered of the glory of God breaking forth from

within, and felt a strong attraction to consider her the friend of my soul.' See Moore's *Mrs. Fletcher*, p. 29

<sup>3</sup> Jan. 20, the day the previous letter was written. See letter of Dec. 23.

that I had written that morning. In the evening, while I was preaching at the chapel, she came into the chamber<sup>1</sup> where I had left my clothes, searched my pockets, and found the letter there which I had finished but had not sealed. While she read it, God broke her heart; and I afterwards found her in such a temper as I have not seen her in for several years. She has continued in the same ever since. So I think God has given a sufficient answer with regard to our writing to each other.

I still feel some fear concerning you. How have you found yourself since we parted? Have you suffered no loss by anything? Has nothing damped the vigour of your spirit? Is honour a blessing, and dishonour too? the frowns and smiles of men? Are you one and the same in ease or pain, always attentive to the voice of God? What kind of humility do you feel? What have you to humble you, if you have no sin? Are you wise in the manner of spending your time? Do you employ it all, not only well, but as well as it is possible? What time have you for reading? I want you to live like an angel here below, or rather like the Son of God. Woman, walk thou as Christ walked; then you cannot but love and pray for Your affectionate brother.

### *To Dorothy Furlly*

LEWISHAM, February 9, 1758.

Undoubtedly you may arise now and receive power from on high. You are hindered chiefly by not understanding the freeness of the gift of God. You are perpetually seeking for something in yourself to move Him to love and bless you. But it is not to be found there; it is in Himself and in the Son of His love. He did then give you a proof of this in that fresh evidence of pardon; and He is ready to give it you again to-day, for He is not weary of well doing. But even after this you may or you may not use the power which attends that peace. And if you ask for more power, it shall be given you; for you have an Advocate with the

---

<sup>1</sup> Of the chapel house at West Street, Seven Dials. See letter of July 12.



Father. O cast yourself upon Him; learn more of that lesson,—

Thy salvation to obtain  
Out of myself I go;  
Freely Thou must heal my pain,  
Thy unbought mercy show.<sup>1</sup>

How much of it may you find in this hour! Look up and see redemption near!—I am

Your affectionate brother and servant.

*To Mrs. Ryan*

LONDON, *February 10, 1758.*

MY DEAR SISTER,—Your last letter was seasonable indeed. I was growing faint in my mind. The being continually watched over for evil; the having every word I spoke, every action I did (small and great) watched over with no friendly eye; the hearing a thousand little, tart, unkind reflections in return for the kindest words I could devise,—

Like drops of eating water on the marble,  
At length have worn my sinking spirits down.

Yet I could not say, 'Take Thy plague away from me,' but only, 'Let me be purified, not consumed.'<sup>2</sup>

What kind of humility do you feel? Is it a sense of sinfulness? Is it not a sense of helplessness, of dependence, of emptiness, and, as it were, nothingness? How do you look back on your past sins, either of heart or life? What tempers or passions do you feel while you are employed in these reflections? Do you feel nothing like pride while you are comparing your present with your past state, or while persons are showing their approbation of or esteem for you? How is it that you are so frequently charged with pride? Are you careful to abstain from the appearance of it? O how important are all your steps! The Lord God guide and support you every moment!—I am

Your affectionate friend.

<sup>1</sup> From *Hymns and Sacred Poems*, 1742, Part I. See *Poetical Works of J. and C. Wesley*, ii. 76. The

hymn is headed *Salvation by Grace.*

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Jan. 27.

## To Mrs. Ryan

MALDON, February 20, 1758.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Is your eye altogether single? Is your heart entirely pure? I know you gave up the whole to God once; but do you stand to the gift? Once your will was swallowed up in God's. But is it now, and will it be so always? The whole Spirit and power of God be upon you; stablish, strengthen, settle you; and preserve your spirit, soul, and body, spotless and unblameable unto the coming of Jesus Christ!—I am  
 Yours, &c.

## To Samuel Furly

SUNDON, March 7, 1758.

DEAR SAMMY,—You have done well in writing to me the first week of this month. I should be glad if you would continue that regularly. And you have done exceeding well in giving me the full, particular account of that (shall I say unlucky?) accident. For really *non satis mihi constiterat cum aliquane animi mei molestia an potirer libenter accepi*.<sup>1</sup> I am grieved, I am troubled for the consequences that may ensue. But I am pleased, I rejoice that the Lord has carried on such a work of conviction in that poor Pharisee. Yea, I cannot but be exceeding glad *me non laborem inanem cepisse*.<sup>2</sup> Neither am I sorry but rather well satisfied that you lent her<sup>3</sup> that little 'awakening tract.' Upon the first hearing of this, indeed, my spirit was troubled; confusion of mind seized me, struck partly with fear, partly with sorrow, and partly with astonishment. But what need we fear? or wherefore are we cast down? The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. And cannot He make all things turn to His glory? How long shall the boasting enemy triumph? Not longer (at least) than the breath is in his nostrils; and then shall all his vain thoughts perish. But they have not yet won the day. Who knoweth but the Lord may give peace and love and power and the spirit of a sound mind to her who for a season is sorely vexed with the cruel overwhelming power of

<sup>1</sup> Cicero to Caius Memmius, *Epistolae ad diversos*, XIII. 1. 'It is not clear whether I should receive it with a certain feeling of

distress or accept it cheerfully'  
<sup>2</sup> 'That I have not begun a useless task.'

<sup>3</sup> See letter of Nov. 20, 1756.

Satan? At a moment when the ungodly think not of it, the Lord may arise and maintain His own cause and put to silence the vauntings of the proud. So that all that are around may see it and fear, and acknowledge, 'This is the Lord's doing.' What He does now we know not yet. It is our part to wait patiently to see what He will do. *Quietus esto.* Be calm in the midst of this storm. I pity you, indeed, who are in the very midst of it. For my own part I leave the matter without concern in His hands who will not, cannot do wrong; but not without taking much shame unto myself. I did not order my conversation aright all the time I was in the place; I was afraid of giving offence: therefore I assumed too much the appearance of one of them. I did not dare to be altogether singular, to be constantly, steadily serious before them. Now by this circumstance the Lord has rebuked me and taught me wisdom. Here He has permitted no small offence to arise from a quarter I could neither foresee nor prevent. Where now is all my worldly prudence? What is become of my fearful caution? The Lord hath blasted it. Not, indeed, with the breath of His mouth, but with the rushing torrent of His sudden providence. Mark this, and settle it in thine heart: that the Lord will be feared, honoured, and obeyed even in the midst of lions; or will make us feel the weight of His uplifted hand. I feel this moment my just punishment for my base cowardice. This sin sets heavier upon my conscience at this time than almost all my crimes and all the transgressions of my youth. And one sin lying upon the conscience is a load of misery.

There is not now time to give you any particular relation of myself, that affair having spun out my letter too long. In study at present I make but a slow progress. I am not at all content with myself in this point. I have just entered upon Lord Clarendon's *History*, which is such an account of the ways, vices, and passions of men as one who did not know the corruption of human nature could scarce be induced to believe of his fellow creatures. I shall conclude this letter with affirming that I would to God such a deep work of conviction was wrought in your heart and mine as God has begun in that poor distressed woman. I wish we also felt the arrows

of the Lord fastened in our conscience even as she has done. O when shall we with that piercing sense repent of all our sins and all our backslidings? Is not the time now come? We are spared to-day. God knoweth whether we shall be to-morrow. But this we know, that whatever knowledge, whatever gifts we have, purity of heart alone will be of true worth in the end. To the earnest pursuit of which I commend your being.

Yours, &c.

(1) It is the love of God. It hath in it heights, depths, strength stronger than death.

(2) Of God in Christ. Sweetness of it. Better than all. Subject to no change.

*To Jonathan Pritchard*

LIVERPOOL, *March 25, 1758.*

DEAR JONATHAN,—I am persuaded what you say is true. John Nelson may be useful at Chester, and at other places in this circuit.<sup>1</sup> So I have appointed him to come without delay. If there be a supply for other places, he may spend a week with you; but no place must be neglected. O Jonathan, make the best of life! With love to your wife and all the brethren, I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Mrs. Ryan*

DUBLIN, *April 4, 1758.*

MY DEAR SISTER,—Oh that I could be of some use to you! I long to help you forward in your way. I want to have your understanding a mere lamp of light, always shining with light from above! I want you to be full of divine knowledge and wisdom, as Jordan in the time of harvest. I want your words to be full of grace, poured out as precious ointment. I want your every work to bear the stamp of God, to be a sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savour; without any part weak, earthly, or human; all holy, all divine. The great God, your Father and your Love, bring you to this selfsame thing! Begin, soldier of Christ, child of God! Walk worthy of the vocation wherewith thou art called! Remember the faith! Remember the Captain of thy salvation! Fight! conquer! Die,—and live for ever!—I am

Yours, &c.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Jan. 16, 1753.

*To Elizabeth Hardy*

This letter and those of May 1758 (undated) and December 26, 1761, are probably all addressed to Elizabeth Hardy, of Bristol. They show Wesley's anxiety to help his correspondent to clearer views on the much-discussed subject of Perfection.

DUBLIN, *April 5, 1758.*

It is with great reluctance that I at length begin to write<sup>1</sup>: first, because I abhor disputing, and never enter upon it but when I am, as it were, dragged into it by the hair of the head; and, next, because I have so little hope that any good will arise from the present dispute. I fear your passions are too deeply interested in the question to admit the force of the strongest reason. So that, were it not for the tender regard I have for you, which makes your desire a motive I cannot resist, I should not spend half an hour in so thankless a labour, and one wherein I have so little prospect of success.

'The doctrine of Perfection,' you say, 'has perplexed me much since some of our preachers have placed it in so dreadful a light: one of them affirming, A believer till perfect is under the curse of God and in a state of damnation; another. If you die before you have attained it, you will surely perish.'

By 'perfection' I mean 'perfect love,' or the loving God with all our heart, so as to rejoice evermore, to pray without ceasing, and in everything to give thanks. I am convinced every believer may attain this: yet I do not say he is in a state of damnation or under the curse of God till he does attain. No, he is in a state of grace and in favour with God as long as he believes. Neither would I say, 'If you die without it, you will perish'; but rather, Till you are saved from unholy tempers, you are not ripe for glory. There will, therefore, more promises be fulfilled in your soul before God takes you to Himself.

'But none can attain perfection unless they first believe it attainable.' Neither do I affirm this. I know a Calvinist in London who never believed it attainable till the moment she did attain it, and then lay declaring it aloud for many days till her spirit returned to God.

See letter to her in May.

'But you yourself believed twenty years ago that we should not put off the infection of nature but with our bodies.' I did so. But I believe otherwise now, for many reasons, some of which you afterwards mention. How far Mr. Rouquet<sup>1</sup> or Mr. Walsh<sup>2</sup> may have mistaken these I know not: I can only answer for myself.

'The nature and fitness of things' is so ambiguous an expression that I never make use of it. Yet if you ask me, 'Is it fit or necessary in the nature of things that a soul should be saved from all sin before it enters into glory?' I answer, It is. And so it is written, 'No unclean thing shall enter into it.' Therefore, whatever degrees of holiness they did or did not attain in the preceding parts of life, neither Jews nor heathens any more than Christians ever did or ever will enter into the New Jerusalem unless they are cleansed from all sin before they enter into eternity.

I do by no means exclude the Old Testament from bearing witness to any truths of God. Nothing less. But I say the experience of the Jews is not the standard of Christian experience; and that therefore, were it true 'The Jews did not love God with all their heart and soul,' it would not follow 'Therefore no Christian can,' because he may attain what they did not.

'But,' you say, 'either their words do not contain a promise of such perfection, or God did not fulfil this promise to them to whom He made it.' I answer, He surely will fulfil it to them to whom He made it—namely, to the Jews after their dispersion into all lands: and to these is the promise made; as will be clear to any who impartially considers the 30th chapter of Deuteronomy, wherein it stands.

I doubt whether this perfection can be proved by Luke

<sup>1</sup> James Rouquet said of perfection in a letter of 1763, 'To me it is the one thing needful' (*Armsian Mag* 1782, p 105) See letter of March 30, 1761

<sup>2</sup> Through illness Thomas Walsh was detained in Bristol from the latter part of February till April 13, 1758. He then went to Ireland,

where he died of consumption on April 8, 1759, at the age of twenty-eight Just before his last illness he said in his sermon on 1 John iv 18: 'My mind was more clearly enlightened than ever to see that "perfect love" is Christian perfection.' See letters of Jan 8, 1757, and July 28, 1775 (to John King).

vi. 40. From 1 John iii. 9 (which belongs to all the children of God) I never attempted to prove it; but I still think it is clearly described in those words, 'As He is, so are we in this world.' And yet it doth not now appear 'what we shall be' when this vile body is 'fashioned like unto His glorious body,' when we shall see Him, not in a glass, but face to face, and be transformed into His likeness.

Those expressions (John xiii. 10), 'Ye are clean, clean every whit,' are allowed to refer to justification only. But that expression, 'If we walk in the light as He is in the light,' cannot refer to justification only. It does not relate to justification at all, whatever the other clause may do. Therefore those texts are by no means parallel; neither can the latter be limited by the former, although it is sure the privileges described in both belong to every adult believer.

But not only abundance of particular texts, but the whole tenor of Scripture declares, Christ came to 'destroy the works of the devil, to save us from our sins'—all the works of the devil, all our sins, without any exception or limitation. Indeed, should we say we have no sin to be saved or cleansed from, we should make Him come in vain. But it is at least as much for His glory to cleanse us from them all before our death as after it.

'But St. James says, "In many things we offend all"; and whatever "we" might mean, if alone, the expression "we all" was never before understood to exclude the person speaking.' Indeed it was. It is unquestionably to be understood so as to exclude Isaiah, the person speaking, 'We are all as an unclean thing; we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away' (lxiv. 6). For this was not the case with Isaiah himself. Of himself he says, 'My soul shall be joyful in my God; for He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness' (lxi. 10). Here the Prophet, like the Apostle, uses the word 'we' instead of 'you,' to soften the harshness of an displeasing truth.

In this chapter the Apostle is not cautioning them against censuring others, but entering upon a new argument; wherein the second verse has an immediate reference to

the first, but none at all to the thirteenth of the preceding chapter.

I added, “ We offend all ” cannot be spoken of all Christians ; for immediately there follows the mention of one who offends not, as the “ we ” before-mentioned did.’ You answer, ‘ His not offending in word will not prove that he does not offend “ in many things.” ’ I think St. James himself proves it in saying, ‘ He is able to bridle also the whole body ’ ; to direct all his actions as well as words according to the holy, perfect will of God ; which those, and those only, are able to do who love God with all their hearts. And yet these very persons can sincerely say, ‘ Forgive us our trespasses.’ For as long as they are in the body, they are liable to mistake and to speak or act according to that mistaken judgement. Therefore they cannot abide the rigour of justice, but still need mercy and forgiveness.

Were you to ask, ‘ What if I should die this moment ? ’ I should answer, I believe you would be saved, because I am persuaded none that has faith can die before he is made ripe for glory. This is the doctrine which I continually teach, which has nothing to do with justification by works. Nor can it discourage any who have faith, neither weaken their peace, nor damp their joy in the Lord. True believers are not distressed hereby, either in life or in death ; unless in some rare instance, wherein the temptation of the devil is joined with a melancholy temper.

Upon the whole, I observe your great argument turns all along on a mistake of the doctrine. Whatever warm expressions may drop from young men, we do not teach that any believer is under condemnation. So that all the inferences drawn from this supposition fall to the ground at once.

Your other letter I hope to consider hereafter ; though I have great reason to apprehend your prejudice will still be too strong for my arguments. However, whether you expect it or not, I must wish for your perfection. You of all people have most need of perfect love, because this alone casts out fear.—I am, with great sincerity,

Your affectionate brother and servant.



*To Samuel Furly*

DUBLIN, April 8, 1758.

DEAR SAMMY,—Very probably I may procure your admission into Orders with a title or without.<sup>1</sup>

It is not strange that any one<sup>2</sup> should stifle the first convictions; neither ought that to discourage you at all. Speak again. Be instant *εὐκαιρῶς ἀκαιρῶς*,<sup>3</sup> and by-and-by you will see the effect.

Ten, perhaps twenty people, being dissatisfied they know not why, cry out, 'Everybody is dissatisfied.' Far from it. There wanted a little evil report to balance the good report.

O Sammy, be all in earnest! Press through things temporal! Expect not happiness from any creature! Here we are, whether for life or for death we know not. But God knows, and that is enough!—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Dorothy Furly*

DUBLIN, April 13, 1758.

But if you find such a surprising alteration at Bonner's Hall,<sup>4</sup> what need have you of removing to Bristol? Perhaps a lodging there might answer the purpose of health full as well as one at Clifton, and the purpose of religion considerably better. There are few in that neighbourhood from whom I should hope you would receive much profit, except Sarah Ryan. If she abides in her integrity, she is a jewel indeed; one whose equal I have not yet found in England.

You ought not to drink much tea, and none without pretty much cream (not milk) and sugar. But I believe, were you to drink nettle-tea for a few mornings, it would do you more good than any other. It seems best for you to have frequent returns of weakness: it may be needful to fix seriousness upon your spirit by a lasting impression that there is but

<sup>1</sup> See letters of Sept. 25, 1757, and May 3, 1758.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of March 7.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 2: 'in season, out of season.'

<sup>4</sup> She was apparently at Bonner's Hall, near Hackney, formerly a seat of the Bishop of London. Wesley retired there in Oct. 1754. See *Journal*, iv. 101, 127.

one step between you and eternity But sickness alone will not do this—no, nor even the near approach of death Unless the Spirit of God sanctify both, a man may laugh and trifle with his last breath

You will overcome trifling conversation and the fear of man, not by yielding, but by fighting This is a cross which you cannot be excused from taking up bear it, and it will bear you. By prayer you will receive power so to do, to be a good soldier of Jesus Christ But it is more difficult to resist hurtful desire, I am most afraid you should give way to this. Herein you have need of all the power of God. O stand fast ! Look up and receive strength ! I shall be glad to hear that you are more than conqueror, and that you daily grow in the vital knowledge of Christ Peace be with your spirit—I am  
Your affectionate servant.

#### To Dr. Free

John Free, Vicar of East Coker Somerset had written against the Methodists, and had challenged Wesley to reply ' I wrote,' he says in *Journal*, iv 262-3, ' a short answer to Dr Free's weak, bitter, scurrilous invective against the people called Methodists But I doubt whether I shall meddle with him any more he is too dirty a writer for me to touch ' Unfortunately the Vicar compelled another answer on August 24 For Free's tract, *A Display of the Bad Principles of the Methodists*, see Green's *Anti-Methodist Publications*, No 273.

TULLAMORE, May 2, 1758.

REVEREND SIR,—I. A little tract appearing under your name was yesterday put into my hands You therein call upon me to speak, if I have any exceptions to make to what is advanced, and promise to reply as fairly and candidly as I can expect, ' provided those exceptions be drawn up, as you have set the example, in a short compass, and in the manner wherein all wise and good people would choose to manage a religious dispute ' (page 22).

2. ' In a short compass,' sir, they will certainly be drawn up, for my own sake as well as yours; for I know the value of time, and would gladly employ it all in what more immediately relates to eternity But I do not promise to draw them up in that manner whereof you have set the example I cannot, I dare not, for I fear God, and do really believe

there is a judgement to come. Therefore I dare not 'return evil for evil,' neither 'railing for railing.' Nor can I allow that your manner of treating this subject is that 'wherein all wise and good people would choose to manage a religious dispute.' Far, very far from it. I shall rejoice if a little more fairness and candour should appear in your future writings. But I cannot expect it; for the *nigrae succus lobiginis*,<sup>1</sup> 'wormwood and gall,' seem to have infected your very vitals.

3. The quotation from Bishop Gibson (which takes up five out of nineteen pages) I have answered already,<sup>2</sup> and in a manner wherewith I have good reason to believe his lordship was entirely satisfied. With his lordship, therefore, I have no present concern; my business now is with you only: and seeing you are 'now ready,' as you express it, 'to run a tilt,' I must make what defence I can. Only you must excuse me from meeting you on the same ground or fighting you with the same weapons: my weapons are only truth and love. May the God of truth and love strengthen my weakness!

4. I waive what relates to Mr. Vowler's<sup>3</sup> personal character, which is too well known to need my defence of it; as likewise the occurrence (real or imaginary, I cannot tell) which gave birth to your performance. All that I concern myself with is your five vehement assertions with regard to the people called Methodists. These I shall consider in their order and prove to be totally false and groundless.

5. The first is this: 'Their whole ministry is an open and avowed opposition to one of the fundamental Articles of our religion' (page 4). How so? Why, 'the Twentieth Article declares we may not so expound one scripture that it be repugnant to another. And yet it is notorious that the Methodists do ever explain the word "faith" as it stands in some of St. Paul's writings so as to make his doctrine a direct and flat contradiction to that of St. James.' (Page 5.)

This stale objection has been answered an hundred times, so that I really thought we should have heard no more of it. But since it is required, I repeat the answer once more: by

<sup>1</sup> Horace's *Satires*, I. iv. 100: 'The dark secretion of the cuttlefish.'

<sup>2</sup> See letter of June 11, 1747.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of Sept. 19, 1757.

faith we mean 'the evidence of things not seen'; by justifying faith, a divine evidence or conviction that 'Christ loved me and gave Himself for me.' St. Paul affirms that a man is justified by this faith; which St. James never denies, but only asserts that a man cannot be justified by a dead faith: and this St. Paul never affirms.

'But St. James declares, "Faith without works is dead." Therefore it is clearly St. James's meaning that a faith which is without virtue and morality cannot produce salvation. Yet the Methodists so explain St. Paul as to affirm that faith without virtue or morality will produce salvation.' (Page 6.) Where? In which of their writings? This needs some proof: I absolutely deny the fact. So that all which follows is mere flourish and falls to the ground at once, and all that you aver of their 'open and scandalous opposition to the Twentieth Article' (*ibid.*) is no better than open and scandalous slander.

6. Your second assertion is this: 'The Methodist, for the perdition of the souls of his followers, openly gives our Saviour the lie, loads the Scripture with falsehood and contradiction' (and pray what could a Mahometan or infidel or the devil himself do more?), 'yea, openly blasphemes the name of Christ, by saying that the works of men are of no consideration at all, that God makes no distinction between virtue and vice, that He does not hate vice or love virtue. What blasphemy, then, and impiety are those wretches guilty of who in their diabolical frenzy dare to contradict our Saviour's authority, and that in such an essential article of religion!' (Pages 7-9.) Here also the Methodists plead, Not guilty, and require you to produce your evidence, to show in which of their writings they affirm that God 'will not reward every man according to his works, that He makes no distinction between virtue and vice, that He does not hate vice or love virtue.' These are positions which they never remember to have advanced. If you can, refresh their memory.

7. You assert, thirdly, the Methodists by these positions 'destroy the essential attributes of God and ruin His character as Judge of the world.' Very true—if they held these positions. But here lies the mistake. They hold no such

positions. They never did. They detest and abhor them. In arguing, therefore, on this supposition, you are again 'beating the air.'

8. You assert, fourthly, the Methodists 'teach and propagate downright Atheism—a capital crime; and Atheists in some countries have been put to death. Hereby they make room for all manner of vice and villany, by which means the bands of society are dissolved. And therefore this attempt must be considered as a sort of treason by magistrates.' (Pages 10–11.)

Again we deny the whole charge, and call for proof; and, blessed be God, so do the magistrates in Great Britain. Bold, vehement asseverations will not pass upon them for legal evidence; nor, indeed, on any reasonable men. They can distinguish between arguing and calling names: the former becomes a gentleman and a Christian; but what is he who can be guilty of the latter?

9. You assert, lastly, that any who choose a Methodist clergyman for their lecturer 'put into that office, which should be held by a minister of the Church of England, an enemy, who undermines not only the legal establishment of that Church, but also the foundation of all religion' (page 13).

Once more we must call upon you for the proof—the proof of these two particulars: first, that I, John Wesley, am 'an enemy to the Church, and that I undermine not only the legal establishment of the Church of England, but also the very foundation of all religion'; secondly, that 'Mr. Vowler is an enemy to the Church, and is undermining all religion as well as the Establishment.'

10. Another word, and I have done: are there 'certain qualifications required of all lecturers before they are by law permitted to speak to the people'? (Page 14.) And is a subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles of religion one of these qualifications? And is a person who does not 'conform to such subscription' disqualified to be a lecturer? or who 'has ever held or published anything contrary to what the Church of England maintains'? Then certainly you, Dr. John Free, are not 'permitted by law to speak to the people';

neither are you 'qualified to be a lecturer' in any church in London or England as by law established. For you flatly deny and openly oppose more than one or two of those Articles. You do not in any wise conform to the subscription you made before you was ordained either priest or deacon. You both hold and publish (if you are the author and publisher of the tract before me) what is grossly, palpably 'contrary to what the Church of England maintains' in her Homilies as well as Articles; those Homilies to which you have also subscribed in subscribing the Thirty-sixth Article. You have subscribed them, sir; but did you ever read them? Did you ever read so much as the first three Homilies? I beg of you, sir, to read these at least, before you write again about the doctrine of the Church of England. And would it not be prudent to read a few of the writings of the Methodists before you undertake a farther confutation of them? At present you know not the men or their communication. You are as wholly unacquainted both with them and their doctrines as if you had lived all your days in the islands of Japan or the deserts of Arabia. You have given a furious assault to you know not whom; and you have done it you know not why. You have not hurt me thereby; but you have hurt yourself—perhaps in your character, certainly in your conscience: for this is not doing to others 'as you would they should do unto you.' When you grow cool, I trust you will see this clearly; and will no more accuse, in a manner so remote from fairness and candour, reverend sir, Your servant for Christ's sake.

To Samuel Furly

TULLAMORE, May 3, 1758.

DEAR SAMMY,—Two conversations I have had with the Bishop of Londonderry,<sup>1</sup> and *processimus pulchre*.<sup>2</sup> I intend to write to him in a few days, and then I shall be able to form a better judgement. He loves the Methodists from his heart, but he is not free from the fear of man. Yet I have much hope that love will conquer fear. Will it not conquer

<sup>1</sup> William Barnard (1697–1768), of April 8 and July 28. Bishop of Derry 1747. See letters

<sup>2</sup> 'We made good progress.'

all sin? Why do you not go every afternoon to visit the sick? Can you find a more profitable employment?—I am  
Your affectionate brother.

To Rev. Mr. Furly,  
At Mr. Greenwood's.

*To Elizabeth Hardy*

[May 1758.]

Without doubt it seems to you that yours is a peculiar case.<sup>1</sup> You think there is none like you in the world. Indeed there are. It may be ten thousand persons are now in the same state of mind as you. I myself was so a few years ago. I felt the wrath of God abiding on me. I was afraid every hour of dropping into hell. I knew myself to be the chief of sinners. Though I had been very innocent in the account of others, I saw my heart to be all sin and corruption. I was without the knowledge and the love of God, and therefore an abomination in His sight.

But I had an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous. And so have you. He died for your sins; and He is now pleading for you at the right hand of God. O look unto Him and be saved! He loves you freely, without any merit of yours. He has atoned for all your sins.

See all your sins on Jesus laid!

His blood has paid for all. Fear nothing; only believe. His mercy embraces you; it holds you in on every side. Surely you shall not depart hence till your eyes have seen His salvation.—I am, madam,  
Your affectionate brother.

*To Ebenezer Blackwell*

The first half of this letter is not in the *Works*. Mrs. Wesley, after many severe words, had left her husband in January, vowing she would never see him again. In a letter of the 27th of that month, however, Wesley shows how she was brought to a better mind; but, as seen here, she soon returned to her old ways, and managed to win his household over to her side. See Telford's *Wesley*, p. 256; and letters of January 20 and 27.

<sup>1</sup> See letters of April 5, 1758, and Dec. 26, 1761, to her.

CASTLEBAR, June 5, 1758.

DEAR SIR,—I suppose my wife is now in London, as the letters I received thence in the last frank were open; for she still insists on her right of reading all the letters which are sent to me. And I have no friend or servant where she is who has honesty and courage to prevent it. I find since I left England all my domestics have changed their sentiments, and are convinced she is a poor, quiet creature that is barbarously used. I should not at all wonder if my brother and you were brought over to the same opinion.<sup>1</sup>

Since I came into this kingdom I have wrote several times; but I have not received one line in answer. So I sit still. I have learned by the grace of God in every state to be content. I have in this respect done what *I ought* and what *I could*. Now let God do what seemeth Him good. What a peace do we find in all circumstances when we can say, 'Not as I will, but as Thou wilt'!

I have now gone through the greatest part of this kingdom—Leinster, Ulster, and the greater half of Connaught. Time only is wanting. If my brother could take care of England and give me but one year for Ireland, I think every corner of this nation would receive the truth as it is in Jesus. They want only to hear it; and they will hear me, high and low, rich and poor. What a mystery of Providence is this! In England they may hear, but will not. In Ireland they fain would hear, but cannot. So in both thousands perish for lack of knowledge. So much the more blessed are your ears, for they hear; if you not only hear the word of God, but keep it.

I hope you find public affairs changing for the better. In this corner of the world we know little about them; only we are told that the great little king in Moravia is not swallowed up yet.<sup>2</sup>

Will near the middle of next month I expect to be at Mr.

<sup>1</sup> See next letter.

<sup>2</sup> Frederick the Great began the campaign of 1758 by invading Moravia and attempting to take

Olmütz. It was defended by Marshal Daun, who cut off the supplies of the Prussian Army.



Beauchamp's in Limerick.<sup>1</sup> I hope you have a fruitful season in every respect. My best wishes attend you all—I am, dear sir, Your affectionate servant.

*To Ebenezer Blackwell*

Only the last paragraph of this letter, beginning 'In a week or two,' is given in the *Works*. The letter of June 5 shows how Mrs Wesley misinterpreted things and prejudiced servants. Even a friend like Blackwell was influenced by her, as Wesley anticipated.

BANDON, July 12, 1758.

Really, sir, you had made me almost angry at an innocent person—I mean, innocent of the fault supposed. I wrote to Mr. Downing<sup>2</sup> nearly at the time I wrote to you; and seeing no name, I read part of your letter as from him, and thought my wife did very wrong to trouble him 'with matters of this kind, which might do him more harm than good.' Time and patience will remove many other troubles, and show them to have no more foundation than this.

While you have so eloquent a *person*<sup>3</sup> at your elbow, and I am two or three hundred miles off, I have little to say: it may be time enough when I return to London. At present I would only make two or three cursory remarks.

(1) That letter was not *left on a chair*, but *taken out of my pocket*.<sup>4</sup>

(2) It was not *letters*, but a *letter* of mine (and one which did not signify a straw) which Sarah Crosby some time since showed to three or four persons, and of which she will hear these ten years. I write to her when I judge it my duty so to do; but I have not wrote these ten or twelve weeks.

(3) If you softened or salved over anything I wrote in the letter from Bedford,<sup>5</sup> you did her an irreparable damage. What *I* am is not the question there, but what *she* is; of which I must needs be a better judge than you, for I wear the shoe: as you must needs be a better judge of Mrs. Blackwell's temper than I.

(4) 'She is now full of anger.' Heigh day! Anger!

<sup>1</sup> There he met Thomas Walsh, 'alive, and but just alive' See *Journal*, iv. 275.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of April 6, 1761.

<sup>3</sup> Mrs. Wesley.

<sup>4</sup> See letter of Jan 27.

<sup>5</sup> He was in Bedford on March 9, and had to wait a day before he could preach his 'Great Assize' sermon. See *Journal*, iv. 254.

For what? Why, because, when Captain Dancey called upon me in Dublin (on the 7th of April) and asked, 'Sir, have you any commands? I am just sailing for Bristol,' I said, 'Yes; here is a letter. Will you deliver it with your own hands?' He promised he would; and that was our whole conversation.

(5) But suppose he delivered this about the 12th of April, why did she not write for a month before? What excuse or pretence for this?

(6) I certainly will, as long as I can hold a pen, assert my right of conversing with whom I please. Reconciliation or none, let *her* look to that. If the unbeliever will depart, let her depart. That right I will exert just when I judge proper, giving an account only to God and my own conscience. Though (as it happens) the last letter I wrote to Sarah Ryan was in the beginning of May.

(7) My conscience bears me witness before God that I have been as 'cautious as I ought to have been'; for I have rigorously kept my rule, 'To *do* everything and *omit* everything which I could with a *safe conscience* for peace' sake.'

But there is no fence against a flail, against one that could tell T. Walsh calmly and deliberately (he begs this may not be mentioned again, nor his name brought into the question), 'His parting words to me were, "I hope I shall see your wicked face no more."' Can you ever be safe against being deceived by such an one but by not believing a word you hear?

In a week or two I shall be looking out for a ship. You people in England are bad correspondents. Both Mr. Downing, Mr. Venn,<sup>1</sup> and Mr. Madan<sup>2</sup> are a letter in my debt; and yet I think they have not more business than I have. How unequally are things distributed here! Some want time, and some want work! But all will be set right hereafter. There is no disorder on that shore.

Wishing all happiness to you and all that are with you,  
I remain, dear sir,

Yours most affectionately.

<sup>1</sup> Henry Venn.

<sup>2</sup> Martin Madan (1726-90), cousin to Cowper the poet, was converted under Wesley's ministry, became a clergyman, and Chaplain of the

Lock Hospital in London 1750-80. His book in favour of polygamy made him notorious. See *Journal*, iv. 11 n, vi. 313.

*To Samuel Furly*

CORK, July 28, 1758

DEAR SAMMY,—Your conjecture is right. I never received the letter you speak of, nor heard before that you was in Holy Orders.<sup>1</sup> I hope you are also in great earnest to save your own soul as well as those that hear you. You have need to pray much for steadiness of spirit and seriousness in conversation. If there be added to this the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, your words will not fall to the ground. There will be danger, if you write so much, of writing in a dry and formal manner. We may suffer loss either by writing too little or too much. Observe every step you take, walk circumspectly, and God will be with you.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

We expect to sail in three or four days.

*To Dr. Free*

John Free preached a sermon before the University, at St. Mary's, Oxford, on *Rules for the Discovery of False Prophets; or, The Dangerous Impositions of the People called Methodists detected at the Bar of Scripture and Reason*. This led to Wesley's second letter. In the *Journal*, iv 282, he calls him 'the warmest opponent I have had for many years. I leave him now to laugh, and scold, and witticize, and call names just as he pleases; for I have done'. See letter of May 2.

FONMON CASTLE, August 24, 1758.

REVEREND SIR,—In the preface to your sermon, lately printed, you mention your having received my former letter, and add that 'if the proofs you have now brought do not satisfy me as to the validity of your former assertions, if I am not yet convinced that such positions are held by people who pass under the denomination of Methodists, and will signify this by a private letter, I shall have a more particular answer.' I desire to live peaceably with all men; and should therefore wish for no more than a private answer to a private letter, did the affair lie between you and me. But this is not the case: you have already appealed to the Archbishop, the University,<sup>2</sup> the nation. Before these judges you have advanced a charge of the highest kind, not only against me, but an whole body of people.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of May 3.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Secker.

Before these, therefore, I must either confess the charge or give in my answer.

But you say, 'I charge blasphemy, impiety, &c., upon the profession of Methodism in general. I use no personal reflections upon you nor any invective against you but in the character of a Methodist.' That is, you first say, 'All Methodists are pickpockets, rebels, blasphemers, Atheists'; and then add, 'I use no reflections upon you but in the character of a Methodist,' but in the character of a pick-pocket, blasphemer, Atheist. None but! What can you do more?

But this, you say, is the practice of all honest men, and a part of the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free. Nay, surely there are some honest men who scruple using their opponents in this manner—at least, I do. Suppose you was an Atheist, I would not bring against you a railing accusation. I would still endeavour to 'treat you with gentleness and meekness,' and thus to 'show the sincerity' of my faith. I leave to you that exquisite 'bitterness of spirit and extreme virulence of language,' which, you say, is your duty, and term 'zeal' (Preface, p. 5). And certainly zeal, fervour, heat, it is. But is this heat from above? Is it the offspring of heaven or a smoke from the bottomless pit?

O sir, whence is that zeal which makes you talk in such a manner to his Grace of Canterbury? 'I lay before you the disposition of an enemy who threaten our Church with a general alteration or total subversion; who interrupt us as we walk the streets' (Whom? when? where?) 'in that very dress which distinguishes us as servants of the State' (altogether servants of the State?) 'in the now sad capacity of ministers of the falling Church of England. Such being the prostrate, miserable condition of the Church, and such the triumphant state of its enemies, none of the English priesthood can expect better security or longer continuance than the rest. They all subsist at mercy. Your Grace and those of your order will fare no better than those of our own.' Sir, are you in earnest? Do you really believe Lambeth is on the point of being blown up?

You go on: 'In the remote counties of England I have

seen an whole troop of these divines on horseback, travelling with each a sister behind him.' O sir, O sir,

What should be great you turn to farce !

Have you forgot that the Church and nation are on the brink of ruin? But pray when and where did you see this? In what year, or in what county? I cannot but fear you take this story on trust; for such a sight I will be bold to say was never seen.

With an easy familiarity you add: 'My Lord, permit me here to whisper a word' (is not this whispering in print something new?) 'that may be worth remembering. In our memory some of the priesthood have not proved so good subjects as might have been expected, till they have been brought over with preferments that were due to other people.' Meaning, I presume, to yourself. Surely his Grace will remember this, which is so well worth remembering, and dispose of the next preferment in his gift where it is so justly due. If he does not, if he either forgets this or your other directions, you tell him frankly what will be the consequence: 'We must apply to Parliament' (page 6), or to His Majesty; and, indeed, how can you avoid it? 'For it would be using him,' you think, 'extremely ill not to give him proper information that there are now a set of people offering such indignity to his crown and Government.'

However, we are not to think your opposing the Methodists was 'owing to self-interest' alone. Though, what if it was? 'Was I to depart from my duty because it happened to be my interest? Did these saints ever forbear to preach to the mob in the fields for fear lest they should get the pence of the mob? Or do not the pence and the preaching go hand in hand together?' No, they do not: for many years neither I nor any connected with me have got any 'pence,' as you phrase it, 'in the fields.' Indeed, properly speaking, they never did. For the collections which Mr. Whitefield made, it is well known, were not for his own use, either in whole or part. And he has long ago given an account in print of the manner wherein all that was received was expended.

But it is not my design to examine at large either your dedication, preface, or sermon. I have only leisure to make a few cursory remarks on your 'definition' of the Methodists (so called), and on the account you give of their first rise, of their principles and practice; just premising that I speak of those alone who began, as you observe, at Oxford. If a thousand other sets of men 'pass under that denomination,' yet they are nothing to me. As they have no connexion with me, so I am in no way concerned to answer either for their principles or practice, any more than you are to answer for all who 'pass under the denomination of Church of England men.'

The account you give of their rise is this. The Methodists began at Oxford. 'The name was first given to a few persons who were so uncommonly methodical as to keep a diary of the most trivial actions of their lives—as how many slices of bread-and-butter they ate, how many country dances they danced at their dancing-club, or after a fast how many pounds of mutton they devoured. For upon these occasions they ate like lions, having made themselves uncommonly voracious.' Of this not one line is true; for (1) It was from an ancient sect of physicians, whom we were supposed to resemble in our regular diet and exercise, that we were originally styled Methodists.<sup>1</sup> (2) Not one of us ever kept a diary of 'the most trivial actions' of our lives. (3) Nor did any of us ever set down what or how much we ate or drank. (4) Our 'dancing-club' never existed; I never heard of it before. (5) On our 'fast-days' we used no food but bread; on the day following we fed as on common days. (6) Therefore our voraciousness and eating like lions is also pure, lively invention.

You go on: 'It was not long before these gentlemen began to dogmatize in a public manner, feeling a strong inclination to new-model almost every circumstance or thing in the system of our national religion.' Just as true as the rest. These gentlemen were so far from feeling any inclination at all 'to new-model' any 'circumstance or thing,' that, during their whole stay at Oxford, they were High Churchmen

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Nov. 26, 1762, to Bishop Warburton, p. 350.

in the strongest sense, vehemently contending for every 'circumstance' of Church order according to the old 'model.' And in Georgia, too, we were rigorous observers of every Rubric and Canon, as well as (to the best of our knowledge) every tenet of the Church. Your account, therefore, of the rise of the Methodists is a mistake from beginning to end.

I proceed to your definition of them : ' By the Methodists was then and is now understood a set of enthusiasts, who, pretending to be members of the Church of England, either offend against the order and discipline of the Church or pervert its doctrines relating to faith and works and the terms of salvation.'

Another grievous mistake. For whatever ' is now, by the Methodists then was ' not ' understood any set of enthusiasts,' or not enthusiasts, ' offending against the order and discipline of the Church.' They were tenacious of it to the last degree, in every the least jot and tittle. Neither were they ' then understood to pervert its doctrines relating to faith and works and the terms of salvation.' For they thought and talked of all these, just as you do now, till some of them, after their return from Georgia, were ' perverted ' into different sentiments by reading the book of Homilies. Their perversion, therefore (if such it be), is to be dated from this time. Consequently your definition by no means agrees with the persons defined.

However, ' as a Shibboleth to distinguish them at present, when they pretend to conceal themselves, throw out this or such-like proposition, " Good works are necessary to salvation." ' You might have spared yourself the labour of proving this ; for who is there that denies it ? Not I ; not any in connexion with me. So that this Shibboleth is just good for nothing.

And yet we firmly believe that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law ; that to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith, without any good work preceding, is counted to him for righteousness. We believe (to express it a little more largely) that we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of Christ, by faith, and not for our own works

or deservings. Good works follow after justification, springing out of true, living faith; so that by them living faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit. And hence it follows that as the body without the soul is dead, so that faith which is without works is dead also. This, therefore, properly speaking, is not faith, as a dead man is not properly a man.

You add: 'The original Methodists affect to call themselves Methodists of the Church of England; by which they plainly inform us there are others of their body who do not profess to belong to it. Whence we may infer that the Methodists who take our name do yet, by acknowledging them as namesakes and brethren, give themselves the lie when they say they are of our communion.' Our name! Our communion! *Apage cum ista tua magnificentia!*<sup>1</sup> How came it, I pray, to be your name any more than Mr. Venn's? But (waiving this) here is another train of mistakes. For (1) We do not call ourselves Methodists at all. (2) That we call ourselves members of the Church of England is certain. Such we ever were, and such we are to this day. (3) Yet we do not by this plainly inform you that there are others of our body who do not belong to it. By what rule of logic do you infer this conclusion from those premises? (4) You have another inference full as good: 'Hence one may infer that, by acknowledging them as namesakes and brethren, they give themselves the lie when they say they are of our communion.' As we do not take the name of Methodists at all, so we do not acknowledge any 'namesakes' in this. But we acknowledge as 'brethren' all Dissenters (whether they are called Methodists or not) who labour to have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. What lies upon you to prove is this: whoever acknowledges any Dissenters as brethren does hereby give himself the lie when he says he is a member of the Church of England.

<sup>1</sup> 'Away with this your grandiloquent verbiage!' Adapted by Wesley from Terence's *Phormio*, v. vii. 37:

I in malam rem hinc cum istac magnificentia,  
Fugitive!

which Dr. Patrick has rather broadly translated, 'Go, be hanged, you rascal, with your vain rodomon-tades!'



However, you allow there may be place for repentance: 'For if any of the founders of this sect renounce the opinions they once were charged with, they may be permitted to lay aside the name.' But what are the opinions which you require us to renounce? What are, according to you, the principles of the Methodists?

You say in general, 'They are contradictory to the gospel, contradictory to the Church of England, full of blasphemy, impiety, and ending in downright Atheism.' For '(1) They expound the Scripture in such a manner as to make it contradict itself. (2) With blasphemy, impiety, and diabolical frenzy they contradict our Saviour by denying that He will judge man according to His works. (3) By denying this they destroy the essential attributes of God and ruin His character as Judge of the world.'

In support of the first charge you say: 'It is notorious; and few men of common sense attempt to prove what is notorious till they meet with people of such notorious impudence as to deny it.'

I must really deny it. Why, then you will prove it by Mr. Mason's<sup>1</sup> own words. Hold, sir. Mr. Mason's words prove nothing. For we are now speaking of original Methodists: but he is not one of them; nor is he in connexion with them, neither with Mr. Whitefield nor me. So that what Mr. Mason speaks, be it right or wrong, is nothing to the present purpose. Therefore, unless you can find some better proof, this whole charge falls to the ground.

Well, 'here it is: Roger Balls.'<sup>2</sup> Pray who is Roger Balls? No more a Methodist than he is a Turk. I know not one good thing he ever did or said beside the telling all men, 'I am no Methodist,' which he generally does in the first sentence he speaks when he can find any one to hear him. He is therefore one of your own allies, and a champion worthy of his cause!

If, then, you have no more than this to advance in support of your first charge, you have alleged what you are not able to prove. And the more heavy that allegation is, the more

<sup>1</sup> See letter of June 19, 1746.

See *Journal*, iii. 238, iv. 285; and

<sup>2</sup> Roger Ball, the Antinomian. letter of April 12, 1750.

unkind, the more unjust, the more unchristian, the more inhuman it is to bring it without proof.

In support of the second charge you say: 'Our Saviour declares our works to be the object of His judgement. But the Methodist, for the perdition of the souls of his followers, says our works are of no consideration at all.'

Who says so? Mr. Whitefield, or my brother, or I? We say the direct contrary. But one of my 'anonymous correspondents says so.' Who is he? How do you know he is a Methodist? For aught appears, he may be another of your allies, a brother to Roger Balls.

Three or threescore anonymous correspondents cannot yield one grain of proof any more than an hundred anonymous remarkers on *Theron and Aspasio*. Before these can prove what the Methodists hold, you must prove that these are Methodists—either that they are original Methodists, or in connexion with them.

Will you say, 'If these were not Methodists themselves, they would not defend the Methodists'? I deny the consequence. Men may be far from being Methodists, and yet willing to do the Methodists justice. I have known a clergyman of note say to another who had just been preaching a very warm sermon, 'Sir, I do not thank you at all for this. I have no acquaintance with Mr. Whitefield or Mr. Wesley, and I do not agree with them in opinion; but I will have no more railing in my pulpit.'

From the principles of the Methodists you proceed to their practice. 'They hunt,' say you, 'for extraordinary marks and revelations whereby to know the state of the soul.' The marks by which I know the state of any soul are the inward fruit of the Spirit—love, joy, peace, and meekness, gentleness, goodness, longsuffering, temperance, patience, shown, not by words only, but by the genuine fruit of outward holiness.

Again: 'They magnify their office beyond the truth by high pretences to miraculous inspiration.' To this assertion we have answered over and over, We pretend to no other inspiration than that which not only every true gospel minister but every real Christian enjoys.

Again : ' The end of all impostors is some kind of worldly gain, and it is difficult for them to conceal their views entirely. The love of filthy lucre will appear either by the use they make of it or the means of getting it.' As to the use made of it you are silent. But as to the means of getting it you say, ' Besides inhumanly wringing from the poor, the helpless widows, the weeping orphans ' (the proof ! the proof !), ' they creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with divers lusts.' It is easy to say this and ten times more ; but can you prove it ? And ought you to say it till you can ?

I shall not concern myself with anything in your Appendix but what relates to me in particular. This premised, I observe on No. 1. There are several instances in my Journals of persons that were in agonies of grief or fear and roared for the disquietness of their heart ; of some that exceedingly trembled before God, perhaps fell down to the ground ; and of others whom God in His adorable providence suffered to be lunatic and sore vexed. The particular instances hereof to which you refer have been largely vindicated already in the two letters to the Rev. Dr. Church as well as that to the late Bishop of London.<sup>1</sup>

In the six following numbers I am not concerned. The eighth contains those words from my Second Journal : ' The rest of the day we spent in hearing the wonderful work which God is beginning to work all over the earth.' Of this likewise I have spoken at large to Dr. Church and Bishop Gibson. The sum is, it is a great work when one notorious sinner is thoroughly changed in heart and life. It is wonderfully great when God works this entire change in a large number of people ; particularly when it is done in a very short time. But so He hath wrought in Kingswood, Cornwall, Newcastle. It is therefore a truly wonderful work which God hath now more than begun to work upon earth.

I have now, sir, briefly answered for myself, which, if required, I will do more at large. But I trust it does already appear to every impartial reader that, of the many and

---

<sup>1</sup> See letters of Feb. 2, 1745, June 17, 1746, June 11, 1747.

heavy allegations you have brought with an unparalleled bitterness of spirit and an acrimony of language almost without precedent, you have not yet proved one. How far you are to be commended for this (unless by Messrs. Balls and the Monthly Reviewers) it is not fit for me to judge. Let all lovers of truth, of humanity, and candour determine. At present I have no more to add than that I beseech the Father of everlasting compassion to show more mercy to you than you have shown to, reverend sir,

Your servant for Christ's sake.

*To Samuel Furly*

BRISTOL, *September 2, 1758.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I know no way to cure men of curiosity but to fill them with the love of God.

If a great majority of those who attended the Thursday sermon were Methodists, I know not but it was right to put Mr. Charles in your place. Otherwise it would be wrong; for him that escapes the sword of Jehu shall Elisha slay. Every preacher whom God has sent will have a message to some souls who have not been reached by any other. And the more persons attend his preaching the better; the more room there is for God to work.

Mr. Jones's book I have found, and will send by Jemmy Morgan.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Holloway's probably I shall find by-and-by. I wish you would carefully read over the *Directions for Married Persons*.<sup>2</sup> It is an excellent tract. You need to have your heart full of grace, or you will have your hands full of work. Universal watchfulness is absolutely necessary in order to our victory over any evil. Whatever you do, do it with your might.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Francis Okeley*

Francis Okeley was an old friend, with whom the Wesleys had much intercourse in 1739. His mother was a Moravian, and is described by Hutton as 'truly a mother in Israel.' Okeley had charge of the Moravian children at Bedford, where he told Wesley on March 9,

<sup>1</sup> Evidently books borrowed from Mr. Jones and Mr. Holloway. Morgan had come with Wesley from Ireland. See *Journal*, iii. 335, 459; and letters of Jan. 8, 1757, and April 26, 1760.

<sup>2</sup> See Green's *Bibliography*, No 163.

1758, he could remain no longer. He joined Wesley at Manchester on March 16, went with him to Ireland, and was at the Bristol Conference in August, but did not preach there for fear of offending the Moravians. He returned to his post at Bedford, where he lived with his wife and three children. Dr. Byrom says on April 2, 1761, Wesley reported that he had seen him lately and told him that he loved him. He was the Moravian minister, and held a high position among them for many years. See *Journal*, iv. 254, 256; Benham's *Hutton*, p. 176.

Richard Viney was 'cut off from the Church and delivered over to Satan' by the Moravians in November 1743, but afterwards went back to them. He came to see Wesley in London in February 1744, and told him how he had been treated. Wesley talked with him at Birstall in the following May; and in October Charles Wesley found he had perverted the Society there, 'so that they laughed at all fasting, and self-denial, and family prayer, and such-like works of the law.' See *Journal*, iii. 121, 139; C. Wesley's *Journal*, i. 385, *W.H.S.* xiii. 79.

SALISBURY, October 4, 1758.

DEAR SIR,—The plain reason why I did not answer you before is, I had no heart to write. For I had no expectation of doing any good. And why should I trouble myself or you to no purpose? However, I will once more cast my bread upon the waters, and leave the event to God.

1. You say, 'I cannot preach because I have not faith.' That is not the thing; you do not speak simply. The direct reason why you did not preach at Bristol was because you would not displease *the Brethren*. They have still hold of your heart; the chain enters into your soul: therefore you could not even seem to *act against them*.

2. 'I am not convinced, and cannot be so, that what *now passes* for faith——' Hold! Do you mean that what *now passes* for faith among the Methodists is not true Christian faith? that we have not a right conception of faith? I know the teachers among *the Brethren* have not. But the conception which we *now* have of faith is the same which the Apostles had; for we conceive faith to be a divine *ἐλεγχος* of things not seen, particularly of this, that Christ loved *me* and gave Himself for *me*. Did St. Paul conceive it to be either less or more? *You* know he did not.

'But I am not convinced, and cannot be so, that this is experienced by most that profess it'—suppose in the United Society at Bristol. I know you are not convinced of this, and

that you cannot be so ; but the hindrance lies in your heart, not your understanding : you *cannot* because you *will not* ; so much of the old prejudice still remains, and says, nor *persuadebis etiamsi persuaseris*.<sup>1</sup> But you *ought* to be convinced that *most of them* who there profess it truly experience what they profess. For (unless they are an whole heap of wilful liars, which you *ought* not to think without proof) they have those fruits which cannot possibly subsist without true Christian faith : they have a peace that passes all understanding and banishes the fear of death ; they have the love of God shed abroad in their heart, overcoming the love of the world ; and they have abiding power over all sin, even that which did easily beset them. Now, what excuse have you for not being convinced that *they* have *faith*, who have fruits which nothing but faith can produce ?

3. ' But they seem at best to have the *letter of the new covenant* and the *spirit of the old*.' How so ? What is the spirit of the new covenant ? Is it not love ? the love of God and man ? *This spirit* they have ; it is the great moving spring both of their desires, designs, words, and actions. This also cannot be denied, unless they are the vilest liars upon earth. I speak now more confidently, having last week (together with my brother) examined all one by one.

4. ' But still you have not found what you expected among the Methodists, nor can you see your way clear to join them.' I think this was the sum of what you wrote to my brother. But what did you expect to have found among them ? Faith and love and holiness (whether in your own soul or not) you did find among them—at least, you *ought* to have found them ; for there they are, which neither men nor devils can deny. What else did you expect to find ? Or why cannot you see your way clear to join them ? I will tell you why. You have at least five strong reasons to the contrary : (1) a wife ; (2) a mother ; (3) children ; (4) cowardice ; (5) love of ease. But are these reasons good in the sight of God ? I will not affirm that.

5. However, *the Brethren* are good men, and I dare not oppose them. ' If they are not *the only people* of God (which

<sup>1</sup> ' Nor will you convince, though you have persuaded.'

they cannot be if the Scriptures are true), they are not good men ; they are very wicked men. They are as a body deceiving and being deceived ; they are liars, proud, boasters, despisers of those that are good, slaves to an ungodly man, and continually labouring to enslave others to him. O take warning at last ! Have no commerce with them ! Come not near the tents of these wicked men, whose words are smoother than oil, and yet they are very swords ! I dare not but oppose them ; for in many places they have wellnigh destroyed the work of God. Many souls, once full of faith and love, they have caused to draw back to perdition. Many they have driven into the deep and then trampled over them. Beware it be not so with *you*. You have greatly resisted the Spirit in this matter ! Remember Richard Viney—a pillar of salt ; not because he came out of Sodom, but because he *looked back* !—I am, dear sir,

Your affectionate brother and servant.

### To his Wife

COLCHESTER, October 27, 1758.

MY DEAR LOVE,—I had a pleasant ride to Inगतstone in the coach. I then took horse and came to Maldon by dinner-time.<sup>1</sup> Between ten and eleven this morning we set out from Maldon, and in three hours found honest Brother Arvin here. If I find no particular reason to alter my design, I purpose going on toward Norwich on Monday.

You obliged me on Tuesday afternoon by inviting my sister Hall<sup>2</sup> to drink tea with you ; and likewise by leaving Betty Duchesne<sup>3</sup> with me till she had said what she had to say. My dear, this is the way (as I have often told you) to secure a person's affections.

Let all his ways be unconfined,  
And clap your padlock on his<sup>4</sup> mind.

Believe me, there is no other way : leave every one to his own conscience. For why am I judged, says St. Paul, of another's conscience ? Every one must give an account of himself to

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal*, iv. 289

<sup>3</sup> See letters of Sept. 15, 1756, and

<sup>2</sup> The 24th, the day before he left London

Jan 12, 1780

<sup>4</sup> 'her' in Prior's *English Padlock*.

God. And even if a man acts contrary to good conscience, can you reclaim him by violent methods? Vain thought!

By force beasts act, and are by force restrained :  
The human mind by gentle means is gained.

Either by gentle means or by none at all Or if there be an exception, if a rod be for a fool's back, the wife is not the person who is to use it towards her husband.

If it please God to bring me safe to Norwich, I hope to have a letter from you there. Peace be with your spirit.—I am  
Your affectionate Husband.

To Mrs. Wesley, at the Foundery,  
London.

*To Thomas* —

COLCHESTER, *October 28, 1758.*

DEAR TOMMY,—I hope you will set out for Wednesbury on Monday. But from thence I would not have . . .

*To Mr. Potter, Vicar of Reymerston*

Mr. Potter, Vicar of Reymerston in Norfolk, published in 1758 *A Sermon on the Pretended Inspiration of the Methodists* This letter is Wesley's reply, which was begun at Norwich on November 4, and finished three days later at Lakenheath See Green's *Bibliography*, No. 189.

NORWICH, *November 4, 1758.*

REVEREND SIR,—I. Till to-day I had not a sight of your sermon on the Pretended Inspiration of the Methodists. Otherwise I should have taken the liberty some days sooner of sending you a few lines. That sermon, indeed, only repeats what has been often said before, and as often answered. But as it is said again, I believe it is my duty to answer it again. Not that I have any acquaintance with Mr. Cayley<sup>1</sup> or Osborn : I never exchanged a word with either. However, as you lump me and them together, I am constrained to speak for myself, and once more to give a reason of my hope that I am clear from the charge you bring against me.

<sup>1</sup> Cornelius Cayley (1729-80?), friend of James Hervey, and a born in Hull; clerk in treasury of Prince of Wales; published his autobiography in 1758. He was a preacher. He wrote an answer to Potter's sermon.



2. There are several assertions in your sermon which need not be allowed; but they are not worth disputing. At present, therefore, I shall only speak of two things: (1) your account of the new birth; and (2) 'the pretended inspiration' (as you are pleased to term it) 'of the Methodists.'

3. Of the new birth you say: 'The terms of being regenerated, of being born again, of being born of God are often used to express the works of gospel righteousness' (pages 10-11). I cannot allow this. I know not that they are ever used in Scripture to express any outward work at all. They always express an inward work of the Spirit, whereof baptism is the outward sign. You add: 'Their primary, peculiar, and precise meaning signifies' (a little impropriety of expression) 'our redemption from death and restoration to eternal life through the grace of God' (page 13). It does not, unless by death you mean sin, and by eternal life holiness. The precise meaning of the term is 'a new birth unto righteousness,' an inward change from unholy to holy tempers. You go on: 'This grace our Lord here calls "entering into the kingdom of God."' If so, His assertion is, 'Except a man be born again, he cannot' be born again. Not so. What He says is, Except a man experience this change, he cannot enter into My kingdom.

4. You proceed: 'Our holy Church doth teach us that . . . by the laver of regeneration in baptism we are received into the number of the children of God. . . . This is the first part of the new birth.' What is the first part of the new birth? baptism? It is the outward sign of that inward and spiritual grace; but no part of it at all. It is impossible it should be. The outward sign is no more a part of the inward grace than the body is a part of the soul. Or do you mean that regeneration is a part of the new birth? Nay, this is the whole of it. Or is it the 'laver of regeneration' which is the first part of it? That cannot be; for you suppose this to be the same with baptism.

5. 'The second part, the inward and spiritual grace, is a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness.' What! is the new birth the second part of the new birth? I apprehend it is the first and second part too; and surely nothing

could have prevented your seeing this but the ardour of your spirit and the impetuosity with which you rush along and trample down all before you. Your manner of writing reminds me of an honest Quaker in Cornwall, whose words I would recommend to your consideration. Being consulted by one of the Friends whether he should publish a tract which he had read to many in private, he replied, 'What! art thou not content with laying John Wesley on his back, but thou must tread his guts out too?'<sup>1</sup>

6. So much for your account of the new birth. I am, in the second place, to consider the account you give of 'the pretended inspiration' (so you are pleased to term it) 'of the Methodists.'

'The Holy Ghost sat on the Apostles with cloven tongues as of fire; . . . and signs and wonders were done by their hands' (pages 16-18). Wonders indeed! For they healed the sick by a word, a touch, a shadow!

They spake the dead alive and living dead.

'But though these extraordinary operations of the Spirit have been long since withdrawn, yet the pretension to them still subsists in the confident claim of the Methodists.' This you boldly affirm, and I flatly deny. I deny that either I or any in connexion with me (for others, whether called Methodists or anything else, I am no more concerned to answer than you are) do now, or ever did, lay any claim to 'these extraordinary operations of the Spirit.'

7. But you will prove it. They 'confidently and presumptuously claim a particular and immediate inspiration' (ibid.).

I answer, first: So do you, and in this very sermon, though you call it by another name. By inspiration we mean that inward assistance of the Holy Ghost which 'helps our infirmities, enlightens our understanding, rectifies our will, comforts, purifies, and sanctifies us' (page 14). Now, all this you claim as well as I; for these are your own words. 'Nay, but you claim a particular inspiration.' So do you: do not

---

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Sept. 15, 1762, to Samuel Furly.

you expect Him to sanctify you in particular? 'Yes; but I look for no immediate inspiration.' You do; you expect He will immediately and directly help your infirmities. Sometimes, it is true, He does this by the mediation or intervention of other men; but at other times, particularly in private prayer, He gives that help directly from Himself. 'But is this all you mean by particular, immediate inspiration?' It is; and so I have declared a thousand times in private, in public, by every method I could devise. It is pity, therefore, that any should still undertake to give an account of my sentiments without either hearing or reading what I say. Is this doing as we would be done to?

8. I answer, secondly: There is no analogy between claiming this inspiration of the Spirit, who, you allow, 'assists, and will assist, all true believers to the end of the world' (page 18), and claiming those extraordinary operations of the Spirit which were vouchsafed to the Apostles. The former both you and I pretend to—yea, and enjoy, or we are not believers. The latter you do not pretend to; nor do I, nor any that are in connexion with me.

9. 'But you do pretend to them. For you pray that "signs and wonders may still be wrought in the name of Jesus."' True; but what signs and wonders? The conversion of sinners; the 'healing the broken in heart; the turning men from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God.' These, and these only, are the signs and wonders which were mentioned in that prayer. And, did I not see these signs and wonders still wrought, I would sooner hew wood or draw water than preach the gospel. For those are to me very awful words which our Lord speaks of prophets or teachers: 'Ye shall know them' (whether they are true or false prophets) 'by their fruits. Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.' What fruit you have brought forth at Reymerton I know not; God knoweth.

10. 'Your followers, however, do pretend to the grace of a miraculous conversion.' Is there any conversion that is not miraculous? Is conversion a natural or supernatural

work? I suppose all who allow there is any such thing believe it to be supernatural. And what is the difference between a supernatural and a miraculous work I am yet to learn.

'But they say that at such a time and in such a manner the divine illumination shone upon them, Jesus knocked at the door of their hearts, and the Holy Ghost descended upon their souls'—that is, in plain terms, raillery apart, at a particular time, which they cannot easily forget, God did, in so eminent a manner as they never experienced before, 'enlighten their understanding' (they are your own words), 'comfort and purify their hearts, and give His heavenly Spirit to dwell in them.' But what has all this to do with those extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit?

11. 'Under these pretended impressions their next advance is to a call to preach the word themselves; and forth they issue, as under the immediate inspiration of God's Spirit, with the language of apostles and zeal of martyrs, to publish the gospel as if they were among our remotest ancestors, strangers to the name of Christ' (pages 20-1).

The plain truth is this: one in five hundred of those whom God so enlightens and comforts, sooner or later believes it to be his duty to call other sinners to repentance. Such an one commonly stifles this conviction till he is so uneasy he can stifle it no longer. He then consults one or more of those whom he believes to be competent judges, and under the direction of these goes on step by step from a narrower to a larger sphere of action. Meantime he endeavours to use only 'the language of the apostles,' to speak the things of the Spirit in the words of the Spirit. And he longs and prays for 'the zeal of martyrs,' continually finding the need thereof, seeing our present countrymen are as great strangers to the mind that was in Christ as our ancestors were to His name.

12. 'But the Holy Spirit no longer comes from heaven like a rushing mighty wind. It no longer appears in cloven tongues as of fire.' I wonder who imagines it does. 'We now discern not between His suggestions and the motions of our own rational nature.' Many times we do not; but at other

times God may give such peace or joy and such love to Himself and all mankind as we are sure are not 'the motions of our own nature.' 'To say, then, that the Holy Spirit began His work at such a time, and continued it so long in such a manner, is as vain as to account for the blowing of the wind.' Hold! *accounting for* is not the thing. To make a parallel it must be, 'is as vain as to say that the wind *began to blow at such a time and continued so long in such a manner.*' And where is the vanity of this? Why may I not say, either that the wind *began to blow at such a time and blew so long in such a manner,* or that God *began at such a time to comfort my soul, that He continued that consolation so long and in such a manner,* by giving me either peace and joy in believing or a lively hope of the glory of God?

13. 'Not that we are without a memorable instance of this instantaneous impulse in the sudden conversion of St. Paul' (page 23). A poor instance this; for it does not appear that his was a sudden conversion. It is true 'a great light suddenly shone round about him'; but this light did not convert him. After he had seen this, 'he was three days without sight and neither did eat nor drink.' And probably during the whole time God was gradually working in his heart, till he 'arose, and, being baptized, washed away his sins, and was filled with the Holy Ghost.'

14. But to return. 'Their teachers claim a particular and immediate inspiration in their nauseous effusions' (page 22). Certainly they claim either a particular and immediate inspiration (as above explained) or none at all. But this is no other inspiration (call it influence if you please, though it is a far stronger term) than every one must have before he can either understand or preach or live the gospel. 'But there is not in Scripture the least promise or encouragement to expect any particular inspiration.' Yes, surely such an inspiration as this: you have allowed it over and over. And what external evidence of this would you have? I will believe you are thus inspired, if you convert sinners to God, and if you yourself are 'holy in all manner of conversation.'

15. Is there 'no need of this inspiration now, because the prejudices of mankind are in favour of the gospel and the

profession of it is under the protection and encouragement of the civil power'? 'The prejudices of mankind are in favour of the gospel'? What! the prejudices of the bulk of mankind? To go no farther than England: are the bulk of our nation prejudiced in favour of the genuine gospel, of the holiness which it enjoins, of chastity and temperance, of denying ourselves and taking up our cross daily, of dying to the world and devoting all our heart and all our life to God? Are they prejudiced in favour of presenting our souls and bodies a constant, holy sacrifice to God? What less than this is gospel holiness? And are the prejudices of mankind in favour of this?

16. Likewise, how far this real Christianity is 'under the protection and encouragement of the civil power' I know not. But I know 'all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution'—domestic persecution, if no other; for 'the foes of' such 'a man shall be they of his own household. There shall be,' and there are now, 'five in one house, three against two, and two against three'; and that not for being Methodists, for having a nickname (although that may be the pretence, for want of a better; for who scruples to throw a man into the ditch and then beat him because his clothes are dirty?), but for living godly, for loving and serving God, according to the best light they have. And certainly these need the assistance of God's Spirit to strengthen and comfort them, that they may suffer all things rather than turn aside in any point from the gospel way.

17. 'But the Scriptures are a complete and a sufficient rule. Therefore to what purpose could any farther inspiration serve? All farther inspiration is unnecessary; the supposed need of it is highly injurious to the written Word. And the pretension thereto (which must be either to explain or to supply it) is a wicked presumption, with which Satan hath filled their hearts to lie of the Holy Ghost.' (Pages 27-8.) High-sounding words! But, blessed be God, they are only *brutum fulmen*; they make much noise, but do not wound. 'To what purpose could any farther inspiration serve?' Answer yourself: 'To enlighten the understanding and to rectify the will.' Else, be the Scriptures ever so complete,

they will not save your soul. How, then, can you imagine it is unnecessary, and that 'the supposed need of it is injurious to the written Word'? And when you say yourself, 'The Spirit is to teach us all things and to guide us into all truth,' judge you whether this is 'to explain or to supply the written Word.' 'Oh, He does this by the written Word.' True; but also 'by His holy inspiration.' So the compilers of our Liturgy speak; who therefore, according to you, are guilty of 'wicked presumption, with which Satan filled their hearts to lie of the Holy Ghost.'

18. These also are the men upon whom you fall in the following warm words: 'The power of enthusiasm over an heated imagination may be very great. But it must be under the ferment of that old, sour leaven, hypocrisy, to rise to that daring height.' I think not: I think they were neither hypocrites nor enthusiasts, though they teach me to pray for, and consequently to expect (unless I am an hypocrite indeed), 'God's holy inspiration,' both in order to 'think the things that be good,' and also 'perfectly to love Him and worthily to magnify His holy name.'

19. You go on: 'They boast that their heart is clean and their spirit right within them.' Sir, did you ever read Morning Prayer on the tenth day of the month? You then said, 'Make me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me.' Did you mean what you said? If you did not, you was guilty of the grossest hypocrisy. If you did, when did you expect God would answer that prayer? When your body was in the grave? Too late! Unless we have clean hearts before we die, it had been good we had never been born.

20. 'But they boast they are pure from sin, harmless, and undefiled.' So in a sound sense is every true believer. 'Nay, they boast that their bodies are a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God.' Sir, is not yours? Are not your soul and body such a sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God? As the Lord God liveth, before whom we stand, if they are not, you are not a Christian. If you are not an holy, living sacrifice, you are still 'dead in trespasses and sins'; you are an 'alien from the commonwealth of Israel, without' Christian 'hope, without God in the world'!

21. You add: ' Thus have I exposed their boasted claim to a particular and immediate inspiration ' (page 30). No, sir, you have only exposed yourself; for all that we claim you allow. ' I have shown what a miserable farce is carrying on beneath the mask of a more refined holiness.' No tittle of this have you shown yet; and before you attempt again to show anything concerning us, let me entreat you, sir, to acquaint yourself better with our real sentiments. Perhaps you may then find that there is not so wide a difference as you imagined between you and, reverend sir,

Your servant for Christ's sake.

*To Mrs. Ryan*

NORWICH, November 4, 1758.

. . . Yesterday I transcribed Charles Perronet's questions, with a little alteration. A few of them I will put to *you*, which I know you will answer with all plainness. (The first four questions.)

As to myself, I am still cold and faint, though (as I told you) a little revived since I wrote freely. Pray that God may at length lift up the hands that hang down and the feeble knees!

On November 12 this answer was sent, apparently by Mrs. Ryan (see letters of December 14, 1757, and January 20, 1758):

REVEREND SIR,—I will answer your questions with plainness and uprightness of heart. God did testify that He had saved me from all sin. By this shall I know it right to write to you, by your being free and trusting me as *before*.

*To Sarah Moore*

Sarah Moore was admitted on trial into the Methodist Society at Sheffield by Edward Perronet on October 26, 1749. She was born at King's Lynn in 1738. Her parents left that town when she was four years old. She began to teach a school in Sheffield in her seventeenth year; and at eighteen was appointed the first class-leader at Hallam, walking there from Sheffield every week for two years. The first Quarterly Meeting was held in her house at Fargate between 1756 and 1760, and the Society held its meetings there. She went not infrequently to hold prayer-meetings at Bradwell in Derbyshire, sixteen miles distant. She married Samuel Knutton, a popular local



preacher at Sheffield, in 1772. See Everett's *Methodism in Sheffield*, p. 79; and letters of March 3, 1761, and July 5, 1764.

LONDON, November 22, 1758.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Praise God for what He hath already done. Let those give thanks whom the Lord hath redeemed and delivered from the hand of the enemy<sup>1</sup>; but you know a greater deliverance is at hand. What have you to do but to fight your way through the world, the flesh, and the devil? It is a good though a painful fight. Unless you yield, you cannot but conquer. It is true you will first conquer by little and little. For

More of this life and more we have  
As the old Adam dies.

But there is also an instantaneous conquest: in a moment sin shall be no more. You are gradually dying for a long time. But you will die in a moment. O hasten to that happy time! Pray, strive, hope for it!—I am

Your affectionate brother.

### To James Hervey

Hervey was dying when he wrote his answers to Wesley's criticisms. He says on November 7, 1758: 'I am now reduced to a state of infant weakness and given over by my physician.' He had asked William Cudworth, Minister of an Independent Church in Margaret Street, London, whether he should reply to Wesley. This is Wesley's last letter to his old Oxford friend, who died on December 25, in his forty-fifth year. Wesley regarded Cudworth as an Antinomian, and his two *Dialogues between an Antinomian and his Friend*, 1745, were partly in answer to a Dialogue by Cudworth. See *Works*, x. 266-84; and letter of October 15, 1756.

LONDON, November 29, 1758.

DEAR SIR,—A week or two ago, in my return from Norwich,<sup>2</sup> I met with Mr. Pierce of Bury, who informed me of a conversation which he had had a few days before. Mr. Cudworth, he said, then told him that he had prevailed on

<sup>1</sup> This refers apparently to the sudden death of a young man at Totley, who had pulled 'the preacher from his stand' and offered other acts of violence. 'The wicked them-

selves viewed it as a judgement.' See Everett's *Methodism in Sheffield*, pp. 80, 126.

<sup>2</sup> He left Norwich on Nov. 6.

Mr. Hervey to write against me, who likewise, in what he had written, referred to the book which he (Mr. Cudworth) had lately published.

Every one is welcome to write what he pleases concerning me. But would it not be well for you to remember that, before I published anything concerning you, I sent it to you in a private letter ; that I waited for an answer for several months, but was not favoured with one line ; that when at length I published part of what I had sent you, I did it in the most inoffensive manner possible—in the latter end of a larger work, purely designed to preserve those in connexion with me from being tossed to and fro by various doctrines ? <sup>1</sup> What, therefore, I may fairly expect from my friend is to mete to me with the same measure ; to send to me first in a private manner any complaint he has against me ; to wait as many months as I did ; and if I give you none or no satisfactory answer, then to lay the matter before the world, if you judge it will be to the glory of God.

But, whatever you do in this respect, one thing I request of you : give no countenance to that insolent, scurrilous, virulent libel which bears the name of William Cudworth. Indeed, how you can converse with a man of his spirit I cannot comprehend. O leave not your old, well-tryed friends ! The new is not comparable to them. I speak not this because I am afraid of what any one can say or do to me. But I am really concerned for you : an evil man has gained the ascendant over you, and has persuaded a dying man, who had shunned it all his life, to enter into controversy as he is stepping into eternity ! Put off your armour, my brother ! You and I have no moments to spare : let us employ them all in promoting peace and goodwill among men. And may the peace of God keep your heart and mind in Christ Jesus !

So prays                      Your affectionate brother and servant.

### *To Augustus Montague Toplady*

Toplady was not yet eighteen. Two years earlier he was converted under a sermon preached in a barn at Coolmain by James

<sup>1</sup> *A Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion.* See Green's *Bibliography*, No. 191.

Morris, one of Wesley's preachers. Toplady wrote Wesley on September 13, 'I thank you for your satisfactory letter'; wherein he says he had lost ground through 'assiduous application to my college business, which prevents my attending the preaching so often as I would.' See *Arminian Magazine*, 1780, p. 54; Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 315-16; *W.H.S.* viii. 11-14; and for Dr. Taylor, letter of July 3, 1759.

LONDON, *December 9, 1758.*

DEAR SIR,—I verily believe no single person since Mahomet has given such a wound to Christianity as Dr. Taylor. They are his books, chiefly that upon Original Sin, which have poisoned so many of the clergy, and indeed the fountains themselves—the Universities in England, Scotland, Holland, and Germany.

If you do not immediately see the fruit of your labour in conversing with this or that person, still there is no reason to think it lost. The wind bloweth when as well as where it listeth. We know, the help that is done, God doth it Himself. And it is fit He should do it in His own time as well as manner.

If you continue to walk humbly and simply with God, there is no need the darkness should ever return. God is willing to give the love, the joy, the peace always which He gives once. Only, hear His voice, and follow it with all diligence. Do whatever He calls you to, be it ever so grievous to flesh and blood, and shun whatever you find lessens your communion with Him.

Nothing but almighty grace can amend that child. She had a taste of it once; and she may again. It would be well to put her in the way of it as frequently as may be.

I have not had my health so well for many years. How many are the mercies of God! We want only thankful hearts.

Have you had yet any thoughts as to your future life? in what way you might most glorify God?—I am, dear sir,

Your affectionate servant.

To Mr. Toplady, In Trinity College,  
Dublin.

To Mr. —

LONDON, *December 9, 1758.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—From time to time I have had more trouble with the Society at Leeds than with all the other

Societies in Yorkshire. And now I hear that *the leaders* insist that such and such persons be put out of the Society! I desire the leaders may know their place, and not stretch themselves beyond their line. Pray let me judge who should be put out of a Methodist Society and who not. I desire Faith and Ann Hardwick may not be put out of the Society, unless some fresh matter appear against them; and if any new matter does appear, let it be laid before me. He shall have judgement without mercy who hath shown no mercy.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To his Wife*

NORWICH, December 23, 1758.

DEAR MOLLY,—I was much concerned, the night before I left London,<sup>1</sup> at your unkind and unjust accusation. You accused *me* of unkindness, cruelty, and what not. And why so? Because I insist on choosing my own company! because I insist upon conversing, by speaking or writing, with those whom I (not you) judge proper! For more than seven years this has been a bone of contention between you and me. And it is so still. For I will not, I cannot, I dare not give it up. 'But then *you* will rage and fret and call me names.' I am sorry for it. But I cannot help it. I still do and must insist that I have a right to choose my own company. Then 'you will denounce against me all the curses from Genesis to the Revelation.' You may so. But you gain no ground hereby; for still I cannot give up my right. Nay, but 'you will say all manner of evil of me.' Be it so; but still I stand just where I was. Then 'you will show my private letters to all the world.' If you do, I must assert my right still. All this will not extort it from me; *nor anything else which you can do*. You may therefore as well *allow* it now as after we have squabbled about it (if we live so long) seven years longer. For it is my right by all the laws of God and man, and a right which I never can part with. O do not continue to trouble yourself and me and

<sup>1</sup> He left London on Dec. 18. See letters of Jan. 27, 1758, and March 2, 1759.

to disturb the children of God by still grasping at a power which must be denied you by him who is nevertheless  
Your truly affectionate Husband.

*To Dorothy Furlly*

COLCHESTER, *December 28, 1758.*

MY DEAR SISTER,—I thought it long since I heard from you ; but I imputed it to your illness. And I did not desire you should do anything which would put you to pain or increase your bodily weakness.

When you seemed confident of receiving the promise in a few days, I did not judge it needful to say anything to the contrary ; both because I was persuaded that expectation would be a quickening to your soul, and because I knew you had one near you who was able to advise you in any emergency. See that your desires do not cool, and you shall not be ashamed of this confident expectation. So long as it is tempered with resignation it can do you no disservice. And what else is there worthy of a desire ? Health you shall have if health be best, even bodily health. But what is that in comparison of an healthful mind ? And this you are sure to have.

I scruple Sarah Ryan's drinking tar-water because it is so extremely nauseous. Neither will it profit if it occasion costiveness, unless stewed prunes be taken every second or third night instead of it. I rather wish she would resume the medicine I formerly prescribed, only taking care not to catch cold with it. Perhaps in a few days <sup>1</sup> you may see

Your affectionate brother.

*To Samuel Furlly*

LONDON, *February 17, 1759.*

DEAR SAMMY,—James Kershaw <sup>1</sup> is an independent minister. Probably, if we live till another Conference, he may be in connexion with us. Hitherto he acts as an independent. We have no Society at Renninghall.

<sup>1</sup> He got to Bristol on Jan. 2.

in 1765 is stationed at Yarm. See letters of March 1, 1762, and Oct. 16, 1765, to Christopher Hopper.

<sup>2</sup> James Kershaw had been one of Wesley's preachers from 1752 to 1757. He returned to the ranks, and

I take John Pearse <sup>1</sup> to be an honest man. As soon as he sees the truth he will preach it. Dolly Furly was considerably better in health before I came from Bristol. And she was all athirst for God. I think her soul prospers more and more.

I will desire Mr. Gilbert <sup>2</sup> to see whether the four volumes of the *Library* which you mention can be spared. And if they can, if they are not necessary for the making up of sets, they will be sent with the last Journal and the *Pilgrim's Progress*.

It is very possible the day of grace may be at end before the day of life is. But I believe this is very rarely the case. I have narrowly observed, and have found but one indisputable instance in thirty years.

Nancy <sup>3</sup> must give me credit for her letter a little longer, for I am at present much straitened for time. March 1 I hope to be at Mr. Berridge's, whence I must strike off for Colchester; so that you will not see me this spring, unless you come to Everton.—I am, dear Sammy,

Yours affectionately.

To Miss ——

LONDON, February 21, 1759.

Probably, Miss ——, this may be the last trouble of the kind which you will receive from me. Therefore you may forgive me this, and the rather when you consider my motives to it. You know I can have no temporal view; I can have none but a faint, distant hope (because with God all things are possible) of doing some service to one whom I love. And this may answer the question which you might naturally ask, 'What would you have? What do you want with me?' I want you, not to be a convert to my opinions, but to be a member of Christ, a child of God, and an heir of His kingdom. Be anything as to outward profession, so you are lowly in heart, so you resist and conquer every motion of pride, and have that mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus. Be what you

<sup>1</sup> One of the early preachers. See Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 127.

<sup>2</sup> Nicholas Gilbert became an itinerant in 1744, and died in 1763.

See *Journal*, v. 10 n; and for the *Christian Library*, letter of Aug. 14, 1748, to Ebenezer Blackwell.

<sup>3</sup> Probably his young wife.

please besides ; only be meek and gentle, and in patience possess your soul : so that one may truly say to you,

Calm thou ever art within,  
All unruffled, all serene.

Hear what preacher you will ; but hear the voice of God, and beware of prejudice and every unkind temper : beware of foolish and hurtful desires, or they will pierce you through with many sorrows. In one word, be anything but a trifler, a trifler with God and your own soul. It was not for this that God gave you

A mind superior to the vulgar herd.

No, Miss —, no ! but that you might employ all your talents to the glory of Him that gave them. O do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God ! Is He not still striving with you ? striving to make you not almost but altogether a Christian ? Indeed, you must be all or nothing—a saint or a devil, eminent in sin or holiness ! The good Lord deliver you from every snare, and guide your feet in the way of peace ! How great a pleasure would this give to all your real friends, and in particular to  
Your affectionate servant for Christ's sake.

### *To Ebenezer Blackwell*

This letter and Mr. Blackwell's reply show how Mrs. Wesley troubled her husband by her interference with his correspondence. Blackwell's feeling towards her comes out in his answer, and shows how wisely he bore himself in difficult circumstances. See letters of Dec. 23, 1758, and April 9, 1759.

EVERTON, *March 2, 1759.*

DEAR SIR,—When it is probable I may alter my judgement or practice, I am very willing to speak upon any head. But when I am clearly and fully fixed, then I do not speak ; for it would be lost labour. For this reason I did not speak the other night ; because I was fully fixed. My wife picks my lock and steals my papers. Afterwards she says, ' You cannot trust me.' I answer, ' I cannot, till you restore what you stole and promise to steal no more.' She replies, ' I will burn them, or lodge them with another, on such terms.' I answer

nothing. Do you ask, Why so? I answer to *you*: (1) I will not *consent* my goods shall be *burnt*, much less accept it as a favour: I require her to *restore* them. (2) I will not thank her for lodging them with another: I require that they be restored to *me*. (3) I will not so much as consider *the terms*: I require the restitution of my own goods without *any terms*. And I know you would do so were it your case. And so would any man of common sense. 'But she will not restore them.' Then she must keep them. But let her not blame *me* because I cannot trust her.

Permit me to add one word to you. You think yourself a match for her; but you are not. By her exquisite art she has already made you think ill of two very deserving women.<sup>1</sup> And you have been more than once much puzzled what to think of me! Nor could you help thinking me *a little* in the wrong. I am almost afraid she likewise entertains you with the faults of many in the Society; the knowing of which (be they real or feigned) does you no good at all. O sir, let us look inward; let us *live at home*! The more we know of our own faults and the less of other people's, the more will the work of God prosper in our hearts. Wishing all happiness to you and yours, I am, dear sir, Your affectionate servant.

*From Ebenezer Blackwell*

Blackwell's reply deserves to be given in full.

DEAR SIR,—I this day received your favour of the 2nd inst. I am sensible of my incapacity either to speak or write in that lively, concise manner you do; but as well as I can I will paragraph by paragraph give a direct answer to your letter. And, first, I desire never to interfere between you and Mrs. Wesley, without there is at least a probability of my being of service to one, or (what I would much rather wish) to both of you; and I declare I have seldom if ever spoken of one to the other without being first desired either by yourself or Mrs. Wesley. Therefore you may be assured I will not in the least hinder your maintaining the authority of the husband in the greatest latitude that either myself or any man of common sense would wish.

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Ryan and Mrs. Crosby. See next letter and that of July 12, 1758.



I likewise say that I do not think myself a match for Mrs. Wesley or any one that studies to deceive me ; but I deny that by any exquisite art she has made me think ill of two *very deserving* women. I suppose you mean Mrs. Ryan and Mrs. Crosby. The first I know nothing of, having never seen her in my life, and hardly ever (for I won't say never) spoken of her to anybody but yourself. The latter I only know from the letter wrote by yourself, which she owned to me was her handwriting, and which I think will plainly prove to every one of common sense that she is not that *very deserving* woman you think her ; and, permit me to add, I am afraid she has too much art for my dear *friend*.

I think my behaviour must fully convince you what my thoughts have been of yourself. When I have spoken to you, it has been without reserve ; and if at any time I have expressed myself a little freer than many others would dare to do, do not think the harder of me, for indeed it has constantly been with a view if possible to have established peace between yourself and Mrs. W. And I seldom if ever see Mrs. Wesley from the time you leave London until you return, and would even then be glad to be excused that honour if it was not out of civility to yourself. Therefore she has no opportunity, or if she had I dare not give encouragement to her or any one, to entertain me with the faults of any either in your Society or not. Indeed, sir, I am sensible, if I did, it would very much hurt my soul.

And yet, alas ! I have been often much hurt, though I dare not blame my dear friend on that account, and yet must declare what you have said, and what I have seen of your brother, has very often much grieved and stumbled my poor soul. I feel I have an evil heart ; I know I am not renewed ; and I earnestly wish that my own faults were more and more engraven on my mind, that so I may never rest until I am born again and have the image of God stamped on my soul.

I earnestly wish you all happiness, and pray that the peace and love of God may continually attend you.—I am, dear sir,

Your very affectionate and much obliged servant,

EBENEZER BLACKWELL.

### *To William Alwood*

William Alwood was one of the preachers in York, and a trustee of the site purchased there for a preaching-place on February 27, 1759. Wesley set out from Epworth for Selby on April 18. Near the town the recent flood had carried away the bank and left a great hole. Wesley

says. 'We made shift to lead our horses over a narrow path where the water was fordable.' The congregation at Selby was such that he had to preach in the garden, though the north wind was exceeding high. He preached at York at seven that evening, and at six on the following night in the shell of the new house in Peaseholme Green, for which he had started a subscription list in July 1757. See *Journal*, iv. 224, 309; and letter of March 29.

Dr. Cockburn was an old schoolfellow of Charles Wesley, who went with him from Hunslet to York on September 28, 1756. At York 'the doctor's house was open to all, and his heart also; his whole desire being to spread the gospel.' He gave £100 towards the new building. See *Journal*, iv. 156; C. Wesley's *Journal*, ii. 116-21, 197; Lyth's *Methodism in York*, pp. 83-90.

NORWICH, March 6, 1759.

DEAR BILLY,—You spoil my plan. I had appointed, with God's leave, to be at Wakefield on Wednesday, April 18. But you tell me I must be at York. If I must, who can help it? Then I must set out from Epworth that morning, dine at Selby about noon, and so go on in the afternoon for York. But I hope you will begin the building directly. I suppose Dr. Cockburn has my plan. Lose no time. I have some money in my hands for you. The King's business requireth haste. You may still direct your letters to London.—I am

Your affectionate friend and brother,

To Mr. Will. Alwood, At Mr. John Hall's,  
In Newgate Street, York.

To Dorothy Furly

NORWICH, March 6, 1759.

MY DEAR SISTER,—I shall always be glad to hear from you when you can write without hurting yourself. But I am almost afraid to write, for fear of tempting you to answer whether you can or not.

Since you left Kingswood, I hope you use the water at the Hot Wells as often as possible. If anything medicinal profit you, probably it will be this. But perhaps God will not suffer you to be healed by outward medicines. It may be He is determined to have all the glory of His own work. Meantime He designs by this weakness of body to keep your soul low, as a weaned child. There is a wonderful mystery

in the manner and circumstances of that mighty working whereby He subdues all things to Himself and leaves nothing in the heart but His pure love alone.

I have no doubt but God will give you the answer to that prayer,—

Let me Thy witness live,  
When sin is all destroyed !  
And then my spotless soul receive,  
And take me home to God !

—I am, my dear sister,

Your affectionate brother.

### To Matthew Lowes

Matthew Lowes became one of Wesley's preachers in 1757, and laboured with much success till 1771, when failing health compelled him to settle in Newcastle. He died there on February 8, 1795. Some of his last words were, ' All my dependence for present and eternal salvation is upon the blood and merits of Jesus Christ ' The *Minutes* of 1795 says : ' He was remarkable for humility, meekness, and seriousness.' See Atmore's *Memorial*, p. 244 ; and letter of September 8, 1761, to him.

NORWICH, March 6, 1759.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—Lawrence Coughlan,<sup>1</sup> who was at first appointed for Whitehaven, is to set out from Colchester on Monday, and to stay at Whitehaven till the Conference in the beginning of August. Till he comes I desire you diligently to inquire whether the bulk of the Society are for or against W. Wilson's preaching. If they are against it, he had better not preach at Whitehaven (but he may preach anywhere else) till I come. If the bulk of them are for it, let him preach at some times : at others Brother Browning<sup>2</sup> may read a sermon. But if he does speak, let him take care to conclude the whole service within the hour.

Certainly, rather than any flame should have arisen concerning it, Brother Hodgson and the rest ought to have dropped

<sup>1</sup> Lawrence Coughlan was an Irishman who was afterwards ordained by the Bishop of London and sent to Newfoundland as a missionary. He had done fruitful service in Col-

chester He died in 1785. See *Journal*, iv 297, Atmore's *Memorial*, pp 80-3, and letter of March 6, 1763

<sup>2</sup> Wilson and Browning were probably laymen beginning to preach.

their opposition. What would not one do (except sin) that brotherly love may continue!—I am

Your affectionate brother

To Mr. Matthew Lowes, At the Methodist  
Preaching-house, In Whitehaven,

*To the Countess of Huntingdon*

Peter Kruse, of Chelsea, sent copies of this letter and two others to the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* for 1857 (pp 690-3) 'The letters now enclosed were given to me some months ago by a lady residing in this vicinity' This letter appears in the *Life* of the Countess of Huntingdon. The Countess, who was then at Bath, had gone to Bristol on January 4 to meet Wesley. He accompanied her to Bath, and, after preaching to several of the nobility at her house, returned to London. In February Lady Huntingdon came to London, and on the 16th, the day of the Public Fast, heard Wesley preach at the Foundery at half-past eight at night to an overflowing multitude on 'Seek ye the Lord while He may be found'. Lady Huntingdon arranged intercession-meetings at her house, and Wesley took part in that on the 23rd. The following Tuesday he breakfasted there with his brother and Thomas Maxfield. After the breakfast Whitefield, Madan, Romaine, Jones, Downing, and Venn, with some persons of quality and a few others, came in. Wesley administered the sacrament and preached from 1 Corinthians xiii 13. On Wednesday he was there at the prayer-meeting. See *Journal*, iv. 299-301, *Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon*, 1 396-8

NORWICH, March 10, 1759

TO THE RIGHT HON. THE COUNTESS OF HUNTINGDON.

The agreeable hour which I spent with your Ladyship the last week recalled to my mind the former times, and gave me much matter of thankfulness to the Giver of every good gift. I have found great satisfaction in conversing with those instruments whom God has lately raised up. But still, there is I know not what in them whom we have known from the beginning, and who have borne the burthen and heat of the day, which we do not find in those who have risen up since, though they are upright of heart. Perhaps, too, those who have but lately come into the harvest are led to think and speak more largely of justification and the other first principles of the doctrine of Christ; and it may be proper for *them* so to do. Yet *we* find a thirst after something farther. We want to sink deeper and rise higher in the knowledge of God our Saviour. We want all helps for walking closely with Him

whom we have received, that we may the more speedily come to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.

Mr. Berridge <sup>1</sup> appears to be one of the most simple as well as most sensible men of all whom it has pleased God to employ in reviving primitive Christianity. I designed to have spent but one night with him; but Mr. Gilbert's <sup>2</sup> mistake (who sent him word I would be at Everton on Friday) obliged me to stay there another day, or multitudes of people would have been disappointed. They come now twelve or fourteen miles to hear him; and very few come in vain. His word is with power; he speaks as plain and home as John Nelson, but with all the propriety of Mr. Romaine and tenderness of Mr. Hervey.

At Colchester likewise the word of God has free course; only no house will contain the congregation. On Sunday I was obliged to preach on St. John's Green. The people stood on a smooth sloping ground, sheltered by the walls of an old castle, and behaved as men who felt that God was there.

I am persuaded your Ladyship still remembers in your prayers  
Your willing servant for Christ's sake.

To the Right Honourable the Countess  
of Huntingdon, in London.

*To Ebenezer Blackwell*

NORWICH, March 12, 1759.

DEAR SIR,—You have entirely satisfied me as to what I was afraid of.<sup>3</sup> We are at present upon pretty good terms; and I am not without hope that this good understanding will continue for some time longer. I am sure it will, if He who has the hearts of all men in His hand sees it to be expedient for me.

You have never yet spoken to me with more freedom than was agreeable to me. Your freedom is the best proof of our friendship. There are not many that will deal freely with me; nor, indeed, are there many from whom I would desire it, lest it should hurt themselves without profiting us. But I do desire it of *you*; and do not doubt but it will profit me, as it has done in time past.

<sup>1</sup> Wesley stayed at Everton with John Berridge on March 1 and 2.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Feb. 17.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of March 2, and Blackwell's answer. His relations with his wife were easier for the moment.

I know not if in all my life I have had so critical a work on my hands as that wherein I am now engaged. I am endeavouring to gather up those who were once gathered together and afterwards scattered by James Wheatley.<sup>1</sup> I have reunited about seventy of them, and hope this evening to make up an hundred. But many of them have wonderful spirits, having been always accustomed to teach their teachers ; so that how they will bear any kind of discipline I cannot tell.

At Colchester the case is far otherwise. About an hundred and sixty simple, upright people are there united together, who are as little children, minding nothing but the salvation of their souls. Only they are greatly distressed for a larger house. What we could have done last Sunday I know not, but that, the day being mild, I took the field and preached on St. John's Green. I see but one way—to build a commodious house ; and I desired them to look out for a piece of ground. It is true they are poor enough ; but if it be God's work, He will provide the means.

Wishing an increase in all grace both to Mrs. Blackwell, Mrs. Dewal, and you, I remain, dear sir,

Your very affectionate servant.

*To Miss Johnson (?)*

COLCHESTER, *March 20, 1759.*

My wife, Miss —, surprised me last night by informing me you are left mistress of a large fortune. Shall I say, agreeably surprised me? I cannot tell ; because I believe there is another world, and I do not know what influence this change may have on your condition. Therefore I am in fear and in hope. You may be hereby far more happy or far more miserable in eternity! O make a stand! Consider the situation you are in ; perhaps never before were you in so great danger. You know a little of your natural tempers : now you have means of indulging and thereby inflaming them to the uttermost. And how many will incite you so to do ! How few will dare to warn you against it !

<sup>1</sup> On Nov. 3, 1758, Wheatley had offered him the Tabernacle. Wesley preached there on Dec. 21, and took the lease on the 26th. He found on

March 7 that ' the Society, once consisting of many hundred members, was mouldered into nothing.' See *Journal*, iv. 290-6, 301.

Now what food will you have for pride ! what infinite temptations to think more highly than you ought to think ! You do so already. But O where will you stop ? The good Lord arrest the storm in mid career ! How impetuously now, unless God interpose, must self-will whirl you along ! How deeply, unless He help, will you shortly be immersed in practical Atheism ! as ten thousand things will concur to drive God out of your thoughts, as much as if He were not in the world. But, above all, how will you escape from being swallowed up in idolatry ? love of the world, such as you never knew before ?

Hitherto you have been greatly superior to every delicacy in food ; but even this may assault you now, and perhaps raise in you other desires which you are now a stranger to. At present you are above the follies of dress ; but will you be so a twelvemonth hence ? May you not easily slide into the pride of life, in this as well as other instances ? especially considering how your vanity will be gratified thereby ? For who will not admire and applaud your admirable taste ? It will only remain for you to marry some agreeable person that has much wit and sense with little or no religion ; then it is finished ! Either you will be throughly miserable in this world or miserable to eternity.

' But what business is this of yours ? Cannot you let me alone ? What have I to do with you ? ' Believe me, I could very easily let you alone, if I had not a real and tender goodwill toward you, and if I did not know (what perhaps you do not) that you have need even of me. You want friends who understand you well, and who dare tell you the whole, plain truth ; and yet not in a surly, imperious manner, for then you could not receive it. I have endeavoured to do this once more. Will not you forgive me ? I cannot but think, if you do not thank, you will at least excuse Your affectionate servant.

*To William Alwood*

NORWICH, *March 29, 1759.*

DEAR BILLY,—I believe each window may stand eight foot (the bottom of it) from the ground,<sup>1</sup> and be four foot broad and six or seven high, arched at the top.

<sup>1</sup> The preaching-house at York was being built. See letter of March 6 to Alwood.

If you think it would do good, I should have no objection to preaching at Selby about eleven o'clock, as I come from Epworth, on Wednesday, April 18.

Oblige Dr. Cockburn as far as possibly you can. We can bear with little tempers, though we do not *approve* of them. I can say little now to what T. Tobias<sup>1</sup> writes of. I should think a patient, mild man might quiet two scolding women. Billy, pray and labour with your might. You may direct your next to me at Epworth.—I am

Your affectionate friend and brother.

I doubt Sister Hall<sup>a</sup> forgets me.

*To his Wife*

GRIMSBY, April 9, 1759.

MY DEAR MOLLY,—I must write once more. Then, if I hear nothing from you, I have done.

About a year ago, while I suspected nothing less, you opened my bureau and took out many of my letters and papers. Mr. Blackwell advised me, before you, if you refused to restore them, to send that instant for a smith, and break open your bureau and take my own. To prevent which you restored them. But it was not long before you robbed me again, and showed my private letters to more than twenty different persons on purpose to make them have an ill opinion of me. For the same end you spoke much evil of me while I was several hundred miles off.

Your pretence was that I conversed with Sister Ryan and Crosby.<sup>2</sup> I know it was only a pretence, and told your friends the humouring you herein would leave matters just where they were. I knew giving a person drink would not cure a dropsy. However, at their instance I made the experiment. I broke off all correspondence with them, whether by speaking

<sup>1</sup> One of Alwood's colleagues  
A letter from him to Wesley is given  
in Atmore's *Memorial*, pp 429-30  
He died about the year 1767

<sup>2</sup> Ruth Hall (born at Woolley,  
near Barnsley, in 1732) did much for

the spread of Methodism in and  
around York. See Lyth's *Methodism in York*, pp 69-71, *Arminian Mag* 1781, p 477, 1789, p 303

<sup>3</sup> See letters of July 12, 1758, and  
March 2 and Oct 23, 1759



or writing. For a while, having gained your point, you was in a good humour. Afterwards it was just as I said. You robbed me again; and your sin (as before) carried its own punishment: for the papers you had stole harrowed up your soul and tore your poor fretful spirit in pieces.

Notwithstanding this, you wrote me two loving letters. (I hope, not with a design of reading them to other people; which I shall not suspect if you assure me you have not read or shown them in part or in whole to any one.) So that I was a little surprised when at our meeting in Colchester I found you thoroughly out of humour. It really seemed as if you was heartily vexed by the papers you had taken, and so were resolved to have it out with me. Accordingly you could not refrain from throwing squibs at me even in company,<sup>1</sup> and from speaking with such keenness when we were alone, as I think no wife ought to speak to an husband—such as I apprehend you could not have used decently to any but Noah Vazeille.<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps you may now take the greater liberty, because, having stripped me of all my papers, you imagine it is now absolutely impossible for me to justify myself. But you are under a mistake. To all that know me my word is a sufficient justification. And if anything more is needful, I know One that is able to say to the Grave, 'Give back!' Yea, and if He say it to Jealousy, cruel as the Grave, it shall hear and obey His voice.

Wishing you the blessing which you now want above any other—namely, unfeigned and deep repentance,—I remain

Your much injured yet still affectionate Husband.

To Mrs. Wesley, At the Foundery,  
London.

*To Sir James Lowther, afterwards Earl of Lonsdale*

The first Sir James Lowther, of Whitehaven, to whom Wesley wrote on October 28, 1754, was probably known to him through Benjamin Biggs (see letter of February 8, 1763). This letter is to Sir James Lowther, afterwards Earl of Lonsdale. He replied on May 21; and Wesley wrote again on July 1.

<sup>1</sup> He was at Colchester on March 19.

<sup>2</sup> Her first husband.

LONDON, *May 16, 1759.* .

DEAR SIR,—Since I received your favour I have had many thoughts on worldly and Christian prudence. What is the nature of each? How do they differ? How may we distinguish one from the other?

It seems worldly prudence either pursues worldly ends—riches, honour, ease, or pleasure; or pursues Christian ends on worldly maxims or by worldly means. The grand maxims which obtain in the world are, The more power, the more money, the more learning, and the more reputation a man has, the more good he will do. And whenever a Christian, pursuing the noblest ends, forms his behaviour by these maxims, he will infallibly (though perhaps by insensible degrees) decline into worldly prudence. He will use more or less of conformity to the world, if not in sin, yet in doing some things that are good in themselves, yet (all things considered) are not good to him; and perhaps at length using guile or disguise, simulation or dissimulation; either seeming to be what he is not, or not seeming to be what he is. By any of these marks may worldly prudence be discerned from the wisdom which is from above.

This Christian prudence pursues Christian maxims, and by Christian means. The ends it pursues are holiness in every kind and in the highest degree, and usefulness in every kind and degree. And herein it proceeds on the following maxims:—The help that is done upon earth, God doeth it Himself. It is He that worketh all in all; and that, not by human power; generally He uses weak things to confound the strong;—not by men of wealth; most of His choicest instruments may say, 'Silver and gold have I none';—not by learned or wise men after the flesh; no, the foolish things hath God chosen;—not by men of reputation, but by the men that were as the filth and offscouring of the world: all which is for this plain reason—'that no flesh may glory in His sight.'

Christian prudence pursues these ends upon these principles, by only Christian means. A truly prudent Christian, while in things purely indifferent he becomes all things to all men,

yet wherever duty is concerned, matters the example of all mankind no more than a grain of sand. His word is then,

Non me, qui caetera, vincit  
Impetus ; et rapido contrarius evehor orbi.<sup>1</sup>

He will not, to gain the favour or shun the hate of all, omit the least point of duty. He cannot prevail upon himself on any account or pretence to use either simulation or dissimulation. There is no guile in his mouth, no evasion or ambiguity. Having one desire, one design, to glorify God with his body and with his spirit ; having only one fear,

Lest a motion, or a word,  
Or thought arise to grieve his Lord ;

having one rule, the Word of God ; one guide, even His Spirit, he goes on in childlike simplicity. Continually seeing Him that is invisible, he walks in open day. Looking unto Jesus, and deriving strength from Him, he goes on in His steps, in the work of faith, the labour of love, the patience of hope, till he is called up to be ever with the Lord.

Oh that this were in all points your own character ! Surely you desire it above all things. But how shall you attain ? Difficulties and hindrances surround you on every side ! Can you bear with my plainness ? I believe you can. Therefore I will speak without any reserve. I fear you have scarce one friend who has not more or less of the prudence which is not from above. And I doubt you have (in or near your own rank) hardly one example of true Christian prudence ! Yet I am persuaded your own heart advises you right, or rather God in your heart. Oh that you may hearken to His voice alone, and let all creatures keep silence before Him ! Why should they encumber you with Saul's armour ? If you essay to go forth thus, it will be in vain. You have no need of this, neither of his sword or spear ; for you trust in the Lord of hosts. O go forth in His strength ! and with the stones of the brook you shall overthrow all your enemies.—I am, dear sir,  
Your obedient servant for Christ's sake.

<sup>1</sup> Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, II. i. 72-3 (trs. by Addison) :

' I steer against their notions ; nor am I  
Borne back by all the current of the sky.

*To Clayton Carthy*

Wesley's fourth volume of *Sermons* was published in Bristol in 1760. The sermon on the New Birth is the second of the seven. Carthy was probably one of Wesley's preachers, who was looking after his printing. The letter shows how Wesley did his literary work, sending a sermon as it was ready. He was busy finishing the volume at Bristol on October 1759. See *Journal*, iv. 355; and letter of June 23, 1760.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, *June 12, 1759.*

DEAR CLAYTON,—I hope you have received the sermon upon the New Birth. I can easily send you one a week. I have finished eight, and am now transcribing the fourth. You should supply any word that is wanting.

Go east, west, north, or south, to Norton<sup>1</sup> or elsewhere, and speak sense or nonsense for a quarter of an hour. I believe it will avail both for your soul and body more than you imagine.

I do 'think what is doing.' By this post (to leave that poor sinner without excuse) I have wrote once more in the following words :

I make you one more offer. Only leave off speaking against me behind my back (whereby you do not hurt me, but the cause of God) and restore my papers to me, and you will find me

Your still affectionate Husband.<sup>2</sup>

My part is to go on my way and to finish my work.—I am,  
dear Clayton, Yours affectionately.

To Mr. Carthy, At the New Room,  
In Bristol.

*To Sir James Lowther*

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, *July 1, 1759.*

DEAR SIR,—Considering the variety of business which must lie upon you, I am not willing to trouble you too often, yet cannot any longer delay to return thanks for your favour of May 21. How happy is it that there is an higher wisdom than our own to guide us through the mazes of life! that we have an unction from the Holy One to teach us of all things where

<sup>1</sup> Norton St. Philips (*Journal*, iii. 324). Wesley's anger by defending her husband's character. See letter of

<sup>2</sup> Carthy had incurred Mrs. April 9.

human teaching fails ! And it certainly must fail in a thousand instances. General rules cannot reach all particular cases, in some of which there is such a complication of circumstances that God alone can show what steps we should take. There is one circumstance in your case which claims your peculiar attention, and makes it necessary often to check that boldness and simplicity which otherwise would be both your duty and pleasure. But oh how easily may you comply too far, and hurt yourself in hopes of gaining another ! nay, perhaps hurt the other too, by that very compliance which was designed to help ! And who is able to lay the line ? to determine how far you should comply, and where fix your foot ? May the God of wisdom direct you in all your steps ! And I conceive He will rather do this by giving you light directly from Himself in meditation and private prayer than by the advice of others, who can hardly be impartial in so tender a point. Is it not, then, advisable that you should much commune with God and your own heart ? You may then lay aside all the trappings that naturally tend to hide you from yourself, and appear naked, as a poor sinful worm, before the great God, the Creator of heaven and of earth ! the great God, who is your Father and your Friend ! who hath prepared for you a kingdom ! who calls you to forget the little things of earth, and to sit down with Him on His throne ! O may you dwell on these things till they possess your whole soul and cause you to love the honour which cometh of God only !—I am, dear sir,

Your obedient servant.

*To Dr. Taylor, of Norwich*

John Taylor (1694–1761) went to Norwich in 1733 ; where he founded the Octagon Chapel, 1754. He became divinity tutor at Warrington Academy in 1757. His *Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin* appeared in 1735–6. Wesley's *Doctrine of Original Sin* was published in 1757. How strongly he felt on the subject is shown by his letter to Toplady on December 9, 1758 : ' I verily believe no single person since Mahomet has given such a wound to Christianity as Dr. Taylor.' Wesley wrote Sir Harry Trelawney in 1,61 that he had ' reason to believe he was convinced of his mistake some years before he died.' Taylor did not publish any reply to Wesley's treatise ; but after his death a pamphlet was issued which purported to give some ' Observations by way of Reply.' See *W.H.S.* viii. 53.

HARTLEPOOL, July 3, 1759.

REVEREND SIR,—I esteem you as a person of uncommon sense and learning, but your doctrine I cannot esteem; and some time since, I believed it my duty to speak my sentiments at large concerning your doctrine of Original Sin. When Mr. Newton of Liverpool<sup>1</sup> mentioned this, and asked whether you designed to answer, you said you thought not, 'for it would only be a personal controversy between John Wesley and John Taylor.' How gladly, if I durst, would I accept of this discharge from so unequal contest! for I am thoroughly sensible, humanly speaking, it is *formica contra leonem*.<sup>2</sup> How gladly, were it indeed no other than a personal controversy! But certainly it is not: it is a controversy *de re*, if ever there was one in this world; indeed, concerning a thing of the highest importance—nay, all the things that concern our eternal peace. It is Christianity or heathenism! for, take away the scriptural doctrine of Redemption or Justification, and that of the New Birth, the beginning of sanctification, or (which amounts to the same) explain them as you do, suitably to your doctrine of Original Sin, and what is Christianity better than heathenism? wherein, save in rectifying some of our notions, has the religion of St. Paul any pre-eminence over that of Socrates or Epictetus?

This is, therefore, to my apprehension, the least a personal controversy of any in the world. Your person and mine are out of the question. The point is, Are those things that have been believed for many ages throughout the Christian world real, solid truths, or monkish dreams and vain imaginations?

But farther: it is certain, between you and me there need be no personal controversy at all; for we may agree to leave each other's person and character absolutely untouched, while we sum up and answer the several arguments advanced as plainly and closely as we can.

Either I or you mistake the whole of Christianity from the beginning to the end! Either my scheme or yours is as contrary to the scriptural as the Koran is. Is it mine, or

<sup>1</sup> Afterwards the Rev. John Newton of Olney. See letter of April 9, 1765.

<sup>2</sup> 'An ant against a lion.'

yours? Yours has gone through all England and made numerous converts. I attack it from end to end. Let all England judge whether it can be defended or not !

Earnestly praying that God may give you and me a right understanding in all things, I am, reverend sir,

Your servant for Christ's sake.

*To Samuel Furly*

Wesley's *Journal* for July 6 says : ' I rode on to Yarm. The heat of the day was hardly to be borne ; but in the evening it was extremely pleasant, and the whole congregation were deeply serious.' This letter was written before one o'clock the next day, when he reached Hutton Rudby, six miles to the south, where a new preaching-house had just been built.

YARM, July 7, 1759.

DEAR SAMMY,—Our Conference at Leeds is to begin on Wednesday, August 1. I hope to see you at it. If you are in Yorkshire some days sooner, we shall have more time together. Your present call to Kippax is clear : when you are called farther, that will be clear also. What avails all knowledge but that which ministers to the knowledge of Christ, and which qualifies us for saving our own souls and the souls of them that hear us ? What knowledge you have of other things retain ; but secure this in all and above all.—I am, with love to Nancy, dear Sammy, Yours affectionately.

To the Rev<sup>d</sup>. Mr. Furly, At Lakenheath,  
Near Brandon, Suffolk.

*To Miss C—*

YORK, July 15, 1759.

DEAR MISS C—,—Your letter gave me much satisfaction, though it was long before I received it. Now I find you can speak freely to me ; and as you have found the way, I hope to hear from you a little oftener. In a few days I hope to be at Leeds. Why should you not give me the pleasure of hearing from you there ?

At present you are a captive of unbelief, though an unwilling captive. But I trust you shall ere long know One that

bringeth the prisoners out of captivity. You can say from your heart,—

I would not to the foe submit ;  
I hate the tyrant's chain :  
Bring, Lord, the prisoner from the pit ;  
Nor let me cry in vain.<sup>1</sup>

And you will not cry in vain ; only cry on, though it be weariness and pain to slothful flesh and blood. If instability and ingratitude were sufficient to prevent either present or future salvation, then would no child of Adam ever have been saved from the foundation of the world. But these and all manner of sin are washed away by the blood of the covenant. You want only to be acquainted with this to have it sprinkled upon your heart. And how soon may it be ? Why not now ? If you have nothing to pay, leave all your harmlessness, your good desires or works, all you have and are behind ! Are you to be saved *freely* ? Then be it as thou wilt !

Freely the gift of God receive,  
Pardon and peace in Jesus find.

Away with your preparation ! The Lord Himself prepare your heart and then hearken thereto ! Away with your reasoning ! Be a little child ! Sink down before the Saviour of sinners, the Lover of *your* soul ! Let Him have the glory over you. What hinders ? Dear Miss C—, be not reserved or fearful when you speak to

Your affectionate brother and servant.

To Mr.—

Wesley refers to the *Minutes*, June 1747: 'Q. 22. Is not the teaching believers to be continually poring upon their inbred sin the ready way to make them forget that they were purged from their former sins ? A. We find by experience it is, or to make them undervalue and account it a little thing : whereas, indeed (though there are still greater gifts behind), this is inexpressibly great and glorious.'

<sup>1</sup> *Poetical Works of J. and C. Wesley*, iv. 247, altered slightly.



EVERTON, August 6, 1759.

DEAR SIR,—In the *Minutes* of the Conference we observe that 'poring too much upon our inbred sin' may bring us 'under a kind of bondage'—that is, when we fix, as it were, *both eyes* of the mind upon it; whereas one only should be fixed upon this, and the other constantly upon Christ. One with whom I was speaking a day or two ago, who seems to be entered into rest, by looking at *sin alone*, had lost all her joy and peace, and almost her faith, and was like a condemned unbeliever; while her friend (whom I judge to be higher in grace than her) only felt an inexpressible want and emptiness (yet consistent with peace as well as with love) till she was filled with the fullness of God. O tread in her steps! Be simple, little, nothing: yet be loved of God! yet a member of Christ, a child of God! an heir of all His promises! Be still, and know that He is God! *Obmutesce, pulvis et cinis. καὶ γηθήσεται γαλήνη ἢ μεγάλη.*<sup>1</sup>

To Dorothy Furlly

At Middlezoy, not far from Bristol, Wesley had 'an exceeding good account of a young man here, Cornelius Bastable, both with regard to his gifts and grace and fruits' Wesley asked him if he was willing to leave all and give himself up to the work of calling sinners to repentance. 'He said he was; and that he had weighed all circumstances before, knowing in his own mind that I would now ask him the question. I desired him then to go home and fetch his horse. He did so, and we rode together to Beer Crocombe.' Two letters from him to Wesley in 1767 show that Bastable was in feeble health, but was not suffered 'to live one moment without a ravishing and increasing sense of His glorious presence.' He died in 1777. See *Journal*, viii. 159; *Arminian Magazine*, 1783, pp. 500-1; and letter of December 15, 1763.

LONDON, August 19, 1759.

MY DEAR SISTER,—The observing that rule might prevent abundance of mischief: I wish others would observe it as well as you. Thomas Walsh was a good and a wise man; yet there were some circumstances, not commonly known, which easily account for the darkness he went through before he went to paradise.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'Become dumb, dust and ashes. And there shall be a great calm.' A piece of the letter has been torn off;

but this seems to be its substance.  
<sup>2</sup> See *Wesley's Veterans*, v. 190-8.

I hope you have talked with Cornelius Bastable as well as heard him preach. He is an uncommon monument of the power of grace, strengthening the understanding as well as renewing the heart. For so weak an head and so bad a temper as he once had I do not know among all our preachers.

Probably the difference between you and others lies in words chiefly. All who expect to be sanctified at all expect to be sanctified by faith. But meantime they know that faith will not be given but to them that obey. Remotely, therefore, the blessing depends on our works, although immediately on simple faith.

Enjoy while you may the advantage which I had once, and shall have again when God sees best.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

Certainly you may say to me whatever you have a mind, either by writing or speaking.

#### To Mr. Jones

The *Journal* for December 27, 1758, shows how much Wesley's strength was overtaxed at this time. He bore up well during the journeys of the next few months; but on August 12 he felt exceeding weak in view of his Sunday work, and deferred his journey to Norwich or Cornwall on Tuesday, as he felt the need of a little rest. He was quiet for the remainder of the week, but on the 19th was in full work again. His *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*, to which he refers in his postscript, appeared in 1755; the third corrected edition in three volumes was published in Bristol 1760-2. See p. 99.

LONDON, August 22, 1759.

SIR,—Nothing is more certain than that the kingdom of God is not divided against itself; that peace and joy in the Holy Ghost are no ways obstructive of righteousness, even in the highest degree of it. Hold fast, therefore, that whereunto you have attained, and in peace and joy wait for perfect love. *We know this is not of works, lest any man should boast*; and it is no more of sufferings than it is of works. Nothing is absolutely pre-required but a sense of our want; and this may be a calm, peaceful, yet joyful sense of it. When I was lately in Rotherham, I talked with eleven persons who seem

to be perfected in love.<sup>1</sup> Of these Jane Green (the wife of one of our preachers) was *facile princeps*—higher and deeper in experience than them all; and she never was in darkness or heaviness one hour during the second conviction. Only she felt in a manner not to be expressed her own foolishness, emptiness, and nothingness. And in this state she quietly continued till God said, 'Be thou clean.'

While I was riding (since Christmas) three- or four-and-twenty hundred miles I found no want of strength. But when my work was at an end, so was my strength. When I want it, I shall have it again. I thought you was to have been here in October; but God's time is the best! He doth all things well. Why should we not trust Him in all?—I am, dear sir,

Ever yours.

Will you take the time and pains to read the *Notes* critically over, and give me your alterations and additions before I print another edition?

### To Richard Tompson

The editor of the pamphlet *Original Letters between the Reverend Mr. John Wesley and Mr. Richard Tompson*, 'imagining it would not be proper to publish any person's letters without their knowledge, requested Mr. Tompson to inform Mr. Wesley of the design, and to ask his permission. He returned him the following answer' See letter of June 28, 1755, to Tompson.

LONDON, August 22, 1759.

I am afraid you would hardly save yourself harmless by the publication of those letters. However, if you are inclined to run the hazard, I do not object. Only it would be needful to advertise the readers that what I wrote was in haste, just as I could snatch a little time now and then, to answer the private letter of a private friend, without any thought of its going any farther.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

<sup>1</sup> Wesley says in the *Journal* for Aug. 2, 1759: 'Thence I went on to Rotherham, and talked with five men and six women (as I had done with many others before in various places) who believe they are saved

from sin. And this fact I believe, that they "rejoice evermore, pray without ceasing, and in everything give thanks." I believe they feel nothing but love now: what they will do, I leave to God.'

*To the Editor of 'Lloyd's Evening Post'*

On October 15 Wesley 'walked up to Knowle, a mile from Bristol, to see the French prisoners.' He found they had only a few foul, thin rags to cover them. 'I was much affected, and preached in the evening on Exodus xxiii. 9.' £18 was collected, and next day it was made up to £24. Clothes were bought and carefully distributed to the most needy. The Corporation sent mattresses and blankets. Contributions were set on foot in London and other places; and from that time the prisoners 'were pretty well provided with all the necessaries of life.' See *Journal*, iv. 355-6; and letter of November 4.

BRISTOL, *October 20, 1759.*

SIR,—Since I came to Bristol I heard many terrible accounts concerning the French prisoners at Knowle,—as that 'they were so wedged together that they had no room to breathe'; that 'the stench of the rooms where they lodged was intolerable'; that 'their food was only fit for dogs'; that 'their meat was carrion, their bread rotten and unwholesome'; and that, 'in consequence of this inhuman treatment, they died in whole shoals.'

Desiring to know the truth, I went to Knowle on Monday, and was showed all the apartments there. But how was I disappointed! (1) I found they had large and convenient space to walk in, if they chose it, all the day. (2) There was no stench in any apartment which I was in, either below or above. They were all sweeter and cleaner than any prison I have seen either in England or elsewhere. (3) Being permitted to go into the larder, I observed the meat hanging up, two large quarters of beef. It was fresh and fat, and I verily think as good as I ever desire to eat. (4) A large quantity of bread lay on one side. A gentleman took up and cut one of the loaves. It was made of good flour, was well-baked, and perfectly well-tasted. (5) Going thence to the hospital, I found that even in this sickly season there are not thirty persons dangerously ill out of twelve or thirteen hundred. (6) The hospital was sweeter and cleaner throughout than any hospital I ever saw in London. I think it my duty to declare these things, for clearing the innocent and the honour of the English nation.

Yet one thing I observed with concern. A great part of these men are almost naked; and winter is now coming upon

them in a cold prison and a colder climate than most of them have been accustomed to. But will not the humanity and generosity of the gentlemen of Bristol prevent or relieve this distress? Did they not make a notable precedent during the late war? And surely they are not weary of well-doing. Tuesday night *we* did a little according to our power; but I shall rejoice if this be forgotten through the abundance administered by their liberality in a manner which they judge most proper. Will it not be both for the honour of their city and country, for the credit of our religion, and for the glory of God, who knows how to return it sevenfold into their bosom?—  
I am  
Your humble servant,

### To his Wife

The following contemporary estimate, and especially the statement of the trusty old preacher, John Furz, shows what Wesley had to stand against in his wife's endeavour to rob his preachers of the Book Room money. The date of the Conference in Leeds is not given; but Furz became a preacher about 1765, and retired in 1782, four years before Joseph Sutcliffe entered the rank. Conference met in Leeds in 1766, 1769, and 1772. Furz died in 1800, and his obituary in the *Minutes* of that year says he 'was a zealous defender of our purest doctrines.' See Atmore's *Memorial*, pp 148-54, *Wesley's Veterans*, v 199-228; and letters of April 9 and November 24

Sutcliffe says in his manuscript *History of Methodism*, 1 402 —

Mrs. Vazeille was in many views a generous-hearted woman. Her house and heart were open to ministers whenever it was convenient for them to call. But her temper was difficult, yet such as Mr. Vazeille had known how to manage. Mr. and Mrs. Charles [Wesley] had visited at her house, and in return had taken her round to Oxford, Evesham, Blenheim, and Ludlow, where Mr. Gwynne's family then resided; Charles not then dreaming that she would be his brother's wife. The fact is, Mrs. Vazeille had not counted the cost that in marrying Mr. Wesley she married a man already married to the work of the Lord. His society she could not hope to enjoy more than a fourth part of the year. To accompany him, as he then had no chaise, would be expensive and deprive her of her children. In that case farewell to his rides of fifty and sixty miles a day. Be that as it might, she would often accompany him to small distances in and about the city.

On one occasion, when going to preach at a small distance, the time being come and the coach waiting, but she was not ready, he stood for ten minutes with a watch in his hand. Still she was not ready, so he stepped into the coach and left her behind.

She accompanied him to the Leeds Conference. Mr. John Furz told me that Mr. Wesley took him into a room and wept; adding she was teasing him continually to settle £800 upon her son, which would swallow up for

one year more than the proceeds of his books. Then nothing would be left for the preachers that had families and for his own travelling expenses above what the Stewards in certain places gave him. It happened that during this Conference she was walking up Briggate, and an old woman exclaimed, 'Oh, God bless you, Mrs Wesley!' She asked, 'What does that woman mean?' 'Why, ma'am,' said he, 'I suppose she thinks that Mrs. Wesley is the happiest woman in all the world.'

After marriage, they associated for the space of about five years; then she left him, and went to her friends, alleging many complaints. After leaving her husband's house, she saw her error, felt as an isolated woman, and wished to return. Some letters passed between them. She had alleged neglects and slights. On one occasion she went into the house when Mr. Wesley was sitting down to supper with a friend or two, and said that she was coming home on Tuesday evening, and requested that a room might be ready. The reply was, 'It happens very contrary; for I am going off for Yorkshire early on Monday morning.'

Among the letters that passed were two letters in which Mr. Wesley admitted some improprieties in himself. These Mrs Wesley preserved, and sometimes showed to his friends—a source of mischief in future years between Mr. Charles and Mr Maxfield. Maxfield in his first love and ingenuous zeal has so successfully imitated the trait of Mr Wesley's pen, that people could scarcely distinguish their handwritings. When those letters after a lapse of time came to Charles's knowledge, he reproached Maxfield with the forgery, and, being ever jealous of Maxfield's popularity, on a Saturday morning, when the preachers met to receive their Sabbath appointments, would give him no work! Mrs. Green, great-niece of Mrs. Charles, told me that Sam often said Maxfield had forged those letters; and every trait in the character of Maxfield would authorize us to think the contrary. But oh, what is it that the enemy will not do when once he enters the fold and gains a partial possession of the heart!

COLEFORD, October 23, 1759.

DEAR MOLLY,—I will tell you simply and plainly the things which I dislike. If you remove them, well. If not, I am but where I was. I dislike (1) Your showing any one my letters and private papers without my leave. This never did any good yet, either to you or me or any one. It only sharpens and embitters your own spirit. And the same effect it naturally has upon others. The same it would have upon me, but that (by the grace of God) I do not think of it. It can do no good. It can never bring me nearer, though it may drive me farther off. And should you do as you often threaten, then the matter is over. I know what I have to do. In all this you are fighting against yourself. You are frustrating your own purpose, if you want me to love you. You take just the wrong way. No one ever was *forced* to love another. It cannot be: love can only be won by *softness*;

foul means avail nothing. But you say, 'I have tried fair means, and they did not succeed.' If they do not, none will. Then you have only to say, 'This evil is of the Lord: I am clay in His hand.'

I dislike (2) Not having the command of my own house, not being at liberty to invite even my nearest relations so much as to drink a dish of tea without disoblising *you*. I dislike (3) The being myself a prisoner in my own house; the having my chamber door watched continually so that no person can go in or out but such as have your good leave. I dislike (4) The being but a prisoner at large, even when I go abroad, inasmuch as you are highly disgusted if I do not give you an account of every place I go to and every person with whom I converse. I dislike (5) The not being safe in my own house. My house is *not* my castle. I cannot call even my study, even my bureau, my own. They are liable to be plundered every day. You say, 'I plunder you of nothing but papers.' I am not sure of that. How is it possible I should? I miss money too, and he that will steal a pin will steal a pound. But were it so, a scholar's papers are his treasure—my Journal in particular. 'But I took only such papers as relate to Sarah Ryan and Sarah Crosby.' That is not true. What are Mr. Landey's letters to them? Besides, you have taken parts of my Journal which relate to neither one nor the other. I dislike (6) Your treatment of my servants (though, indeed, they are not properly mine). You do all that in you lies to make their lives a burthen to them. You browbeat, harass, rate them like dogs, make them afraid to speak to me. You treat them with such haughtiness, sternness, sourness, surliness, ill-nature, as never were known in any house of mine for near a dozen years. You forget even good breeding, and use such coarse language as befits none but a fishwife.

I dislike (7) Your talking against me behind my back, and that every day and almost every hour of the day; making my faults (real or supposed) the standing topic of your conversation. I dislike (8) Your slandering me, laying to my charge things which you know are false. Such are (to go but a few days back)—'that I beat you,' which you told

James Burges<sup>1</sup>; that I rode to Kingswood with Sarah Ryan, which you told Sarah Crosby; and that I required you, when we were first married, never to sit in my presence without my leave, which you told Mrs. Lee,<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Fry, and several others, and stood it before my face. I dislike (9) Your common custom of saying things not true. To instance only in two or three particulars. You told Mr. Ireland<sup>3</sup> 'Mr. Vazeille learnt Spanish in a fortnight.' You told Mr. Fry 'Mrs. Ellison<sup>4</sup> was the author as to my intrigue in Georgia.' You told Mrs. Ellison 'you never said any such thing; you never charged her with it.' You also told her 'that I had laid a plot to serve you as Susannah was served by the two elders.' I dislike (10) Your extreme, immeasurable bitterness to all who endeavour to defend my character (as my brother, Joseph Jones, Clayton Carthy<sup>5</sup>), breaking out even into foul, unmannerly language, such as ought not to defile a gentlewoman's lips if she did not believe one word of the Bible.

And now, Molly, what would any one advise you to that has a real concern for your happiness? Certainly (1) to show, read, touch those letters no more, if you did not restore them to their proper owner; (2) to allow *me* the command of my own house, with free leave to invite thither whom I please; (3) to allow me my liberty there that any who will may come to me without let or hindrance; (4) to let me go where I please and to whom I please without giving an account to any; (5) to assure me you will take no more of my papers nor anything of mine without my consent; (6) to treat all the servants where you are, whether you like them or no, with courtesy and humanity, and to speak (if you speak at all) to them, as well as others, with good nature and good manners; (7) to speak no evil of me behind my back; (8) never to accuse me falsely; (9) to be extremely cautious of

<sup>1</sup> One of the masters at Kingswood. Wesley visited the school-house in 1739, and was there during the fire of 1757. See *Diary in Journal*, ii. 206, 240, 302; iv. 242.

<sup>2</sup> Eleanor Lee, 'a mother in Israel,' whom Wesley buried in 1778. See *Journal*, vi. 213.

<sup>3</sup> James Ireland, of Brislington, near Bristol. See next letter.

<sup>4</sup> Wesley's sister Susanna, who spent her last years in London. Evidently some reference to Sophia Hopkey.

<sup>5</sup> See letter of June 12.



saying anything that is not strictly true, both as to the matter and manner; and (10) to avoid all bitterness of expression till you can avoid all bitterness of spirit.

These are the advices which I now give you in the fear of God and in tender love to your soul. Nor can I give you a stronger proof that I am      Your affectionate Husband.

*To the Editor of the 'Morning Chronicle'*

In the *Morning Chronicle* for March 11, 1791, appears an extract from a letter of Wesley's in answer to some insinuations as to his appropriation of money collected for the French prisoners at Knowle. The writer says: 'Those who tell us that his income was £10,000 a year have fallen into that mistake by supposing that the collections in the various chapels were for his use, whereas he had not so much as the beholding this money with *his eye*; it was all constantly expended where it was collected.' See letter of October 20.

November 4, 1759.

On Tuesday, October 16 last, I made a collection at the New Room in Bristol for the French prisoners confined at Knowle. The money contributed then and the next day was about three-and-twenty pounds. Judged it best to lay this out in shirts and flannel waistcoats, and accordingly bought, of Mr. Zepheniah Fry, in the Castle, check shirts and woollen cloth to the amount of eight pounds ten shillings and sixpence; and of Mrs. Sarah Cole, check linen to the amount of five pounds seventeen shillings. The linen was immediately delivered to two or three poor women, who were to be paid the common price, and to some others, who offered to make them into shirts, &c., for nothing. The money remaining I lodged in the hands of Mr. James Ireland of Horsleydown Street, as he speaks French readily, and Mr. John Salter of Bedminster, who had been with me both at the prison and the hospital. I directed them to give a waistcoat and two shirts to every one who was remanded from the hospital to the prison, and the other half to those they should judge most needy or most deserving.—I am, &c.

*To John Downes, Rector of St. Michael's, Wood Street*

For the letter of November 17, 1759, to John Downes, author of the pamphlet *Methodism Examined and Exposed*, see pp. 325-37.

## To Samuel Furly

LONDON, November 21, 1759.

DEAR SAMMY,—At present you are just *where* you ought to be, and *as* you ought to be. It is of great use to be in suspense. Nothing more effectually breaks our will. While you stay, you do well to give all the assistance you can to the Society. They must be weak and undisciplined as yet. Probably they want you more than once a month.<sup>1</sup>

I doubt not of Abraham's being perfected in love. But he was rather under the evangelical than the legal dispensation. And none can doubt but all the Jewish believers were perfected *before* they died. But that many of them were perfected *long before* they died I see no reason to think. The Holy Ghost was not *fully* given before Jesus was glorified. Therefore *the law* (unless in a very few exempt cases) *made nothing perfect*. It is certain the word 'perfect' in the Old Testament bears several senses. But we lay no stress upon the word at all. The thing is *pure love*. The promise of this was given by *Moses*, but not designed to be fulfilled till long after. See Deuteronomy xxx. 1-6. By the whole tenor of the words it appears it was *then*, when He had *gathered* the Jews *from all nations*, that God was so to *circumcise their hearts*. However, this may be fulfilled in you and me. Let us hasten toward it! With love to Nancy, I am

Your affectionate friend and brother.

To the Rev. Mr. Furly, At Kippax,  
Near Ferry Bridge, Yorks.

## To his Wife

BEDFORD, November 24, 1759.

MY DEAR MOLLY,—You have been much upon my thoughts this morning. Shall I tell you what I thought? Then take it in good part. Take it kindly, as it is kindly meant.

What do you gain by keeping my papers?<sup>2</sup> or, at least, think you gain? Why, this: you gain the satisfaction of showing them, or parts of them, to others; you gain the power of justifying *yourself*, and of hurting (at least by vexing) *me*; you gain occasion to make people think ill of *me*, and

<sup>1</sup> See letter of June 19, 1760.<sup>2</sup> See letter of Oct. 23.

to make them think well of *you*. And hereby you make yourself more friends and me more enemies.

Very well. But are you quite sure of this? Is it *pure satisfaction* which you gain by showing them? Is there not often a doubt whether you do right, a secret misgiving which spoils the satisfaction? Will the *showing* them justify you for *taking* them? Is it not rather adding sin to sin? And will not even men of the world say, 'What a wretch is this, first to *rob*, then to *expose* her own husband'? If, therefore, you make them think ill of *me*, you do not make them think well of *yourself*. If you make me more enemies, you do not make yourself one more friend—nay, all these after a time are less your friends than ever they were before.

But what if you did gain by it all that you suppose, would it make amends for what you lose thereby? You totally lose my esteem; you violently shock my love; you quite destroy my confidence. You oblige me to lock up everything as from a thief; to stand continually upon my guard; to watch all the time you are near me, as never knowing what you may steal next and expose to all the world. You cut yourself off from joint prayer. For how can I pray with one that is daily watching to do me hurt? You cut yourself off from all friendly intercourse with many who would otherwise rejoice to converse with and serve you. You rob yourself of many precious opportunities of public prayer and attending the Lord's Table. Now, how dearly must you love *justifying* yourself and *blackening* me, if you will do it at this expense! O Molly, throw the fire out of your bosom! Shun as you would a serpent those that stir it up. And see in a true light  
Your affectionate Husband.

To Mrs. Wesley, At the Foundery,  
London.

TRIALS AND BLESSINGS  
JANUARY 24, 1760, TO DECEMBER 15, 1763

PRINCIPAL EVENTS

- 1760, Feb. 21. *French landing at Carrickfergus.*  
May 5. *Execution of Earl Ferrers.*  
Oct. 25. *Death of George II.*  
1762. *Care and trouble in London.*  
Nov. 26. *Answer to Bishop Warburton.*  
1763, Jan. 7. *Wesley meets George Bell.*  
Mar. *Earthquake panic in London.*  
Apr. 28. *Thomas Maxfield leaves Wesley.*

This was one of the most trying periods of Wesley's life. On December 31, 1762, he writes in his Journal 'I now stood and looked back on the past year, a year of uncommon trials and uncommon blessings.'

Thomas Maxfield, one of his first lay preachers, deserted him in April 1763, under circumstances described in the letter of November 2, 1762. George Bell crowned his fanaticism by a prophecy that the world would be brought to an end on February 28, 1763. London was convulsed by the earthquake panic of March.

Wesley had now to bear the burden of administration alone; his chief lay counsellor was Ebenezer Blackwell. He lived in the public eye, as his frequent letters to the press show, and how careful he was to give account of his stewardship appears by what he wrote on February 18, 1760. The letter of January 2, 1761, describing Newgate in London as one of the chief 'seats of woe on this side hell,' and Newgate in Bristol as even worse, makes one thankful indeed for the reformation he had seen. His letters to his brother reveal that his hand and eye were everywhere.

The set of thirty-seven letters to 'A Member of the Society' begun on March 4, 1760, and on August 23, 1763, the first of twenty-seven to Mrs Bennet of Limerick. On April 25, 1761, Thomas Olivers is put through his catechism. The counsels to young friends are as wise and helpful as ever; and the letters to Lord and Lady Rawdon and Lady Gardiner give us a glimpse of his growing influence in higher circles.

Wesley's chief controversy was with Bishop Warburton, whom he does not flatter in the private letter to Charles on January 5, 1763. The anxieties of the time were increased by his brother standing so much aloof and his friends among the clergy failing to give him their sympathy. He deeply felt this desertion. Yet through evil report and good he held on his way; with the result that, when the period closed, Methodism had 'found itself,' and Wesley's influence and usefulness moved on a rising tide to the end of his life.

## TRIALS AND BLESSINGS

JANUARY 24, 1760, TO DECEMBER 15, 1763

To George Merryweather

BRENTFORD, January 24, 1760.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I received yours with the bill a day or two ago. I wish you would everywhere recommend two books in particular—*The Christian Pattern* and the *Primitive Physick*.<sup>1</sup> It is a great pity that any Methodist should be without them.

I wonder Brother Mather<sup>2</sup> does not write to me. He should not forget his friends. I hope the gentleman with whom I breakfasted at Yarm<sup>3</sup> has not forsaken you. Even the rich *may* enter into the kingdom ; for with God all things are possible.

See that you stir up the gift of God that is in you. What is our Lord's word to *you*?—'Let the dead bury their dead ; but follow thou Me !'—I am Your affectionate brother.

To the Editor of 'Lloyd's Evening Post'

This letter shows Wesley's care to give account of his stewardship and to find out worthy recipients for money sent to him. It appeared in the issue for February 22 See letter of October 20, 1759.

The Foundery was in Windmill Street, so called after three windmills, erected in Elizabeth's reign on more than a thousand cartloads of bones removed from the charnel of Old St. Paul's when the charnel-house was destroyed in 1549 by order of the Duke of Somerset. See Cunningham's *Handbook of London*, p. 557.

<sup>1</sup> Wesley's *An Extract of the Christian's Pattern* had been published in 1741, and reprinted in 1744, 1746, and 1759. It was an abridgement of his translation of 1735. The eighth edition of his *Primitive Physick* was issued in 1759.

<sup>2</sup> Alexander Mather was stationed

in the York Circuit, which included Yarm. He became one of the most powerful preachers and judicious leaders of Methodism, and was President of the Conference in 1792.

<sup>3</sup> Probably in July 1759. Mr. Waldy was a landed proprietor in Yarm. See letter of Dec. 28, 1767.

WINDMILL HILL, *February 18, 1760.*

SIR,—On Sunday, December 16 last, I received a £20 Bank bill from an anonymous correspondent, who desired me to lay it out in the manner I judged best for the use of poor prisoners. I immediately employed some in whom I could confide to inquire into the circumstances of those confined in Whitechapel and New Prison. I knew the former to have very little allowance even of bread, and the latter none at all. Upon inquiry they found one poor woman in Whitechapel Prison very big with child and destitute of all things. At the same time I casually heard of a poor man who had been confined for nine months in the Poultry Compter, while his wife and three children (whom he before maintained by his labour) were almost perishing through want. Not long after, another poor woman, who had been diligent in helping others, was herself thrown into Whitechapel Prison. The expense of discharging these three and giving them a few necessaries amounted to £10 10s. One pound fourteen shillings I expended in stockings and other clothing, which was given to those prisoners who were in the most pressing want. The remainder, £7 16s., was laid out in bread, which was warily distributed thrice a week. I am therefore assured that the whole of this sum was laid out in real charity. And how much more noble a satisfaction must result from this to the generous benefactor (even supposing there were no other world, supposing man to die as a beast dieth) than he could receive from an embroidered suit of clothes or a piece of plate made in the newest fashion ! Men of reason, judge !—I am, sir, Your humble servant.

*To Samuel Furly*

Furly was at Kippax, near Ferry Bridge, about twelve miles from Leeds, where Wesley arrived on the day mentioned, 'sufficiently tired; but I forgot it as soon as I began to preach.' Furly probably knew William Dodd through Mrs. Lefevre. See *Journal*, iv. 371-2; and letters of February 3 and 5, 1756.

LONDON, *February 25, 1760.*

DEAR SAMMY,—At present I have but just time to tell you I hope to be at Leeds on Tuesday, March 11. Your manner of proposing your objection puts me in mind of your friend

Mr. Dodd. You speak *ex cathedra*. But the matter is not so clear as it appears to you. It is, however, a point, though considered long ago, worth considering again and again. But you must stay your stomach till you either see or hear again from  
Your affectionate brother.

### To Miss March

This is the first of thirty-seven letters described in the *Works* as 'To a Member of the Society.' In the last, dated December 10, 1777, Wesley closes with 'My dear Miss M.' That of April 16, 1760, seems to imply that she was living at Eltham; and on May 13, 1762, and October 13, 1764, Wesley refers to her 'band.' Miss Mary Thornton says that before her marriage in 1773 to Charles Greenwood, of Stoke Newington, she lived as friend and companion with Miss March, 'a lady of fortune and piety.' Maxfield declined in December 1761 to meet at Mrs. [Miss] March's house, where Wesley hoped his conduct might be explained. On Monday morning, September 3, 1764, John Valton was taken by a friend to Miss March's meeting for Christian communion. The friends gave their experience, and at the close Maxfield, who had been ordained, administered the sacrament. Thomas Jackson adds a note: 'Miss March was a lady of good education; and, having a small independent fortune, devoted her life and all she had in doing good. She sometimes made excursions to Bristol and other parts of the country, where she met classes, &c.' In August 1774 she is at Bristol during the Conference, and probably stayed with Wesley at Miss Johnson's. Wesley couples their names together in 1783, when he says the pious people of Holland 'dress as plain as Miss March did formerly and Miss Johnson does now.' If these letters were to Miss March, four others, addressed 'To Miss J. C. M.' on January 30, 1762, June 24, 1764, June 3, 1774, and May 30, 1776, must be added. See *Journal*, v. 5, vi. 427; *Methodist Magazine*, 1805, p. 37; *Wesley's Veterans*, vi. 21; and for Miss Johnson, letter of December 15, 1763.

WEDNESBURY, March 4, 1760.

Certainly the more freedom you use the more advantage you will find. But at the same time it will be needful continually to remember from whom every good and perfect gift cometh. If He blesses our intercourse with each other, then we shall never repent of the labour.

It is a blessing indeed when God uncovers our hearts and clearly shows us what spirit we are of. But there is no manner of necessity that this self-knowledge should make us miserable. Certainly the highest degree of it is well consistent both with



peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Therefore how deeply soever you may be convinced of pride, self-will, peevishness, or any other inbred sin, see that you do not let go that confidence whereby you may still rejoice in God your Saviour. Some, indeed, have been quite unhappy, though they retained their faith, through desire on the one hand and conviction on the other. But that is nothing to you ; you need never give up anything which you have already received : you will not, if you keep close to that,—

For this my vehement soul stands still ;  
Restless, resigned, for this I wait.

We have a fuller, clearer knowledge of our own members than of those belonging to other Societies ; and may therefore, without any culpable partiality, have a better opinion of them.

It is a great thing to spend all our time to the glory of God. But you need not be scrupulous as to the precise time of reading and praying ; I mean, as to the dividing it between one and the other. A few minutes one way or the other are of no great importance.

May He who loves you fill you with His pure love !—I am  
Your affectionate brother.

*To Ebenezer Blackwell (?)*

This letter is given in the *Works* as to Mr. Blackwell. It is not, however, in Wesley's style of writing to his friend. It was probably addressed to someone in authority in the Excise whom he met at Mr. Blackwell's at Lewisham and to whom he wrote on Vine's behalf. Wesley refers to the mob at Northwich in the *Journal*, iv. 522. See *W.H.S.* iv. 213.

MANCHESTER, *March 17, 1760.*

SIR,—The humanity which you showed during the short time I had the pleasure of conversing with you at Lewisham emboldens me to trouble you with a line in behalf of a worthy man.

I apprehend the collector at Northwich in Cheshire has informed the Honourable Board that ' Mr. James Vine is a preacher at Northwich and makes disturbances in the town.' That he attends the preaching of the Methodists is true ; but it is not true that he is a preacher. It is likewise true that the

rabble of Northwich have sometimes disturbed our congregations ; but herein Mr. Vine was only concerned as a sufferer, not an actor. I know him to be a careful, diligent officer, and a zealous lover of King George. Wishing you all temporal and spiritual blessings, I remain, sir, Your obedient servant.

*To Lady Rawdon*

Lady Elizabeth Hastings, eldest daughter of the Countess of Huntingdon, married in 1752 Lord Rawdon, who succeeded to the Earldom of Moira in 1761. They were friendly to Methodism at Moira, where Wesley preached on May 12, 1760. The trouble in which her 'tender parent' was involved was that caused by her cousin Earl Ferrers, who was executed on May 5, 1760. See C Wesley's *Journal*, ii. 228, 233-7 ; *Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon*, i. 401-9 ; Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 364-6, and letter of May 18.

LIVERPOOL, *March 18, 1760.*

MY LADY,—It was impossible to see the distress into which your Ladyship was thrown by the late unhappy affair without bearing a part of it, without sympathizing with you. But may we not see God therein ? May we not both hear and understand His voice ? We must allow it is generally 'small and still' ; yet He speaks sometimes in the whirlwind. Permit me to speak to your Ladyship with all freedom ; not as to a person of quality, but as to a creature whom the Almighty made for Himself, and one that is in a few days to appear before Him.

You were not only a nominal but a real Christian. You tasted of the powers of the world to come. You knew God the Father had accepted you through His eternal Son, and God the Spirit bore witness with your spirit that you were a child of God.

But you fell among thieves, and such as were peculiarly qualified to rob you of your God. Two of these in particular were sensible, learned, well-bred, well-natured, moral men. These did not assault you in a rough, abrupt, offensive manner. No ; you would then have armed yourself against them, and have repelled all their attacks. But by soft, delicate, unobserved touches, by pleasing strokes of raillery, by insinuations rather than surly arguments, they by little and little

sapped the foundation of your faith—perhaps not only of your living faith, your ‘evidence of things not seen,’ but even of your notional. It is well if they left you so much as an assent to the Bible or a belief that Christ is God over all ! And what was the consequence of this ? Did not your love of God grow cold ? Did not you

*Measure back your steps to earth again ?*

Did not your love of the world revive ? even of those poor, low trifles, which in your very childhood you utterly despised ?

Where are you now ? full of faith ? looking into the holiest, and seeing Him that is invisible ? Does your heart now glow with love to Him who is daily pouring His benefits upon you ? Do you now even desire it ? Do you now say (as you did almost twenty years ago),—

Keep me dead to all below,  
Only Christ resolved to know ;  
Firm, and disengaged, and free,  
Seeking all my bliss in Thee ?

Is your taste now for heavenly things ? Are not you a lover of pleasure more than a lover of God ? And oh what pleasure ! What is the pleasure of visiting ? of modern conversation ? Is there any more reason than religion in it ? I wonder what rational appetite does it gratify ? Setting religion quite out of the question, I cannot conceive how a woman of sense can—relish, should I say ? no, but suffer so insipid an entertainment.

Oh that the time past may suffice ! Is it now not high time that you should awake out of sleep ? Now God calls aloud ! My dear Lady, now hear the voice of the Son of God, and live ! The trouble in which your tender parent is now involved may restore all that reverence for her which could not but be a little impaired while you supposed she was ‘righteous over-much.’ Oh how admirably does God lay hold of and ‘strengthen the things that remain’ in you !—your gratitude, your humane temper, your generosity, your filial tenderness ! And why is this but to improve every right temper ; to free you from all that is irrational or unholy ; to make you all that

you were—yea, all that you should be ; to restore you to the whole image of God ?—I am, my Lady, Yours, &c.

### To his Wife

Wesley was married in February 1751. His wife left him in 1758, but returned. His letter of October 23, 1759, shows how utterly uncongenial the marriage proved. He could not call even his study or his bureau his own. 'Squabbling for almost these ten years' is a pitiful comment on his wife's conduct.

LIVERPOOL, March 23, 1760.

Poor Molly ! Could you not hold out a little longer ! not one month ? not twenty days ? Have you found out a pretence already for talking in the old strain ? A thin one indeed : but, such as it is, it may serve the turn for want of a better. 'You have taken a bed to pieces. And you want to put it in my study. And I do not tell you whether you may or no' ! Truly I cannot look upon this whole affair as any other than a pretence. For what need had you to take the bed in pieces at all ? and what need was there (if it was taken in pieces) that it should lie in the one little room which I have when you have four rooms to yourself ?

Alas, that to this hour you should neither know your duty nor be willing to learn it ! Indeed, if you was a wise, whether a good woman or not, you would long since have given me a *carte blanche* : you would have said, 'Tell me what to do, and I will do it ; tell me what to avoid, and I will avoid it. I promised to *obey* you, and I will keep my word. Bid me do *anything, everything*. In whatever is not sinful, *I obey*. *You direct, I will follow the direction*.'

This it had been your wisdom to have done long ago, instead of squabbling for almost these ten years. This it is both your wisdom and your duty to do now ; and certainly better late than never. This must be your indispensable duty, till (1) I am an adulterer ; (2) you can prove it. Till then I have the same right to claim obedience from *you* as you have to claim it from Noah Vazeille.<sup>1</sup> Consequently every act of disobedience is an act of rebellion against God and the King, as well as against Your affectionate Husband.

<sup>1</sup> Her son.

*To Miss March*

The ship should have sailed for Dublin on the 29th, but it was delayed by fog. They embarked next day about nine, and got under sail at noon. See *Journal*, iv. 373-4.

LIVERPOOL, *March 29, 1760.*

Having a little longer reprieve, I snatch the opportunity of writing a few lines before we embark. Prayer is certainly the grand means of drawing near to God; and all others are helpful to us only so far as they are mixed with or prepare us for this. The comfort of it may be taken away by wandering thoughts, but not the benefit: violently to fight against these is not the best and speediest way to conquer them; but rather humbly and calmly to ask and wait for His help, who will bruise Satan under your feet. You may undoubtedly remain in peace and joy until you are perfected in love. You need neither enter into a dispute, when persons speak wrong, nor yet betray the truth; there is a middle way. You may simply say, 'I believe otherwise; but I think, and let think; I am not fond of contending on this or any other head, lest I receive more hurt than I can do good.' Remember your calling; be

A simple follower of the Lamb,  
And harmless as a little child.

*To Miss March*

DUBLIN, *April 16, 1760.*

Eltham is a barren soil indeed. I fear scarce any are to be found there who know anything of the power of religion, and not many that have so much as the form. But God is there, and He can supply every want. Nothing contributes to seriousness more than humility, because it is a preparation for every fruit of the Holy Spirit; and the knowledge of our desperate state by sin has a particular tendency to keep us earnest after deliverance; and that earnestness can hardly consist with levity, either of temper or behaviour.

Those who have tasted of the goodness of God are frequently wanting in declaring it. They do not as they ought stir up the gift of God which is in every believer by exciting one another to continual thankfulness and provoking each

other to love and good works. We should never be content to make a drawn battle, to part neither better nor worse than we met. Christian conversation is too precious a talent to be thus squandered away.

It does not require a large share of natural wisdom to see God in all things—in all His works of creation as well as of providence. This is rather a branch of spiritual wisdom, and is given to believers more and more as they advance in purity of heart.

Probably it would be of use to you to be as regular as you can: I mean, to allot such hours to such employments; only not to be troubled when Providence calls you from them. For the best rule of all is to follow the will of God.

### To John Berridge

John Berridge became Vicar of Everton in 1755, and 'fled to Jesus alone for refuge' in 1756. Wesley visited him at his request in November 1758, and on March 1 and August 5, 1759. He pays a high tribute to him in a letter to Lady Huntingdon on March 10, 1759. Berridge published in 1760 *A Collection of Divine Songs*, in the Preface to which he says: 'All the hymns have been revised, and many of them almost new made. The greatest and best part of them has been selected from the hymns of the Revs. Mr. John and Charles Wesley.' He delayed his answer till November 22, 'that I might not write in a spirit unbecoming the gospel.' He says he discouraged the reading of any books except the Bible and Homilies, because 'I find they who read many books usually neglect the Bible, and soon become eager disputants, and in the end turn out Predestinarians. At least, this has so happened with one. If my sentiments do not altogether harmonize with yours, they differ the least from yours of any other.' See *Journal*, iv. 291, 300, 344; *Methodist Magazine*, 1797, p 305; *W.H.S.* xi. 169-74.

DUBLIN, April 18, 1760.

DEAR SIR,—*Disce, docendus adhuc quae censet amicus*<sup>1</sup>; and take in good part my mentioning some particulars which have been long on my mind, and yet I knew not how to speak them. I was afraid it might look like taking too much upon me or assuming some superiority over you. But love casts

<sup>1</sup> Horace's *Epistles*, i. xvii. 3: Who would himself be better taught,  
'To the instruction of an humble attend.'  
friend,

out, or at least overrules, that fear. So I will speak simply, and leave you to judge.

It seems to me that, of all the persons I ever knew save one, you are the hardest to be convinced. I have occasionally spoken to you on many heads ; some of a speculative, others of a practical nature : but I do not know that you was ever convinced of one, whether of great importance or small. I believe you retained your own opinion in every one, and did not vary an hair's breadth. I have likewise doubted whether you was not full as hard to be persuaded as to be convinced ; whether your will do not adhere to its first bias, right or wrong, as strongly as your understanding. I mean with regard to any impression which another may make upon them. For perhaps you readily, too readily, change of your own mere motion ; as I have frequently observed great fickleness and great stubbornness meet in the same mind. So that it is not easy to please you long, but exceeding easy to offend you. Does not this imply the thinking very highly of yourself ? particularly of your own understanding ? Does it not imply, what is always connected therewith, something of self-sufficiency ? ' You can stand alone ; you care for no man ; you need no help from man.' It was not so with my brother and me when we were first employed in this great work. We were deeply conscious of our own insufficiency ; and though in one sense we trusted in God alone, yet we sought His help from all His children, and were glad to be taught by any man. And this, although we were really alone in the work ; for there were none that had gone before us therein, there were none then in England who had trod that path wherein God was leading us. Whereas you have the advantage which we had not : you tread in a beaten path ; others have gone before you, and are going now in the same way, to the same point. Yet it seems you choose to stand alone ; what was necessity with us is choice with you ; you like to be unconnected with any, thereby tacitly condemning all.

But possibly you go farther yet ; do not you explicitly condemn all your fellow labourers, blaming one in one instance, one in another, so as to be thoroughly pleased with the conduct of none ? Does not this argue a vehement proneness to con-

denn? a very high degree of censoriousness? Do you not censure even *peritos in sua arte*?<sup>1</sup> Permit me to relate a little circumstance to illustrate this. After we had been once singing an hymn at Everton, I was just going to say, 'I wish Mr. Whitefield would not try to mend my brother's hymns. He cannot do it. How vilely he has murdered that hymn, weakening the sense as well as marring the poetry!' But how was I afterwards surprised to hear it was not Mr. Whitefield, but Mr. B. ! In very deed it is not easy to mend his hymns any more than to imitate them. Has not this aptness to find fault frequently shown itself in abundance of other instances? sometimes with regard to Mr. Parker or Mr. Hicks,<sup>2</sup> sometimes with regard to me? And this may be one reason why you take one step which was scarce ever before taken in Christendom: I mean, the discouraging the new converts from reading—at least, from reading anything but the Bible. Nay, but get off the consequence who can: if they ought to read nothing but the Bible, they ought to hear nothing but the Bible; so away with sermons, whether spoken or written! I can hardly imagine that you discourage reading even our little tracts, out of jealousy lest we should undermine you or steal away the affections of the people. I think you cannot easily suspect this. I myself did not desire to come among them; but you desired me to come. I should not have obtruded myself either upon them or you: for I have really work enough, full as much as either my body or mind is able to go through; and I have, blessed be God, friends enough—I mean, as many as I have time to converse with. Nevertheless, I never repented of that I spent at Everton; and I trust it was not spent in vain.

I have not time to throw these thoughts into a smoother form; so I give you them just as they occur. May the God whom you serve give you to form a right judgement concerning them, and give a blessing to the rough sincerity of, dear sir,  
Your affectionate servant.

<sup>1</sup> 'Those who are clever in their particular profession.'

<sup>2</sup> William Parker, Mayor of Bedford, was excluded by the Moravians from their Society, and preached at

the Foundery in 1758 (*Journal*, iv. 86, 201, 248). For William Hicks, see *ibid.* 335, 344; and letter of June 14, 1780.



To Ebenezer Blackwell

NEWRY, April 26, 1760.

DEAR SIR,—I hope your lameness is now at an end, but not the benefit you have reaped from it. May we not in every trial, great or small, observe the hand of God? And does He send any sooner than we want it or longer than we want it? I found the inflammation which I had in my eyes last month<sup>1</sup> came just in the right time. The danger is that anything of this kind should pass over before the design of it is answered.

Whether Miss Freeman<sup>2</sup> should make use of Lough Neagh, or Lough Leighs (forty miles nearer Dublin), I suppose she is not yet able to determine till I can send her some farther information. And that I cannot do to my own satisfaction till I am upon the spot; for though Lough Neagh is scarce fifteen miles from hence, yet I can hardly find any one here who knows any more of the circumstances of it than if it lay in the East Indies.

Hitherto I have had an extremely prosperous journey. And all the fields are white to the harvest. But that the labourers are few is not the only hindrance to the gathering in effectually. Of those few, some are careless, some heavy and dull, scarce one of the spirit of Thomas Walsh. The nearest to it is Mr. Morgan<sup>3</sup>; but his body too sinks under him, and probably will not last long.

In a few days I expect to be at Carrickfergus,<sup>4</sup> and to have from those on whose word I can depend a full account of that celebrated campaign. I believe it will be of use to the whole kingdom. Probably the Government will at last awake and be a little better prepared against the next encounter.

When you have half an hour to spare, I hope you will give it me under your own hand that Mrs. Blackwell and you

<sup>1</sup> The inflammation began at Warrington, and 'was much increased by riding forty miles with a strong and cold wind exactly in my face' to Chester. See *Journal*, iv. 373.

<sup>2</sup> She went with him in Dublin to

see the French prisoners sent from Carrickfergus. See *Journal*, iv. 377; and letter of May 28, 1757.

<sup>3</sup> James Morgan. See letters of Sept. 2, 1758, and June 23, 1760.

<sup>4</sup> See next letter.

are not only in good health, but labouring more than ever after an healthful mind, and trampling the world and the devil under your feet.—I am, dear sir

Your ever affectionate servant.

The week after next I shall spend mostly at Sligo.

*To Ebenezer Blackwell*

On February 21, 1760, 'Thurot, one of the most enterprising commanders in the service of France, succeeded in escaping from Dunkirk, and, with three frigates, surprised Carrickfergus. His success, however, ended there. There was no rising whatever in his favour. A large body of volunteers from Belfast marched to attack him; and after holding the town for five days, he was compelled to re-embark, was overtaken by the English fleet, and lost his life in the combat.' (*Lecky's Ireland*, i. 470-1.) See *Journal*, iv. 379-83.

CARRICKFERGUS, May 7, 1760.

DEAR SIR,—I can now give you a clear and full account of the late proceedings of the French here; as I now lodge at Mr. Cobham's, under the same roof with Mons. Cavenac, the French Lieutenant-General. When the people here saw three large ships about ten in the morning anchor near the town, they took it for granted they were English, till about eleven the French began landing their men. The first party came to the north gate between twelve and one. Twelve soldiers planted on the wall (there were an hundred and sixty in the town) fired on them as they advanced, wounded the General, and killed several. But when they had fired four rounds, having no more ammunition, they were obliged to retire. The French then entered the town (at the same time that another party entered at the east end of it), keeping a steady fire up the street, till they came near the Castle. The English then fired hotly from the gate and walls, killed their second General (who had burst open the gate and gone in sword in hand), with upwards of fourscore men; but, having no more cartridges nor any man that knew how to make them, they thought it best to capitulate. They agreed to furnish such a quantity of provisions in six hours, on condition the French should not plunder. But they began immediately to serve themselves with meat and drink; having been in such pressing want that,

before they landed, the men were glad to eat raw oats to sustain nature. And some hours after, no provisions being brought, they took all they could find, with a good deal of linen and wearing-apparel, chiefly from the houses whose inhabitants were run away. But they neither hurt nor affronted man, woman, or child, nor did any mischief for mischief's sake; though many of the inhabitants affronted them, cursed them to their face, and even took up pokers or other things to strike them.

I have had much conversation with Mons. Cavenac, who speaks Latin pretty readily. He is a Lieutenant-Colonel in the King's Guards and a Knight of the Order of St. Louis. (Indeed, all the soldiers were picked men drafted out of the Guards, and more like officers than common men.) I found him not only a very sensible man but thoroughly instructed even in heart religion. I asked him 'if it was true that they had a design to burn Carrick and Belfast.' (After one General was wounded and the other killed, the command had devolved upon him.) He cried out, 'Jesu, Maria! We never had such a thought! To burn, to destroy, cannot enter into the head or the heart of a good man.' One would think the French King sent these men on purpose to show what officers he has in his Army. I hope there are some such in the English Army. But I never found them yet.—I am, dear sir,

Your affectionate servant.

*To Lord Rawdon*

SLIGO, May 18, 1760.

MY LORD,—I have taken the liberty to speak to Lady Rawdon<sup>1</sup> all that was in my heart, and doubt not that your Lordship will second it on every proper occasion. The late awful providence I trust will not pass over without a suitable improvement. God has spoken aloud, and happy are they that hear and understand His voice.

In one respect I have been under some apprehension on your Lordship's account also. I have been afraid lest you should exchange the simplicity of the gospel for a philosophical

<sup>1</sup> See letter of March 18.

religion. O my Lord, why should we go one step farther than this, 'We love Him because He first loved us'?—I am  
Your Lordship's most obedient servant.

We go to Castlebar to-morrow, thence to Loughrea.

To Dorothy Furly

ATHLONE, June 1, 1760.

MY DEAR SISTER,—I am persuaded it is not a little thing which will make me angry at you. I hope your thinking evil of me would not ; for you may have many reasons so to do.

Try : perhaps by prayer and a little resolution you may avoid hearing those disputes about holiness. It implies no more than this : If John Jones or any other begins a discourse concerning the errors or sins of absent persons, tell him, 'I beg you would say no more on this head ; I dare not, and I will not, hear, unless those persons were present.' If one begins any caution of that kind, stop him, only with mildness and good humour ; say, 'I believe you speak out of kindness : but I must not hear ; it both distresses and hurts my soul. Therefore, if you really wish my welfare, be silent, or let us call another cause.' Where you see good, you may add, 'I consulted Mr. Wesley on this head, and this was the advice he gave me.'

No one ever 'walked in the light as God is in the light' (I mean in the full sense of the expression) till 'the blood of Jesus Christ had cleansed him from all sin.' 'If we are perfectly saved, it is through His blood.' This is the plain meaning of the text ; and it may be fulfilled in you before you sleep. God is Sovereign, in sanctifying as well as justifying. He will act when as well as how He pleases ; and none can say unto him, What doest Thou ?

When the lungs are ulcerated, cold bathing not only does no hurt, but is the most probable cure. Sammy is a letter in my debt. I do not know but he is providentially called to this kingdom. I have now finished more than half my progress, having gone through two of the four provinces. Who knows whether I shall live to go through the other two ? It matters not how long we live, but how well.—I am, my dear sister,

Your affectionate brother.

To Samuel Furlly

Furlly evidently wished to leave his curacy under the Rev. Henry Crook, who was both Vicar of Kippax and Perpetual Curate of Hunslet, near Leeds. John Newton told Lord Dartmouth on May 12, 1759, that his scruples and difficulties about Episcopal ordination were so far removed by conversation with Mr. Crook, that he determined to apply. Not long after, he accepted a title from Crook, who wanted a curate. See Overton and Relton's *History of the English Church*, p. 184.

MOUNTMELICK, June 19, 1760.

DEAR SAMMY,—Certainly you cannot remove without giving Mr. Crook a quarter's warning. If you do remove, you need be under no concern about repaying, nor about those you leave behind. Our preachers, when it is needful, must allow them a little more time.<sup>1</sup> How easy it is to puzzle a cause, and to make a thousand plausible objections to any proposition that can be advanced. This makes me quite out of conceit with *human understanding* and *human language*. So confused is the clearest apprehension! So ambiguous the most determinate expressions!

Lay aside the terms 'Adamic law,' 'gospel law,' or any law. The thing is beyond dispute, and you may as well demand a scriptural proof that two and two make four. Adam in Paradise was able to apprehend *all* things distinctly, and to *judge truly* concerning them; therefore it was his duty so to do. But no man living *is now able* to do this; therefore neither is it the duty of any man now living. Neither is there any man now in the body who does or can walk in this instance by that rule which was bound upon Adam. Can anything be more plain than this—that Adam *could*, that I *cannot* avoid mistaking? Can anything be plainer than this—If he *could* avoid it, he *ought*? or than this—If I *cannot*, I *ought not*? I mean it is not my duty: for the clear reason that no one can do the impossible. Nothing in the Sermon or the Law contradicts this. If anything does, it is wrong.

Oh what a work might be done in this kingdom if we had six zealous, active, punctual men in it! Be *you* one.—I am, dear Sammy,

Your affectionate brother.

<sup>1</sup> He had been helping the Methodists in the neighbourhood of his curacy. See letters of Nov. 21, 1759, and June 23, 1760.

*To his Brother Charles*

This was an anxious time for the Wesleys, for Greenwood, Murlin, and Mitchell had begun to administer the sacraments at Norwich without consulting them. The Conference was held at Bristol on August 29 and 30. The preachers had been waiting two or three days for Wesley, who was becalmed in his passage from Ireland. It is a relief to read that 'their love and unanimity was such as soon made me forget all my labour.' Charles Wesley tells his wife on March 17: 'I read the *Reasons* against leaving the Church, enforcing each; then my hymns, and then prayed *after* God. A spirit of unanimity breathed in all or most of our hearts.' This was at Spitalfields Chapel, where he went 'still under my burden, but there it left me, after I had delivered my own soul.' See *Journal*, iv. 405-6, C. Wesley's *Journal*, ii. 229, Jackson's *Charles Wesley*, ii. 179.

In 'the Sussex affair' Wesley probably refers to the fine of £20 imposed under the Act of Charles II on the preacher who had conducted service in the house of Thomas Osborne at Rolvenden. Osborne was also fined £20. £43 10s was paid to the magistrate on March 29, The Quarter Sessions confirmed the convictions; but the Court of King's Bench quashed them both in Trinity term. Rolvenden is in Kent, but only three miles from the Sussex border. See Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 359.

COOLALOUGH, June 23, 1760.

DEAR BROTHER,—Where you are I know not, and how you are I know not; but I hope the best. Neither you nor John Jones<sup>1</sup> has ever sent me your remarks upon that tract in the late volume of *Sermons*.<sup>2</sup> You are not kind. Why will you not do all you can to make me wiser than I am? Sam. Furlly told me his objections at once; so we canvassed them without loss of time.<sup>3</sup> Do you know what is done, anything or nothing, with regard to the small edition of the *Notes*?<sup>4</sup>

Mr. F'Anson writes me a long account of the Sussex affair. It is of more consequence than our people seem to apprehend. If we do not exert ourselves, it may drive us to that bad

<sup>1</sup> See letter of June 1.

<sup>2</sup> The fourth volume, which included six tracts. *Thoughts on Christian Perfection* is the fifth. The doctrine had been largely considered at the London Conference in Aug. 1759, and this tract was published soon after. The Preface to it is

dated Bristol, Oct. 16, 1759. See letter of June 12, 1759.

<sup>3</sup> See previous letter.

<sup>4</sup> First edition, 4to, 1755. Third, corrected, Bristol, Grabham & Pine, 1760-2, 12mo, 3 vols. See letter of June 18, 1756.

dilemma—Leave preaching, or leave the Church. We have reason to thank God it is not come to this yet. Perhaps it never may.

In this kingdom nothing is wanting but a few more zealous and active labourers. James Morgan,<sup>1</sup> John Johnson,<sup>2</sup> and two or three more do their best; the rest spare themselves.

I hope Sally and your little ones are well. Where and how is my wife? I wrote to her on Saturday last. Adieu!

Where must the Conference be, at Leeds or Bristol? If we could but chain or gag the blatant beast, there would be no difficulty.

Charles has this note at back of letter: 'Wants to be found fault with, doubts whether to leave the Church. Dreads the Blatant Beast.'

### *To Miss March*

SLIGO, June 27, 1760.

A day or two ago I was quite surprised to find among my papers a letter of yours, which I apprehend I have not answered.

Every one, though born of God in an instant, yea and sanctified in an instant, yet undoubtedly grows by slow degrees, both after the former and the latter change. But it does not follow from thence that there must be a considerable tract of time between the one and the other. A year or a month is the same with God as a thousand: if He wills, to do is present with Him. Much less is there any necessity for much suffering: God can do His work by pleasure as well as by pain. It is therefore undoubtedly our duty to pray and look for full salvation every day, every hour, every moment, without waiting till we have either done or suffered more. Why should not this be the accepted time?

Certainly your friend will suffer loss if he does not allow himself time every day for private prayer. Nothing will supply the want of this. Praying with others is quite another

<sup>1</sup> See letter of April 26.

<sup>2</sup> John Johnson became an itinerant preacher in 1755, and after sixteen years settled at Lisburn. For some time he was General Superin-

tendent in Ireland. He died on Dec. 29, 1803, at the age of seventy-eight. See letter of Sept. 26, 1784, to him.

thing. Besides, it may expose us to great danger ; it may turn prayer into an abomination to God : for

Guilty we speak, if subtle from within  
Blows on our words the self-admiring sin !

O make the best of every hour !

*To his Wife*

ENNIS, NEAR LIMERICK, July 12, 1760.

MY DEAR,—Though you have not answered my two last, I will not stand upon ceremony. I am now looking toward England again, having wellnigh gone through this kingdom. In a few days I purpose moving toward Cork, where I shall probably take ship for Bristol. There the Conference is to begin (if it please God to give me a prosperous voyage) on Wednesday, August 27. If there be no ship ready to sail from Cork on or about August 20, I design (God willing) to return straight to Dublin, and embark there.<sup>1</sup>

My desire is to live peaceably with all men ; with *you* in particular. And (as I have told you again and again) everything which is in my power I do and will do to oblige you ; everything you desire, unless I judge it would hurt my own soul, or yours, or the cause of God. And there is nothing which I should rejoice in more than the having you always with me ; provided only that I could keep you in a good humour, and that you would not speak against me behind my back.

I still love you for your indefatigable industry, for your exact frugality, and for your uncommon neatness and cleanliness, both in your person, your clothes, and all things round you. I value you for your patience, skill, and tenderness in assisting the sick. And if you could submit to follow my advice, I could make you an hundred times more useful both to the sick and healthy in every place where God has been pleased to work by my ministry. O Molly, why should these opportunities be lost ? Why should you not

Catch the golden moments as they fly,  
And by few fleeting hours ensure eternity ?<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> He returned by Dublin. See Samuel's poem on William Morgan. letter of June 23. See *Journal*, i. 104.

<sup>2</sup> Adapted from his brother



If you really are of the same mind with me, if you want to make the best of a few days, to improve the evening of life, let us begin to-day ! And what we do let us do with our might. Yesterday is past, and not to be recalled : to-morrow is not ours. Now, Molly, let us set out :

Let us walk hand in hand  
To Immanuel's land !

If it please God we meet again, let us meet for good. Had you rather we should lodge at the room<sup>1</sup> or at Mr. Stonehouse's ? Peace be with your spirit !—I am, dear Molly,  
Your affectionate Husband.

*To John Trembath*

CORK, August 17, 1760.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—The conversation I had with you yesterday in the afternoon gave me a good deal of satisfaction. As to some things which I had heard (with regard to your wasting your substance, drinking intemperately, and wronging the poor people of Siberton), I am persuaded they were mistakes ; as I suppose it was that you converse much with careless, unawakened people. And I trust you will be more and more cautious in all these respects, abstaining from the very appearance of evil.<sup>2</sup>

That you had not always attended the preaching when you might have done it you allowed, but seemed determined to remove that objection, as well as the other of using such exercises or diversions as give offence to your brethren. I believe you will likewise endeavour to avoid light and trifling conversation, and to talk and behave in all company with that seriousness and usefulness which become a preacher of the gospel.

Certainly some years ago you was alive to God. You experienced the life and power of religion. And does not God intend that the trials you meet with should bring you

<sup>1</sup> When they were to be together at Bristol. The Rev. George Stonehouse lived there for some time.

See C. Wesley's *Journal*, ii. 215<sup>n</sup>, 223, &c.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Sept. 21, 1755.

back to this? You cannot stand still; you know this is impossible. You must go forward or backward. Either you must recover that power and be a Christian altogether, or in a while you will have neither power nor form, inside nor outside.

Extremely opposite both to one and the other is that aptness to ridicule others, to make them contemptible, by exposing their real or supposed foibles. This I would earnestly advise you to avoid. It hurts yourself; it hurts the hearers; and it greatly hurts those who are so exposed, and tends to make them your irreconcilable enemies. It has also sometimes betrayed you into speaking what was not strictly true. O beware of this above all things! Never amplify, never exaggerate anything. Be rigorous in adhering to truth. Be exemplary therein. Whatever has been in time past, let all men now know that John Trembath abhors lying, that he never promises anything which he does not perform, that his word is equal to his bond. I pray be exact in this; be a pattern of truth, sincerity, and godly simplicity.

What has exceedingly hurt you in time past, nay, and I fear to this day, is want of reading. I scarce ever knew a preacher read so little. And perhaps by neglecting it you have lost the taste for it. Hence your talent in preaching does not increase. It is just the same as it was seven years ago. It is lively, but not deep; there is little variety; there is no compass of thought. Reading only can supply this, with meditation and daily prayer. You wrong yourself greatly by omitting this. You can never be a deep preacher without it any more than a thorough Christian. O begin! Fix some part of every day for private exercises. You may acquire the taste which you have not; what is tedious at first will afterwards be pleasant. Whether you like it or no, read and pray daily. It is for your life; there is no other way: else you will be a trifle all your days, and a pretty, superficial preacher. Do justice to your own soul; give it time and means to grow. Do not starve yourself any longer. Take up your cross, and be a Christian altogether. Then will all the children of God rejoice (not grieve) over you, and in particular

Yours, &c.

To Samuel Furly

LAUNCESTON, September 4, 1760.

DEAR SAMMY,—People in England, and in Ireland much more, are apt to veer from north to south.

In May last Mr. Archdeacon wanted to see *me*, of all people in the world, and was ready (as he sent me word), not only to receive me into his church and house, but to go with me wherever I went. In July he is quite of another mind, having found I take too much upon me. Either this is owing (as I much fear) to a false brother, who, after eating of my bread, privately lifts up his heel against me, or he was struck to the heart on reading the *Appeals* and some of our other writings, and has now, by the assistance of the neighbouring clergy, worn off the impression. That he was provided with a curate before he received yours, I do not believe. However, all is well.<sup>1</sup>

Most of our preachers had very near left off preaching on practical religion. This was, therefore, earnestly recommended to them in the Conference at London. I am glad they followed the advice which was then given, which may be done without neglecting to speak on justification. This I choose to do on Sundays chiefly, and wherever there is the greatest number of unawakened hearers.

I thought I had sent to *you* the answer to those queries which I sent a copy of to the printer in Bristol. But whether you have it or no, do *you* preach according to *your* light, as I do according to mine.

I am now entering into Cornwall, which I have not visited these three years, and consequently all things in it are out of order.<sup>2</sup> Several persons *talk* of sharing my burthen, but none *does* it; so I must wear out one first.—I am, dear Sammy,

Your affectionate brother.

<sup>1</sup> Furly had evidently been applying to the Archdeacon for a curacy. See letter of June 19.

<sup>2</sup> The previous day at Launceston he had found 'the small remains of a dead, scattered Society; and no wonder, as they have had scarce any

discipline and only one sermon in a fortnight.' Next day he had a similar experience at Camelford; but the state of other Societies cheered him. See *Journal*, iv. 406.

*To the Editor of the 'London Chronicle'*

A Collection of William Law's letters had been published with his consent and through the instrumentality of his enthusiastic London friends Thomas Langcake (a clerk in the Bank of England) and George Ward. Wesley's letter to Law is given under the date of January 6, 1756. The *Address to the Clergy* was published the same year. Wesley, however, doubts whether Law had seen it. See *Works*, x. 480-500; *Overton's Law*, pp. 365-7; and letter of September 28.

Wesley here shows his unfailing regard for the teacher to whom he owed so large a debt at Oxford, and the letter reveals the contrast that had gradually grown up between the two men. Law died on April 9, 1761.

LONDON, September 17, 1760.

SIR,—As you sometimes insert things of a religious nature in your paper, I shall count it a favour if you will insert this.

Some years ago I published *A Letter to Mr. Law*, and about the same time *An Address to the Clergy*. Of the former Mr. Law gives the following account in his *Collection of Letters* lately published :

To answer Mr. Wesley's letter seems to be quite needless, because there is nothing substantial or properly argumentative in it. I was once a kind of oracle to Mr. Wesley. I judged him to be much under the power of his own spirit. To this was owing the false censure which he published against the Mystics as enemies to good works. (Pages 128, 130.) His letter is such a juvenile composition of emptiness and pertness as is below the character of any man who had been serious in religion for half a month. It was not ability but necessity that put his pen into his hand. He had preached much against my books, and forbid his people the use of them ; and for a cover of all this he promised from time to time to write against them ; therefore an answer was to be made at all adventures. He and the Pope conceive the same reasons for condemning the mystery revealed by Jacob Behmen. (Page 190.)

Of the latter he gives this account :

The pamphlet you sent is worse than no advice at all ; but infinitely beyond Mr. Wesley's Babylonish *Address to the Clergy*, almost all of which is empty babble, fitter for an old grammarian that was grown blear-eyed in mending dictionaries than for one who had tasted of the powers of the world to come (page 198).

I leave others to judge whether an answer to that letter be quite needless or no, and whether there be anything substantial in it; but certainly there is something argumentative. The very queries relating to Jacob's Philosophy are arguments, though not in form, and perhaps most of them will be thought conclusive arguments by impartial readers. Let these likewise judge if there are not arguments in it (whether conclusive or no) relating to that entirely new system of divinity which he has revealed to the world.

It is true that Mr Law, whom I love and reverence *now*, was *once* 'a kind of oracle' to me. He thinks I am still 'under the power of' my 'own spirit,' as opposed to the Spirit of God. If I am, yet my censure of the Mystics is not at all owing to this, but to my reverence for the oracles of God, which, while I was fond of them, I regarded less and less, till at length, finding I could not follow both, I exchanged the Mystic writers for the scriptural

It is sure, in exposing the Philosophy of Behmen, I use ridicule as well as argument, and yet I trust I have by the grace of God been in some measure 'serious in religion,' not 'half a month' only, but ever since I was six years old,<sup>1</sup> which is now about half a century. I do not know that the Pope has condemned him at all, or that he has any reason so to do. My reason is this, and no other. I think he contradicts Scripture, reason, and himself, and that he has seduced many unwary souls from the Bible way of salvation. A strong conviction of this, and a desire to guard others against that dangerous seduction, laid me under a necessity of writing that letter. I was under no other necessity, though I doubt not but Mr Law heard I was, and very seriously believed it. I very rarely mention his books in public; nor are they in the way of one in an hundred of those whom he terms my people—meaning, I suppose, the people called Methodists. I had therefore no temptation, any more than power, to forbid the use of them to the Methodists in general. Whosoever informed Mr. Law of this wanted either sense or honesty

He is so deeply displeas'd with the *Address to the Clergy*

<sup>1</sup> His father admitted him to the Lord's Table when he was only eight. See Stevenson's *Wesley Family*, p 330

because it speaks strongly in favour of learning; but still, if this part of it is only 'fit for an old grammarian grown blear-eyed in mending dictionaries,' it will not follow that 'almost all of it is mere empty babble'; for a large part of it much more strongly insists on a single eye and a clean heart. Heathen philosophers may term this 'empty babble'; but let not Christians either account or call it so!—I am, sir,

Your humble servant.

To his Brother Charles

REDRUTH, September 21, 1760.

DEAR BROTHER,—I do not apprehend that letter to be any proof of L. A.'s understanding.<sup>1</sup> I believe you had not time to consider it. Do you really think *she* was the inditer? That she was the transcriber of it I allow; but is not the hand of Joab in this? Did you not take knowledge not only of the sentiments but the very language of honest James Rely?<sup>2</sup>

Your message by John Jones seems to supersede the necessity of my writing; yet I think of sending a few civil lines, without entering into the merits of the cause. Is it not an excellent copy of our friend's countenance to 'beg leave to live apart'? *Quis enim negat?*<sup>3</sup> If the unbeliever will depart, let her depart. But she will as soon leap into the sea.<sup>4</sup>

I speak everywhere of bribery and run goods. I suppose John Jones has sent you the *Minutes* of the Conference.<sup>5</sup> On Friday se'nnight I hope to preach at Shepton Mallet at noon and at Bristol in the evening.<sup>6</sup> *Vive hodie!*<sup>7</sup> Adieu.

I should think if you was *solus cum solo*,<sup>8</sup> the point to be insisted on with John Gambold would be, 'You went to the Moravians to find happiness. Have you found it? What have you gained by the exchange?' It is time enough, I suppose, for me to write; for you cannot go to London soon.

<sup>1</sup> Nehemiah Crnock thought this reference might be to Wesley's sister Anne. See *Journal*, iv. 413n.

<sup>2</sup> See Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 400-1n. He was an Antinomian of bad repute. But see letter of July 7, 1761.

<sup>3</sup> 'For who forbids this?'

<sup>4</sup> 'Our friend' is his wife.

Charles wrote on the letter: 'She asks to part.'

<sup>5</sup> Held at Bristol in August.

<sup>6</sup> On Oct. 3 he preached at both places at the time mentioned.

<sup>7</sup> 'Live to-day,' the motto on his seal.

<sup>8</sup> 'Closeted only with him.'

To his Brother Charles

PLYMOUTH DOCK, September 28, 1760.

DEAR BROTHER,—I have no objection to the bestowing another reading upon Mr. Law's *Letters*. But I think I have answered them *quantum sufficit* by the letter in *Lloyd's Evening Post*<sup>1</sup>; only, if need be, it may be inserted in some of the monthly magazines. Since I wrote that letter I have procured (which I could not before) the *Address to the Clergy*. It is amazing! Nothing is more plain than that he never *read it*. I doubt whether he ever *saw it*.<sup>2</sup>

I care not a rush for ordinary means; only that it is our duty to try them. All our lives and all God's dealings with us have been extraordinary from the beginning. We have all reason, therefore, to expect that what has been will be again. I have been preternaturally restored more than ten times. I suppose you will be thus restored for the journey, and that by the journey as a natural means your health will be re-established, provided you determine to spend all the strength which God shall give you in His work.

Cornwall has suffered miserably by my long absence and the unfaithfulness of the preachers. I left seventeen hundred in the Societies, and I find twelve hundred. If possible, you should see Mr. Walker.<sup>3</sup> He has been near a month at the Hot Wells. He is absolutely a Scot in his opinions, but of an excellent spirit. Mr. Stonehouse's horse performs to a miracle. He is considerably better than when I had him. On Friday evening (if nothing extraordinary occur) I hope to be at Bristol between five and six. Probably I shall leave Shepton Mallet at two. My love to Sally. Adieu.

If John Fisher<sup>4</sup> is at Bristol, pray desire him to send what Thomas Seccomb left<sup>5</sup> (with an account) to his poor mother.

<sup>1</sup> And the *London Chronicle*. See letter of Sept. 17.

<sup>2</sup> This letter shows the importance the brothers attached to Law's strictures.

<sup>3</sup> Samuel Walker, Vicar of Truro. See letter of July 16, 1761.

<sup>4</sup> One of the preachers. See letter of Nov. 21.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Seccomb, a Cornishman,

was one of Wesley's preachers. His father disinherited him, and he died of consumption in Ireland, where Lord Rawdon took him into his house and treated him as his son. Seccomb asked that the Methodists might come and receive his dying benediction. Lord Rawdon was present, and after Seccomb had addressed the people he lay down and passed

## To Miss March

LONDON, November 11, 1760.

Conviction is not condemnation. You may be convinced, yet not condemned; convinced of useless thoughts or words, and yet not condemned for them. You are condemned for nothing, if you love God and continue to give Him your whole heart.

Certainly spiritual temptations will pass through your spirit, else you could not feel them. I believe I understand your state better than you do yourself. Do not perplex yourself at all about what you shall call it. You are a child of God, a member of Christ, an heir of the kingdom. What you have hold fast (whatever name is given to it), and you shall have all that God has prepared for them that love Him. Certainly you do need more faith; for you are a tender, sickly plant. But see,—

Faith while yet you ask is given;  
God comes down, the God and Lord  
That made both earth and heaven!

You cannot live on what He did yesterday. Therefore He comes to-day! He comes to destroy that tendency to levity, to severe judging, to anything that is not of God.

Peace be with your spirit!

## To the Editor of 'Lloyd's Evening Post'

'Philodemus,' the 'very angry gentleman' of this letter, suggested the establishment of 'a Court of Judicature to detect the cunning cant and hypocrisy of all pretenders to sanctity and devotion.' He painted the Methodists in no friendly colours. See Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 377; and letter of December 1.

Spirat tragicum satis, et feliciter audet.<sup>1</sup>

LONDON, November 17, 1760.

SIR,—In your last paper we had a letter from a very angry gentleman (though he says he had put himself into as good

away. Lord Rawdon sent an account of his death to a nobleman in London, adding, 'Now, my Lord, find me if you can a man that will die like a Methodist!' See Atmore's *Me-*

*morial*, pp. 379-80; Crookshank's *Methodism in Ireland*, i. 139.

<sup>1</sup> Horace's *Epistles*, II. i. 166: 'He breathes sufficiently the tragic spirit, and is successfully daring.'



humour as possible), who personates a clergyman, but is, I presume, in reality a retainer to the theatre. He is very warm against the people vulgarly called Methodists, 'ridiculous impostors,' 'religious buffoons,' as he styles them; 'saint-errants' (a pretty and quaint phrase), full of 'inconsiderateness, madness, melancholy, enthusiasm'; teaching a 'knotty and unintelligible system' of religion—yea, a 'contradictory or self-contradicting'; nay, a 'mere illusion,' a 'destructive scheme, and of pernicious consequence'; since 'an hypothesis is a very slippery foundation to hazard our all upon.'

Methinks the gentleman has a little mistaken his character: he seems to have exchanged the sock for the buskin. But, be this as it may, general charges prove nothing. Let us come to particulars. Here they are: 'The basis of Methodism is the grace of assurance' (excuse a little impropriety of expression), 'regeneration being only a preparative to it.' Truly this is somewhat 'knotty and unintelligible.' I will endeavour to help him out. The fundamental doctrine of the people called Methodists is, Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the true faith;—the faith which works by love; which, by means of the love of God and our neighbour, produces both inward and outward holiness. This faith is an evidence of things not seen; and he that thus believes is regenerate, or born of God; and he has the witness in himself (call it assurance or what you please): the Spirit itself witnesses with his spirit that he is a child of God. 'From what scripture' every one of these propositions 'is collected' any common Concordance will show. 'This is the true portraiture of Methodism,' so called. 'A religion superior to this' (the love of God and man) none can 'enjoy,' either in time or in eternity.

But the Methodists do not hold 'good works meritorious.' No; neither does ours, or any other Protestant Church. But meantime they hold it is their bounden duty, as they have time, to do good unto all men; and they know the day is coming wherein God will reward every man according to his works.

But they 'act with sullenness and sourness, and account innocent gaiety and cheerfulness a crime almost as heinous

as sacrilege.' Who does? Name the men. I know them not, and therefore doubt the fact; though it is very possible you account that kind of gaiety innocent which I account both foolish and sinful.

I know none who denies that true religion—that is, love, the love of God and our neighbour—'elevates our spirits, and renders our minds cheerful and serene.' It must, if it be accompanied (as we believe it always is) with peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, and if it produces a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man.

But they 'preach up religion only to accomplish a lucrative design, to fleece their hearers, to accumulate wealth, to rob and plunder, which they esteem meritorious.' We deny the fact. Who is able to prove it? Let the affirmer produce his witnesses, or retract.

This is the sum of your correspondent's charge, not one article of which can be proved; but whether it can or no, we have made them,' says he, 'a theatrical scoff and the common jest and scorn of every chorister in the street.' It may be so; but whether you have done well herein may still admit of a question. However, you cannot but wish 'we had some formal Court of Judicature erected' (happy Portugal and Spain!) 'to take cognizance of such matters.' Nay, *cur optas quod habes?*<sup>1</sup> Why do you wish for that you have already? The Court is erected: the holy, devout playhouse is become the House of Mercy; and does take cognizance hereof 'of all pretenders to sanctity, and happily furnishes us with a discerning spirit to distinguish betwixt right and wrong.' But I do not stand to their sentence; I appeal to Scripture and reason, and by these alone consent to be judged.

—I am, sir, Your humble servant.

*To Mrs. Abigail Brown*

LONDON, November 21, 1760.

DEAR ABBY,—I cannot advise. You must follow your own conscience. Act as you are fully persuaded in your own mind. Consider first what is best with regard to eternity, and then

<sup>1</sup> Horace's *Satires*, i. iii. 126.

take your measures accordingly. Mr. Fisher<sup>1</sup> will assist you in whatever you would have done; and if you want money, I have desired him to help you to it. Speak freely to me, if you love me; and believe me to be, dear Abby.

Your sincere friend and affectionate brother.

*To the Editor of 'Lloyd's Evening Post'*

The Sermons of John Downes, Rector of St Michael's, Wood Street, are answered in the letter of November 17, 1759. The tract by a clergyman in the county of Durham is '*A Friendly and Compassionate Address to all serious and well-disposed Methodists*, in which their principal Errors concerning the Doctrine of the New Birth, their Election, and the Security of their Salvation, and their notion of the Community of Christian Men's goods, are largely displayed and represented' By Alexander Jephson, A B, Rector of Craike, in the County of Durham. See Green's *Anti-Methodist Publications*, No 297.

The third tract is '*The Principles and Practices of the Methodists Considered*. In some Letters to the Leaders of that Sect. The first addressed to the Reverend Mr B[erridge]' Signed 'Academicus'. This was Dr John Green, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge 1748-56, Dean of Lincoln 1756, Bishop of Lincoln 1761-79. A further letter to Whitefield was published in 1761. (See Green, Nos 294, 315.) The quotations referred to are,—a 'If, as Mr Wesley represents the matter, it is shed abroad in men's hearts, even like lightning falling from heaven' (*Wesley's Sermons*, vol 1) b 'Mr W tells us, A behaviour does not pretend to add the least to what Christ has done, it is spoiled by being added to' 'Behaviour' is corrected to 'believer' in the second edition of the pamphlet c 'You must never trust to your polemical skill in any of the carnal weapons which are now in use.'

For *A Caveat against the Methodists*, which was published anonymously, see letter of February 19, 1761.

LONDON, November 22, 1760

SIR,—Just as I had finished the letter published in your last Friday's paper four tracts came to my hands: one wrote, or procured to be wrote, by Mrs. Downes; one by a clergyman in the county of Durham; the third by a gentleman of Cambridge; and the fourth by a member (I suppose, dignitary) of the Church of Rome. How gladly would I leave all these to themselves, and let them say just what they please! as my day is far spent and my taste for controversy is utterly lost

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Sept. 28.

and gone. But this would not be doing justice to the world, who might take silence for a proof of guilt. I shall therefore say a word concerning each. I may, perhaps, some time say more to one or two of them.

The letter which goes under Mrs. Downes's name scarce deserves any notice at all, as there is nothing extraordinary in it but an extraordinary degree of virulence and scurrility. Two things only I remark concerning it, which I suppose the writer of it knew as well as me: (1) that my letter to Mr. Downes was both wrote and printed *before Mr. Downes died*; (2) that when I said, *Tibi parvula res est*<sup>1</sup> ('Your ability is small') I had no view to his fortune, which I knew nothing of, but (as I there expressly say) to his wit, sense, and talents as a writer.

The tract wrote by the gentleman in the North is far more bulky than this; but it is more considerable for its bulk than for its matter, being little more than a dull repetition of what was published some years ago in *The Enthusiasm of the Methodists and Papists Compared*.<sup>2</sup> I do not find the author adds anything new, unless we may bestow that epithet on a sermon annexed to his *Address*, which, I presume, will do neither good nor harm. So I leave the Durham gentleman, with Mrs. Downes, to himself and his admirers.

The author of the letter to Mr. Berridge is a more considerable writer. In many things I wholly agree with him, though not in admiring Dr. Taylor; but there is a bitterness even in him which I should not have expected in a gentleman and a scholar. So in the very first page I read, 'The Church, which most of your *graceless fraternity* have deserted.' Were the fact true (which it is not), yet is the expression to be commended? Surely Dr. Green himself thinks it is not. I am sorry, too, for the unfairness of his quotations. For instance: he cites me (<sup>a</sup> page 53) as speaking of 'faith shed abroad in men's hearts like lightning.' *Faith shed abroad* in men's hearts! I never used such an expression in my life: I do not talk after this rate. Again, he quotes, as from me (<sup>b</sup> page 57), so, I presume, Mr. W. means, 'a behaviour does not pretend to add the least to what Christ has done.' But be these words whose

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Nov. 17, 1759.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Feb. 1, 1750.

they may, they are none of mine. I never spoke, wrote—no, nor read them before. Once more, is it well judged for any writer to show such an utter contempt of his opponents as you affect to do with regard to the whole body of people vulgarly termed Methodists? 'You may keep up,' say you, 'a little bush-fighting in controversy; you may skirmish awhile with your feeble body of irregulars; but you must never trust to your skill in reasoning' (° page 77). Upon this I would ask: (1) If these are such poor, silly creatures, why does so wise a man set his wit to them? 'Shall the King of Israel go out against a flea?' (2) If it should happen that any one of these silly bush-fighters steps out into the plain, engages hand to hand, and foils this champion by mere dint of reason, will not his defeat be so much the more shameful as it was more unexpected? But I say the less at present, not only because Mr. Berridge is able to answer for himself, but because the title-page bids me expect a letter more immediately addressed to myself.

The last tract, entitled *A Caveat against the Methodists*, is in reality a caveat against the Church of England, or rather against all the Churches in Europe who dissent from the Church of Rome. Nor do I apprehend the writer to be any more disgusted at the Methodists than at Protestants of every denomination; as he cannot but judge it equally unsafe to join to any society but that of Rome. Accordingly all his arguments are levelled at the Reformed Churches in general, and conclude just as well if you put the word 'Protestant' throughout in the place of the word 'Methodist.' Although, therefore, the author borrows my name to wound those who suspect nothing less, yet I am no more concerned to refute him than any other Protestant in England; and still the less, as those arguments are refuted over and over in books which are still common among us.

But is it possible any Protestants, nay Protestant clergymen, should buy these tracts to give away? Is, then, the introducing Popery the only way to overthrow Methodism? If they know this, and choose Popery as the smaller evil of the two, they are consistent with themselves. But if they do not intend this, I wish them more seriously to consider what they do.—I am, sir,

Your humble servant.

*To the Editor of 'Lloyd's Evening Post'*

TO MR. SOMEBODY, *alias* PHILODEMUS, *alias* T. H.

LONDON, December 1, 1760.

SIR,—I am very happy in having given you 'infinite pleasure by my animadversions upon your letter,' and therefore cannot but add a few more, hoping they may give you still farther satisfaction. It is, indeed, great condescension in you to bestow a thought upon me, since 'it is only losing time' (as you observe in your last), as you 'judge arguing with *Methodists* is like pounding fools in a mortar.' However, do not despair; perhaps, when you have pounded me a little more, my *foolishness* may *depart from me*.

I really was so foolish as to think that by saying 'We Churchmen' you assumed the character of a *clergyman*. Whether you *retain* to the *theatre* or no is easily shown: tell your name, and the doubt is cleared up.<sup>1</sup> But who or what you are affects not me: I am only concerned with what you say.

But you complain, I have 'passed over the most interesting and material circumstances' in your letter. I apprehend just the contrary: I think nothing in it is passed over which is at all material. Nor will I knowingly pass over anything material in this; though I am not a dealer in many words.

You say: (1) 'You have impiously apostatized from those principles of religion which you undertook to defend.' I hope not. I still (as I am able) defend the Bible, with the Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies of our Church; and I do not defend or espouse any other principles, to the best of my knowledge, than those which are plainly contained in the Bible as well as in the Homilies and Book of Common Prayer.

You blame me (2) for teaching heterodox doctrine concerning faith and good works (I am obliged to put the meaning of many of your straggling sentences together as well as I can). As to the former, which you still awkwardly and unscripturally style *the grace of assurance* (a phrase I never use), you say:

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Nov. 17.

'You have given it a true *Methodistical* gloss. But where are the proofs from Scripture? Not one single text.' Sir, that is your ignorance. I perceive the Bible is a book you are not acquainted with. Every sentence in my account is a text of Scripture. I purposely refrained from quoting chapter and verse, because I expected you would bewray your ignorance, and show that you was got quite out of your depth. As your old friend Mr. Vellum says, 'You will pardon me for being jocular.'

To one who seriously desired information on this point I would explain it a little farther. *Faith* is an evidence or conviction of things not seen, of God, and the things of God. This is faith in general. More particularly it is a divine evidence or conviction that Christ loved *me* and gave Himself for *me*. This directly leads us to *work out our salvation with fear and trembling*; not with slavish, painful fear, but with the utmost diligence, which is the proper import of that expression. When this evidence is heightened to exclude all doubt, it is the *plerophory* or *full assurance of faith*. But any degree of true faith prompts the believer to be zealous of good works.

On this head you say: 'Your definition of good works' (truly I gave none at all) 'is still more extraordinary. You shall have it in your own words, where you quarrel with me for esteeming them meritorious,—*No, neither does ours or any other Protestant Church; but meantime they hold it their bounden duty as they have time to do good unto all men. And they know the day is coming wherein God will render to every man according to his works.* Admirable contradiction! Was you intoxicated, or *jure divino* mad? Is man to be judged for his deeds done in this life, when it is immaterial whether he does any or not? These are your own words, sir.' What? That 'it is immaterial whether he does any good works or not'? Hey-day! How is this? O, I cry your mercy, sir, now I find where the shoe pinches. You have stumbled on an hard word which you do not understand. But give me leave, sir, to assure you (you may take my word for once) that *meritorious* and *material* are not all one. Accordingly not only the Church of England but all other Protestant Churches allow good works

to be material, and yet (without any contradiction) deny them to be meritorious.

They all likewise allow that the genuine fruit of faith is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost; and consequently that cheerfulness or serenity of spirit (a mixture of that peace and joy) is so far from being a crime, that it is the undoubted privilege of every real Christian. I know no *Methodist* (so called) who is of another mind; if you do, tell me the man. I believe 'it is not your intention to do this.' But you must either do it or bear the blame.

You blame me (3) for allowing of lay preachers. This is too knotty a point to be settled at present. I can only desire those who want farther information therein to read calmly *A Letter to a Clergyman*<sup>1</sup> or the latter part of the third *Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*.

You blame me (4) for acting from 'a lucrative principle,' though you 'deny you used the word *robbing*.' (True; for you only said, 'To rob and plunder.') In proof of this you refer to the houses I have built (in Bristol, Kingswood, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne). But don't you know, sir, those houses are none of mine? I made them over to trustees long ago. I have food to eat and raiment to put on; and I *will have no more* till I turn Turk or Pagan.—I am, sir, in very good humour,  
Your well-wisher.

PS.—It is not very material whether *T. H.*, *Somebody*, and *Philodemus* are the same individual or not. I have sub-joined his Questions with my Answers; though they have all been answered fifty times before.

Q. 1. Whether a very considerable body of the *Methodists* do not declare that there can be no good hopes of salvation without *Assurance*?

A. Yes: if you mean by that term a divine evidence or conviction that Christ loved *me* and gave Himself for *me*.

Q. 2. Whether they do not put a greater confidence in what they call Regeneration than in the moral or social duties of life?

<sup>1</sup> See letter of May 4, 1748, and *Works*, viii. 221-6.



A. No. They hold the due discharge of all these duties to be absolutely necessary to salvation. The latter part of this query, 'of the mercy of the Divine Being,' seems to have lost its way.

Q. 3. Whether the Stage in later years has ever ridiculed anything really serious?

A. Yes; a thousand times. Who that reads Dryden's, Wycherley's, or Congreve's plays can doubt it?

Q. 4. Whether anything can be religious that has not right reason to countenance it?

A. No. True religion is the highest reason. It is indeed wisdom, virtue, and happiness in one.

*To Samuel Furly*

LONDON, December 9, 1760.

DEAR SAMMY,—I am determined to publish nothing against Mr. Hervey unless his answer to my letter is published. Indeed, it is not his; it is Mr. Cudworth's,<sup>1</sup> both as to matter and manner. So let it pass for the present.

Richard Tompson (who lives in Prince's Square, Ratcliff Highway) told me honestly, 'Sir, I want a little money, and I can have it by printing the letters which passed between you and me.' I answered, 'You know I never designed my letters for public view, but you may print them if you please. I am quite indifferent about it.'<sup>2</sup>

When I say 'I have no time to write largely in controversy,' I mean this; every hour I have is employed more to the glory of God. Therefore, if short answers to opponents will not suffice, I cannot help it; I will not, I cannot, I dare not spend any more time in that kind of writing than I do. 'Well, but many think you ought.' Undoubtedly they do; but I am to be guided by my own conscience.

I am laying another plot for *you*. Mr. Fletcher is rector of Madeley, in Shropshire.<sup>3</sup> If he takes you to be his curate, probably you may be ordained priest. I will write to him about it.—I am, with love to Nancy,

Your affectionate friend and brother.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Nov. 29, 1758.

<sup>2</sup> Fletcher became vicar in 1760.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of Aug. 22, 1759, to Tompson.

See letter of Jan. 25, 1762, to Furly.

*To the Editor of the 'London Magazine'*

This letter was sent to the *London Magazine* in 1760, where it appears on page 651, and also to the *London Chronicle*, dated December 26. The *Country Minister's Advice* was studied by the Holy Club at Oxford and read in Georgia. The account of the Oxford Methodists and of Wesley's books and medical work is of special interest. In 1755 some of the preachers administered the Lord's Supper to those who felt unable to take it at church. At the Leeds Conference the same year all fully agreed that to separate from the Church of England was in no way expedient. In 1758 Wesley published his *Reasons against a Separation from the Church of England*. Two years later three preachers commenced to administer the sacraments. See *Journal*, i. 282, viii. 267; Green's *Bibliography*, No. 201; Telford's *Wesley*, pp. 305-6; letters of November 17 and December 1, and also that of June 23.

TO MR. T. H., *alias* PHILODEMUS, *alias* SOMEBODY, *alias* STEPHEN CHURCH, *alias* R. W.

LONDON, December 12, 1760.

Patience, dear sir, patience! or I am afraid your choler will hurt your constitution as well as your argument. Be composed, and I will answer your queries, 'speedily, clearly, and categorically.' Only you will give me leave to shorten them a little, and to lay those together which have some relation to each other.

Permit me likewise, before I enter on particulars, to lay a few circumstances before you which may add some light to the subject and give you a clearer knowledge of the people with whom you are so angry.

About thirty years since, I met with a book written in King William's time, called *The Country Parson's Advice to his Parishioners*. There I read these words: 'If good men of the Church will unite together in the several parts of the kingdom, disposing themselves into friendly societies, and engaging each other in their respective combinations to be helpful to each other in all good, Christian ways, it will be the most effectual means for restoring our decaying Christianity to its primitive life and vigour and the supporting of our tottering and sinking Church.' A few young gentlemen then at Oxford approved of and followed the advice. They were all zealous Churchmen, and both orthodox and regular to the

highest degree. For their exact regularity they were soon nicknamed Methodists; but they were not then, or for some years after, charged with any other crime, real or pretended, than that of being righteous over-much.<sup>1</sup> Nine or ten years after, many others 'united together in the several parts of the kingdom, engaging in like manner to be helpful to each other in all good, Christian ways.' At first all these were of the Church; but several pious Dissenters soon desired to unite with them. Their one design was to forward each other in true, scriptural Christianity.

Presently the flood-gates were opened, and a deluge of reproach poured upon them from all quarters. All manner of evil was spoken of them, and they were used without either justice or mercy; and this chiefly (I am sorry to say it) by the members of our own Church. Some of them were startled at this, and proposed a question, when they were met together at Leeds, whether they ought not to separate from the Church; but after it had been fairly and largely considered, they were one and all satisfied that they ought not. The reasons of that determination were afterwards printed and lately reprinted and strongly enforced by my brother. *Hinc illae lacrymae!*<sup>2</sup> This, I presume, has occasioned your present queries. For though you talk of our 'Episcopal communion,' I doubt not that you are either a Papist or a Dissenter. If I mistake, you may easily set me right by telling your real name and place of abode.

But, in spite of all we could say or do, the cry still continued; 'You have left the Church; you are no ministers or members of it.' I answer, as I did fourteen years ago to one who warmly affirmed this: 'Use ever so many exaggerations, still the whole of the matter is, (1) I often use extemporary prayer; (2) wherever I can, I preach the gospel; (3) those who desire to live according to the gospel, I advise how to watch over each other and to put from them those who walk disorderly.'<sup>3</sup> Now, whether these things are right or wrong, this single point I must still insist upon: all this does not prove either that I

<sup>1</sup> See letter of June 11, 1731, to *Anãria*, I. i. 99.  
his mother.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of June 17, 1746, sect.

<sup>3</sup> 'Hence these tears,' Terence's III. 9.

am no member or that I am no minister of the Church of England. Nay, nothing can prove that I am no member of the Church, till I am either excommunicated or renounce her communion, and no longer join in her doctrine and in the breaking of bread and in prayer. Nor can anything prove I am no minister of the Church, till I either am deposed from my ministry or voluntarily renounce her, and wholly cease to teach her doctrines, use her offices, and obey her rubrics.

Upon the same principle that I still preach and endeavour to assist those who desire to live according to the gospel, about twelve years ago I published proposals for printing '*A Christian Library: Consisting of Extracts from and Abridgements of the Choicest Pieces of Practical Divinity which have been published in the English Tongue.*' And I have done what I proposed. Most of the tracts therein contained were written by members of our own Church; but some by writers of other denominations: for I mind not who speaks, but what is spoken.

On the same principle, that of doing good to all men, of the ability that God giveth, I published '*Primitive Physick; or an Easy and Natural Method of Curing most Diseases*'; and, some years after, a little tract entitled '*Electricity made Plain and Useful.*' On the same principle I printed an English, a Latin, a French, and a short Hebrew Grammar, as well as some of the Classics, and a few other tracts, *in usum juventutis Christianae*.<sup>1</sup> This premised, I now proceed to the queries:—

Q. 1. 'Why have you not cleared yourself of those reflections that you stand charged with by a learned author?' I have thoroughly cleared myself in the three letters to that learned author which were published immediately after his tracts.

Q. 2. 'Can you constantly charge your people to attend the worship of our Church and not Dissenters' meetings?' I can: this is consistent with all I have written and all I have done for many years. 'But do you not call our Church a mere rope of sand?' No: look again into the *Plain Account*,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'For the use of Christian youth.'

<sup>2</sup> See letter in Dec. 1748, sect. I. II, to Vincent Ferronet.

and you will see (if you care to see) that those words are not spoken of our Church.

Q. 6. 'But do you not hold doctrine contrary to hers?' No. 'Do you not make a dust about words?' No. 'Do you not bewilder the brains of weak people?' No.

Q. 11. 'Do you not in print own Episcopacy to be *jure divino*?' Not that I remember. Can you tell me where? But this I own; I have no objection to it—nay, I approve it highly.

Q. 16. 'But are you not guilty of canonical disobedience to your Bishop?' I think not. Show me wherein.

Q. 17. 'Did not you suffer your lay preachers at Leeds to debate whether they should separate from the Church?' Yes, and encouraged them to say all that was in their hearts. 'Why did you do this?' To confirm their adherence to it; and they were so confirmed that only two out of the whole number have since separated from it.

Q. 18. 'If most votes had carried the day, what had followed?' If the sky should fall!

Q. 12. 'What did you propose by preaching up to the people a solemn covenant?' To confirm them in fearing God and working righteousness. I shall probably do the same again shortly. And if you desire any farther information, you are welcome to hear every sermon which I preach concerning it.

Q. 13. 'Was not this intended to cut them off from ever communicating with any company of Christians but yourselves?' No; nothing less. It was not intended to cut them off from anything but the devil and his works.

Q. 14. 'Do you not commend the Quakers?' Yes, in some things. 'And the French prophets?' No.

Q. 15. 'Do you not stint your lay preachers to three or four minutes only in public prayers?' I advise them not usually to exceed four or five minutes either before or after sermon.<sup>1</sup>

Q. 3. 'Is not your *Christian Library* an odd collection of mutilated writings of Dissenters of all sorts?' No. In the first ten volumes there is not a line from any Dissenter of any

<sup>1</sup> See *A Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion*, 1758, p. 244.

sort; and the greatest part of the other forty is extracted from Archbishop Leighton, Bishops Taylor, Patrick, Ken, Reynolds, Sanderson, and other ornaments of the Church of England.

Q. 4. 'Is not this declaring that you have a superior privilege beyond all men to print, correct, and direct as you please?' I think not. I suppose every man in England has the same privilege.

Q. 5. 'Is it performed according to the first proposals and the expectation of the subscribers?' It is performed according to the first proposals; nor could any subscriber reasonably expect more.

Q. 7. 'Why did you not in your *New Testament* distinguish those places with italics where you altered the old translation?' Because it was quite needless; as any who choose it may easily compare the two translations together. 'But should you not have given the learned a reason for every alteration?' Yes, if I had written for the learned; but I did not, as I expressly mentioned in the Preface.

Q. 8. 'Do you not assume too much in philosophy and physic as well as in theology?' I hope not.

Q. 9. 'Why did you meddle with electricity?' For the same reason as I published the *Primitive Physick*—to do as much good as I can.

Q. 19. 'Are you a clergyman at all?' Yes. 'Are you not a Quaker in disguise?' No. 'Did not you betray the Church, as Judas his Master, with a kiss?' No. 'If you be in the wrong, God confound your devices!' I say the same thing. 'If in the right, may He display it to all people!' Amen! In His own time.

I take this opportunity to answer the queries also which occur on page 614:—

1. 'If the operations of the Spirit overpower the natural faculties, must they not destroy free agency?' I neither teach nor believe that the ordinary operations of the Spirit do overpower the natural faculties.

2. 'If every man be furnished with an inward light as a private guide and director, must it not supersede the necessity of revelation?' This affects the Quakers, not the Methodists, who allow no inward light but what is subservient to the

written Word, and to be judged thereby: they are therefore no 'enthusiasts'; neither is it yet proved that they are 'deluded' at all. They follow no *ignis fatuus*, but 'search the Scriptures freely and impartially.' And hence their 'doctrines are not the dogmas of particular men,' but are all warranted by Scripture and reason.—I am, sir,

Your sincere well-wisher.

*To Miss March*

LONDON, *December 12, 1760.*

You may blame yourself, but I will not blame you, for seeking to have your every temper, and thought, and word, and work suitable to the will of God. But I doubt not you seek this by faith, not without it; and you seek it in and through Christ, not without Him. Go on; you shall have all you seek, because God is love. He is showing you the littleness of your understanding and the foolishness of all natural wisdom. Certainly peace and joy in believing are the grand means of holiness; therefore love and value them as such.

'Why is the law of works superseded by the law of love?' Because Christ died. 'Why are we not condemned for coming short even of this?' Because He lives and intercedes for us. I believe it is impossible not to come short of it, through the unavoidable littleness of our understanding. Yet the blood of the covenant is upon us, and therefore there is no condemnation.

I think the extent of the law of love is exactly marked out in the 13th of the [First of] Corinthians. Let faith fill your heart with love to Him and all mankind; then follow this loving faith to the best of your understanding; meantime crying out continually, 'Jesus is all in all to me.'

*To the Editor of 'Lloyd's Evening Post'*

To MR. T. H., *alias* E. L., &c. &c.

*December 20, 1760.*

What, my good friend again! Only a little disguised with a new name and a few scraps of Latin! I hoped, indeed, you had been pretty well satisfied before; but since you desire to hear a little farther from me, I will add a few words, and

endeavour to set our little controversy in a still clearer light.

Last month you publicly attacked the people called Methodists without either fear or wit. You charged them with 'madness, enthusiasm, self-contradiction, imposture,' and what not! I considered each charge, and, I conceive, refuted it to the satisfaction of all indifferent persons. You renewed the attack, not by proving anything, but affirming the same things over and over. I replied; and, without taking notice of the dull, low scurrility, either of the first or second letter, confined myself to the merits of the cause, and cleared away the dirt you had thrown.

You now heap together ten paragraphs more, most of which require very little answer. In the first you say: 'Your foolishness is become the wonder and admiration of the public.' In the second: 'The public blushes for you, till you give a better solution to the articles demanded of you.' In the third you cite my words, I still maintain 'the Bible, with the Liturgy, and Homilies of our Church; and do not espouse any other principles but what are consonant to the Book of Common Prayer.' You keenly answer: 'Granted, Mr. Methodist; but whether or no you would not espouse other principles if you durst is evident enough from some innovations you have already introduced, which I shall attempt to prove in the subsequent part of my answer.' Indeed, you will not. You neither prove, nor attempt to prove, that I would espouse other principles if I durst. However, you give me a deadly thrust: 'You falsify the first Article of the Athanasian Creed.' But how so? Why, I said: 'The fundamental doctrine of the people called Methodists is, *Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the true faith.*' Sir, shall I tell you a secret?—It was for the readers of your class that I changed the hard word 'catholic' into an easier.

In the fourth paragraph you say: 'Did you never use that phrase *the grace of assurance?*' Never, that I remember, either in preaching or writing; both your ears and eyes have been very unhappy if they informed you I did: and, how many soever look either sorrowful or joyful, that will not prove the contrary. 'But produce your texts.' What, for a phrase I



never use? I pray you have me excused. But (as I said before) 'from what scripture every one of my propositions is collected any common Concordance will show.' To save you trouble, I will for once point out those scriptures: 'Whosoever will be saved must believe' (Mark xvi. 16; Acts xvi. 31); 'This faith works by love' (Gal. v. 6); it is 'an evidence of things not seen' (Heb. xi. 1); 'He that believes is born of God' (1 John v. 1); 'He has the witness in himself' (verse 10); 'The Spirit itself witnesses with his spirit that he is a child of God' (Rom. viii. 16).

In the fifth you say: 'You embrace any shift to twist words to your own meaning.' This is saying just nothing. Any one may say this of any one. To prove it is another point.

In the sixth you say: 'No Protestant divine ever taught your doctrine of Assurance.' I hope you know no better; but it is strange you should not. Did you never see Bishop Hall's Works? Was not he a Protestant divine? Was not Mr. Perkins, Bolton, Dr. Sibbs, Dr. Preston, Archbishop Leighton? Inquire a little farther; and do not run thus hand over head, asserting you know not what. By assurance (if we must use the expression) I mean 'a confidence which a man hath in God that by the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven and he reconciled to the favour of God.' Stop! Do not run your head into a noose again. These are the words of the Homily.

In the seventh you grant 'that works are not meritorious unless accompanied with faith.' No, nor then neither. But pray do not talk of this any more till you know the difference between meritorious and rewardable; otherwise your ignorance will cause you to blunder on without shame and without end.

In your eighth you throw out an hard word, which somebody has helped you to, Thaumaturg—what is it?—about lay preachers. When you have answered the arguments in the *Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, I will say something more upon that head.

In the ninth you say something, no way material, about the houses at Bristol, Kingswood, and Newcastle; and in the last you give me a fair challenge to a 'personal dispute.' Not so; you have fallen upon me in public, and to the public I appeal. Let all men, not any single umpire, judge whether I

have not refuted your charge, and cleared the people called Methodists from the foul aspersions which, without why or wherefore, you had thrown upon them. Let all my countrymen judge which of us have spoken the words of truth and soberness, which has reason on his side, and which has treated the other with a temper suitable to the gospel.

If the general voice of mankind gives it against you, I hope you will be henceforth less flippant with your pen. I assure you, as little as you think of it, the Methodists are not such fools as you suppose. But their desire is to live peaceably with all men ; and none desires this more than

JOHN WESLEY.

*To the Editor of the 'London Chronicle'*

January 2, 1761.

SIR,—Of all the seats of woe on this side hell few, I suppose, exceed or even equal Newgate. If any region of horror could exceed it a few years ago, Newgate in Bristol did ; so great was the filth, the stench, the misery, and wickedness which shocked all who had a spark of humanity left. How was I surprised, then, when I was there a few weeks ago ! (1) Every part of it, above stairs and below, even *the pit* wherein the felons are confined at night, is as clean and sweet as a gentleman's house ; it being now a rule that every prisoner wash and clean his apartment throughly twice a week. (2) Here is no fighting or brawling. If any thinks himself ill-used, the cause is immediately referred to the Keeper, who hears the contending parties face to face and decides the affair at once. (3) The usual grounds of quarrelling are removed ; for it is very rarely that any one cheats or wrongs another, as being sure, if anything of this kind is discovered, to be committed to a closer confinement. (4) Here is no drunkenness suffered, however advantageous it might be to the Keeper as well as the tapster. (5) Nor any whoredom, the women prisoners being narrowly observed and kept separate from the men ; nor is any woman of the town now admitted—no, not at any price. (6) All possible care is taken to prevent idleness : those who are willing to work at their callings are provided with tools and materials, partly by the Keeper, who gives them credit at a very moderate profit ; partly by the alms occasionally

given, which are divided with the utmost prudence and impartiality. Accordingly at this time, among others, a shoemaker, a tailor, a brazier, and a coachmaker are working at their several trades. (7) Only on the Lord's Day they neither work nor play, but dress themselves as clean as they can, to attend the public service in the chapel, at which every person under the roof is present. None is excused unless sick; in which case he is provided gratis both with advice and medicines. (8) And, in order to assist them in things of the greatest concern (besides a sermon every Sunday and Thursday), they have a large Bible chained on one side of the chapel, which any of the prisoners may read. By the blessing of God on these regulations the prison now has a new face: nothing offends either the eye or ear; and the whole has the appearance of a quiet, serious family. And does not the Keeper<sup>1</sup> of Newgate deserve to be remembered full as well as *the Man of Ross*? Man the Lord remember him in that day! Meantime will not one follow his example?—I am, sir,

Your humble servant.

*To the Author of the 'Westminster Journal'* \*

This letter, dated January 12, was also published in the *London Chronicle*, with the preface, 'Sir, be pleased to insert in your paper what follows. It is an answer to a letter published in the *Westminster Journal* and the *Gazetteer*, and begins, "Sir, there is gone abroad."' "

LONDON, January 7, 1761.

SIR,—I hope you are a person of impartiality; if so, you will not insert what is urged on one side of a question only, but likewise what is offered on the other.

Your correspondent is doubtless a man of sense, and he seems to write in a good humour; but he is extremely little acquainted with the persons of whom he undertakes to give an account.

<sup>1</sup> Samuel Johnson, in his *Lives of the Poets*, says that Abel Dage, the keeper, treated Savage 'with the utmost tenderness and civility' when confined in Newgate jail, Bristol, for debt. Dage was one of the firstfruits of Whitefield's

ministry in Bristol prison in 1737, and adorned his profession. See *Journal*, ii. 173; *Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon*, ii. 356-7; and letter of May 7, 1739.

<sup>2</sup> *The New Weekly Miscellany, or Westminster Journal*.

There is 'gone abroad,' says he, 'an ungoverned spirit of enthusiasm, propagated by knaves and embraced by fools.' Suffer me now to address the gentleman himself. Sir, you may call me both a knave and a fool; but prove me either the one or the other if you can. 'Why, you are an enthusiast.' What do you mean by the term? A believer in Jesus Christ? An asserter of His equality with the Father and of the entire Christian revelation? Do you mean one who maintains the antiquated doctrines of the New Birth and Justification by Faith? Then I am an enthusiast. But if you mean anything else, either prove or retract the charge.

The enthusiasm which has lately gone abroad is faith which worketh by love. Does this 'endanger government itself'? Just the reverse. Fearing God, it honours the King. It teaches all men to be subject to the higher powers, not for wrath, but for conscience' sake.

But 'no power in England ought to be independent of the supreme power.' Most true; yet 'the Romanists own the authority of a Pope, independent of civil government.' They do, and thereby show their ignorance of the English Constitution. 'In Great Britain we have many popes, for so I must call all who have the souls and bodies of their followers devoted to them.' Call them so, and welcome. But this does not touch me; nor Mr. Whitefield, Jones,<sup>1</sup> or Romaine; nor any whom I am acquainted with. None of us have our followers thus devoted to us. Those who follow the advice we constantly give are devoted to God, not man. But 'the Methodist proclaims he can bring into the field twenty-five thousand men.' What Methodist? Where and when? Prove this fact, and I will allow you I am a Turk.

(1) 'But it is said they are all good subjects. Perhaps they are; because under a Protestant Government they have all the indulgence they can wish for.' And do you seriously wish for a Popish Government to abridge them of that indulgence? 'But has not a bad use been made of this? Has

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Jones, M.A., of St. Saviour's, Southwark, died of fever on June 6, 1762, in his thirty-third year. He set up a weekly lecture in his church; but before long this

was stopped by his enemies. See letter to Wesley in *Arminian Mag.* 1780, p. 165; Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 324-5.

not the decency of religion been perverted ? ' Not in the least the decency of religion is never so well advanced as by advancing inward and outward religion together. (2) ' Have not the minds of the vulgar been darkened to a total neglect of their civil and social duties ? ' Just the contrary. Thousands in London as well as elsewhere have been enlightened to understand and prevailed on to practise those duties as they never did before (3) ' Has not the peace of many families been ruined ? ' The lost peace of many families has been restored. In others a furious opposition to true religion has occasioned division, as our Lord foretold it would. (4) ' Have not the circumstances of many industrious tradesmen been hurt ? ' I believe not. I know no instance ; but I know an hundred tradesmen in London who began to be industrious since they began to fear God, and their circumstances, low enough till then, are now easy and affluent.

I am almost ashamed to spend time upon these threadbare objections, which have been answered over and over But if they are advanced again, they must be answered again, lest silence should pass for guilt.

' But how can the Government distinguish between tenderness of conscience and schemes of interest ? ' Nothing more easy. ' They may withdraw the licences of such ' Sir, you have forgot the question. Before they withdraw them they are to distinguish whether they are such or no And how are they to do this ? ' Oh, it is very easy ' ! So you leave them as wise as they were before

But ' the Methodist who pretends to be of the Church of England in forms of worship and differs from her in point of doctrine is not, let his pretences be what they will, a member of that Church ' Alas, sir ! your friends will not thank you for this. You have broke their heads sadly. Is no man of the Church, let him pretend what he will, who differs from her in point of doctrine ? *Au ! obsecro ; cave dixeris* ! <sup>1</sup> I know not but you may stumble upon *scandalum magnatum* <sup>2</sup> But stay , you will bring them off quickly ' A truly good man may

<sup>1</sup> Terence's *Eunuchus*, IV III 14  
' Stop, I beseech you , beware what  
you say '

<sup>2</sup> Terence's *Adelphi*, III IV 12  
' Libel against persons of exalted  
rank '

scruple signing and swearing to Articles that his mind and reason cannot approve of.' But is he a truly good man who does not scruple signing and swearing to Articles which he cannot approve of? However, this does not affect us, for we do not differ from our Church in point of doctrine. But all do who deny justification by faith; therefore, according to you, they are no members of the Church of England.

'Methodists preachers,' you allow, 'practise, sign, and swear whatever is required by law'—a very large concession; 'but the reserves they have are incommunicable and unintelligible.' Favour us, sir, with a little proof of this; till then I must plead, Not guilty. In whatever I sign or swear to I have no reserve at all. And I have again and again communicated my thoughts on most heads to all mankind; I believe intelligibly, particularly in the *Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion*.

But 'if Methodism, as its professors pretend, be a new discovery in religion——' This is a grievous mistake; we pretend no such thing. We aver it is the one old religion; as old as the Reformation, as old as Christianity, as old as Moses, as old as Adam.

'They ought to discover the whole ingredients of which their nostrum is composed; and have it enrolled in the public register, to be perused by all the world.' It is done. The whole ingredients of Methodism (so called) have been discovered in print over and over; and they are enrolled in a public register, the Bible, from which we extracted them at first. 'Else they ought not to be tolerated.' We allow it, and desire toleration on no other terms. 'Nor should they be suffered to add or alter one grain different from what is so registered.' Most certainly. We ought neither to add or diminish, nor alter whatever is written in that Book.

I wish, sir, before you write concerning the Methodists again, you would candidly read some of their writings. Common report is not a sure rule of judging; I should be unwilling to judge of you thereby.

To sum up the matter. The whole ingredients of our religion are love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance. Against these, I think, there

is no law; and, therefore, I still apprehend they may be tolerated—at least, in a Christian country.—I am, sir,

Your sincere well-wisher.

*To Dorothy Furlly*

NORWICH, *January 18, 1761.*

MY DEAR SISTER,—I have sometimes wondered that not one of all the clergymen we have known should ever cleave to me for God's sake, nor one man of learning, which would ease me exceedingly. Tommy Walsh designed it;

But death had quicker wings than love.

Perhaps it was not best, because I am so immeasurably apt to pour out all my soul into any that loves me.

It is well for Sister Clarke<sup>1</sup> that she is landed safe. And it is well for us, who are still amidst the waves, that He is with us whom the winds and the seas obey. He is steering you to the haven where you would be. You may well trust your soul with Him and let him do with you as seemeth Him good.

Certainly nothing can be of greater importance than the behaviour both of those who are renewed and of those who are known to be pressing after it. You have need to weigh every step you take. When and where do you meet now? and who are they that meet? Pray send the enclosed to your neighbour; and let all of you love and pray for

Your affectionate brother.

*To Mrs. Crosby*

Sarah Crosby left London for Derby at the beginning of 1761. She met classes, and on February 8 found two hundred present. She could not speak particularly to each, and therefore told them of what God had done for her and exhorted them to flee from sin. This she did to a similar company on the following Friday, and found all her scruples removed as to the propriety of her acting thus publicly. John Hampson was the preacher. See *Methodist Magazine*, 1806, p. 518; and letter of September 8 to Grace Walton.

<sup>1</sup> Mary Clarke had a small house in Christopher Alley, Moorfields, where Sarah Ryan and Sarah Crosby boarded with her, and where Miss Bosanquet stayed as a girl. See Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 286.

LONDON, February 14, 1761.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Miss Bosanquet gave me yours on Wednesday night. Hitherto, I think you have not gone too far. You could not well do less. I apprehend all you can do more is, when you meet again, to tell them simply, 'You lay me under a great difficulty. The Methodists do not allow of women preachers; neither do I take upon me any such character. But I will just nakedly tell you what is in my heart.' This will in a great measure obviate the grand objection and prepare for J. Hampson's coming. I do not see that you have broken any law. Go on calmly and steadily. If you have time, you may read to them the *Notes* on any chapter before you speak a few words, or one of the most awakening sermons, as other women have done long ago.

The work of God goes on mightily here both in conviction and conversion. This morning I have spoken with four or five who seem to have been set at liberty within this month. I believe within five weeks six in one class have received remission of sins and five in one band received a second blessing.<sup>1</sup> Peace be with you all!—I am Your affectionate brother.

To the Editor of the 'London Magazine'

TO MR. G. R., *alias* R. A., *alias* M. K., *alias* R. W.

LONDON, February 17, 1761.

DEAR SIR,—As you are stout, be merciful; or I shall never be able to stand it. Four attacks in one month! and pushed so home! Well, I must defend myself as I can.

Indeed, your first attack under the character of G. R. is not very desperate. You first give a short history of Montanism, and innocently say: 'It would fill a volume to draw a parallel between Montanism and Methodism.' According as it was drawn; but if it contained nothing but truth, it would not fill a nutshell. You add: 'Such a crude composition is this Methodism, that there is scarce any one pestilent heresy that has infested the Church but what is an actual part of their doctrine.' This is easily said: but, till you can prove it, it will pass for nothing.

<sup>1</sup> Wesley had been visiting the classes in London during the week.



In your second letter you say : ' The present troublers of our Israel are that heterogeneous mass, the Methodists.' ' Heterogeneous ' ! an hard word, a very hard word ! Pray, sir, what is the meaning of it ? ' They are avowed enemies to the doctrine and discipline of the Church.' Surely not avowed enemies (if they are secret ones, which no man can prove) : they flatly disavow any such thing. ' Have faithfully copied the worst of men in the worst of times.' This means nothing ; it is mere garniture of the dish. ' If such men's enthusiastical notions be the true doctrine of Jesus Christ, better would it be to be a Jew, a Turk, an infidel, than a Christian.' This proves nothing but what was pretty plain before—namely, that you are very angry. ' Notions repugnant to common sense and to the first principles of truth and equity.' My fundamental notions are that true religion is love, the love of God and our neighbour ; the doing all things to the glory of God, and doing to all men as we would be done to. Are these notions repugnant to common sense or to the first principles of truth and equity ? ' What punishment do they deserve ? ' they who walk by this rule ? By nature they deserve hell ; but by the grace of God, if they endure to the end, they will receive eternal life.

In your third letter you say : ' None of the principles of the Methodists have a more fatal tendency than the doctrine of Assurance.' I allow it ; and it is past your skill to prove that this has any fatal tendency at all, unless as you wonderfully explain it in the following words : ' They insist that themselves are sure of salvation, but that all others are in a damnable state ! ' Who do ? Not I, nor any that I know but Papists. Therefore all that you add to disprove this, which no one affirms, is but beating the air. ' But St. Paul commands us to pass the time of our sojourning here in fear.' Indeed, he does not ; your memory fails : but St. Peter does, and that is as well.

Your fourth (for want of a better) is to serve for a reply to my answer. In this you stoutly say : ' Sir, your performance is frivolous and fallacious.' Very well ; but others must judge of that. ' Shocks, sir, or violent operations of the Spirit are too fully evidenced by your trances, ecstasies, and

I know not what.' I assure you, neither do I; but if you please to tell me, when you do know a little of the matter, I will give you what satisfaction I can. 'These appear in the practices of your followers, and as such must destroy free agency.' Nay, sir, you are now too severe, especially in that keen 'as such.' 'As you then assert such practices, you are (excuse the harshness of the expression) an enemy to religion and a deceiver of the people.' Sir, I do excuse you. I am pretty well used to such expressions: if they hurt not you, they hurt not me. 'Until you publish in plain, intelligible words your scheme of principles, it is impossible to say what you are.' I have done it ten times over, particularly in *The Principles of a Methodist*, the *Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion*, and (what I am not without hope might be intelligible even to you) *Instructions for Children*. 'I must be plain with you: you seem, sir, to have as much knowledge of the Scriptures as a Mahometan.' Sir, I thank you; and I presume you do not expect any other answer to this. 'That you are an enthusiast, a very great enthusiast, not I, let your own Journals demonstrably prove.' Nay, why not you? I fear my Journals will not give such proof as will satisfy any impartial person. 'As to dogmas, I do not know that it is good English: I know it is false dog-Latin.' Now, I really thought it was neither Latin nor English: I took it to be mere heathen Greek.

Whenever you please to favour the public with your name and place of abode, you may perhaps (if I have leisure) hear farther from

Your humble servant and well-wisher.

*To the Editor of the 'London Chronicle'*

The *Caveat against the Methodists*, published anonymously, was written by Richard Challoner (1691-1781), titular Bishop of Debra and Coadjutor in London 1741, Bishop in charge of the Roman Catholic London district 1758-81. See Green's *Anti-Methodist Publications*, No. 311; and letter of November 22, 1760.

LONDON, February 19, 1761.

SIR,—Is it not surprising that every person of understanding does not discern at the very first view that the tract entitled *A Caveat against the Methodists* is in reality a Caveat against

the Protestants? Do not the arguments conclude (if they conclude at all), not against the Methodists only, but against the whole body of Protestants? The names, indeed, of Mr. Whitefield and Mr. Wesley are used; but this is mere finesse! Greater men are designed, and all along are wounded through our sides.

I was long in hopes of seeing an answer to this artful performance from someone of more leisure as well as abilities, and some whose name would have recommended his work. For that thought has something of truth in it,—

Oh what a tuneful wonder seized the throng  
When Marlbro's conquering name alarmed the foe!<sup>1</sup>  
Had Whiznowisky<sup>1</sup> led the armies on  
The General's scarecrow name had foiled each blow

However, who knows but reason for once may be stronger than prejudice? And many may forget my *scarecrow* name, and mind not who speaks but what is spoken. I am pleading now not for Methodists only, but for the whole body of Protestants; first for the Church of England, then for the Protestants of every denomination: in doing which I shall first give the substance of each section of the Romish tract; secondly an answer, and retort it upon the members of the Church of Rome. Oh that this may incite some more skilful advocate to supply my lack of service!

#### SECTION I

'The Methodists' (Protestants) 'are not the people of God; they are not true gospel Christians; nor is their new-raised Society the true Church of Christ, nor any part of it' (page 3).

'This is demonstrated by the Word of God marking out the people of God, the true Church of Christ, by such characters as cannot agree to the Methodists or any other new-raised sect or community' (ibid.).

<sup>1</sup> Duke Michael Wisnowiski, son of a famous general, was a weak man elected king in 1668 by the Poles, and was a mere puppet in their hands 'infirm in body and weak

in mind, without influence, because without courage and riches,' 'an object of somewhat contemptuous homage' He died in 1674 See *W H S* vii 115-16

'The Old Testament is full of prophecies relating to the Church; and the New Testament makes glorious promises to it, and gives glorious characters of it' (page 4).

'Now, all those prophecies, promises, and characters point out a society founded by Christ Himself, and by His commission propagated throughout the world, which should flourish till time should end, ever one, ever holy, ever orthodox; secured against error by the perpetual presence of Christ; ever directed by the Spirit of Truth; having a perpetual succession of pastors and teachers divinely appointed and divinely assisted. But no part of this character is applicable to any new-raised sect, who have no succession from or connexion with that one holy society; therefore no modern sect can be any part of the people of God.' (Page 5.)

I answer: It is true 'all these promises, prophecies, and characters point out a society founded by Christ Himself, and by His commission propagated throughout the world, which should flourish till time should end.' And such is the Catholic Church—that is, the whole body of men, endued with faith working by love, dispersed over the whole earth, in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America. And this Church is 'ever one.' In all ages and nations it is the one body of Christ. It is 'ever holy'; for no unholy man can possibly be a member of it. It is 'ever orthodox'; so is every holy man in all things necessary to salvation; 'secured against error' in things essential 'by the perpetual presence of Christ; and ever directed by the Spirit of Truth' in the truth that is after godliness. This Church has 'a perpetual succession of pastors and teachers divinely appointed and divinely assisted.' And there has never been wanting in the Reformed Churches such a succession of pastors and teachers, men both divinely appointed and divinely assisted; for they convert sinners to God—a work none can do unless God Himself doth appoint them thereto and assist them therein; therefore every part of this character is applicable to them. Their teachers are the proper successors of those who have delivered down through all generations the faith once delivered to the saints; and their members have true spiritual communion with the 'one holy' society of true believers. Consequently, although they are

not the whole 'people of God,' yet are they an undeniable part of His people.

On the contrary, the Church of Rome in its present form was not 'founded by Christ Himself.' All the doctrines and practices wherein she differs from us were not instituted by Christ; they were unknown to the ancient Church of Christ; they are unscriptural, novel corruptions: neither is that Church 'propagated throughout the world.' Therefore, if either antiquity or universality be essential thereto, the Church of Rome cannot be 'the true Church of Christ.'

Nor is the Church of Rome one; it is not in unity with itself; it is to this day torn with numberless divisions. And it is impossible it should be 'the one Church,' unless a part can be the whole; seeing the Asiatic, the African, and the Muscovite Churches (to name no more) never were contained in it.

Neither is it holy. The generality of its members are no holier than Turks or heathens. You need not go far for proof of this. Look at the Romanists in London or Dublin. Are these the holy, the only holy Church? Just such holiness is in the bottomless pit.

Nor is it 'secured against error' either 'by Christ' or 'His Spirit': witness Pope against Pope, Council against Council, contradicting, anathematizing each other. The instances are too numerous to be recited.

Neither are the generality of her 'pastors and teachers' either 'divinely appointed' or 'divinely assisted.' If God had sent them, He would confirm the word of His messengers. But He does not; they convert no sinners to God; they convert many to their own opinion, but not to the knowledge or love of God. He that was a drunkard is a drunkard still; he that was filthy is filthy still: therefore neither are they 'assisted' by Him; so they and their flocks wallow in sin together. Consequently (whatever may be the case of some particular souls) it must be said, if your own marks be true, the Roman Catholics in general are not 'the people of God.'

It may be proper to add here the second section, which is all I had leisure to write, though it was not published till the following week:—

SECTION II

'The Methodist' (Protestant) 'teachers are not the true ministers of Christ; nor are they called or sent by Him' (page 6).

'This appears from what has been already demonstrated; for if the Protestants are not the true people of Christ, their ministers cannot be the true ministers of Christ' (ibid.).

Farther, 'The true ministers came down by succession from the Apostles; but the Protestant teachers do not: therefore they are not the true ministers of Christ' (ibid.).

'All power in the Church of Christ comes from Him; so that whoever without a commission from Him intrudes into the pastoral office is a thief and a robber. Now, the commission can be conveyed but two ways: either immediately from God Himself, as it was to the Apostles, or from men who have the authority handed down to them from the Apostles.

'But this commission has not been conveyed to Protestant preachers either of these ways. Not immediately from God Himself; for how do they prove it? By what miracles? Neither by men deriving authority from the Apostles through the channel of the Church. And they stand divided in communion from all Churches that have any pretensions to antiquity. Their doctrine of Justification by Faith Alone was anathematized at its first appearance by the undoubted heirs of the Apostles, the pastors of the apostolic Churches; consequently they are sent by no other but him who sent all the false prophets from the beginning.' (Pages 8-9.)

I answer, 'from what has been already demonstrated,' that nothing will follow; for you have demonstrated just nothing.

Now for your 'farther' proof. 'The true ministers came down by succession from the Apostles.' So do the Protestant ministers if the Romish do; the English in particular; as even one of yourselves, F. Courayer,<sup>1</sup> has irrefragably proved.

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter F. Courayer (1681-1776), the Roman Catholic professor, wrote *A Defence of the Validity of the English*

*Ordinations* in 1723; and had to take refuge in England in 1728, where he joined the English Church.

' All power in the Church of Christ comes from Him ; either immediately from Himself, or from men who have the authority handed down to them from the Apostles. But this commission has not been conveyed to the Protestant preachers either of these ways : not immediately ; for by what miracles do they prove it ? ' So said Cardinal Bellarmine long ago. Neither ' by men deriving authority from the Apostles.' Read F. Courayer, and know better. Neither are the Protestants ' divided from ' any ' Churches ' who have true ' pretensions to antiquity.' But ' their doctrine of Justification by Faith Alone was anathematized at its first appearance by the undoubted heirs of the Apostles, the pastors of the apostolic Church.' By the prelates at the Council of Trent it was ; who thereby anathematized the Apostle Paul, to all intents and purposes. Here you throw off the mask ; otherwise you might have passed for a Protestant a little longer. ' Consequently they are sent by no other but him who sent all the false prophets from the beginning.' Sir, we thank you. This is really a very modest assertion for the subject of a Protestant king.

But to turn the tables : I said, ' If the Romish bishops do.' For this I absolutely deny. I deny that the Romish bishops came down by *uninterrupted* succession from the Apostles. I never could see it proved ; and I am persuaded I never shall. But unless this is proved, your own pastors on your principles are no pastors at all.

But farther : it is a doctrine of your Church that the intention of the administrator is essential to the validity of the sacraments which are administered by him. Now, are you assured of the intention of every priest from whom you have received the Host ? If not, you do not know but what you received as the sacrament of the altar was no sacrament at all. Are you assured of the intention of the priest who baptized you ? If not, perhaps you are not baptized at all. To come close to the point in hand : if *you* pass for a priest, are you assured of the intention of the bishop that ordained you ? If not, you may happen to be no priest, and so all your ministry is nothing worth : nay, by the same rule he may happen to be no bishop. And who can tell how often this has been the

case? But if there has been only one instance in a thousand years, what becomes of your *uninterrupted* succession?

This *ad hominem*. But I have a word more *ad rem*. Can a man teach what he does not know? Is it possible a man should teach others what he does not know himself? Certainly it is not. Can a priest, then, teach his hearers the way to heaven marked out in our Lord's Sermon on the Mount if he does not know or understand the way himself? Nothing is more impossible. But how many of your priests know nothing about it! What avails, then, their *commission* to teach what they cannot teach, because they know it not? Did God, then, send these men on a fool's errand? send them to do what they cannot do? O say not so! And what will be the event of their attempting to teach they know not what? Why, 'if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the pit.'

*To Sarah Moore*

LONDON, March 3, 1761.

MY DEAR SISTER,—I hope to spend a night or two with you at Sheffield<sup>1</sup> in my return from Newcastle. Probably I may see Hallam too. I am glad to hear you are athirst for God. Look for Him. Is He not nigh at hand? Beware of unbelief. Receive a blessing now.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Christopher Hopper*

Wesley had not been at Barnard Castle since 1752. Rowell had a wide Round, which included Teesdale, Weardale, with other dales, and extended to Hexham, North Tyne, and Alston. His wife had to keep a small shop to earn a living. When Rowell died in 1784, Wesley described him as 'a faithful old soldier, fairly worn out in his Master's service.' Wesley visited Barnard Castle on June 10, and found the people who had been roaring lions as quiet as lambs. See letter of February 8, 1766, to George Merryweather.

LEEDS, March 24, 1761.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I stepped over from Manchester hither yesterday, and am to return thither to-morrow.<sup>1</sup> I

<sup>1</sup> Wesley preached at Sheffield on July 29. He had not been able to visit there the previous year. See letter of May 29.

<sup>2</sup> He preached at Manchester at 5 a.m., and reached Leeds about 5 p.m. See *Journal*, iv. 445.



cannot fix my route through Scotland till I hear from Mr. Gillies<sup>1</sup>; but I expect to be at Aberdeen in four or five weeks and at Newcastle about the middle of May. My best friend (such she undoubtedly is in a sense) remains still in London.<sup>2</sup> I do not expect any change till the approach of death; and I am content. With regard to *me* all is well.

John Nelson and John Manners<sup>3</sup> both write to me from York that they wish T. Olivers<sup>4</sup> would spend some time longer in the Newcastle Circuit. I wish so too. I think it would be better for himself and for many others. O let us follow after the things which make for peace!—I am

Yours affectionately.

Alas! Alas! So poor Jacob Rowell says: 'Mr. Wesley has nothing to do with *his* Round; and all the Societies in it but Barnard Castle are willing to separate.' In God's name, let one of you go into that Round without delay!

### *To James Rouquet*

James Rouquet was grandson of a French Protestant refugee who was condemned to the galleys. His father came to England, and James was educated at the Merchant Taylors' School, when he was converted under Whitefield's ministry. He graduated at St. John's College, Oxford, and was a master at Kingswood for three years. He became Vicar of West Harptree; and then Curate of St. Werburgh's, Bristol, and lecturer of St. Nicholas's and chaplain to St. Peter's Hospital there. On September 11, 1756, he married Sarah Fenwicke, sister to the Dowager-Countess of Deloraine. She had five children, and died on April 28, 1768. In 1773 he married the widow of John Cannon, of Greenwich. In his will of 1768 Wesley left him 'all my manuscripts'; but he died in 1776. See *W.H.S.* ix. 11-14, 123-5; and letter of April 19, 1764.

MANCHESTER, *March 30, 1761.*

DEAR JEMMY,—The thing you mention has been much in my thoughts, and indeed for some years last past. The

<sup>1</sup> Dr. John Gillies, of the College Church, Glasgow. See *Journal*, iv. 62-3, 117.

<sup>2</sup> See next letter.

<sup>3</sup> John Manners's health gave way under the strain of a preacher's life.

He died at York in 1764. See *Journal*, iv. 515-18, v. 58, 67; and letter of July 28, 1775, to John King.

<sup>4</sup> See letters of March 24, 1757, and April 25, 1761, to him.

dreadful consequences which have arisen from the disunion of Christian ministers, especially those whom God has lately employed, are too glaring to be hid from any who do not wilfully shut their eyes. How often has this put a sword into the hand of the common enemy! how often has it made the children of God go heavily! and how many of them has it turned out of the way! On the other hand, how many and how great are the advantages which would flow from a general *union*, of those at least who acknowledge each other to be messengers of God! I know nothing [but sin] which I would not do or leave undone to promote it; and this has been my settled determination for at least ten years last past. But all my overtures have been constantly rejected; almost all of them stand aloof, and at length they have carried their point. I let them alone.

I'll give the fruitless contest o'er.

However, if you can think of any expedient which is likely to avail, I will make a fresh trial. God has lately done great things. Mr. Berridge and Whitefield were much knit to us. The grand breach is now between the irregular and regular clergy. The latter say: 'Stand by yourselves; we are better than you!' And a good man is continually exhorting them so to do, whose steady advice is so very *civil* to the Methodists. But we have nothing to do with them. And this man of war is a dying man—it is poor, honest Mr. Walker.

Finding all other means ineffectual, on Monday the 2nd instant I opened my wife's bureau and took what I found of my own. (No notes, bills, or papers of hers: in saying this, she only does as she uses to do.) Some hours after, she talked like an Empress Queen; on which I told her plainly, '*While you are in this mind* I will neither bed nor board with you.' On . . . following I found her of a better mind; so on Saturday and Sunday<sup>1</sup> we were together as usual. But if we should live to meet again, and she behaves as she did on that day, I should think it my bounden duty to do as I did then. I judge her case to be proper lunacy; but it is a preternatural, a diabolical lunacy, and therefore *at those times*

<sup>1</sup> He was then in London.

(I know what I say) I do not think my life is safe with her. And yet I feel just as much resentment toward her as I do to Sall. Roq<sup>t</sup>.

Peace be with you and yours.

*To Dr. Green*

John Green was Dean of Lincoln, and became Bishop in 1761. See heading to letter of November 22, 1760.

LONDON, April 2, 1761.

REVEREND SIR,—I have no desire to dispute, least of all with one whom I believe to fear God and work righteousness. And I have no time to spare. Yet I think it my duty to write a few lines with regard to those you sent to Mr. Bennet.

You therein say: 'If you sent me the books to inform me of an error which I had publicly advanced, pardon me if I say I know numbers who call themselves Methodists assert their assurance of salvation at the very time they wallow in sins of the deepest dye.' Permit me, sir, to speak freely. I do not doubt the fact. But (1) Those who are connected with me do not call themselves Methodists. Others call them by that nickname, and they cannot help it; but I continually warn them not to pin it upon themselves. (2) We rarely use that ambiguous expression of 'Christ's righteousness imputed to us.' (3) We believe a man may be a real Christian without being 'assured of his salvation.' (4) We know no man can be assured of salvation while he lives in any sin whatever. (5) The wretches who talk in that manner are neither Methodists nor Moravians, but followers of William Cudworth, James Relly, and their associates, who abhor us as much as they do the Pope, and ten times more than they do the devil. If you oppose these, so do I; and have done privately and publicly for these twenty years.

But you say: 'Such as do not profess this doctrine will not be affected by my sermon.' Indeed they will; for the world (as you yourself did) lump all that are called Methodists together. Consequently whatever you then said of Methodists in general falls on us as well as them; and so we are condemned for those very principles which we totally detest and abhor: a small part of the *Preservative* (had you taken

the pains to read it) would have convinced you of this. 'Did you send them to convince me of some important truth? I have the New Testament.' So have I; and I have read it for above these fifty years, and for near forty with some attention. Yet I will not say that Mr. Green may not convince me of some truth which I never yet learned from it. I want every help, especially from those who strive both to preach and to live the gospel. Yet certainly I must dissent from you or you from me wherever either conceives the other to vary from it. Some of my writings you 'have read.' But allow me to ask, Did not you read them with much prejudice or little attention? Otherwise surely you would not have termed them 'perplexing.' Very few lay obscurity or intricacy to my charge. Those who do not allow them to be true do not deny them to be plain. And if they believe me to have done any good at all by writing, they suppose it is by this very thing—by speaking on practical and experimental religion more plainly than others have done.

I quite agree we 'neither can be better men nor better Christians than by continuing members of the Church of England.' And not only her doctrines but many parts of her discipline I have adhered to at the hazard of my life. If in any point I have since varied therefrom, it was not by choice but necessity. Judge, therefore, if they do well who throw me into the ditch, and then beat me because my clothes are dirty!

Wishing you much of the love of God in your heart and much of His presence in your labours, I remain, reverend sir,  
Your affectionate brother.

### *To George Downing*

George Downing was chaplain to the Earl of Dartmouth, and Rector of Ovington, Essex, where the Wesleys visited him. Charles Wesley describes him as 'humble, loving, zealous Mr. Downing.' See *Journal*, v. 61, 105; *Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon*, i. 429; the next letter, and that of April 19, 1764.

LIVERPOOL, April 6, 1761.

DEAR SIR,—Let who will speak, if what is spoken be true, I am ready to subscribe it. If it be not, I accept no man's

person. *Magis amica veritas.*<sup>1</sup> I had an agreeable conversation with Mr. Venn,<sup>2</sup> who, I suppose, is now near you. I think he is exactly as regular as he ought to be. I would observe every punctilio of order, except where the salvation of souls is at stake. There I prefer the end before the means.

I think it great pity that the few clergymen in England who preach the three grand scriptural doctrines—Original Sin, Justification by Faith, and Holiness consequent thereon—should have any jealousies or misunderstandings between them. What advantage must this give to the common enemy! What an hindrance is it to the great work wherein they are all engaged! How desirable is it that there should be the most open, avowed intercourse between them! So far, indeed, as they judge it would be for the glory of God, they may openly declare wherein they disagree.

But surely, if they are ashamed to own one another in the faces of all mankind, they are ashamed of Christ, they are ashamed of Him that sends if they dare not avow whom He has sent. Excuses, indeed, will never be wanting. But will these avail before God? For many years I have been labouring after this—labouring to unite, not scatter, the messengers of God. Not that I want anything from them. As God has enabled me to stand almost alone for these twenty years, I doubt not but He will enable me to stand either with them or without them. But I want all to be helpful to each other, and all the world to know we are so. Let them know who is on the Lord's side. You, I trust, will always be of that number. O let us preach and live the whole gospel! The grace of our Lord be with your spirit!—I am, dear sir,

Your ever affectionate brother and servant.

*To the Earl of Dartmouth (?)*

LIVERPOOL, April 10, 1761

DEAR SIR,—I. In order to answer the question more clearly which Mr. [Downing<sup>3</sup>] has proposed to you, it may be well look a little backward. Some years since, two or three

<sup>1</sup> 'I prefer truth to the dearest friend.'

<sup>2</sup> On March 25 he breakfasted

with Henry Venn, recently appointed Vicar of Huddersfield.

<sup>3</sup> See previous letter.

clergymen of the Church of England, who were above measure zealous for all her rules and orders, were convinced that religion is not an external thing, but 'righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,' and that this righteousness and peace and joy are given only to those who are justified by faith. As soon as they were convinced of these great truths, they preached them; and multitudes flocked to hear. For these reasons, and no others, real or pretended (for as yet they were strictly regular), because they preached such doctrine, and because such multitudes followed them, they were forbid to preach in the churches. Not daring to be silent, they preached elsewhere, in a school, by a river-side, or upon a mountain; and more and more sinners forsook their sins and were filled with peace and joy in believing.

2. But at the same time huge offence was taken at their 'gathering congregations' in so irregular a manner; and it was asked,—

(1) 'Do you judge that the Church with the authority of the State has power to enact laws for her own government?'

I answer: If a dispensation of the gospel is committed to me, no Church has power to enjoin me silence. Neither has the State; though it may abuse its power and enact laws whereby I suffer for preaching the gospel.

(2) 'Do you judge it your duty to submit to the laws of the Church and State as far as they are consistent with a good conscience?'

I do. But 'woe is me if I preach not the gospel': this is not consistent with a good conscience.

(3) 'Is it a law of the Church and State that none of her ministers shall gather congregations but by the appointment of the bishop? If any do, does not she forbid her people to attend them? Are they not subversive of the good order of the Church? Do you judge there is anything sinful in such a law?'

I answer: (i) If there is a law that a minister of Christ who is not suffered to preach the gospel in the church should not preach it elsewhere, I do judge that law to be absolutely sinful. (ii) If that law forbids Christian people to hear the gospel of Christ out of their parish church when they cannot

hear it therein, I judge it would be sinful for them to obey it. (iii) This preaching is not subversive of any good order whatever. It is only subversive of that vile abuse of the good order of our Church whereby men who neither preach nor live the gospel are suffered publicly to overturn it from the foundation, and in the room of it to palm upon their congregations a wretched mixture of dead form and maimed morality.

(4) 'If these premises be allowed.'

They cannot be allowed. So, from nothing, nothing follows.

3. It was objected farther,—

(1) 'In every nation there must be some settled order of government, ecclesiastical and civil.'

There must; but put civil out of the question. It only tends to puzzle the cause.

(2) 'The Scriptures likewise enjoin this.'

They do, that all things in the church be done in order.

(3) 'There is an ecclesiastical order established in England, and it is a lawful one.'

I believe it is in general not only lawful but highly commendable.

(4) 'But Mr. [Downing] tells you: "You are born under this Establishment. Your ancestors supported it, and were ennobled on that account." These points, I think, are not very material; but that which follows is. "You have by deliberate and repeated acts of your own engaged yourself to defend it. Your very rank and station constitute you a formal and eminent guardian of it."'

A guardian of what? What is it that you have 'deliberately engaged yourself to defend'? The constitution of the Church of England. And is not her doctrine a main part of this constitution? a far more essential part thereof than any rule of external order? Of this, then, you are a formal guardian; and you have deliberately engaged yourself to defend it. But have you deliberately engaged to defend her orders to the destruction of her doctrine? Are you a guardian of this external circumstance when it tends to destroy the substance of her constitution? And if you are engaged, at all events, to defend her order, are you also to defend the

abuse of it? Surely no. Your rank, your station, your honour, your conscience, all engage you to oppose this.

(5) 'But how can it consist with the duty arising from all these to give encouragement, countenance, and support to principles and practices that are a direct renunciation of the established constitution, and that in their genuine issue' (or natural tendency) 'are totally subversive of it?'

Are the principles of those clergymen a direct renunciation of the established constitution? Are their practices so? Are either the one or the other 'totally subversive of it'? Not so: their fundamental principles are the very principles of the Established Church. So is their practice too; save in a very few points, wherein they are constrained to deviate. Therefore it is no ways inconsistent with your duty to encourage, countenance, and support them; especially seeing they have no alternative. They must either be thus far irregular or destroy their own souls, and let thousands of their brethren perish for lack of knowledge.

(6) Nay, but their 'principles and practices are of this character. For (i) They gather congregations and exercise their ministerial office therein in every part of this kingdom, directly contrary to the restraint laid on them at their ordination and to the design of that parochial distribution of duty settled throughout this nation. (ii) They maintain it lawful for men to preach who are not episcopally ordained, and thereby contradict the Twenty-third Article. (iii) They disclaim all right in the bishops to control them in any of these matters, and say that, rather than be so controlled, they would renounce all communion with this Church. (iv) These principles they industriously propagate among their followers.'

I answer: (i) They do gather congregations everywhere and exercise their ministerial office therein. But this is not contrary to any restraint which was laid upon them at their ordination; for they were not ordained to serve any particular parish. And it is remarkable that Lincoln College was founded *ad propagandam Christianam fidem et extirpandas haereses*.<sup>1</sup> But were it otherwise, suppose a parish minister

<sup>1</sup> 'For propagating the Christian faith and extirpating heresies.' See letter of June 17, 1746, sect. III. 5.



to be either ignorant or negligent of his duty, and one of his flock adjures me for Christ's sake to tell him what he must do to be saved, was it ever the design of our Church that I should refuse to do it because he is not of my parish? '(ii) They maintain it lawful for men to preach who are not episcopally ordained.' In some circumstances they do; particularly where thousands are rushing into destruction, and those who are ordained and appointed to watch over them neither care for nor know how to help them. 'But hereby they contradict the Twenty-third Article, to which they have subscribed.' They subscribed it in the simplicity of their hearts, when they firmly believed none but Episcopal ordination valid. But Bishop Stillingfleet has since fully convinced them this was an entire mistake.<sup>1</sup> '(iii) They disclaim all right in the bishops to control them in any of these matters.' In every point of an indifferent nature they obey the bishops for conscience' sake; but they think Episcopal authority cannot reverse what is fixed by divine authority. Yet they are determined never to renounce communion with the Church unless they are cast out headlong. If it be said, 'Nay, but if I varied from the Church at all, I would throw off my gown and be a professed Dissenter,'—what! would you profess to dissent when you did not? If you would, they dare not do it. They love the Church, and therefore keep to all her doctrine and rules as far as possibly they can; and if they vary at all, it shall not be an hair's breadth farther than they cannot help. '(iv) These principles they industriously propagate among their followers.' Indeed they do not: the bulk of their followers know just nothing of the matter. They industriously propagate among them nothing but inward and outward holiness.

(7) 'Now these are oppositions to the most fundamental principles and essentially constituent parts of our Establishment; and not of ours only, but of every ecclesiastical Establishment that is or ever has been in the Christian world.'

'The most fundamental principles'! No more than the tiles are the most fundamental principles of an house. Useful, doubtless, they are; yet you must take them off if you would

<sup>1</sup> See letter of July 16, 1755.

repair the rotten timber beneath. 'Essentially constituent parts of our Establishment'! Well, we will not quarrel for a word. Perhaps the doors may be essentially constituent parts of the building we call a church. Yet, if it were on fire, we might innocently break them open or even throw them for a time off the hinges. Now this is really the case. The timber is rotten—yea, the main beams of the house; and they want to place that firm beam, salvation by faith, in the room of salvation by works. A fire is kindled in the Church, the house of the living God: the fire of love of the world, ambition, covetousness, envy, anger, malice, bitter zeal—in one word, of ungodliness and unrighteousness. Oh who will come and help to quench it? Under disadvantages and discouragements of every kind, a little handful of men have made a beginning; and I trust they will not leave off till the building is saved or they sink in the ruins of it.

4. To sum up the whole. A few irregular men openly witness those truths of God which the regular clergy (a few excepted) either suppress or wholly deny.

Their word is accompanied with the power of God, convincing and converting sinners. The word of those is not accompanied with power: it neither wounds nor heals.

The former witness the truth and the power of God by their own life and conversation: therefore the world, men who know not God, hate them and speak all manner of evil against them falsely. The latter are of the world: therefore the world loves its own and speaks honourably of them.

Which of these ought you to hear,—those who declare or those who deny the truth of God? that word which is the power of God unto salvation, or that which lulls men on to destruction? the men who live as well as preach the gospel, or those whose lives are no better than their doctrine?

'But they are irregular.'

I answer: (1) That is not their choice. They must either preach irregularly or not at all. (2) Is such a circumstance of weight to turn the scale against the substance of the gospel? If it is, if none ought to speak or hear the truth of God unless in a regular manner, then (to mention but one consequence) there never could have been any reformation from Popery.

For here the entire argument for Church order would have stood in its full force. Suppose one had asked a German nobleman to hear Martin Luther preach ; might not his priest have said (without debating whether he preached the truth or not) : ' My lord, in every nation there must be some settled order of government, ecclesiastical and civil. There is an ecclesiastical order established in Germany. You are born under this Establishment. Your ancestors supported it, and your very rank and station constitute you a formal and eminent guardian of it. How, then, can it consist with the duty arising from all these to give encouragement, countenance, and support to principles and practices that are a direct renunciation of the established constitution ? ' Had the force of this reasoning been allowed, what had become of the Reformation ?

Yet it was right ; though it really was a subversion of the whole ecclesiastical constitution with regard to doctrine as well as discipline. Whereas this is no such thing. The doctrine of the Established Church, which is far the most essential part of her constitution, these preachers manifestly confirm, in opposition to those who subvert it. And it is the opposition made to them by those subverters which constrains them in some respects to deviate from her discipline ; to which in all others they conform for conscience. Oh what pity that any who preach the same doctrine, and whom those subverters have not yet been able to thrust out, should join with them against their brethren in the common faith and fellow witnesses of the common salvation !—I am, dear sir,

Your willing servant for Christ's sake.

*To his Wife*

WHITEHAVEN, April 24, 1761.

MY DEAR MOLLY,—Although I have not had any answer to my former letters, yet I must trouble you once more, and repeat the advice I gave you before, ' Beware of tale-bearers.' God has given you plenty of temporal blessings ; and if you only avoid this snare (to which your natural temper lays you open), you may have plenty of spiritual too. Indeed, He mingles afflictions with your cup. But may not these be bless-

ings also? May they not be admirable means to break the impetuosity and soften the harshness of your spirit? Certainly they may. Certainly they have this effect on many; and why not on *you* likewise? Is not everything contrary to your will intended to conquer it, and to bring it into a full subordination to the will of God? And when once this is done, what can hurt you? Then you are invulnerable; you are defended from head to foot by armour which neither the world nor the devil can pierce. Then you will go on unmoved, through honour and dishonour, through evil report and good report. You will happily experience in your own soul the truth of that fine observation, 'In the greatest afflictions which can befall the just, either from heaven or earth, they remain immovable in virtue, and perfectly submissive to God, by an inward, loving regard to Him uniting all the powers of their soul.'—I am with much sincerity, dear Molly,

Your affectionate Husband.

What is become of the Chancery suit? Of Noah<sup>1</sup>? Of John<sup>2</sup> and Jenny Matthews, and poor Anthony?

To Mrs Wesley, At the Foundery,  
London.

### To Thomas Olivers

This letter was first directed by Wesley to 'Mr. T. Olivers, at Mr. John Hall's, in Newgate Street, York'; then, in another hand, to 'Mr. T. Olivers, at the Orphan House, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.'

Wesley had a high opinion of Thomas Olivers's judgement and skill as a controversialist, and these questions were probably intended to guide his thought and study. See letters of March 24, 1761, and January 18, 1762.

WHITEHAVEN, April 25, 1761.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I have a desire to ask you some questions on two or three heads, which you may answer as particularly as you please. (1) Have you read over *The Doctrine of Original Sin*? I mean the book wrote in answer to Dr. Taylor? Have you read it with attention and prayer? Do you understand it? Have you seriously considered it? Is there anything in it which you think wrong? or does it

<sup>1</sup> Noah and Anthony Vazeille, her sons.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of April 24, 1757.

express your own judgement? (2) Have you read over the sermons in the first and fourth volumes on Justification and the New Birth? Do you think you thoroughly understand them? Is there anything in them which you cannot agree to? (3) Have you read over the *Thoughts upon Perfection* in the fourth volume? Did you read them with humility and prayer? with calmness and deliberation? Have you considered them again and again, crying to God for help? Is there anything in them which you do not understand, or which you think is not right? On all these heads you may speak freely to, dear Tommy,

Your affectionate friend and brother.

Direct to Newcastle.

*To Mrs. Booth*

Elizabeth Booth was the wife of Jonathan Booth, of Woodseats, whose daughter's illness is described in the *Journal*, iv. 70. The daughter married John Oliver, one of the preachers. On July 29 Wesley preached 'in Woodseats at two, and in the evening at the end of the house in Sheffield to thrice as many people as it would have contained.'

SUNDERLAND, May 29, 1761.

MY DEAR SISTER,—It is a long time to the 1st of August. Before that time many of us may be in Abraham's bosom. If I am at Sheffield that morning, very probably I may be at Woodseats the same day at noon. I do not know but George Tizard<sup>1</sup> may be on that Round some time longer. Oh what cause have we to praise God for all the wonders He has wrought!—I am, with love to Brother Booth,

Your affectionate brother.

I return to Newcastle in a day or two.

*To John Hosmer*

John Hosmer, one of the first converts at Darlington, became an itinerant preacher. When his health failed, he settled as a surgeon in Sunderland. He died at York in 1780. See Atmore's *Memorial*, p. 200.

<sup>1</sup> Tizard became a preacher in 1759, and was afterwards a clergyman.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, June 7, 1761.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I apprehend, if you will give another careful reading to those four pages, 244-7,<sup>1</sup> you will find all your objections anticipated or answered. However, I do not think much of answering them over again. Your words are : ‘ You say, “ A mistake is not a sin, if love is the sole principle of action ; yet it is a transgression of the perfect law ” ; therefore perfect love is not the perfect law ’ ! Most sure ; for by ‘ the perfect law ’ I mean that given to Adam at his creation. But the loving God with all his heart was not the whole of that law : it implied abundantly more ; even thinking, speaking, and acting right in every instance, which he was then able, and therefore obliged, to do. But none of his descendants are able to do this ; therefore love is the fulfilling of their law.

Perhaps you had not adverted to this. The law of love, which is the whole law given to us, is only one branch of that perfect law which was given to Adam in the beginning. His law was far wider than ours, as his faculties were more extensive. Consequently many things might be transgressions of the latter which were not of the former.

‘ But if ignorance be a transgression of the perfect law.’ Whoever said or thought so ? Ignorance is not, but mistake is. And this Adam was able to avoid ; that kind of ignorance which was in him not constraining him to mistake, as ours frequently does.

‘ But is “ a voluntary transgression of a known law ” a proper definition of sin ? ’ I think it is of all such sin as is imputed to our condemnation. And it is a definition which has passed uncensured in the Church for at least fifteen hundred years.

To propose any objections that naturally arise is right ; but beware you do not seek objections. If you once begin this, you will never have done. Indeed, this whole affair is a strife of words. The thing is plain. All in the body are liable to mistakes, practical as well as speculative. Shall we call them sins or no ? I answer again and again, Call them just what you please.

<sup>1</sup> *Thoughts on Christian Perfection.* See letter of June 23, 1760.

*To George Merryweather*

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, June 7, 1761.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I had allotted two nights for Yarm ; but by the advice of our brethren here I have made a little alteration in my plan. On Wednesday and Thursday the 18th instant I am to be at Stockton. On Friday evening and Saturday noon I purpose (with God's leave) to preach at Yarm.<sup>1</sup> On Saturday evening I am to be at Hutton Rudby, which is nearer the centre of our Societies.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Mrs. Hall*

NEAR NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, June 14, 1761.

DEAR PATTY,—Why should any of us live in the world without doing a little good in it ? I am glad you have made a beginning. See that you are not weary of well doing ; for it will often be a cross. But bear the cross, and it will bear *you*. The best fruit grows under the cross.

I have often thought it strange that so few of my relations should be of any use to me in the work of God. My sister Wright was, of whom I should least have expected it ; but it was only for a short season. My sister Emly and you, of whom one might have expected more, have, I know not how, kept at a distance, and sometimes cavilled a little, at other times as it were approved, but never heartily joined in the work. Where did it stick ? Did you not thoroughly understand what my brother and I were doing ? Did you not see the truth ? Or did the cause lie in your heart ? You had no will to join hand in hand. You wanted resolution, spirit, patience. Well, the day is far spent. What you do, do quickly. ' Life for delay no time will give ! '

[My] work in the country cannot be finished before the latter end of August, as the circuit is now larger by [some] hundred miles than when I was in the North two [years] ago. O let the one thing be ever uppermost in our thoughts !

<sup>1</sup> He preached at Yarm on the Friday evening at seven, and on Saturday at noon 'applied those words, " Now abide faith, hope, love ; but the greatest of these is love." ' See *Journal*, iv. 464 ; and letter of Jan. 24, 1760.

To promote either your temporal or eternal good will always be a pleasure to, dear Patty,

Your affectionate Brother.<sup>1</sup>

Endorsed 'I am obliged to my dear B[rother] for [thus].'

### To Miss March

STOCKTON, June 17, 1761.

I apprehend your great danger now is this—to think you never shall receive that blessing because you have not received it yet; nay, perhaps you may be tempted to believe that there is no such thing, and that those who thought they had received it were mistaken as well as you. This danger will be increased if some who professed to be sanctified long ago, and yet have not received this blessing, affirm there is no such thing, and begin to warn others against falling into this delusion. But keep close to your rule, the Word of God, and to your guide, the Spirit of God, and never be afraid of expecting too much. As yet you are but a babe. Oh what heights of holiness are to come! I hope you do not forget to pray for me. Adieu!

### To Alexander Coates

Alexander Coates, a Scotsman, became Wesley's oldest itinerant. He had great abilities as a preacher, and was very popular. He died in perfect peace in October 1765 at the Orphan House, Newcastle. See *Journal*, v. 149, *Atmore's Memorial*, pp 75-7. *Wesley's Veterans*, i. 146

James Relly, a Welshman, was converted under Whitefield's ministry. He became a minister among the Calvinistic Methodists, and afterwards took the meeting-house in Bartholomew Close. He published a hymn-book which was widely used and a treatise on the Union of Christ and His Church. Thomas Taylor says 'By him I was much blinded, and for a time all seemed right which he advanced.' He saw afterwards that Relly had sadly perverted the truth. See *Journal*, iv 178; *Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon*, ii. 371n. *Wesley's Veterans*, vii 24; and letter of September 21, 1760.

OTLEY, July 7, 1761.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—The perfection I teach is perfect love: loving God with all the heart; receiving Christ as

<sup>1</sup> Wesley was much concerned about his sister. See letter of Dec 26 to his brother



Prophet, Priest, and King, to reign alone over all our thoughts, words, and actions. The Papists neither teach nor believe this: give even the devil his due. They teach there is no perfection here which is not consistent with venial sins; and among venial sins they commonly reckon simple fornication. Now, I think this is so far from the perfection I teach, that it does not come up to any but Mr. Relly's perfection. To say Christ will not reign alone in our hearts in this life, will not enable us to give Him all our hearts—this in my judgement is making Him an half-Saviour. He can be no more, if He does not quite save us from our sins. I pray, then, be not quite so peremptory. Who exalts Christ most? those who call on Him to be the sole Monarch of the heart, or those who allow Him only to share the power and to govern most of the thoughts and tempers? Who honour Him most? those who believe He heals all our sickness, takes away all our ungodliness, or those who say, He heals only the greater part of it, till death does what He cannot do? I know no creature (of us) who says, 'Part of our salvation belongs to Christ and part to us.' No; we all say, Christ alone saves us from all sin; and your question is not about the Author but the measure of salvation. Both agree it is all Christ; but is it all salvation or only half salvation He will give? Who was Pelagius? By all I can pick up from ancient authors, I guess he was both a wise and an holy man. But we know nothing but his name; for his writings are all destroyed, not one line of them left. But, Brother Coates, this way of talking is highly offensive. I advise you (1) If you are willing to labour with us, preach no doctrine contrary to ours. I have preached twenty years in some of Mr. Whitefield's Societies; yet to this day I never contradicted him among his own people. I did not think it honest, neither necessary at all. I could preach salvation by faith, and leave all controversy untouched. I advise you (2) Avoid all those strong, rhetorical exclamations 'Oh horrid! Oh dreadful!' and the like, unless when you are strongly exhorting sinners to renounce the devil and all his works. (3) Acquaint yourself better with the doctrine we preach, and you will find it not dreadful but altogether lovely. (4) Observe that if forty

persons think and speak wrong, either about justification or sanctification (and perhaps fancy they have attained both), this is no objection to the doctrines themselves. They must bear their own burthen. But this does not at all affect the point in question. (5) Remember, as sure as you are that 'believers cannot fall from grace,' others (wise and holy men too) are equally sure they can; and you are as much obliged to bear with them as they are to bear with you. (6) Abstain from all controversy in public. Indeed, you have not a talent for it. You have an honest heart, but not a clear head. Practical religion is your point; therefore (7) Keep to this: repentance toward God, faith in Christ, holiness of heart and life, a growing in grace and in the knowledge of Christ, the continual need of His atoning blood, a constant confidence in Him, and all these every moment to our life's end. In none of these will any of our preachers contradict you or you them.

When you leave this plain path and get into controversy, then they think you 'invade the glories of our adorable King and the unspeakable rights and privileges and comforts of His children'; and can they then 'tamely hold their peace'?

O Sander, know the value of peace and love!—I am  
Your affectionate brother.

*To Ebenezer Blackwell*

BRADFORD, July 16, 1761.

DEAR SIR,—Methinks it is a long time since I saw or heard anything of you. I hope, however, that Mrs. Blackwell and you are not only alive, but more alive than ever, seeking and enjoying something more than King George is likely to find either at his wedding or his coronation.<sup>1</sup> And can you likewise give me a comfortable account of Miss Freeman, both as to her health and her spirit? I often think of her, and sometimes have a mind to send her another letter, though she is one in my debt already.

<sup>1</sup> George III was married to Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz on Sept. 8, and crowned on Sept. 22.

Mr. Venn was so kind as to come over hither yesterday and spend the evening with us.<sup>1</sup> I am a little embarrassed on his account, and hardly know how to act. Several years before he came to Huddersfield some of our preachers went thither, carrying their lives in their hands, and with great difficulty established a little, earnest Society. These eagerly desire them to preach there still; not in opposition to Mr. Venn (whom they love, esteem, and constantly attend), but to supply what they do not find in his preaching. It is a tender point. Where there is a gospel ministry already, we do not desire to preach; but whether we can leave off preaching because such an one comes after is another question, especially when those who were awakened and convinced by us beg and require the continuance of our assistance. I love peace, and follow it; but whether I am at liberty to purchase it at such price I really cannot tell.

I hear poor Mr. Walker is near death.<sup>2</sup> It seems strange that, when there is so great a want of faithful labourers, such as him should be removed; but the will of God is always best, and what He does we shall know hereafter! I have been for some days with Mr. Grimshaw, an Israelite indeed. A few such as him would make a nation tremble. He carries fire wherever he goes. Mr. Venn informs me that Mr. Whitefield continues very weak.<sup>3</sup> I was in hope, when he wrote to me lately, that he was swiftly recovering strength. Perhaps, sir, you can send me better news concerning him. What need have we, while we do live, to live in earnest!—I am, dear sir,  
Your affectionate servant.

If you have not a mind for me to write again, you must not write yourself. For about a fortnight I shall be at or near Leeds.

---

<sup>1</sup> This visit of Henry Venn is not mentioned in the *Journal*, but another is noticed on July 24. See next letter.

<sup>2</sup> Samuel Walker, of Truro. He died at Blackheath on the 19th.

<sup>3</sup> Whitefield took a serious cold

in Bristol, and was laid aside in March and April. He was an invalid for twelve months, and obliged with a few exceptions to refrain from preaching. See Tyerman's *Whitefield*, ii. 441-3.

## To Ebenezer Blackwell

NORWICH, August 15, 1761.

DEAR SIR,—As you are encompassed with a thousand temptations, and some of them of the most dangerous kind, it is an unspeakable blessing that you still continue with your face heavenward. And if you have resolution to break through a thousand hindrances and allow some time every day for private prayer, I doubt not but you will receive every gospel blessing in this world and in the world to come.

Mr. Venn<sup>1</sup> and I have had some hours' conversation together, and have explained upon every article. I believe there is no bone of contention remaining, no matter of offence, great or small. Indeed, fresh matter will arise if it be sought; but it shall not be sought by me. We have amicably compromised the affair of preaching. He is well pleased that the preachers should come once a month.

That story was one of those which we cleared up. But Mr. Oddie<sup>2</sup> (the person of whom it was told) will be in town next week, and can himself give you full satisfaction concerning it. On this day se'nnight I hope to be in town, and tomorrow se'nnight at West Street Chapel. With sincere love to Mrs. Blackwell and Mrs. Dewal, I am, dear sir,

Your very affectionate servant.

I thank you for sending me the letters.

## To his Brother Charles

LONDON, September 8, 1761.

DEAR BROTHER,—Our Conference<sup>3</sup> ended, as it began, in peace and love. All found it a blessed time:

Excepto, quod non simul esses, caetera laeti.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See previous letter, and that of June 22, 1763. Venn was present at the Conference in Leeds on Aug. 10, 1762.

<sup>2</sup> James Oddie, one of Wesley's ablest and most judicious preachers. He entered into trade at Yarm, and married, as his second wife, Mrs. Colbeck, of Keighley, from whom he was separated in 1785. For a short time he preached at Dewsbury in

connexion with John Atlay. See *Journal*, iv. 531; *Atmore's Memorial*, pp. 298–300; and letter of Feb. 13, 1762.

<sup>3</sup> The Conference in London began on Tuesday, Sept. 1, and closed on Saturday.

<sup>4</sup> Horace's *Epistles*, i. x. 50: 'Our minds with this exception gay, That you, our friend, were far away.'

The *Minutes* John Jones can help you to, who sets out hence in two or three days. The right hand of the Lord bringeth mighty things to pass. Not the least of them is that my wife cordially loves T. Maxfield.

Why should not Bath be supplied from Bristol? Order it so. I have no objection. They will by that means often have a more able preacher than they would otherwise have. If he does not linger by the way, a preacher may be at Bristol on Thursday night.

I do not at all think (to tell you a secret) that the work will ever be destroyed, Church or no Church. What has been done to prevent the Methodists leaving the Church you will see in the *Minutes* of the Conference. I told you before, with regard to Norwich, *dixi*. I have done at the last Conference all I *can* or *dare* do. Allow me liberty of conscience, as I allow you.

On Monday se'nnight I hope to set out for Bristol.

My love to Sally. Adieu!

I know not what you will do with an exceeding honest mad woman, Mrs. Greer, of Newry, in Ireland, who, I hear, is embarking for Bristol. She comes without her husband's consent.

P. Jaco desires to take a journey to Canterbury before he returns to Bristol.

I doubt not the Moravians will be courteous. And I fear that is all. Pray tell Brother Sheen<sup>1</sup> I am satisfied with his letter. He may stay at Bristol till I come. And be so kind as to tell Isaac I approve of his reasons, and think he ought to go home; but have the Stewards found one fit to succeed him?

### To Samuel Furly

Furly had formed a friendship with Henry Venn at Cambridge. Venn was now Vicar of Huddersfield; and Furly seems to have been afraid of his influence, which was not altogether friendly to Wesley. The care taken to prevent hasty and unwise publications by the

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Dec. 26 to Charles Wesley.

preachers shows how necessary it was to be watchful in these times of controversy. See letter of July 16.

LONDON, September 8, 1761.

DEAR SAMMY,—I hope we have effectually provided against that evil disease the *scribendi cacoethes* in our preachers, as we have agreed that none shall publish anything for the time to come till he has first submitted it to the judgement of his brethren met in Conference.

That is really a fine passage which you cite from Mr. Ridley. He is an excellent writer. I have often seen that text cleared up before, but never in so convincing a manner.

What all our brethren think concerning that circumstance of entire sanctification—that it is instantaneous, although a gradual growth in grace both precede and follow it, you may see in the *Minutes* of the Conference, wherein it was freely debated. Any of the good old Puritans would have been no less amazed had they come into one of our congregations and heard us declare that God willeth every man without exception to be saved.

O Sammy, shake off the *disputandi cacoethes*, and be a quiet, simple, loving Christian!—I am, with love to Nancy,  
Your affectionate friend and brother.

You seem to fear receiving any hurt from Mr. Venn. Therefore I fear he does hurt you.

To the Rev. Mr. Furly, At Kippax,  
Near Ferry Bridge, Yorks.

To Matthew Lowes

LONDON, September 8, 1761.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—If local preachers who differ from us will keep their opinions to themselves, then they may preach in our Societies; otherwise they must not. And upon this condition we are all willing to receive William Darney into connexion with us. The sooner you set out for Whitehaven the better. The Society there need not be frightened at a married preacher, considering we have paid forty pounds of their debt out of the collection. And if the expense for wives be too heavy, I will help them out.

Do all you can to propagate the books in that circuit and to fulfil the office of an Assistant.—I am, with love to Sister Lowes,

Your affectionate friend and brother.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Lowes, At the Orphan House,  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

*To Grace Walton*

LONDON, *September 8, 1761.*

SISTER,—If a few more persons come in when you are meeting, either enlarge four or five minutes on the question you had, with a short exhortation (perhaps for five or six minutes, sing and pray).<sup>2</sup> I think, and always, its meaning is this: 'I suffer not a woman to teach in a congregation, nor thereby to assert authority over the man . . . God has invested with this prerogative; whereas teaching . . . . .

I ask you some more questions, which you may answer as soon as you have opportunity: Had you then, or have you had since, a witness that you would never finally perish? Have you a witness that sin shall never enter more? Have you a witness that you shall no more offend God? If so, what need have you to watch against sin! Do you ever use self-examination? At what times or in what meaning? Do you always see God? Does no cloud ever interpose? Are you as sure you see Him as that you are living? Does nothing ever dim your sight of God? Have you an experimental proof of the ever-blessed Trinity? Is your mind always stayed on God? Do your thoughts never wander from Him in prayer, in business, or in travelling? What are you looking for now?—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Matthew Lowes*

LONDON, *October 30, 1761.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—The thing is settled. Thomas Newall<sup>3</sup> is to labour with you in the Whitehaven Circuit, and

<sup>1</sup> See letters of March 6, 1759 (to him), and Oct 30, 1761.

<sup>2</sup> See letters of Feb. 14, 1761, and March 18, 1769.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Newall became a preacher in 1761, and retired in 1780.

see that you break up fresh ground. In the meantime William Darney is to divide the Allendale Circuit with T. Hanby.<sup>1</sup>

As to maintenance, first let the Society do what they can. And they have good encouragement. Secondly, at Christmas I will make up what is wanting to you and Sister Lowes.

'Dwell in the land, and be doing good, and verily thou shalt be fed.'—I am

Your affectionate friend and brother.<sup>2</sup>

See that you perform the *whole* office of an Assistant.

To Mrs. Ryan

LONDON, November 12, 1761.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Your letter gave me much satisfaction. You answer me simply and clearly. So much the rather I will ask you some more questions, which you may answer as soon as you have opportunity.<sup>3</sup>

Had you then, or have you had since, a witness that you should never finally perish? Have you a witness that you shall no more offend God? If so, what need have you to watch against sin! Do you ever use self-examination? At what times or in what manner? Do you always see God? Does no cloud ever interpose? Are you as sure you see Him as that you are alive? Does nothing ever dim your sight of God? Have you an experimental proof of the ever-blessed Trinity? Is your mind always stayed on God? Do your thoughts never wander from Him in prayer, in business, or in travelling? What are you looking for now?—I am

Your affectionate brother.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Hanby, born in Carlisle in 1733; President in 1794. Wesley ordained him on Aug. 1, 1785, with John Pawson and Joseph Taylor, 'three of our well-tried preachers,'

to minister in Scotland. See *Wesley's Veterans*, ii. 51-77.

<sup>2</sup> See letters of Sept. 8, 1761, and Jan. 25, 1762, to him.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of Nov. 4, 1758, to her.



To his Brother Charles

LONDON, December 26, 1761.

DEAR BROTHER,—Spend as many hours in the congregation as you will or can. But exercise alone will strengthen *your lungs*. Or electrifying, which I wonder you did not try long ago. Never start at its being a quack medicine. I desire no other, particularly since I was so nearly murdered by being cured of my ague *secundum artem*. You should always (and I hope you do) write standing and sloping.

We are always in danger of enthusiasm, but I think no more now than any time these twenty years. The word of God runs indeed, and loving faith spreads on every side. Don't take my word or any one's else, *but come and see*. 'Tis good to be in London now.

It is impossible for me to correct my own books. I sometimes think it strange that I have not one *preacher* that will and can. I think every one of them owes me so much service.

Is it right that my sister Patty should suffer Mr. Hall to live with her? I almost scruple giving her the sacrament, seeing he does not even pretend to renounce Betty Rogers.<sup>1</sup> Was it right for W. Baynes<sup>2</sup> to carry on his affair with Sammy Whittaker without consulting either you or me?

Pray tell Brother Sheen I am hugely displeas'd at his reprinting the Nativity hymns<sup>3</sup> and omitting the very best hymn in the collection, 'All glory to God in the sky, &c.' I beg they may never more be printed without it. Omit one or two, and I will thank you. They are *namby-pambical*.

I wish you would give us two or three *invitatory* hymns. We want such exceedingly. My love to Sally. My wife gains ground. Adieu!

<sup>1</sup> Mrs Hall Westley Hall died in 1776. Betty Rogers seems to be the young seamstress by whom he had an illegitimate child. See Stevenson's *Wesley Family*, pp. 370-3, and letter of June 14

<sup>2</sup> William Baynes had been a preacher (1749-56), and was a master at Kingswood School at the time of the fire in 1757. See *Journal*, iv. 242, vi. 177-8, C Wesley's *Journal*, ii 256

<sup>3</sup> *Hymns for the Nativity of our Lord*, sixth edition, was printed in Bristol in 1761. Sheen was probably a master at Kingswood, as Charles Wesley wants him to be told there was 'a hue and cry' in London because parents had not been informed of the safe arrival of their boys at school (about 1757). See C. Wesley's *Journal*, ii. 266; and letter of Sept. 8 to him.

*To Elizabeth Hardy*

LONDON, December 26, 1761.

DEAR SISTER,—The path of controversy is a rough path. But it seems smoother while I am walking with you ; so that I could follow you through all its windings, only my time will not permit.

The plain fact is this : I know many who love God with all their heart, mind, soul, and strength. He is their one desire, their one delight, and they are continually happy in Him. They love their neighbour as themselves. They feel as sincere, fervent, constant a desire for the happiness of every man, good or bad, friend or enemy, as for their own. They 'rejoice evermore, pray without ceasing, and in everything give thanks.' Their souls are continually streaming up to God in holy joy, prayer, and praise. This is plain, sound, scriptural experience ; and of this we have more and more living witnesses.

But these souls dwell in a shattered, corruptible body, and are so pressed down thereby that they cannot exert their love as they would by always thinking, speaking, and acting precisely right. For want of better bodily organs, they sometimes inevitably think, speak, or act wrong. Yet I think they need the advocacy of Christ, even for these involuntary defects ; although they do not imply a defect of love, but of understanding. However that be, I cannot doubt the fact. They are all love ; yet they cannot walk as they desire. 'But are they all love while they grieve the Holy Spirit ?' No, surely ; they are then fallen from their steadfastness ; and this they may do even after they are sealed. So that, even to such, strong cautions are needful. After the heart is cleansed from pride, anger, and desire, it may suffer them to re-enter ; therefore I have long thought some expressions in the Hymns are abundantly too strong, as I cannot perceive any state mentioned in Scripture from which we may not, in a measure at least, fall.

Persons who talked of being emptied before they were filled were for some time a great stumbling-block to me too ; but I have since considered it thus : The great point in question is, Can we be saved from all sin or not ? Now, it may please God to act in that uncommon manner, purposely to clear this

point—to satisfy those persons that they are saved from all sin before He goes on in His work.

Forgive me, dear Miss Hardy, that I do but just touch upon the heads of your letter. Indeed, this defect does not spring from the want of love, but only from want of time. I should not wonder if your soul was one of the next that was filled with pure love. Receive it freely, thou poor bruised reed! It is able to make thee stand.—I am

Your affectionate friend and brother.

*To Christopher Hopper*

NORWICH, January 18, 1762.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—Public affairs do look exceeding dark, and the clouds gather more and more.<sup>1</sup> Yet the Lord sitteth above the water-floods, and remaineth a King for ever. And He (whatever be the lot of His enemies) shall give His people the blessing of peace.

If you do not establish good order in the Orphan House, it is pity you should go there. This is the very design of your Master; for this end are you sent. Do just as I would do in every instance if I were in your place. Act just the thing that is right, whoever is pleased or displeased. I hereby give it under my hand I will stand by you with all my might.

I am glad you have had a free conversation with T. Olivers.<sup>2</sup> There is good in him, though he is a rough stick of wood. But love can bow down the stubborn neck. By faith and love we shall overcome all things.

Peace be with you and yours.—I am

Your ever affectionate brother.

I set out for London to-morrow.

*To Samuel Furly*

LONDON, January 25, 1762.

DEAR SAMMY,—But that I have pretty near attained to the happiness *nil admirari*, I should have a little wondered at your long silence. But it is not strange, if 'Time changes Thought,' and it would not surprise me much, if in a year or two more, you should

Wonder at the strange man's face  
As one you ne'er had known.

If you entangled yourself with no kind of promise to

<sup>1</sup> See letter of March 1 to him.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of March 24, 1761.

the Archbishop, I doubt not but your ordination will prove a blessing.<sup>1</sup> The care of a parish is indeed a weighty thing, which calls for much and earnest prayer. In managing it you must needs follow your own conscience, whoever is pleased or displeased. Then, whether your success be less or more, you will by-and-by give up your account with joy.

I myself hear frequently unscriptural as well as irrational expressions from those at whose feet I shall rejoice to be found in the day of the Lord Jesus; but blasphemy I never heard from one of them, either teacher or hearer. What is wide of Scripture or reason I mildly reprove; and they usually receive it in love. Generally they are convinced; when I cannot convince, I can bear them, yea, and rejoice at the grace of God which is in them.

Sammy, beware of the impetuosity of your temper! It may easily lead you awry. It may make you evil affected to the excellent ones of the earth. Don't expect propriety of speech from uneducated persons. The longer I live the larger allowances I make for human infirmities. I exact more from myself and less from others.<sup>2</sup> Go thou and do likewise!—I am, with love to Nancy,

Your ever affectionate friend and brother.

Take nothing, absolutely nothing, at second hand.

*To Matthew Lowes*

LONDON, *January 25, 1762.*

DEAR MATTHEW,—I ordered Mr. Franks<sup>3</sup> to pay the £8 bill to-day, which is £4 more than I had in my hands. What we shall do for money till the next Conference I do not know. But the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof.

You do well to be exact in discipline. Disorderly walkers will give us neither credit nor strength. Let us have just as many members as walk by one rule. I will beg or borrow from William Newall<sup>4</sup>—anything but steal.

My wife joins in love to you and yours.—I am

Your affectionate friend and brother.

<sup>1</sup> Wesley hoped to get him ordained as Fletcher's curate. See letter of Dec. 9, 1760.

<sup>3</sup> His Book Steward. See letter of Nov. 6, 1773.

<sup>4</sup> See letters of Oct. 30, 1761, and Feb. 13, 1762.

<sup>2</sup> A beautiful sign of mellowing character,

*To Miss J. C. March*

John Pawson often visited Miss March's house, where he also met Mrs. Caley, and 'derived great benefit from their conversation and experience in the deep things of God.' See letter of March 4, 1760.

LONDON, *January 30, 1762.*

When you was justified, you had a direct witness that your sins were forgiven; afterward this witness was frequently intermitted, and yet you did not doubt of it. In like manner, you have had a direct witness that you are saved from sin; and this witness is frequently intermitted, and yet even then you do not doubt of it. But I much doubt if God withdraws either the one witness or the other without some occasion given on our part. I never knew any one receive the abiding witness gradually; therefore I incline to think this also is given in a moment. But there will be still after this abundant room for a gradual growth in grace.

*To Matthew Lowes*

LONDON, *February 13, 1762.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—Order concerning Brother Newall as you see good. If he is not wanted in the Manchester Round, I believe he would be welcome in James Oddie's.<sup>1</sup>

You must not be surprised if there is a deadness in many places during the winter season. But the spring will return. Fear nothing. Hope belongs to us. Fight on, and conquer.—  
I am  
Your affectionate friend and brother.

*To Thomas Rankin*

Thomas Rankin was a native of Dunbar. He heard Wesley at Morpeth in May 1761, and rode on with him to Newcastle. He wrote him in October about his call to preach, and was sent to take John Murlin's place in Sussex. When the work in America began, Wesley appointed him General Superintendent. He sailed on April 9, 1773; but he returned in 1778, and spent his last years in London where he died in 1810. See *Wesley's Veterans*, v1 113-97, and letter of March 20.

<sup>1</sup> See letters of Aug 15, 1761, and of Jan 25, 1762 (to Lowes).

LONDON, *February 20, 1762.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—By all means go into Sussex again. And you may continue in that circuit till another preacher comes. I trust God has sent you thither for the good of others and of your own soul. Be exact in observing and in enforcing all the Rules of our Society. Then you will see more and more fruit of your labour.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Henry Brooke*

Brooke was an artist and drawing-master in Dublin, much esteemed by Wesley and Fletcher. His uncle wrote *The Fool of Quality*, of which Wesley published an abridged edition. See Crookshank's *Methodism in Ireland*, i. 182; and letter of May 25, 1768.

LONDON, *March 1, 1762.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I rejoice to hear that you continue in the good way. Never leave off a duty because you are tempted in it. You may be more tempted than usual on fasting days; and yet you may receive a blessing thereby. I expect to be either in Dublin or Cork about the end of this month. I have not, since I have been in London, heard anything of Tommy Bethel.<sup>1</sup> I believe the letters are safely delivered.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Christopher Hopper*

LONDON, *March 1, 1762.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—Public commotions fill the minds and hands of those who might otherwise employ themselves in hindering the course of the gospel. And probably they are of great use to give more seriousness and thoughtfulness to a young and inexperienced Prince.<sup>2</sup>

I am glad you are in the Orphan House, were it only that you may drop a word in season to T. Olivers. This day fortnight I am to set out for Ireland. When will you set out for Scotland? They want you sadly at Aberdeen. Shall I send you two or three guineas for your journey? James Kershaw<sup>3</sup> may spend a month or two in Newcastle Circuit

<sup>1</sup> The Diary for Oct. 15, 1785, has: '1 dinner, conversed, prayer, Mr. Bethel.'

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Jan. 18.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of Feb. 17, 1759.

to supply your place. I think it is of importance. Much good may be done, by you in particular. We join in love to you all.—I am  
 Ever yours.

*To Dr. Horne*

On June 7, 1761, George Horne (1730–92), Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, preached in St. Mary's before the University, from James ii. 24, on 'Works wrought through faith on condition of our Justification.' Wesley says in his *Journal* for March 8, 1762: 'I retired to Lewisham to answer Dr. Horne's ingenious "Sermon on Justification by Works." Oh that I might dispute with no man! But if I must dispute, let it be with men of sense.' On August 31, 1770, Wesley reads Lord Lyttelton's *Dialogues of the Dead*, and asks, 'Could he point out many men of stronger and deeper understanding than Dr. Horne and Mr. William Jones?' There is a pleasant reference in the *Journal* for March 27, 1783. At Hinckley he says: 'Here I met with Dr. Horne's *Commentary on the Psalms*, I suppose the best that ever was wrote. Yet I could not comprehend his aggrandizing the Psalms, it seems, even above the New Testament. And some of them he hardly makes anything of—the 87th in particular.' It was published in 1771. Horne was Vice-Chancellor in 1776, Dean of Canterbury in 1781, and Bishop of Norwich in 1790–2. When the Bishop was asked whether he had any objection to Wesley's preaching in the parish church at Diss on October 20, 1790, he answered, 'None at all.' See *Journal*, iv. 490, v. 382–3, vi. 402, viii. 108.

LEWISHAM, *March 10, 1762.*

REVEREND SIR,—When you spoke of 'heresies making their periodical revolutions,' of 'Antinomianism rampant among us,' and immediately after of 'the new lights at the Tabernacle and Foundery,' must not your hearers naturally think that Mr. Whitefield and I were reviving those heresies? But do you know the persons of whom you speak? Have you ever conversed with them? Have you read their writings? If not, is it kind, is it just, to pass so severe a censure upon them? Had you only taken the trouble of reading one tract, the *Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, you would have seen that a great part of what you affirm is what I never denied. To put this beyond dispute, I beg leave to transcribe some passages from that treatise; which will show not only what I teach now, but what I have taught for many years. I will afterward simply and plainly declare wherein I as yet differ

from you ; and the rather that, if I err therein, you may by God's assistance convince me of it.

I. 1. ' Justification sometimes means our acquittal at the last day (Matt. xii. 37). But this is altogether out of the present question ; that justification whereof our Articles and Homilies speak meaning present forgiveness, pardon of sins, and consequently acceptance with God, who therein " declares His righteousness," or mercy, by or " for the remission of the sins that are past," saying, " I will be merciful to thy unrighteousness, and thine iniquities I will remember no more " (Rom. iii. 25 ; Heb. viii. 12).

' I believe the condition of this is faith (Rom. iv. 5, &c.) : I mean, not only that without faith we cannot be justified, but also that, as soon as any one has true faith, in that moment he is justified.

' Good works follow this faith, but cannot go before it (Luke vi. 43) ; much less can sanctification, which implies a continued course of good works springing from holiness of heart. But it is allowed that entire sanctification goes before our justification at the last day (Heb. xii. 14).

' It is allowed also that repentance and " fruits meet for repentance " go before faith (Mark i. 15 ; Matt. iii. 8). Repentance absolutely must go before faith ; fruits meet for it, if there be opportunity. By repentance I mean conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment ; and by " fruits meet for repentance," forgiving our brother (Matt. vi. 14-15), ceasing from evil, doing good (Luke iii. 8-9, &c.), using the ordinances of God, and in general obeying Him according to the measure of grace which we have received (Matt. vii. 7, xxv. 29). But these I cannot as yet term good works, because they do not spring from faith and the love of God.' <sup>1</sup>

2. ' Faith alone is the proximate condition of present justification.'

II. 1. I have shown here at large what is the doctrine I teach with regard to justification, and have taught ever since I

---

<sup>1</sup> *A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, Part I. See *Works*, viii. 46-7.



was convinced of it myself by carefully reading the New Testament and the Homilies. In many points I apprehend it agrees with yours: in some it does not; these I come now to consider. May God enable me to do it in love and meekness of wisdom!

You say: 'Happy times when faith and a good life were synonymous terms!' (page 7). I conceive they never were. Is not faith the root, a good life the tree springing therefrom?

'That good works are a necessary condition of our justification may be proved, first, from express testimonies of Scripture. So Isaiah i. 16-17: "Cease from evil, learn to do well." Then "your sins that were as scarlet shall be white as snow." Here ceasing from evil and learning to do well are the conditions of pardon.' I answer: Without them there is no pardon; yet the immediate condition of it is faith. He that believeth, and he alone, is justified before God. 'So Ezekiel xxxiii. 14-16: If the sinner "turn from his evil ways" and "walk in the statutes of life," then "all his sins shall not be once mentioned to him."' Most sure—that is, if he believe; else, whatever his outward walking be, he cannot be justified.

The next scripture you cite, Matthew xi. 28 (Sermon, p. 10), proves no more than this—that none find 'rest to their souls' unless they first come to Christ (namely, by faith) and then obey Him.

But 'He says, "Ye are My friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you."' He does so; but how does it appear that this relates to justification at all?

'St. Peter also declares, "In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him" (Acts x. 35).' He is; but none can either fear God or work righteousness till he believes according to the dispensation he is under. 'And St. John: "He that doeth righteousness is righteous."' I do not see that this proves anything. 'And again: "If we walk in the light, as God is in the light, then have we communion with Him, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John i. 7).' This would prove something, if it could be proved that 'cleansing us from all sin' meant only justification.

'The Scriptures insist upon the necessity of repentance in particular for that purpose. But repentance comprehends

compunction, humiliation, hatred of sin, confession of it, prayer for mercy, ceasing from evil, a firm purpose to do well, restitution of ill-got goods, forgiveness of all who have done us wrong, and works of beneficence.' (Pages 11-12.) I believe it does comprehend all these, either as parts or as fruits of it ; and it comprehends ' the fear ' but not ' the love of God ' ; that flows from an higher principle. And he who loves God is not barely in the right way to justification : he is actually justified. The rest of the paragraph asserts just the same thing which was asserted in those words : ' Previous to justifying faith must be repentance, and, if opportunity permits, " fruits meet for repentance." ' But still I must observe that ' neither the one nor the other is necessary either in the same sense or in the same degree with faith.' No scripture testimony can be produced which any way contradicts this.

2. ' That works are a necessary condition of our justification may be proved, secondly, from scripture examples ; particularly those recited in the 11th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. These all ' through faith wrought righteousness : without working righteousness, they had never obtained the promises.' (Page 13.) I say the same thing : none are finally saved but those whose faith ' worketh by love.'

' Even in the thief upon the cross faith was attended by repentance, piety, and charity.' It was : repentance went before his faith ; piety and charity accompanied it. ' Therefore he was not justified by faith alone.' Our Church, adopting the words of St. Chrysostom, expressly affirms in the passage above cited he was justified by faith alone. And her authority ought to weigh more than even that of Bishop Bull, or of any single man whatever. Authority, be pleased to observe, I plead against authority, reason against reason.

It is no objection that the faith whereby he was justified immediately produced good works.

3. How we are justified by faith alone, and yet by such a faith as is not alone, it may be proper to explain. And this also I choose to do, not in my own words, but in those of our Church : ' Faith does not shut out repentance, hope, love, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified ; but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying.

So that although they be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not all together. Neither doth faith shut out good works, necessarily to be done afterwards, of duty towards God. That we are justified only by this faith in Christ speak all the ancient authors; specially Origen, St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, Hilary, Basil, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine.' (Homily on the Salvation of Man.)

4. You go on: 'Thirdly, if we consider the nature of faith, it will appear impossible that a man should be justified by that alone. Faith is either an assent to the gospel truths or a reliance on the gospel promises. I know of no other notion of faith.' (Sermon, p. 15.) I do;—an *ἔλεγχος* of things not seen; which is far more than a bare assent, and yet *toto genere* different from a reliance. Therefore, if you prove that neither an assent nor a reliance justifies, nor both of them together, still you do not prove that we are not justified by faith, even by faith alone. But how do you prove that we cannot be justified by faith as a reliance on the promises? Thus: 'Such a reliance must be founded on a consciousness of having performed the conditions. And a reliance so founded is the result of works wrought through faith.' No: of works wrought without faith; else the argument implies a contradiction. For it runs thus (on the supposition that faith and reliance were synonymous terms): Such a reliance is the result of works wrought through such a reliance.

5. Your fourth argument against justification by faith alone is drawn from the nature of justification. This, you observe, 'implies a prisoner at the bar, and a law by which he is to be tried; and this is not the law of Moses, but that of Christ, requiring repentance and faith, with their proper fruits' (page 16); which now through the blood of Christ are accepted and 'counted for righteousness.' St. Paul affirms this concerning faith, in the 4th chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. But where does he say that either repentance or its fruits are counted for righteousness? Nevertheless I allow that the law of Christ requires such repentance and faith before justification as, if there be opportunity, will bring forth the 'fruits of righteousness.' But if there be not, he that repents and believes is justified notwithstanding. Con-

sequently these alone are necessary, indispensably necessary, conditions of our justification.

6. Your last argument against justification by faith alone 'is drawn from the method of God's proceeding at the last day. He will then judge every man "according to his works." If, therefore, works wrought through faith are the ground of the sentence passed upon us in that day, then are they a necessary condition of our justification' (page 19): in other words, 'if they are a condition of our final, they are a condition of our present, justification.' I cannot allow the consequence. All holiness must precede our entering into glory. But no holiness can exist till, 'being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.'

7. You next attempt to reconcile the writings of St. Paul with justification by works. In order to this you say: 'In the first three chapters of his Epistle to the Romans he proves that both Jews and Gentiles must have recourse to the gospel of Christ. To this end he convicts the whole world of sin; and having stopped every mouth, he makes his inference, "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified. We conclude," then, says he, "a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." But here arise two questions: first, What are the works excluded from justifying? secondly, What is the faith which justifies?' (Pages 20-2.)

'The works excluded are heathen and Jewish works set up as meritorious. This is evident from hence—that heathens and carnal Jews are the persons against whom he is arguing.' Not so: he is arguing against all mankind; he is convicting the whole world of sin. His concern is to stop 'every mouth' by proving that 'no flesh,' none born of a woman, no child of man, can be justified by his own works. Consequently he speaks of all the works of all mankind antecedent to justification, whether Jewish or any other, whether supposed meritorious or not, of which the text says not one word. Therefore all works antecedent to justification are excluded, and faith is set in flat opposition to them. 'Unto him that worketh not, but believeth, his faith is counted to him for righteousness.'

'But what is the faith to which he attributes justification? That "which worketh by love"; which is the same with the

“new creature,” and implies in it the keeping the commandments of God.’

It is undoubtedly true that nothing avails for our final salvation without *καινή κτίσις*, ‘a new creation,’ and, consequent thereon, a sincere, uniform keeping of the commandments of God. This St. Paul constantly declares. But where does he say this is the condition of our justification? In the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians particularly he vehemently asserts the contrary, earnestly maintaining that nothing is absolutely necessary to this but ‘believing in Him that justifieth the ungodly’—not the godly, not him that is already a ‘new creature,’ that previously keeps all the commandments of God. He does this afterward: when he is justified by faith, then his faith ‘worketh by love.’

‘Therefore there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus,’ justified by faith in Him, provided they ‘walk in Him whom they have received, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit’ (page 23). But, should they turn back and walk again after the flesh, they would again be under condemnation. But this no way proves that ‘walking after the Spirit’ was the condition of their justification.

Neither will anything like this follow from the Apostle’s saying to the Corinthians, ‘Though I had all faith, so as to remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.’ This only proves that miracle-working faith may be where saving faith is not.

8. To the argument, ‘St. Paul says “Abraham was justified by faith,”’ you answer, ‘St. James says “Abraham was justified by works”’ (page 24). True; but he neither speaks of the same justification, nor the same faith, nor the same works. Not of the same justification: for St. Paul speaks of that justification which was five-and-twenty years before Isaac was born (Genesis); St. James of that wherewith he was justified when he offered up Isaac on the altar. It is living faith whereby St. Paul affirms we are justified; it is dead faith whereby St. James affirms we are not justified. St. Paul speaks of works antecedent to justification; St. James of works consequent upon it. This is the plain, easy, natural way of reconciling the two Apostles.

The fact was manifestly this: (1) When Abraham dwelt in Haran, being then seventy-five years old, God called him thence: he 'believed God,' and He 'counted it to him for righteousness'—that is, he 'was justified by faith,' as St. Paul strenuously asserts. (2) Many years after Isaac was born (some of the ancients thought three-and-thirty) Abraham, showing his faith by his works, offered him up upon the altar. (3) Here the 'faith' by which, in St. Paul's sense, he was justified long before, 'wrought together with his works'; and he was justified in St. James's sense—that is (as the Apostle explains his own meaning), 'by works his faith was made perfect.' God confirmed, increased, and perfected the principle from which those works sprang.

9. Drawing to a conclusion, you say: 'What pity so many volumes should have been written upon the question whether a man be justified by faith or works, seeing they are two essential parts of the same thing!' (page 25). If by works you understand inward and outward holiness, both faith and works are essential parts of Christianity: and yet they are essentially different, and by God Himself contradistinguished from each other; and that in the very question before us—'Him that worketh not, but believeth.' Therefore whether a man be justified by faith or works is a point of the last importance; otherwise our Reformers could not have answered to God their spending so much time upon it. Indeed, they were both too wise and too good men to have wrote so many volumes on a trifling or needless question.

10. If in speaking on this important point (such at least it appears to me) I have said anything offensive, any that implies the least degree of anger or disrespect, it was entirely foreign to my intention; nor, indeed, have I any provocation: I have no room to be angry at your maintaining what you believe to be the truth of the gospel; even though I might wish you had omitted a few expressions,

Quas aut incuria fudit,  
Aut humana parum cavit natura.<sup>1</sup>

In the general, from all I have heard concerning you, I

<sup>1</sup> Horace's *Ars Poetica*, ll. 352-3: as may be placed to the account of 'Such as escaped my notice, or such human infirmity.'

cannot but very highly esteem you in love. And that God may give you both 'a right judgement in all things, and evermore to rejoice in His holy comfort,' is the prayer of, reverend sir,

Your affectionate brother and servant.

*To Matthew Lowes*

LONDON, March 11, 1762.

DEAR MATTHEW,—I have enclosed that part of the *Minutes* of the Conference which relates to discipline. On the other paper (which you may read in every Society just before you visit the classes) you will see the design of the General Yearly Collection,<sup>1</sup> to which every Methodist in England is to contribute something. If there is any who cannot give an half-penny in a year, another will give it for him.

The Society here has subscribed near £300.

Your affectionate friend and brother.

[For letter to S. Furly, March 20, see end of vol. viii.]

*To Thomas Rankin*

BRISTOL, March 20, 1762.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—You should act as an Assistant in Sussex. Therefore see that our Rules be everywhere observed; and spread our books wherever you go, particularly *Kempis*, *Primitive Physick*, and *Instructions for Children*.<sup>2</sup>

Before eight weeks are ended the Societies will be able to secure you an horse. O be simple! Be a little child before God!—I am

Your affectionate brother.

Read and pray much.

To Mr. Thomas Rankin, At Mr. Barker's,  
In Sevenoaks, Kent.

*To Miss March*

ATHLONE, May 13, 1762.

You did well to write. 'It is good to hide the secrets of a king, but to declare the loving-kindness of the Lord.'<sup>3</sup> Have

<sup>1</sup> See *Works*, viii. 335-6.

and Sept. 21, 1764.

<sup>2</sup> See letters of Feb. 20, 1762,

<sup>3</sup> See Tobit xii. 7.

you never found any wandering since? Is your mind always stayed on God? Do you find every thought brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ? Do no vain thoughts (useless, trifling, unedifying) lodge within you? Does not the corruptible body at some times more or less press down the soul? Has God made your very dreams devout? I have known Satan assault in their sleep (endeavouring to terrify or affright) those whom he could not touch when they were awake.

As to your band, there are two sorts of persons with whom you may have to do—the earnest and the slack: the way you are to take with the one is quite different from that one would take with the other. The latter you must search, and find out why they are slack; exhort them to repent, be zealous, do the first works. The former you have only to encourage, to exhort to push forward to the mark, to bid them grasp the prize so nigh! And do so yourself. Receive a thousand more blessings; believe more, love more: you cannot love enough. Beware of sins of omission. So shall you fulfil the joy of

Your affectionate brother.

### To Samuel Furly

CASTLEBAR, May 21, 1762.

DEAR SAMMY,—This morning I came hither, and received yours. The post-boys in Ireland do not ride Pegasus.

A sermon of Ab. Sharp's<sup>1</sup> fully convinced me about thirty years ago that it is inconsistent with charity to charge any man with those consequences of his doctrine which he disavows. I always did so before, but not since. Otherwise what work should I make with poor George Whitefield.

Another thing I was not so soon nor so easily convinced of, namely, that in spite of all my logic *I cannot so prove* any one point in the whole compass of Philosophy or Divinity as not to leave room for strong objections, and probably such as I could not answer. But if I could, my answer, however guarded,

<sup>1</sup> John Sharp, Archbishop of York. Sermon on Rom. xiv. 17, preached on Aug. 23, 1674, before the Lord Mayor in the Guildhall Chapel: 'Another thing that would make

for peace is this—never to charge upon men the *consequences* of their *opinions* when they expressly disown them.'



will give room to equally strong objections. And in this manner, if the person is a man of sense, answers and objections may go on *in infinitum*.

I am therefore weary of altercation. Once or twice I give my reasons. If they do not convince, I have done. My day is far spent, so that I have no hours to spare for what I verily believe will profit nothing.

As to that particular expression, 'Dying at the feet of mercy,' I have only farther to add, I do not care, as it is not a scriptural phrase, whether any one takes or leaves it. It is enough for me if he says from the heart

Every moment, Lord, I need,  
The merit of Thy death ;  
Never shall I want it less  
When Thou the grace hast given,  
Filled me with Thy holiness  
And sealed the heir of heaven.  
I shall hang upon my God,  
Till I Thy perfect glory see,  
Till the sprinkling of Thy blood  
Shall speak me up to Thee.

I wish Mr. Venn may have more and more success. Has he published his book concerning gospel ministers? I still think it is not prudence, but high imprudence, for any of those who preach the essential gospel truths to stand aloof from each other. I cannot but judge there ought to be the most cordial and avowed union between them. But I rejoice that the shyness is not, and never was, on my side. I have done all I could ; and with a single eye. For as long as God is pleased to continue with me, I want no man living. I have all things and abound. How happy is the man that trusts in Him !

I expect our Conference will begin at Leeds on Tuesday the 10th of August. Peace be with you and yours!—I am,  
dear Sammy, Your affectionate friend and brother.

To the Rev. Mr. Furly, At Slaithwaite,  
Near Huddersfield, Yorks.

### To Jenny Lee

In October 1763 Jane Esther Lee married James Freeman, a zealous leader and local preacher, at Dublin. He died in 1771, in his thirty-second year. Her sister Elizabeth died of consumption in 1762. She

herself lived many years. She met the Wesleys at Limerick while on a visit to her grandmother's, and on her return home introduced Methodism into Larne. See *W.H.S.* viii. 98, 168-9; and letter of March 2, 1764.

LIMERICK, *June 7, 1762.*

MY DEAR SISTER,—You did well to write freely. The more largely you write the more welcome your letters will be; and your soul is now so feeble and tender that it needs every help.

It is certain that God has made bare His arm and wrought a great deliverance for you. He has more fully revealed His Son in you. He has purified your heart. He has saved you from pride, anger, desire. Yea, the Son has made you free, and you are free indeed. Stand fast, then, my dear friend, in this glorious liberty. Stand fast by simple faith! Look unto Jesus! Trust Him, praise Him for ever. Lean upon Him alone! And be not careful about this or that name for the blessing you have received. Do not reason one moment what to call it, whether perfection or anything else. You have faith: hold it fast. You have love: let it not go. Above all, you have Christ! Christ is yours! He is your Lord, your love, your all! Let Him be your portion in time and in eternity! Send word just how you are in every particular to

Your affectionate brother.

*To Christopher Hopper*

CORK, *June 18, 1762.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—So your labour has not been in vain. I shall expect an account of the remaining part of your journey too. And you will be able to inform me of the real character and behaviour of Robert Miller also. I do not rightly understand him. But I see James Kershaw and he do not admire one another.

Pray let me know as particularly as you can how William Fugill<sup>1</sup> has behaved in Scotland, and what has hindered the increase of the work at Edinburgh. I thought the Society would have been doubled before now.

I expect to be in Dublin on Saturday, July 24. Then

<sup>1</sup> Fugill, a native of Rothwell, near Leeds, was at first useful and acceptable; but he fell into 'some grievous

sins,' and was excluded in 1764. See *Atmore's Memorial*, pp. 147-8.

Providence will determine how I shall go forward, and whether I am to embark for Parkgate, Liverpool, or Holyhead in my way to Leeds, where I hope to meet you all on August 10.<sup>1</sup>

—I am

Yours affectionately.

I hope you will all exert yourselves in the Midsummer Collection for Kingswood.

*To Jenny Lee*

CORK, June 18, 1762.

MY DEAR SISTER,—It is observed in Mr. De Renty's *Life* that God Himself does often give desires that He will not suffer to take effect. Such probably may be your desire of death. God may make it a blessing to you, though He does not intend to fulfil it soon. But He will withhold no manner of thing that is good. Do you now find a witness in yourself that you are saved from sin? Do you see God always? and always feel His love? and in everything give thanks? My dear Jenny, you shall see greater things than these! The Lord is your Shepherd; therefore can you lack nothing. O cleave close to Him! Christ is yours! All is yours! Trust Him, praise Him evermore. Pray for Your affectionate brother.

*To Ebenezer Blackwell*

The fifth Irish Conference began on this day. John Maddern, on whose behalf this letter was written, was a man of genuine piety, a lively, zealous, acceptable preacher. His boy shared the blessing of the Revival in 1768. Facts are given here which were unknown to Atmore, who says that after travelling a few years Maddern finished his course with joy. See *Journal*, v. 259; *Lecky's Ireland*, ii. 36-41; and letter of February 23, 1750.

DUBLIN, July 28, 1762.

DEAR SIR,—It was seven or eight weeks before I could prevail upon any of our brethren in England to let me know whether 'Mr. Blackwell, an eminent banker, died at his house in Lewisham or not.' John Maddern was the first who occasionally told me he was alive. Now, a messenger of good news should be rewarded. But what can be done for this poor man, in truth I cannot tell. He hinted at a distance as if he would

<sup>1</sup> Hopper was appointed to the Leeds Circuit at this Conference.

be much obliged if I would be bound for his behaviour. But how could I be bound for a thousand pounds who am not worth a groat? I could not, therefore, but advise him to give up the thought of being in a banker's shop; as I see no manner of probability of his procuring such sureties as are requisite. Indeed, I heartily wish he was in any way of business, as he is capable of almost anything.

The people in this kingdom have been frightened sufficiently by the sickness and by the Levellers, whose design undoubtedly was deep-laid, and extended to the whole kingdom. But they broke out too soon: nothing should have *appeared* till a French or Spanish squadron came. The nation is not now in the same state as it was in 1641. Then there were not four thousand soldiers in the kingdom: now there are near twenty thousand.

I hope you and yours have escaped the general disorder or have found it a blessing. It little matters whether we escape pain or suffer it, so it be but sanctified. Without some suffering we should scarce remember that we are not proprietors here, but only tenants at will, liable to lose all we have at a moment's warning. Happy it were if we continually retained a lively impression of this on our minds; then should we more earnestly seek that portion which shall never be taken from us.

In two or three days I am likely to embark in order to meet our brethren at Leeds. There I hope to have it under your own hand that both you, Mrs. Blackwell, Mrs. Dewal, and Miss Freeman are alive in the best sense.—I am, dear sir,

Your affectionate servant.

*To Samuel Furlly*

DUBLIN, July 30, 1762.

DEAR SAMMY,—‘If I am unanswered, then I am unanswerable.’ Who can deny the consequence? By such an argument you carry all before you and gain a complete victory. You put me in mind of the honest man who cried out while I was preaching, ‘*Quid est tibi nomen?*’ and, upon my giving no answer, called out vehemently, ‘I told you he did not understand Latin!’

I do sometimes understand, though I do not answer. This

is often the case between you and me. You love dispute, and I hate it.<sup>1</sup> You have much time, and I have much work. *Non sumus ergo pares.* But if you will dispute the point with Nicholas Norton, he is your match. He has both leisure and love for the work.

For me, I shall only once more state the case. Here are forty or fifty people who declare (and I can take their word, for I know them well), each for himself, 'God has enabled me to rejoice evermore, and to pray and give thanks without ceasing. He has enabled me to give Him all my heart, which I believe He has cleansed from all sin. I feel no pride, no anger, no desire, no unbelief, but pure love alone.' I ask, 'Do you, then, believe you have no farther need of Christ or His atoning blood?' Every one answers, 'I never felt my want of Christ so deeply and strongly as I do now. I feel the want of Christ my Priest as well as King, and receive all I have in and through Him. Every moment I want the merit of His death, and I have it every moment.'

But you think, 'They cannot want the merit of His death if they are saved from sin.' They think otherwise. They know and feel the contrary, whether they can *explain* it or no. There is not one, either in this city or in this kingdom, who does not agree in this.

Here is a plain fact. You may dispute, reason, cavil about it, just as long as you please. Meantime I know by all manner of proof that these are the happiest and the holiest people in the kingdom. Their light shines before men. They are zealous of good works, and labour to abstain from all appearance of evil. They have the mind that was in Christ, and walk as Christ also walked.

And shall I cease to rejoice over these holy, happy men because they mistake in their judgement? If they do, I would to God you and I and all mankind were under the same mistake; provided we had the same faith, the same love, and the same inward and outward holiness!—I am, dear Sammy,

Yours affectionately.

Will not you meet us at Leeds on the 10th of August?\*

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Sept. 15 to him.

\* The Conference met there on that date.

*To his Brother Charles*

Charles Wesley had been greatly troubled by the wild sayings of Bell and Maxfield, and had spoken in his *Short Hymns on Select Passages of the Holy Scriptures* (2 vols. 1762) as though Christian perfection was not to be obtained by an act of faith but by discipline and affliction. The Preface says: 'Several of the hymns are intended to prove and several to guard the doctrine of Christian Perfection.' The importance of an understanding between the brothers is shown by the next letter to Miss Furly.

[September 1762.]

Some thoughts occurred to my mind this morning, which I believe it may be useful to set down, the rather because it may be a means of our understanding each other clearly, that we may agree as far as ever we can and then let all the world know it.

I was thinking on Christian perfection, with regard to the thing, the manner, and the time.

1. By perfection I mean the humble, gentle, patient love of God and man ruling all the tempers, words, and actions, the whole heart and the whole life.

I do not include a possibility of falling from it, either in part or in whole. Therefore I retract several expressions in our hymns which partly express, partly imply, such an impossibility. And I do not contend for the term 'sinless,' though I do not object against it. Do we agree or differ here? If we differ, wherein?

2. As to the manner, I believe this perfection is always wrought in the soul by faith, by a simple act of faith; consequently in an instant. But I believe a gradual work both preceding and following that instant. Do we agree or differ here?

3. As to the time, I believe this instant generally is the instant of death, the moment before the soul leaves the body. But I believe it may be ten, twenty, or forty years before death. Do we agree or differ here?

I believe it is usually many years after justification, but that it *may be* within five years or five months after it. I know no conclusive argument to the contrary. Do you?

If it *must be* many years after justification, I would be glad to know how many. *Pretium quotus arrogat annus?*<sup>1</sup> And how many days, or months, or even years can you allow to be between perfection and death? How far from justification *must* it be? and how near to death?

If it be possible, let you and me come to a good understanding, both for our own sakes and for the sake of the people.

*To Dorothy Furlly*

ST. IVES, September 15, 1762.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Whereunto you have attained hold fast. But expect that greater things are at hand; although our friend<sup>2</sup> talks as if you were not to expect them till the article of death.

Certainly sanctification (in the proper sense) is 'an instantaneous deliverance from all sin,' and includes 'an instantaneous power then given always to cleave to God.' Yet this sanctification (at least, in the lower degrees) does not include a power never to think an useless thought nor ever speak an useless word. I myself believe that such a perfection is inconsistent with living in a corruptible body; for this makes it impossible 'always to think right.' While we breathe we shall more or less mistake. If, therefore, Christian perfection implies this, we must not expect it till after death.

I want you to be all love. This is the perfection I believe and teach. And this perfection is consistent with a thousand nervous disorders, which that high-strained perfection is not. Indeed, my judgement is that (in this case particularly) to overdo is to undo, and that to set perfection too high (so high as no man that we ever heard or read of attained) is the most effectual (because unsuspected) way of driving it out of the world.

---

<sup>1</sup> Horace's *Epistles*, II. i. 35:      <sup>2</sup> Apparently her brother. See  
'How many years should claim the      letter of July 30, and the next one.  
prize?'

Take care you are not hurt by anything in the *Short Hymns* contrary to the doctrines you have long received. Peace be with your spirit !—I am                      Your affectionate brother.

To Samuel Furly

St. IVES, September 15, 1762.

DEAR SIR,—

Spectatum satis, ac donatum jam rude quaeris,  
Maecenas, iterum antiquo me includere ludo?  
Non eadem est aetas, non mens.<sup>1</sup>

I have entirely lost my taste for controversy.<sup>2</sup> I have lost my readiness in disputing ; and I take this to be a providential discharge from it. All I can now do with a clear conscience is not to enter into a formal controversy about the new birth or justification by faith any more than Christian perfection, but simply to declare my judgement, and to explain myself as clearly as I can upon any difficulty that may arise concerning it.

So far I can go with you, but no farther. I still say, and without any self-contradiction, I know no persons living who are so deeply conscious of their needing Christ both as Prophet, Priest, and King as those who believe themselves, and whom I believe, to be cleansed from all sin—I mean from all pride, anger, evil desire, idolatry, and unbelief. These very persons feel more than ever their own ignorance, littleness of grace, coming short of the full mind that was in Christ, and walking less accurately than they might have done after their divine Pattern ; are more convinced of the insufficiency of all they are, have, or do to bear the eye of God without a Mediator ; are more penetrated with the sense of the want of Him than ever they were before.

If Mr. Maxfield or you say that ' coming short is sin,' be it so ; I contend not. But still I say : ' There are they whom I believe to be scripturally perfect. And yet these never felt their want of Christ so deeply and strongly as they do now.'

<sup>1</sup> Horace's *Epistles*, 1. i. 2-4 :  
' Wherefore, Maecenas, would you  
thus engage  
Your bard, dismissed with honour  
from the stage

Again to venture in the lists of fame,  
His youth, his genius, now no more  
the same ?'

<sup>2</sup> See previous letter and that of  
Oct. 13.



If in saying this I have 'fully given up the point,' what would you have more? Is it not enough that I leave you to 'boast your superior power against the little, weak shifts of baffled error'? 'Canst thou not be content,' as the Quaker said, 'to lay J. W. on his back, but thou must tread his guts out?'<sup>1</sup>

Here are persons exceeding holy and happy; rejoicing evermore, praying always, and in everything giving thanks; feeling the love of God and man every moment; feeling no pride or other evil temper. If these are not perfect, that scriptural word has no meaning. Stop! you must not cavil at that word. you are not wiser than the Holy Ghost. But if you are not, see that you teach perfection too. 'But are they not sinners?' Explain the term one way, and I say, Yes; another, and I say, No. 'Are they cleared from all sin?' I believe they are, meaning from all sinful tempers. 'But have they then need of Christ?' I believe they have in the sense and for the reasons above mentioned. Now, be this true or false, it is no contradiction; it is consistent with itself, and I think consistent with right reason and the whole oracles of God.

O let you and I go on to perfection! God grant we may so run as to attain!—I am

Your affectionate friend and brother.

### *To Miss March*

BRISTOL, October 9, 1762.

Though I have very little time, I must write a few lines. I thank you for your comfortable letter. Some have more of heat and some of light. The danger is that one should say to the other, 'I have no need of thee,' or that any should mistake his place and imagine himself to be what he is not. Be not backward to speak to any whom you think are mistaken either in this or other things. A loving word spoken in faith shall not fall to the ground; and the more freely you speak to me at any time or on any head the more you will oblige

Your ever affectionate brother.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Nov. 4, 1758, sect. 5 (to Potter).

*To Samuel Furly*

BRISTOL, October 13, 1762.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—In general, when I apprehend, ‘Certainly this is a contradiction,’ if I find other persons of equal sagacity with myself, of equal natural and acquired abilities, apprehend it is not, I immediately suspect my own judgement; and the more so because I remember I have been many times full as sure as I am now, and yet afterwards I found myself mistaken.

As to this particular question, I believe I am able to answer every objection which can be made. But I am not able to do it without expending much time which may be better employed. For this reason I am persuaded it is so far from being my duty to enter into a formal controversy about it that it would be a wilful sin; it would be employing my short residue of life in a less profitable way than it may be employed.

The proposition which I will hold is this: ‘A person may be cleansed from all sinful tempers, and yet need the atoning blood.’ For what? For ‘negligences and ignorances’; for both words and actions (as well as omissions) which are in a sense transgressions of the perfect law. And I believe no one is clear of these till he lays down this corruptible body.<sup>1</sup>

Now, Sammy, dropping the point of contradiction or no contradiction, tell me simply what you would have more. Do you believe evil tempers remain till death? all, or some? if some only, which?

I love truth wherever I find it; so if you can help me to a little more of it, you will oblige, dear Sammy, Yours, &c.

*To Thomas Maxfield*

Thomas Maxfield, Wesley’s convert at Bristol, was one of the first lay preachers. He was ordained by the Bishop of Londonderry to assist Wesley; but he left Methodism in 1763.

On Monday, November 1, 1762, Wesley says in his *Journal*: ‘I went down to Canterbury. Here I seriously reflected on some late occurrences, and, after weighing the matter throughly, wrote as

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Sept. 15 to him.

follows.' The letter was to Thomas Maxfield, who had lent himself to the fanaticism of George Bell of the King's Life Guards, and others in the Society. When Wesley returned from Bristol, he found the Society in an uproar, as described in the letter of May 1763. Maxfield had denied that he had any thought of separation. He said the Wesleys contradicted the highest truths, and that almost all who 'call themselves ministers of Christ or preachers of Christ contend for sin to remain in the heart as long as we live as though it were the only thing Christ delighted to behold in His members.' Wesley began to visit the classes on his return and in many of them had hot spirits to deal with. See letter of January 26 1763.

CANTERBURY *November 2, 1762.*

Without any preface or ceremony, which is needless between you and me, I will simply and plainly tell what I dislike in your doctrine, spirit, or outward behaviour. When I say yours, I include Brother Bell and Owen and those who are most closely connected with them.

1. I like your doctrine of Perfection. or pure love; love excluding sin; your insisting that it is merely by faith; that consequently it is instantaneous (though preceded and followed by a gradual work), and that it may be now, at this instant.

But I dislike your supposing man may be as perfect as an angel; that he can be absolutely perfect; that he can be infallible, or above being tempted; or that the moment he is pure in heart he cannot fall from it.

I dislike the saying, This was not known or taught among us till within two or three years. I grant you did not know it. You have over and over denied instantaneous sanctification to me; but I have known and taught it (and so has my brother, as our writings show) above these twenty years.

I dislike your directly or indirectly depreciating justification, saying a justified person is not in Christ, is not born of God, is not a new creature, has not a new heart, is not sanctified, not a temple of the Holy Ghost, or that he cannot please God or cannot grow in grace.

I dislike your saying that one saved from sin needs nothing more than looking to Jesus; needs not to hear or think of anything else; believe, believe is enough; that he needs no self-examination, no times of private prayer; needs not

mind little or outward things ; and that he cannot be taught by any person who is not in the same state.

I dislike your affirming that justified persons in general persecute them that are saved from sin ; that they have persecuted you on this account ; and that for two years past you have been more persecuted by the two brothers than ever you was by the world in all your life.

2. As to your spirit, I like your confidence in God and your zeal for the salvation of souls.

But I dislike something which has the appearance of pride, of overvaluing yourselves and undervaluing others, particularly the preachers : thinking not only that they are blind and that they are not sent of God, but even that they are dead—dead to God, and walking in the way to hell ; that they are going one way, you another ; that they have no life in them. Your speaking of yourselves as though you were the only men who knew and taught the gospel ; and as if not only all the clergy, but all the Methodists besides, were in utter darkness.

I dislike something that has the appearance of enthusiasm, overvaluing feelings and inward impressions : mistaking the mere work of imagination for the voice of the Spirit ; expecting the end without the means ; and undervaluing reason, knowledge, and wisdom in general.

I dislike something that has the appearance of Antinomianism, not magnifying the law and making it honourable ; not enough valuing tenderness of conscience and exact watchfulness in order thereto ; using faith rather as contradistinguished from holiness than as productive of it.

But what I most of all dislike is your littleness of love to your brethren, to your own Society ; your want of union of heart with them and bowels of mercies toward them ; your want of meekness, gentleness, longsuffering ; your impatience of contradiction ; your counting every man your enemy that reproves or admonishes you in love ; your bigotry and narrowness of spirit, loving in a manner only those that love you ; your censoriousness, proneness to think hardly of all who do not exactly agree with you : in one word, your divisive spirit. Indeed, I do not believe that any of you either design or desire a separation ; but you do not enough fear, abhor, and detest

it, shuddering at the very thought. And all the preceding tempers tend to it and gradually prepare you for it. Observe, I tell you before. God grant you may immediately and affectionately take the warning !

3. As to your outward behaviour, I like the general tenor of your life, devoted to God, and spent in doing good.

But I dislike your slighting any, the very least rules of the bands or Society, and your doing anything that tends to hinder others from exactly observing them. Therefore—

I dislike your appointing such meetings as hinder others from attending either the public preaching or their class or band, or any other meeting which the Rules of the Society or their office requires them to attend.

I dislike your spending so much time in several meetings, as many that attend can ill spare from the other duties of their calling, unless they omit either the preaching or their class or band. This naturally tends to dissolve our Society by cutting the sinews of it.

As to your more public meetings, I like the praying fervently and largely for all the blessings of God ; and I know much good has been done hereby, and hope much more will be done.

But I dislike several things therein,—(1) The singing or speaking or praying of several at once : (2) the praying to the Son of God only, or more than to the Father : (3) the using improper expressions in prayer ; sometimes too bold, if not irreverent ; sometimes too pompous and magnificent, extolling yourselves rather than God, and telling Him what you are, not what you want : (4) using poor, flat, bald hymns : (5) the never kneeling at prayer : (6) your using postures or gestures highly indecent : (7) your screaming, even so as to make the words unintelligible : (8) your affirming people will be justified or sanctified just now : (9) the affirming they are when they are not : (10) the bidding them say, ' I believe ' : (11) the bitterly condemning any that oppose, calling them wolves, &c. ; and pronouncing them hypocrites, or not justified.

Read this calmly and impartially before the Lord in prayer. So shall the evil cease and the good remain, and you will then be more than ever united to

Your affectionate brother.

*To Mrs. Moon*

Emma Moon's conversion was due to an old woman, a Methodist from Birstall, who came to her husband's farm at Potto, near Yarm, to card Mr. Moon's sheep 'doddings' and spin them into linsey-woolsey yarn. See Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 409.

The epidemic referred to resembled influenza. The *Annual Register* for 1762, p. 82, says: 'Numbers of people have been lately affected by colds, which attacked them with violent pains in the stomach, head, and bones; it is the opinion of the Faculty that it is in the air, the distemper being so common.' See *W.H.S.* xi. 175.

CANTERBURY, November 5, 1762.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Ten times I believe I have been going to answer your last, and have been as often hindered. Surely Satan does not approve of our corresponding together. And no wonder, seeing he does not like what tends to the furtherance of the kingdom of God. And this your letters always do. I find an animating, strengthening power in them. And this is what I particularly want; for I often feel a feebleness of soul, a languor of spirit, so that I cannot as I would press forward toward the mark. This I am particularly sensible of when I am in company with serious, good-natured people, who are not alive to God, and yet say nothing that one can well reprove. I am then apt to sit silent, and make as it were a drawn battle. I want vigour of spirit to break through, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear. Help me forward, my friend, by your prayers.

If that fever continues in the country still, you may cure all that are taken ill near you. But it must be helped at the beginning. (1) No bleeding, no blistering: these are extremely hurtful. (2) Give the patient a pint of spring water sweetened with a large spoonful of treacle, lying down in bed. If this is taken at the beginning of the fever, I never once knew it fail.

How does the work of God now go on round about you? Is Brother Cotty<sup>1</sup> able to preach? And can John Manners<sup>2</sup> do anything? I want much to know the particulars of Miss Romaine's<sup>3</sup> experience. I wish she would write to me. Do

<sup>1</sup> James Cotty was a preacher from 1767 to 1780.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of March 24, 1761.

<sup>3</sup> Probably a relative of the Rev. William Romaine, who was born at Hartlepool in 1714.

you find a growth in grace ? in lowliness, meekness, patience ? May our Lord make all grace to abound in you !—I am, my dear sister,  
Your affectionate friend and brother.

*To Dr. Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester*

For the letter of November 26, 1762, to Dr. William Warburton, occasioned by his tract on *The Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit*, see pp. 338–84.

*To his Brother Charles*

LONDON, December 11, 1762.

DEAR BROTHER,—For eighteen or twenty days I heard with both ears, but rarely opened my mouth. I think I now understand the affair *at least* as well as any person in England.

The sum is this : (1) The meeting in Beech Lane,<sup>1</sup> before I came to town, was like a bear-garden ; full of noise, brawling, cursing, swearing, blasphemy, and confusion. (2) Those who prayed were partly the occasion of this, by their horrid screaming, and unscriptural, enthusiastic expressions. (3) Being determined either ' to mend them or end them,' I removed the meeting to the Foundery. (4) Immediately the noise, brawling, cursing, swearing, blasphemy, and confusion ceased. (5) There was less and less screaming and less of unscriptural and enthusiastic language. (6) Examining the Society, I found about threescore persons who had been convinced of sin and near fourscore who were justified at these meetings. So that on the whole they have done some hurt and much good. I trust they will now do more good, and no hurt at all. Seven persons had left the Society on this account ; but four of them are come back already.

I bought the ground before Kingswood School of Margaret Ward, and paid for it with my own money.<sup>2</sup> Certainly, there-

<sup>1</sup> The meeting was apparently in Joseph Guilford's house (see *Journal*, v. 7). On visiting the classes in November, Wesley found ' some were vehement for, some against, the meetings for prayer which were in several parts of the town. I said little, being afraid of taking any step

which I might afterwards repent of ' (*ibid.* iv. 538). Thomas Maxfield was making much trouble.

<sup>2</sup> This plot was divided into pastures and gardens, in the latter of which the boys worked. See *Kingswood School*, p. 19.

fore, I have a right to employ it as I please. What can any reasonable man say to the contrary?

I have answered the Bishop, and had advice upon my answer. If the devil owes him a shame, he will reply. He is a man of sense; but I verily think he does not understand Greek!<sup>1</sup>

I should be glad to see Mr. Nitchman.<sup>2</sup> What is all beside loving faith! We join in love to Sally and you. Adieu!

### To Jonah Freeman

George Clark (1711-97) became a Methodist when thirty-five years old, and had three large classes at the Foundry. He received the blessing of entire sanctification in May 1762. He built a house on its north corner when City Road was opened, where the Rev. Peard Dickinson lived with him. Jonah Freeman may have been one of his assistants or a member of his class. Sister Freeman, of London, is mentioned in the *Journal*, vii. 231d.

CITY ROAD, December 20, 1762.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—That you have received a considerable blessing from God is beyond all dispute. Hold fast whereunto you have attained, and do not *reason* about it. Do not concern yourself whether it should be called by this or another name. It is right as far as it goes. And whatsoever is yet lacking, God is able and willing to supply.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

Mr. Jonah Freeman, At Mr. Clark's, Hosier,  
In Farr's Alley, Aldersgate Street.

### To Samuel Furly

LONDON, December 20, 1762.

DEAR SAMMY,—Charles Perronet, the author of that remark on 2 Peter iii. 13, does not believe Christ will reign at all upon earth, nor any millennium<sup>3</sup> till we come to heaven. The argument by which he endeavours to prove that St. Peter there speaks only to what will precede the Day of Judgement is this: 'If those expressions, a *new heaven* and a *new earth*,

<sup>1</sup> See heading to letter on p. 338.

<sup>2</sup> David Nitschmann, who had sailed with the Wesleys to Georgia

as bishop in charge of the Moravian emigrants. See *Journal*, i. 111, ii. 37.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of March 10, 1763.



refer only to this world when they occur in *Isaiah*, then they refer to nothing more where they are used by *St. Peter*.'<sup>1</sup>

I should never have suspected Dr. Sherlock<sup>1</sup> of writing anything in a burlesque way. He never aimed at it in his controversy with Dr. South, and seemed exceeding angry at his opponent for doing so. Probably he knew himself to be overmatched by the Doctor, and therefore did not care to engage him on his own ground. 'But why should you be angry,' says Dr. South, 'at wit? It *might* have pleased God to make you a wit too.'

I think the danger in writing to Bishop Warburton is rather that of saying too much than too little. The least said is the soonest amended, and leaves an ill-natured critic the least to take hold of. I have therefore endeavoured to say as little upon each head as possible. If he replies, I shall say more. But I rather think he will not, unless it be by a side stroke when he writes on some other subject.<sup>2</sup>

How does the work of God prosper at Huddersfield and Slaithwaite?<sup>3</sup> Do you begin to see the fruit of your labours? and does your own soul prosper? What signifies all but this—to save our own souls and them that hear us?—I am, dear Sammy,  
Your affectionate friend and brother.

### To his Brother Charles

LONDON, December 23, 1762.

DEAR BROTHER,—But how to come to the speech of the colliers is the question; as there are an hundred miles between us; as this is too critical a time for me to be out of London.

I am satisfied with the learning of John Jones (as there is no point of learning in debate between us) and the judgement of John Matthews, Charles Perronet, and James Morgan. Yet it is certain his admirers will still think him unanswerable.

<sup>1</sup> William Sherlock (1641–1707) was then Prebendary of St. Paul's, and became Dean in 1691; he was Master of the Temple 1685–1704. His *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* in 1690 was answered by Robert South (1633–1716) in his *Animadversions*. Sherlock replied

with his *Defence* (1694), and in 1695 Dr. South wrote his *Tritheism*, accusing Sherlock of that heresy. The contest was sharp, and men of note took part in it on both sides.

<sup>2</sup> See letters of Dec. 11, 1762, and March 10, 1763.

<sup>3</sup> Furlly was at Slaithwaite 1762–6.

I believe several in London have imagined themselves saved from sin 'upon the word of others'; and these are easily known. For that work does not stand. Such imaginations soon vanish away. Some of these and two or three others are still wild. But I think Mrs. Garbrand<sup>1</sup> exceeds them all. But the matter does not stick here. I could play with all these if I could but set Thomas Maxfield right. He is *mali caput et fons*<sup>2</sup>; so inimitably wrong-headed, and so absolutely unconvincible! And yet (what is exceeding strange) God continues to bless his labours.

My kind love to Sally! Adieu!

I shall soon try your patience with a long letter.

To his Brother Charles

LONDON, January 5, 1763.<sup>3</sup>

DEAR BROTHER,—You take me right. I am far from pronouncing my remarks *ex cathedra*. I only desire they may be fairly considered.

I was a little surprised to find Bishop Warburton<sup>4</sup> so entirely unacquainted with the New Testament; and, notwithstanding all his parade of learning, I believe he is no critic in Greek.

If Thomas Maxfield continues as he is, it is impossible he should long continue with us.<sup>5</sup> But I live in hope of better things. Meantime *festina lente!*

I baptized two Turks two or three weeks ago.<sup>6</sup> They seem to be strong in faith; and their story is very probable, but I am not *sure* it is true. I wait for farther evidence.

This week I have begun to speak my mind concerning five

<sup>1</sup> For Mrs. Garbrand (whose name is in shorthand), see heading to letter of Sept. 29, 1764, to Ann Foard.

<sup>2</sup> 'The head and fountain of the evil.'

<sup>3</sup> Wesley wrote 1762, but the year was young. The contents of the letter show that it should be 1763, as Charles Wesley endorsed it.

<sup>4</sup> See letter of Dec. 11, 1762.

<sup>5</sup> This was a time of great care and

trouble' to Wesley, due to Maxfield and Bell. Wesley had defended Maxfield from charges at the Conference of 1761, and had written plainly to him. See *Journal*, iv. 541-2; Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 432-41.

<sup>6</sup> On Dec. 4, 1762, at the desire of Maxfield, Wesley baptized these two men, who proved to be impostors. See *Journal*, iv. 540, v. 3; and letter of Feb. 8.

or six honest enthusiasts.<sup>1</sup> But I move only an hair's breadth at a time, and by this means we come nearer and nearer to each other. No sharpness will profit. There is need of a lady's hand as well as a lion's heart.

Mr. Whitefield has fallen upon *me* in public open-mouthed, and only not named my name. So has Mr. Madan.<sup>2</sup> But let them look to it. I go on my way. I have a sufficient answer as to George Bell<sup>3</sup>; but I will not give it before the time.

We join in love to you both. My wife gains ground. She is quite peaceable and loving *to all*. Adieu!

*To the Editor of the 'London Chronicle'*

WINDMILL HILL, January 7, 1763.

SIR,—When I returned to London two or three months ago, I received various accounts of some meetings for prayer which had lately been held by Mr. Bell and a few others. But these accounts were contradictory to each other. Some highly applauded them, others utterly condemned; some affirmed they had done much good, others that they had done much hurt. This convinced me it was requisite to proceed with caution and to do nothing rashly. The first point was to form my own judgement, and that upon the fullest evidence. To this end I first talked with Mr. Bell himself, whom I knew to be an honest, well-meaning man. Next I told him they were at liberty for a few times to meet under my roof. They did so, both in the Society room at the Foundery and in the chapel at West Street. By this means I had an opportunity of hearing them myself, which I did at both places. I was present the next meeting after that, which is mentioned by Mr. Dodd and Mr. Thompson in the *Public Ledger*. The same things which they blame I blame also; and so I told him the same evening: and I was in hopes they would be done away, which occasioned my waiting till this time. But, having now lost

<sup>1</sup> Maxfield led a select band in London. They had 'dreams, visions, and impressions,' and he encouraged these enthusiasts. See letter of Nov. 2, 1762.

<sup>2</sup> See letters of July 12, 1758; and March 20, 1763

<sup>3</sup> Wesley heard George Bell pray for nearly an hour on Nov. 24, and afterwards told him 'what I did not admire.' See next letter and that of Feb. 9.

that hope, I have given orders that they shall meet under my roof no more. What farther steps it will be necessary for me to take is a point I have not yet determined.—I am, sir,

Your humble servant.

*To Thomas Maxfield*

LONDON, *January 26, 1763.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—For many years I and all the preachers in connexion with me have taught that every believer may and ought to grow in grace. Lately you have taught, or seemed to teach, the contrary. The effect of this is, when I speak as I have done from the beginning, those who believe what you say will not bear it—nay, they will renounce connexion with us; as Mr. and Mrs. Coventry did last night.<sup>1</sup> This breach lies wholly upon you. You have contradicted what I taught from the beginning. Hence it is that many cannot bear it; but when I speak as I always have done, they separate from the Society. Is this for your honour or to the glory of God?

O Tommy, seek counsel, not from man, but God; not from Brother Bell, but Jesus Christ!—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To his Brother Charles*

LONDON, *February 8, 1763.*

DEAR BROTHER,—I think now the sooner you could be here the better; for the mask is thrown off. George Bell, John Dixon,<sup>2</sup> Joseph Calvert, Benjamin Biggs,<sup>3</sup> &c. &c., have quitted the Society and renounced all fellowship with us. I wrote to Thomas,<sup>4</sup> but was not favoured with an answer. This morning I wrote a second time, and received an answer indeed!

<sup>1</sup> See letter in May to a Friend.

<sup>2</sup> John and Elizabeth Dixon resigned their membership on Jan. 28 (*Journal*, v. 5).

<sup>3</sup> Benjamin Biggs, whom John Murlin met at Whitehaven, was for three or four years his inseparable companion. He embarked with him in July 1758 for Liverpool; but the captain took them to the Isle of Man. Biggs was the only person

present when his master, Sir James Lowther, died. The next heir, Sir William, gave him £50 a year for life, which he spent in doing good. On July 18, 1761, John Fletcher was at a meeting in Biggs's house. See *Wesley's Veterans*, ii. 161; Moore's *Mrs. Fletcher*, p. 373; and letter of May 16, 1759.

<sup>4</sup> Maxfield. See letters of Jan. 5 and 7.

The substance is, 'You take too much upon you. We will not come up.'

I know all the history of the Turk.<sup>1</sup> I must leave London on Friday to bury Mrs. Perronet.<sup>2</sup> She died on Saturday morning.

The answer to the Bishop (who has broke his leg) is forthcoming.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Madan wrote the Queries. I let him have the last word. I should not wonder if a *dying* saint were to prophesy. Listen to Sally Colston's 'last words'!

Molly Westall died last week in huge triumph.

J. Jones does good. I have seen the Colonel.<sup>4</sup> James Morgan<sup>5</sup> has lately been in a violent storm, and is scarce alive. I advise him to retire to Kingswood for a season. We need all your prayers. God is preparing thoroughly to purge His floor. O let us be instant *εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως*.<sup>7</sup>

We join in love to Sally. Adieu!

Charles wrote at the back of this letter: 'Himself confirming my prophecy of the Ranters.'

### *To the Editor of the 'London Chronicle'*

George Bell left Wesley's Society on February 4. He had prophesied that the end of the world was to come on the 28th. 'The terror occasioned by that wonderful prophecy spread far and wide.' Bell and his followers ascended a mound near St. Luke's Hospital on the 27th to await events; and there he was arrested, taken before a magistrate, and committed to prison. See *Journal*, v. 9.

LONDON, February 9, 1763.

SIR,—I take this opportunity of informing all whom it may concern (I) that Mr. Bell is not a member of our Society;

<sup>1</sup> See letters of Jan. 5 and Feb. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Wesley had 'paid the last office of love' (administered the Holy Communion) to her on Jan. 10. See *Journal*, v. 4, 8.

<sup>3</sup> Wesley's letter to Bishop Warburton had just been published.

<sup>4</sup> Charles Wesley prayed by Mr Colston, 'desirous to be with Christ,' at Bristol on Sept 2, 1739. A letter from Sarah Colston is given in the *Journal*, iii. 197-8, dated Bristol,

June 6, 1745, describing the happy death of 'another of my charge,' and closing with the words, 'Oh that when He comes He may find me watching!'

<sup>5</sup> Colonel Gallatin. See letter of July 19, 1750.

<sup>6</sup> Morgan was closely associated with Maxfield. See letter of Jan. 8, 1757.

<sup>7</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 2. 'in season, out of season.'

(2) that I do not believe either the end of the world or any signal calamity will be on the 28th instant; and (3) that not one in fifty, perhaps not one in five hundred, of the people called Methodists believe any more than I do either this or any other of his prophecies.—I am Your humble servant.

*To his Brother Charles*

LONDON, February 26, 1763.

DEAR BROTHER,—I perceive *verba fiunt mortuo*<sup>1</sup>; so I say no more about your coming to London. Here stand I; and I *shall* stand, with or without human help, if God is with me.

Yesterday Mr. Madan and I with a few more gave the full hearing to the famous Turk and his associate.<sup>2</sup> He is an exquisite wretch; was originally a Spanish Jew, afterwards a Turk, then a Papist, then a Jew again, then a Protestant, and now at last (under Mr. Lombardi's wing) a zealous Papist! Concerning his companion we are still in doubt. We *fear* he is little better; though we cannot prove it.

Mr. Gaussen tells us the stroke will come to-morrow evening; the rest say not till Monday.<sup>3</sup> Let us live to-day! I labour for peace; but they still make themselves ready for battle.

Peace be with you and yours! Adieu!

*To his Brother Charles*

LONDON, March 6, 1763.

DEAR BROTHER,—To-morrow I set out for Norwich, which I have delayed as long as possible. I am likely to have rough work there; but the turbulent spirits must bend or break.<sup>4</sup>

That story of Thomas Maxfield is not true. But I doubt more is true than is good. He is a most incomprehensible creature. I cannot convince him that separation is any evil,

<sup>1</sup> Plautus's *Poenulus*, iv. ii. 18: friends. See C. Wesley's *Journal*, ii, 217; and previous letter.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Feb. 8.

<sup>3</sup> The earthquake which Bell prophesied. The Gaussens were London

<sup>4</sup> He spent 'a few quiet, comfortable days . . . without any jar or contention.' See *Journal*, v. 10.

or that speaking in the name of God when God has not spoken is any more than an *innocent mistake*. I know not what to say to him or do with him. He is really *mali caput et fons*.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Neal has grievously peached his associates. But I shall not hastily saddle myself with him and his seven children. The week after Easter week I hope to visit the classes in Bristol, or the week following. James Morgan is love-sick, John Jones physic-sick: so that I have scarce one hearty helper but La. Coughlan.<sup>2</sup>

We join in love to you both. Adieu !

### To Samuel Furlly

NORWICH, March 10, 1763.

DEAR SAMMY,—When we revised the notes on St. Peter, our brethren were all of the same opinion with you. So we set Charles's criticism aside, and let the note stand as it was.

I have not read Dr. Newton on the Prophecies. But the bare text of the Revelation from the time I first read it satisfied me as to the general doctrine of the Millennium.<sup>3</sup> But of the particulars I am willingly ignorant since they are not revealed.

I scarce ever yet repented of saying too little, but frequently of saying too much. To the Bishop I have said more than I usually do, and I believe as much as the occasion requires. But I spare him. If he replies, I shall probably speak more plainly, it not more largely.

A notion has lately started up in London, originally borrowed from the Moravians, which quite outshoots my notions of perfection as belonging only to fathers in Christ—namely, that every man is saved from all (inward) *sin* when he is justified, and that there is *no sin*, neither anger, pride, nor any other, in *his heart* from that moment unless he loses justifying faith.

How will you disprove this position? In particular, by what New Testament authority can you overthrow it? These questions have puzzled many poor plain people. I should be glad of your answer to them at large.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Dec. 23, 1762.

Lowes), and Aug. 27, 1768.

<sup>2</sup> Lawrence Coughlan. See letters of March 6, 1759 (to Matthew

<sup>3</sup> See letters of Dec. 20, 1762, and March 27, 1764.

It is a doubt whether I shall be able to leave London this summer, unless now and then for a week or two. Next week I am to return thither.—I am, dear Sammy,

Yours affectionately.

*To the Editor of 'Lloyd's Evening Post'*

LONDON, March 18, 1763.

SIR,—A pert, empty, self-sufficient man, who calls himself 'Philodemas'<sup>1</sup> (I hope not akin to S. Johnson in the *Public Ledger*), made use of your paper a few days ago to throw abundance of dirt at the people called Methodists. He takes occasion from the idle prophecy of Mr. Bell, with whom the Methodists have nothing to do, as he is not, nor has been for some time, a member of their Society. Had he advanced anything new or any particular charge, it would have deserved a particular answer. But as his letter contains nothing but dull, stale, general slanders, which have been confuted ten times over, it would be abusing the patience of your readers to say any more concerning it. To Bishop Warburton, bringing particular charges, I have given particular answers; I hope to the satisfaction of every reasonable and impartial man.—I am, sir,

Your humble servant.

*To the Countess of Huntingdon*

This letter is without date, but is marked 'Received at Bright-helmstone, March 21, 1763. S. H.' The Countess seems to have sent it to William Romaine. He had been at Oxford with the Wesleys, and was at the Leeds Conference of 1762 with Whitefield, Madan, Venn, and the Countess of Huntingdon, to whom he was chaplain. Romaine replies from Lambeth on March 26: 'Enclosed is poor Mr. John's letter. The contents of it, as far as I am concerned, surprised me; for no one has spoken more freely of what is now passing among the people than myself. Indeed, I have not preached so much as others whose names he mentions, nor could I. . . . I pity Mr. John from my heart. His Societies are in great confusion; and the point which brought them into the wilderness of rant and madness is still insisted on as much as ever. I fear the end of this delusion. As the late alarming Providence has not had its proper effect, and *Perfection* is still the cry, God will certainly give them up to some more dreadful thing. May their eyes be opened before it be too late!' See *Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon*, i. 330; and letter of Sept. 9, 1756.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Dec. 12, 1760, to the Editor of the *London Magazine*.



[LONDON, *March 20, 1763.*]

MY LADY,—For a considerable time I have had it much upon my mind to write a few lines to your Ladyship ; although I cannot learn that your Ladyship has ever inquired whether I was living or dead. By the mercy of God I am still alive, and following the work to which He has called me ; although without any help, even in the most trying times, from those I might have expected it from. Their voice seemed to be rather, ‘ Down with him, down with him, even to the ground.’ I mean (for I use no ceremony or circumlocution) Mr. Madan, Mr. Haweis,<sup>1</sup> Mr. Berridge, and (I am sorry to say it) Mr. Whitefield. Only Mr. Romaine has shown a truly sympathizing spirit and acted the part of a brother. I am the more surprised at this, because he owed me nothing (only the love which we all owe one another) ; he was not my son in the gospel, neither do I know that he ever received any help through me. So much the more welcome was his kindness now. The Lord repay it sevenfold into his bosom !

As to the prophecies of those poor, wild man, George Bell and half a dozen more, I am not a jot more accountable for them than Mr. Whitefield is ; having never countenanced them in any degree, but opposed them from the moment I heard them. Neither have these extravagances any foundation in any doctrine which I teach. The loving God with all our heart, soul, and strength, and the loving all men as Christ loved us, is and ever was, for these thirty years, the sum of what I deliver, as pure religion and undefiled.

However, if I am bereaved of my children, I am bereaved !  
The will of the Lord be done !

Poor and helpless as I am,  
Thou dost for my vileness care :  
Thou hast called me by my name !  
Thou dost all my burthens bear.

Wishing your Ladyship a continual increase of all blessings,  
I am, my Lady,

Your Ladyship's servant for Christ's sake.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Thomas Haweis (1734–1820) was Madan's curate at the Lock Hospital. He became Rector of All Saints', Northampton, and had charge of Lady Huntingdon's College, and managed several of her chapels. He was a director of the London Missionary Society.

To Mrs. —

LONDON, March 21, 1763.

MY DEAR SISTER,—My coming into the country is quite uncertain, till I see what turn things here will take. I am glad to hear the work of God prospers among you ; &c.

To the Editor of the ' London Chronicle '

The tract against which Wesley is protesting is stated in an old magazine to have been compiled by William Mason. See Green's *Anti-Methodist Publications*, No. 345 ; and for Wesley's published reply, Green's *Bibliography*, No. 211.

LONDON, April 5, 1763.

SIR,—Some time since, I heard a man in the street bawling, ' The Scripture Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness asserted and maintained by the Rev. John Wesley ! ' I was a little surprised, not having published anything on the head ; and more so when, upon reading it over, I found not one line of it was mine, though I remembered to have *read* something like it. Soon after (to show what I really do maintain) I published *Thoughts on the Imputed Righteousness of Christ*, mentioning therein that ' pious fraud ' which constrained me so to do.

The modest author of the former publication now prints a second edition of it, and faces me down before all the world—yea, and *proves* that it is mine.

Would you not wonder by what argument ? Oh, the plainest in the world. ' There is not,' says he, ' the least fraud in the publication nor imposition on Mr. Wesley ; for the words are transcribed from the ninth and tenth volumes of his *Christian Library*.' But the *Christian Library* is not Mr. Wesley's writing : it is ' Extracts from and Abridgements of ' other writers ; the subject of which I highly approve, but I will not be accountable for every expression. Much less will I *father* eight pages of I know not what which a shameless man has picked out of that work, tacked together in the manner he thought good, and then published in my name. He puts me in mind of what occurred some years since. A man was stretching his throat near Moorfields and screaming out, ' A

full and true Account of the Death of the Rev. George Whitefield !' One took hold of him, and said, ' Sirrah ! what do you mean ? Mr. Whitefield is yonder before you.' He shrugged up his shoulders, and said, ' Why, sir, an honest man must do something to turn a penny.'—I am, sir,

Your humble servant.

*To Miss March*

LONDON, *April 7, 1763.*

The true gospel touches the very edge both of Calvinism and Antinomianism ; so that nothing but the mighty power of God can prevent our sliding either into the one or the other.

The nicest point of all which relates to Christian perfection is that which you inquire of. Thus much is certain : they that love God with all their heart and all men as themselves are scripturally perfect. And surely such there are ; otherwise the promise of God would be a mere mockery of human weakness. Hold fast this. But then remember, on the other hand, you have this treasure in an earthen vessel ; you dwell in a poor, shattered house of clay, which presses down the immortal spirit. Hence all your thoughts, words, and actions are so imperfect, so far from coming up to the standard (that law of love which, but for the corruptible body, your soul would answer in all instances), that you may well say till you go to Him you love :

Every moment, Lord, I need  
The merit of Thy death.

*To a Friend*

Wesley sent this account of his troubles with Maxfield and Bell to a friend, and gives it in the *Journal*, v. 10-13. See letters of November 2, 1762, and February 14, 1778, to Maxfield.

[LONDON, *May*] 1763.

At your instance I undertake the irksome task of looking back upon things which I wish to forget for ever. I have had innumerable proofs (though such as it would now be an endless task to collect together) of all the facts which I recite. And I

recite them as briefly as possible, because I do not desire to aggravate anything, but barely to place it in a true light.

1. Mr. Maxfield was justified while I was praying with him in Baldwin Street, Bristol.<sup>1</sup>

2. Not long after, he was employed by me as a preacher in London.

3. Hereby he had access to Mrs. Maxfield,<sup>2</sup> whom otherwise he was never likely to see, much less to marry; from whence all his outward prosperity had its rise.

4. He was by me (by those who did it at my instance) recommended to the Bishop of Derry to be ordained priest, who told him then (I had it from his own mouth), 'Mr. Maxfield, I ordain you to assist that good man, that he may not work himself to death.'

5. When a few years ago many censured him much, I continually and strenuously defended him; though to the disgusting several of the preachers and a great number of the people.

6. I disgusted them, not barely by defending him, but by commending him in strong terms from time to time, both in public and private, with regard to his uprightness as well as usefulness.

7. All this time Mr. Maxfield was complaining (of which I was frequently informed by those to whom he spoke) that he was never so ill persecuted by the rabble in Cornwall as by me and my brother.

8. Four or five years since, a few persons were appointed to meet weekly at the Foundery. When I left London, I left these under Mr. Maxfield's care, desiring them to regard him just as they did me.

9. Not long after I was gone some of these had dreams, visions, or impressions, as they thought from God. Mr. Maxfield did not put a stop to these; rather he encouraged them.

10. When I returned, I opposed them with my might, and in a short time heard no more of them. Meanwhile I defended and commended Mr. Maxfield as before, and, when I left the town again, left them under his care.

<sup>1</sup> For his conversion, see letter of May 28, 1739. the firstfruits of Whitefield's ministry in London. She died on Nov. 23,

<sup>2</sup> Miss Elizabeth Brauford, one of 1777.

11. Presently visions and revelations returned: Mr. Maxfield did not discourage them. Herewith was now joined a contempt of such as had them not, with a belief that they were proofs of the highest grace.

12. Some of our preachers opposed them roughly. At this they took fire, and refused to hear them preach, but crowded after Mr. Maxfield. He took no pains to quench the fire, but rather availed himself of it to disunite them from other preachers and attach them to himself. He likewise continually told them they were not to be taught by man, especially by those who had less grace than themselves. I was told of this likewise from time to time; but he denied it, and I would not believe evil of my friend.

13. When I returned in October 1762, I found the Society in an uproar and several of Mr. Maxfield's most intimate friends formed into a detached body. Enthusiasm, pride, and great uncharitableness appeared in many who once had much grace. I very tenderly reprov'd them. They would not bear it; one of them, Mrs. Coventry,<sup>1</sup> cried out, 'We will not be brow-beaten any longer; we will throw off the mask.' Accordingly, a few days after, she came, and before an hundred persons brought me hers and her husband's tickets, and said, 'Sir, we will have no more to do with you; Mr. Maxfield is our teacher.' Soon after, several more left the Society (one of whom was George Bell), saying, 'Blind John is not capable of teaching us; we will keep to Mr. Maxfield.'

14. From the time that I heard of George Bell's prophecy I explicitly declared against it both in private, in the Society, in preaching, over and over; and at length in the public papers. Mr. Maxfield made no such declaration; I have reason to think he believed it.<sup>2</sup> I know many of his friends did, and several of them sat up the last of February at the house of his most intimate friend, Mr. Biggs,<sup>3</sup> in full expectation of the accomplishment.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Jan. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Maxfield says in his *Vindication*, p. 16: 'At Wapping Mr. Bell mentioned the destruction that was to be on the 28th of February. As soon as he had done speaking, I stood up

and set aside all that he had said about it; and went to the Foundery the next morning, and told Mr. Wesley what I had done.'

<sup>3</sup> See letter of Feb. 8.

15. About this time one of our stewards,<sup>1</sup> who at my desire took the chapel in Snowsfields for my use, sent me word the chapel was his, and Mr. Bell should exhort there, whether I would or no. Upon this I desired the next preacher there to inform the congregation that, while things stood thus, neither I nor our preachers could in conscience preach there any more.

16. Nevertheless Mr. Maxfield did preach there. On this I sent him a note desiring him not to do it, and adding, 'If you do, you thereby renounce connexion with me.'

17. Receiving this, he said, 'I *will* preach at Snowsfields.' He did so, and thereby renounced connexion. On this point, and no other, we divided; by this act the knot was cut. Resolving to do this, he told Mr. Clementson, 'I am to preach at the Foundery no more.'

18. From this time he has spoke all manner of evil of me, his father, his friend, his greatest earthly benefactor. I cite Mr. Fletcher<sup>2</sup> for one witness of this, and Mr. Madan for another. Did he speak evil of me to Mr. Fletcher one day only? Nay, but every day for six weeks together. To Mr. Madan he said (among a thousand other things, which he had been twenty years raking together), 'Mr. Wesley believed and countenanced all which Mr. Bell said; and the reason of our parting was this: he said to me one day, "Tommy, I will tell the people you are the greatest gospel preacher in England; and you shall tell them I am the greatest." For refusing to do this Mr. Wesley put me away!'

Now, with perfect calmness, and I verily think without the least touch of prejudice, I refer to your own judgement what connexion I ought to have with Mr. Maxfield, either till I am satisfied these things are not so or till he is throughly sensible of his fault.

To Mr. —

(Fragment)

May 1763.

not so  
receive the sense they  
which I have been insisting on

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Arvin, who held the lease.

<sup>2</sup> See *Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon*, i. 321-2.

And I do not know that [Joseph] Guilford<sup>1</sup> [had any other] objection to them than more or less, than 'By grace ye are saved through faith.' And whenever we give up this fundamental truth, the work of God by us will come to an end.

It is true saving faith is both the gift and the work of God ; yea, and a work of Omnipotence. But, still, this does not exclude any man ; because God is ready to work it in every man : there being nothing more sure, taking the words in a sacred sense, than that ' every man may believe if he will.'

The matters in question between Mr. Maxfield and me<sup>2</sup> may sleep till I have the pleasure of seeing you. Wishing you all light and love, I remain, dear sir,

Your affectionate brother and servant.

### To Mrs. Maitland

Penelope Maitland was sister to the Rev. Martin Madan and wife of General Maitland. She wrote on May 2 : ' I hope, sir, that neither myself or any of my family shall ever forget the greatness of our obligations to you, under whose ministerial labours God has graciously imparted a measure of His grace.' She says : ' I think, in your *Second Thoughts on Perfection*, you say you mean by this term " rejoicing evermore, praying without ceasing, and in everything giving thanks." ' But she asks, ' Would it not be safer to call it a high state of grace than perfection ? ' Mrs. Maitland, or someone, adds : ' Remark—what a contradiction is this ! He *denies* sinless perfection, but *believes* those who are *perfect* (according to this definition) have no *sin* ! ' See letter of Nov. 9, 1750.

LONDON, May 12, 1763.

DEAR MADAM,—Both in the former and in the *Father Thoughts on Perfection* I have said all I have to say on that head. Nevertheless, as you seem to desire it, I will add a few words more.

As to *the word*, it is scriptural ; therefore neither you nor I can in conscience object against it, unless we would send the Holy Ghost to school and teach Him to speak who made the tongue.

By *that word* I mean (as I have said again and again) ' so

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal*, v. 7, 362 ; vi. 149.

<sup>2</sup> See previous letter.

loving God and our neighbour as to rejoice evermore, pray without ceasing, and in everything give thanks.' He that experiences this is scripturally perfect. And if you do not yet, you may experience it : you surely will, if you follow hard after it ; for the Scripture cannot be broken.

What, then, does their arguing prove who object against *perfection*? 'Absolute and infallible *perfection*?' I never contended for it. *Sinless perfection*? Neither do I contend for *this*, seeing the term is not scriptural. A perfection that perfectly fulfils the whole law, and so needs not the merits of Christ? I acknowledge none such—I do now, and always did, protest against it.

'But is there not *sin* in those that are *perfect*?' I believe not ; but, be that as it may, they feel none, no temper but pure love, while they rejoice, pray, and give thanks continually. And whether sin is *suspended* or *extinguished*, I will not dispute ; it is enough that they feel nothing but love. This you allow 'we should daily press after'; and this is all I contend for. O may God give you to taste of it to-day !—I am, dear madam,  
Your very affectionate servant.

### To Jenny Lee

ABERDEEN, May 26, 1763.

MY DEAR SISTER,—If you are likely to fall into a consumption, I believe nothing will save your life but the living two or three months upon buttermilk churned daily in a bottle. Change of air may do something, if you add riding every day. Else it will avail but little.

Your conscience will not be clear unless you find fault wherever occasion requires. Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy brother, and not suffer sin upon him. Regard none who speak otherwise. You have but one rule, the oracles of God. His Spirit will always guide you, according to His word. Keep close to Him, and pray for, dear Jenny,

Your affectionate brother.

### To Ann Foard

Miss Foard was born in Southwark in 1741, joined the Methodist Society in 1761, and in 1772 married John Thornton, an undertaker,



of Southwark. She had received a good education, and 'was a woman of no ordinary mental stature; but, to a strong and reflective intellect, united erudition and accomplishments which, at that period especially, came not within the usual limits of a female education.' Wesley visited the family, 'and was the centre of delighted interest to them and to the social circle who were privileged to meet him there and listen to his animating and instructive conversation.' Mrs. Thornton died at Bath on March 18, 1799.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, June 3, 1763.

MY DEAR SISTER,—I take your writing exceeding kindly, particularly at this time; you have refreshed my bowels in the Lord. Sometimes I thought there was a kind of strangeness in your behaviour. I am now persuaded it sprung only from caution, not from want of love. When you believed you had the pure love of God, you was not deceived: you really had a degree of it, and see that you let it not go; hold the beginning of your confidence steadfast till the end. Christ and all He has is yours! Never quit your hold! Woman, remember the faith! The Lord is increasing in you sevenfold! How wonderfully does He often bring to our remembrance what we have read or heard long ago! And all is good which He sanctifies.

My dear sister, continue to love and pray for

Your affectionate brother.

### To Henry Venn

John Pawson says in his *An Affectionate Address to the Members of the Methodist Societies*, 1795: 'For some years (and at the hazard of their lives) our preachers had preached in Huddersfield, where they formed a Society, and procured peace. Through the interest of our people the Rev. Mr. Venn got to be vicar of that parish, and for some time was made very useful. But in a while he petitioned Mr. Wesley to withdraw the preachers from his parish, as he thought himself quite sufficient for the work without them. Mr. Wesley did so for several years, to the unspeakable grief of our Society, till in the year 1765 we began to visit that place again without Mr. Wesley's knowledge, and by this means a door was opened into that dreadful wilderness beyond Huddersfield, where much good has been done. Mr. Venn's curate took the pains to go from house to house to entreat the people not to come to hear us, but he lost his bad labour.' John Riland was curate to Venn in 1763. See letters of August 15, 1761, and April 19, 1764.

BIRMINGHAM, June 22, 1763.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—Having at length a few hours to spare, I sit down to answer your last, which was particularly acceptable to me, because it was wrote with so great openness. I shall write with the same. And herein you and I are just fit to converse together, because we both like to speak blunt and plain, without going a great way round about. I shall likewise take this opportunity of explaining myself on some other heads. I want you to understand me inside and out. Then I say, *Sic sum : si placeo, utere.*<sup>1</sup>

Were I allowed to boast myself a little, I would say, I want no man living—I mean, none but those who are now connected with me, and who bless God for that connexion. With these I am able to go through every part of the work to which I am called. Yet I have laboured after union with all whom I believe to be united with Christ. I have sought it again and again, but in vain. They were resolved to stand aloof. And when one and another sincere minister of Christ has been inclined to come nearer to me, others have diligently kept them off, as though thereby they did God service.

To this poor end the doctrine of Perfection has been brought in head and shoulders. And when such concessions were made as would abundantly satisfy any fair and candid man, they were no nearer—rather farther off, for they had no desire to be satisfied. To make this *dear* breach wider and wider, stories were carefully gleaned up, improved, yea invented and retailed, both concerning me and ‘the perfect ones.’ And when anything very bad has come to hand, some have rejoiced as though they had found great spoils.

By this means, chiefly, the distance between you and me has increased ever since you came to Huddersfield, and perhaps it has not been lessened by that honest, well-meaning man Mr. Burnett<sup>2</sup> and by others, who have talked largely of my dogmatism, love of power, errors, and irregularities. My dogmatism is neither more nor less than a ‘custom of coming to the point at once,’ and telling my mind flat and plain without any preface or ceremony. I could, indeed, premise

<sup>1</sup> Terence's *Phormio*, III. ii. 42 :  
‘Such I am : if you like me, use me.’

<sup>2</sup> G. Burnett, Vicar of Elland.

something of my own imbecility, littleness of judgement, and the like : but (1) I have no time to lose, I must dispatch the matter as soon as possible ; (2) I do not think it frank or ingenuous—I think these prefaces are mere artifice.

The power I have I never sought. It was the undesired, unexpected result of the work God was pleased to work by me. I have a thousand times sought to devolve it on others ; but as yet I cannot. I therefore suffer it till I can find any to ease me of my burthen.

If any one will convince me of my errors, I will heartily thank him. I believe all the Bible as far as I understand it, and am ready to be convinced. If I am an heretic, I became such by reading the Bible. All my notions I drew from thence ; and with little help from men, unless in the single point of Justification by Faith. But I impose my notions upon none : I will be bold to say there is no man living farther from it. I make no opinion the term of union with any man : I think, and let think. What I want is holiness of heart and life. They who have this are my brother, sister, and mother.

‘ But you hold Perfection.’ True—that is, loving God with *all* our heart, and serving Him with *all* our strength. I teach nothing more, nothing less than this. And whatever infirmity, defect, *ἀνομία*, is consistent with this any man may teach, and I shall not contradict him.

As to *irregularity*, I hope none of those who cause it do then complain of it. Will they throw a man into the dirt and beat him because he is dirty ? Of all men living those clergymen ought not to complain who believe I preach the gospel (as to the substance of it). If they do not ask me to preach in their churches, *they* are accountable for my preaching in the fields.

I come now directly to your letter, in hopes of establishing a good understanding between us. I agreed to suspend for a twelvemonth our stated preaching at Huddersfield, which had been there these many years. If this answered your end, I am glad : my end it did not answer at all. Instead of coming nearer to me, you got farther off. I heard of it from every quarter ; though few knew that I did, for I saw no cause to speak against *you* because you did against *me*. I wanted you

to do more, not less good, and therefore durst not do or say anything to hinder it. And, lest I should hinder it, I will make a farther trial and suspend the preaching at Huddersfield for another year.

1. To clear the case between us a little farther. I must now adopt your words: 'I, no less than you, preach justification by faith only, the absolute necessity of holiness, the increasing mortification of sin, and rejection of all past experiences and attainments. I abhor, as you do, all Antinomian abuse of the doctrine of Christ, and desire to see my people walking even as He walked. Is it, then, worth while, in order to gratify a few bigoted persons or for the sake of the minute differences between us,' to encourage 'all the train of evils which follow *contention for opinions* in little matters as much as in great?'

2. If I was as strenuous with regard to perfection on one side as you have been on the other, I should deny you to be a *sufficient* preacher; but this I never did. And yet I assure you I can advance such reasons for all I teach as would puzzle you and all that condemn me to answer; but I am sick of disputing. Let them beat the air and triumph without an opponent.

3. 'None, you say, preach in your houses who do not hold the very same doctrine with you.' This is not exactly the case. You are welcome to preach in any of those houses, as I know we agree in the main points; and whereinsoever we differ you would not preach there contrary to me. 'But would it not give you pain to have any other teacher come among those committed to your charge, so as to have your plan disconcerted, your labours depreciated, and the affections of your flock alienated?' It has given me pain when I had reason to fear this was done, both at Leeds, Birstall, and elsewhere. And I was 'under a temptation of speaking against you'; but I refrained even among my intimate friends. So far was I from publicly warning my people against one I firmly believed to be much better than myself.

4. Indeed, I trust 'the bad blood is now taken away.' Let it return no more. Let us begin such a correspondence as has never been yet; and let us avow it before all mankind.

Not content with not weakening each other's hands, or speaking against each other directly or indirectly (which may be effectually done under the notion of exposing this and that error), let us defend each other's characters to the uttermost against either ill- or well-meaning evil-speakers. I am not satisfied with 'Be very civil to the Methodists, but have nothing to do with them.' No: I desire to have a league offensive and defensive with every soldier of Christ. We have not only one faith, one hope, one Lord, but are directly engaged in one warfare. We are carrying the war into the devil's own quarters, who therefore summons all his hosts to war. Come, then, ye that love Him, to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty! I am now wellnigh *miles emeritus senex, sexagenarius*<sup>1</sup>; yet I trust to fight a little longer. Come and strengthen the hands till you supply the place of

Your weak but affectionate brother.

### To Duncan Wright

Wesley stayed in London on account of the ferment caused by Maxfield's separation. Duncan Wright was born in Perthshire in 1736, enlisted as a soldier, joined the Methodist Society at Limerick in 1756, and began to preach. He 'walked in darkness' from 1758 to 1763; but in June of 1763 God 'restored to me the joy of His salvation.' At the end of 1764 he became an itinerant. He spent some time in London, as Wesley suggested. He died at Hoxton in May 1791, and was buried in Wesley's vault. See *Wesley's Veterans*, II. 18-50.

LONDON, July 4, 1763.

DEAR DUNCAN,—You have chosen the better part, and will never regret of your choice. Write down the sermon you preached upon that subject, with what additions you see good, and I will correct and print it, if I live to return to London. Perhaps I may likewise print the 'Advice concerning Children' in a separate tract. I am glad Rd. Blackwell<sup>2</sup> goes to Colchester. Perhaps he and you by turns may spend the ensuing year in London.—I am

Yours affectionately.

<sup>1</sup> 'A worn-out old warrior, who preacher about 1766, and died of has seen his sixtieth year.'

<sup>2</sup> Richard Blackwell became a See Atmore's *Memorial*, p. 54.

*To Richard Hart*

Richard Hart was Vicar of St. George's, Bristol. He had been at Bradford, Wilts. See *Journal*, iv 355; and also v. 63-4, where in a genial letter to Wesley he suggests that a book of the New Testament should be studied when the ministers met together.

LONDON, July 11, 1763.

DEAR SIR,—Abundance of business has prevented my writing so soon as I desired and intended; nor have I time now to write so largely as I could wish, and as your openness and frankness would otherwise constrain me to do. But I cannot delay any longer to write a little, lest I should seem to slight your correspondence.

What you before observed is of great importance—namely, 'If it be the professed aim of the gospel to convince us that Jesus is the Christ; if I, a sinner, am convinced of the reality of this fact, am not I, who believe, authorized to expect life, not through any condition, or any act, inward or outward, performed by me, but singly through the name which Jesus assumed, which stands for His whole character or merit?'

Here is the hinge on which Mr. Sandeman's<sup>1</sup> whole system turns. This is the strength of his cause, and you have proposed it with all the strength and clearness which he himself could devise.

Yet suffer me to offer to your consideration a few queries concerning it:—

Is every one who is convinced of the reality of this fact, 'Jesus is the Christ,' a gospel believer? Is not the devil convinced of the reality of this fact? Is, then, the devil a gospel believer?

I was convinced of the reality of this fact when I was twelve years old,<sup>2</sup> when I was without God in the world. Was I then a gospel believer? Was I then a child of God? Was I then in a state of salvation?

Again, you say, 'I who believe am authorized to expect life, not through any condition or act, inward or outward, performed by me.'

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Oct. 14, 1757.

<sup>2</sup> See sect 14 of letter in Dec. 1751 to Bishop Lavington.

'I who believe.' But cannot you as well expect it without believing? If not, what is believing but a condition? For it is something *sine qua non*. And what else do you, or I, or any one living mean by a condition? And is not believing an inward act? What is it else? But you say, 'Not performed by me.' By whom, then? God gives me the power to believe. But does He believe for me? He works faith in me. But still is it not I that believe? And if so, is not believing an inward act performed by me?

Is not, then, this hypothesis (to waive all other difficulties) contradictory to itself?

I have just set down a few hints as they occurred. Wishing you an increase of every blessing, I am, dear sir,

Your very affectionate brother.

### To Dorothy Furly

Miss Furly was married to John Downes in June 1764. Her husband died suddenly while preaching in West Street Chapel in 1774. Charles Wesley visited her in her bereavement. 'She surprised me and all who saw her. So supported, so calm, so resigned! A faithful friend received her into his house. She had one sixpence in the world, and no more! But her Maker is her husband!' Mrs. Downes died in 1807, at the age of seventy-six. See *Methodist Magazine*, 1813, pp. 217-22; and letters of November 7, 1751, and May 28, 1764.

LONDON, July 16, 1763.

MY DEAR SISTER,—I. So far as I know what will make me most holy and most useful I know what is the will of God.

2. Certainly it is possible for persons to be as devoted to God in a married as in a single state.

3. I believe John Downes is throughly desirous of being wholly devoted to God, and that (if you alter your condition at all) you cannot choose a more proper person.—I am, my dear sister,

Your affectionate brother.

### To Mrs. Bennis

This is the first of twenty-seven letters to Elizabeth Bennis, who became the first member in Limerick. She saw Robert Swindells pass her door on March 17, 1749, with a great mob shouting and

insulting him. She heard such an account of his morning sermon that she went to hear him in the evening, and was much affected. She was asked to spend the evening in company with him, and did not miss a sermon whilst he stayed for three days. When Swindells returned to the town about a month later, she was the first to stand up and give her name as a member. On June 21 at the five-o'clock preaching she says, 'I found my burden in a moment taken off and my soul set at liberty.' In 1757, under the preaching of Thomas Olvers, she and two others began to seek for cleansing of the heart from all sin. After Wesley's visit in 1762, Mrs. Bennis had received special blessing. On Whit Sunday, May 22, 'whilst she knelt at the Lord's Table and pleaded in earnest prayer, the question was spoken to her heart, "Believest thou that I am able to do this?"' Her soul eagerly answered, "Lord, I do believe Thou art able." And the word came again, "Be it unto thee according to thy faith." In receiving the memorials of her dying Lord, she was enabled to lay hold of Christ for complete salvation from all sin.' She found the blessing of entire sanctification on June 2, 1763, and proved 'a golden spur' to the preachers. In her first letter to Wesley (August 2, 1763) she tells him how she had been laughed at and reasoned out of her earnestness, till his visit had revived her desire after holiness. Her husband, who was a prosperous man, died in 1788. The family emigrated to America, and she passed away at Philadelphia in 1802. Her *Correspondence with Wesley and Others* was printed by her son in Philadelphia, and reprinted in Cork in 1819. See Crookshank's *Memorable Women of Irish Methodism*, pp. 20-30; and letter of March 29, 1766.

PEMBROKE, August 23, 1763.

MY DEAR SISTER,—You did well to write. This is one of the means which God generally uses to convey either light or comfort. Even while you are writing you will often find relief; frequently while we propose a doubt it is removed.

There is no doubt but what you at first experienced was a real foretaste of the blessing, although you were not properly possessed of it till the Whit Sunday following. But it is very possible to cast away the gift of God, or to lose it by little and little; though I trust this is not the case with you: and yet you may frequently be in heaviness, and may find your love to God not near so warm at some times as it is at others. Many wanderings likewise, and many deficiencies, are consistent with pure love; but the thing you mean is the abiding witness of the Spirit touching this very thing. And this you may



boldly claim on the warrant of that word, ' We have received the Spirit that is of God , that we may know the things which are freely given to us of God '—I am, my dear sister,

Your affectionate brother

*To Christopher Hopper*

Hopper was in London in July, where ' our Conference began and ended in love ' He and his wife lived in ' a little dark room at Edinburgh, encompassed round with old black walls, disagreeable enough but we had a good season many poor sinners were converted to God We saw the fruit of our labours and rejoiced '

BRISTOL, *September 3, 1763*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I am much inclined to think you will be more useful this year than ever you have been in your life. From the first hour abate nothing of our Rules, whether of Society or bands Be a Methodist all over Be exact in everything. Be zealous, be active Press on to the one thing, and carry all before you How much may be done before summer is at an end! Their little misunderstandings at Edinburgh you will soon remove by hearing the parties face to face. I hope a preacher is gone northward, and Brother Roberts come southward<sup>1</sup> I hate delay 'The King's business requires haste!'—I am, with love to Sister Hopper,

Yours most affectionately.

Take the field everywhere as often as possible Who goes to the Highlands now quickly?

*To George Merryweather*

LONDON, *October 5, 1763.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—Your letter was sent from hence to Bristol. But I had left Bristol before it came. I have no objection to Mr. Jaco's<sup>2</sup> coming to Yarm to open the house ;

<sup>1</sup> Robert Roberts, of Leeds, is named in the Deed of Declaration, 1784. He was a farmer's son, born at Upton near Chester in 1731. He became a preacher in 1759, and

died in 1799, a zealous, judicious man. See letters of Nov 2

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Sept 3, 1756, to Samuel Walker

but I suppose he cannot stay long. He will soon be wanted again in his own circuit.

It is strange that the number of hearers should decrease if you have regular preaching. I hope the morning preaching is never omitted. If it be, everything will droop.

What relates to the account I will give Mr. Franks.<sup>1</sup> Probably he will find where the mistake lies. O be in earnest!—  
I am  
Your affectionate brother.

### To Lady Frances Gardiner

Wesley read Dr. Doddridge's *Account of Colonel Gardiner* on October 20, 1747, and asks, in his *Journal*, iii. 321, 'What matters it whether his soul was set at liberty by a fever or a Lochaber axe, seeing he has gone to God?' On April 24 1751, he and Christopher Hopper rode by Preston Field, and saw the place of battle and Colonel Gardiner's house. In 1769 Wesley speaks of Gardiner's conversion as an answer to his mother's prayers. His widow was the daughter of the Earl of Buchan. She wrote to Wesley on July 25, 1763, that she had never been at the preaching-house in a morning, as they preached so early; 'but I ventured to the High School yard the morning you left Edinburgh; and it pleased God, even after I had got home, to follow part of your sermon with a blessing to me. . . . I dare venture to say that Christ and all with Christ is mine.' The sermon was preached on May 29, when the General Assembly was meeting, and many ministers as well as nobles and gentry were present. Christopher Hopper was the Assistant in Edinburgh. He says: 'My dear Edinburgh friends were very kind, especially Lady Gardiner, that good old saint who is now with Jesus in paradise' See *Journal*, v. 15; Moore's *Wesley*, ii. 249; *Wesley's Veterans*, i. 144.

WELLING, November 2, 1763.

MY DEAR LADY,—You are again a messenger of glad tidings. Many were formerly of opinion that our preaching would not be received in North Britain, and that we could be of no use there. But they had forgotten that the Lord sendeth by whom He will send and that He hath the hearts of all in His hand. I have never seen the fields more white for the harvest than they were from Edinburgh to Aberdeen last summer; and if I live to take another journey into the North, especially if I should have a little more time to spare, I doubt not but I should find an open door as far as Caithness, and perhaps the Isles of Orkney.

<sup>1</sup> See letters of Jan. 25, 1762 (to Matthew Lowes), and Nov. 18, 1763.

The harvest surely has not been more plenteous for many hundred years. But there is the same complaint still—the labourers are few. We found this particularly at our last Conference. We had none to spare, and very hardly enough to supply our stated circuits. Mr. Roberts<sup>1</sup> was allotted for the Newcastle Circuit, whence I have had complaint upon complaint. He ought to have been there long ago. Several congregations have suffered loss for want of him. All our preachers should be as punctual as the sun, never standing still or moving out of their course.

I trust your Ladyship is still pressing on to the mark, expecting and receiving blessing upon blessing. Oh how can we sufficiently praise Him who deals so bountifully with us!—  
I am, my dear Lady, Your affectionate servant.

To the Right Honourable  
The Lady Frances Gardner, In Edinburgh.

### *To Christopher Hopper*

Hopper laboured in Scotland in 1763–5. In the summer of 1764 'we laid the foundation of our octagon at Aberdeen'; and in 1765 that of 'our octagon at Edinburgh. . . . I collected all I could, gave all I could spare, and borrowed above £300 to carry on and complete that building.' See *Wesley's Veterans*, i 145.

WELLING, November 2, 1763.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—'Dundee,' you say, 'would be thankful for a preacher.' But who would give him things needful for the body? He cannot live upon air; and we now expect that Scotland should bear its own burthen. John Hampson<sup>2</sup> you must think of no more. But I doubt our Newcastle friends are out of all patience for want of R. Roberts.<sup>3</sup> In spring you will need a fourth preacher. But what would he have to do?

Why, then, I think you must get the plat without Cannon-gate. 'The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof.'

<sup>1</sup> Lady Gardner said in her letter, 'Mr. Roberts's preaching has been remarkably blessed to many in Edinburgh.' See letter of Sept 3.

<sup>2</sup> Hampson was a popular preacher. He remained in Manchester, where the

account-book for Dec 27, 1762, and March 28, 1763, notes payments of £3 3s. to him, in Dec it is £2 2s. In April and Dec 1764, £3 3s; in July £3 13s. 6d

<sup>3</sup> See letter of Sept 3.

Sevenpence halfpenny! Pshaw! Let it be eightpence, even money. By-and-by we may give Mr. Trail more work. O let us work in this fruitful season! We join in love to Sister Hopper and you.—I am  
 Yours affectionately.

*To Dorothy Furly*

Wesley 'lodged once more at Elizabeth Johnson's, a genuine old Methodist,' in Hillgrove Street, Bristol, in March 1784. Her father, a West Indian merchant, left her nothing because she was a Methodist; but her uncle bequeathed to her £400 a year, and she lived with her gay sister, to whom her father left £1,000 a year. She was subsequently converted, and became a Methodist. See *Journal*, vi. 484; Sutcliffe's manuscript *History of Methodism*, i. 267; and letter of March 4, 1760.

LEWISHAM, December 15, 1763.

MY DEAR SISTER,—It has seemed to me for some time that God will not suffer Cornelius Bastable<sup>1</sup> to live at Cork. He may starve there, but he cannot live. The people are not worthy of him.

Salvation from sin is a deeper and higher work than either you or Sarah Ryan can conceive. But do not imagine (as we are continually prone to do) that it lies in an indivisible point. You experienced a taste of it when you were justified; you since experienced the thing itself, only in a low degree; and God gave you His Spirit that you might know the things which He had freely given you. Hold fast the beginning of your confidence steadfast unto the end. You are continually apt to throw away what you have for what you want. However, you are right in looking for a farther instantaneous change as well as a constant gradual one. But it is not good for you to be quite alone; you should converse frequently as well as freely with Miss Johnson, and any other that is much alive. You have great need of this.—I am, my dear sister,

Your affectionate brother.

<sup>1</sup> See letters of Aug. 19, 1759, and Oct. 12, 1778.



PEACEFUL AND STEADY PROGRESS  
JANUARY 14, 1764, TO DECEMBER 30, 1766

PRINCIPAL EVENTS

- 1764, Jan. 12. *First visit to Dorking.*  
Apr. 19. *Letter to Evangelical Clergy.*  
May *Friendship with Lady Maxwell.*  
*Hervey Letters published.*  
1765, Jan. *Conference on Ordinations.*  
June *Correspondence with Peggy Dale.*  
Nov. 24. *Sermon at West Street on The Lord our*  
*Righteousness.*  
1766, Jan. 31. *Closer union with Whitefield.*  
*A Plain Account of Christian Perfection published.*  
Aug. 3. *Great services at Haworth.*  
Oct. 30. *Death of Margaret Lewen.*

*These three years were marked by peaceful and steady progress. The anxiety and loss caused by the fanaticism of George Bell and the disloyalty of Thomas Maxfield were left behind, and Wesley put his whole strength into his work as an evangelist. It is the more surprising that he found time to discuss the treatment of texts and style with his pertinacious young friend Samuel Furly. Still more interesting is his correspondence with John Vallon, who was to become one of the finest figures among his itinerants. Charles Wesley was holding somewhat aloof, and his brother writes, 'Then I must do the best I can.'*

*Wesley's correspondence with Methodist ladies is the chief feature of this period. No one can read his letters to Mrs. Freeman in Dublin and to Mrs. Bennet of Limerick without feeling what a part they played in the spiritual life of his Societies and how much they depended on his counsel and inspiration. He felt that no labour spent in strengthening their hands was without its influence on the work of God. The letters to Mrs. Woodhouse of Epworth and to Lady Maxwell bear witness to his lively interest in all that concerned them. His correspondence with young Christians like Peggy Dale of Newcastle and Ann Foard of London is beautiful. He grew young in their company, and rejoiced in their early consecration. The aftermath of the Bell controversy is seen in letters to Mrs. Ryan and others, who were disposed to criticize Wesley's conduct at certain points.*

*How anxious he was to promote Christian union is seen by his letter of April 19, 1764, to about fifty clergymen. It met with scanty response, but it relieved Wesley's mind and heart. Other letters show how the care of all the circuits and preachers rested on his shoulders, and how he relied on such Assistants as Thomas Rankin and Christopher Hopper. His powerful appeal to a gentleman to join the Society is noteworthy. Lord Darimouth, the Countess of Huntingdon, and Ebenezer Blackwell are among the honoured correspondents of the period.*

## PEACEFUL AND STEADY PROGRESS

JANUARY 14, 1764, TO FEBRUARY 28, 1766

*To Samuel Furly*

LONDON, January 14, 1764.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I shall never think much of paying postage of a letter from *you*. We are all here now in great peace; and God is both widening and deepening His work.

In that text I generally consider (1) what is implied in 'gaining the whole world'; (2) what in losing men's own souls; and show (3) what an ill bargain it would be to gain an whole world at that price.<sup>1</sup>

I hope you are still pressing on to the mark and counting all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ.—  
I am  
Your affectionate brother.

*To John Valton*

Valton had been ordered to Purfleet in December 1763 to do duty at the King's Magazines. Mrs. Edwards, the wife of an officer and the only Methodist in that part of the country, showed him special kindness. He left off his 'grosser sins,' but 'began to despair of salvation.' 'At length, encouraged by my friends, I unbosomed my whole heart to Mr. Wesley in an anonymous letter, soliciting his advice. The answer I beg leave to transcribe for the benefit of those who may be in the same state.' Valton says: 'This letter seemed fraught with impossibilities, and I should have misconstrued the whole had not Mrs. Edwards explained it, and very much to my satisfaction.' See *Wesley's Veterans*, vi. 6-9; and letter of March 1, 1769, to him.

LONDON, January 31, 1764.

It is certainly right with all possible care to abstain from all outward evil. But this profits only a little. The *inward change* is the one thing needful for *you*. You must be born again, or you will never gain an uniform and lasting liberty.

<sup>1</sup> See sermon on The Important Question in *Works*, vi. 493-505; and letter of March 6.



Your whole soul is diseased, or rather dead—dead to God, dead in sin. Awake, then, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give you light. To seek for a particular deliverance from one sin only is mere labour lost. If it could be attained, it would be little worth, for another would arise in its place. But, indeed, it cannot before there is a general deliverance from the guilt and power of sin. This is the thing which you want, and which you should be continually seeking for. You want to be justified freely from all things, through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ. It might be of use if you should read over the first volume of *Sermons* seriously and with prayer. Indeed, nothing will avail without prayer. Pray, whether you can or not. When you are cheerful, and when you are heavy, still pray; pray with many or with few words, or with none at all: you will surely find an answer of peace, and why not now?—I am

Your servant for Christ's sake.

*To his Brother Charles*

LONDON, March 1, 1764.

DEAR BROTHER,—If the parties require it, I will re-hear the cause of William Warren and Abraham Ore<sup>1</sup>; but I do not apprehend there is anything to be said more than what you have heard already.

I read Rollin's *Belles-Lettres*<sup>2</sup> several years ago. Some things I liked; some I did not. Mark in him what you admire, and I will give it a second reading and a farther consideration.

You 'have no thoughts of venturing to London before May'! Then I must indeed 'do the best I can.' So I will comply with the advice of the Stewards, as well as my own judgement, and insist upon John Jones's assisting me on Sunday.<sup>3</sup> I have delayed all this time purely out of tenderness to *you*. Adieu!

<sup>1</sup> Evidently some disputed matter in Bristol.

<sup>2</sup> The publication of extracts from the French historian was probably under consideration, but nothing was done.

<sup>3</sup> He was compelled to ask Jones to assist in the heavy sacramental services. See *Journal*, v. 47*n*; and letter of Sept. 3, 1756, to Nicholas Norton.

*To Mrs. Freeman*

Mrs. Freeman's husband had much to do with the erection of the chapel in Gravel Walk, Dublin. He died of fever caught when visiting a member of his class. His wife became one of the pillars of the Dublin Society. See Crookshank's *Methodism in Ireland*, i. 239, 254; *W.H.S.* xiv. 56; and letter of June 7, 1762.

LONDON, March 2, 1764.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Such love as yours is need not be ashamed. You must make me amends for anything past that looks unkind by altering it for the time to come.

You have no reason to doubt of the work of God. It partly shines by its own light. And when that is not sufficient (as in times of temptation), a clear witness shall be super-added. And see that you strengthen your brethren, particularly those who are tempted to give up their confidence. O lift up the hands that hang down! Help those especially who did once taste of pure love.

My will has nothing to do in my coming over this spring. If a ship be ready, I shall embark.

O Jenny, look up and receive more!—I am

Your affectionate brother.

To Mrs. Jane Freeman.

*To Samuel Furly*

LEWISHAM, March 6, 1764.

DEAR SAMMY,—After showing what is implied in 'gaining the whole world,' and what in 'losing our own soul,'<sup>1</sup> I ask, How is it possible that any man should consent to gain the whole world at the price of losing his own soul? How amazing is it that any man living should do this! But, in order to abate this amazement, consider the suppositions on which he proceeds: (1) that a life of sin is a life of happiness; (2) that a life of religion is a life of misery; and (3) that he shall certainly live twenty, forty, or sixty years. Under the second of these articles you have a fair occasion of describing both false and true religion.

For eight or ten weeks Mr. Maxfield has been laid up by a lingering illness. This has contributed not a little to the

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Jan. 14.

peace of our Society, who in general mind one thing—to save their own souls, and seldom strike first, though they sometimes strike again, especially when they are attacked without fear or wit, which has generally been the case.

You have encouragement to go on at Slaithwaite, seeing already your labour is not in vain. I hope you add private to public application, visiting the poor people from house to house, and distributing little books. By this means only that deplorable ignorance will be removed.

I doubt you had a dunce for a tutor at Cambridge, and so *set out* wrong. Did he never tell you that, of all men living, a clergyman should '*talk* with the vulgar'? yea, and *write*, imitating the language of the *common people* throughout, so far as consists with purity and *propriety* of speech? <sup>1</sup> *Easiness*, therefore, is the first, second, and third point; and *stiffness*, *apparent* exactness, *artificialness* of style the main defect to be avoided, next to solecism and impropriety. You *point* wrong, Sammy: you aim at a wrong *mark*. If he was a standard for any one (which I cannot possibly allow), yet Dr. Middleton <sup>2</sup> is no standard for a preacher—no, not for a preacher before the University. His diction is stiff, formal, affected, unnatural. The art glares, and therefore shocks a man of true taste. Always to talk or write like him would be as absurd as always to walk in minuet step. O tread natural, tread easy, only not careless. Do not blunder or shamle into impropriety. If you *will* imitate, imitate Mr. Addison or Dr. Swift. You will then both save trouble and do more good.—I am, with love to Nancy, dear Sammy,

Your ever affectionate brother.

### To Mrs. Ryan

Miss Bosanquet had moved from Hoxton on March 24, 1763, to The Cedars, Leytonstone, with her friend Mrs. Ryan, who wrote to Wesley on March 6, 1764: 'Honoured and Dear Sir, I have often heard you do not take those persons to be real friends who reprove or tell you what they think wrong; but cleave to those who always

<sup>1</sup> For Wesley's own method of learning to be simple and easily understood, see Telford's *Wesley*, pp. 315-16; and letter of July 15.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Jan. 4, 1749.

give praise and respect, though sometimes only from the teeth outward.' She says: 'I am nearly concerned for your prosperity, because I have received more good through *you* than any other person in the world, and likewise on account of our Lord's glory in the world and among His people, whom my soul loveth.' Her intimate description of 'how our Lord deals with my own soul' explains Wesley's questions. As to her charge, he knows not the men who thus flatter him. She replied on April 5: 'Your questions are very weighty, and such as are not to be answered without deep consideration. . . . I have not lost that child-like, holy affection which I have ever felt for you. God knoweth I regard you more like a natural parent.' See letter of April 23 to her.

WEDNESBURY, March 25, 1764.

MY DEAR SISTER,—I am glad you wrote, and that you write so freely. There needs no reserve between you and me. It is very easy for you to judge concerning what you have heard. Who are they that 'always praise me'? (that is, to my face). I really know none such. *You* are said to do so. But I think you are clear of the accusation. Certain it is, then, I cleave to none *upon this account*. For I know not the men.

But you 'do not take those to be your real friends who tell you what they think wrong.' Do I not take Sally Ryan and Mary Bosanquet to be my real friends? And certainly they have told me more of this kind than all the world besides.

Do you now find an uninterrupted communion with God? Is He in *all* your thoughts? In what sense do you pray always and in everything give thanks? Are you always happy? Is your will wholly subject to the will of God? Do you feel no repugnance to any of His dispensations? Continue to pray for, my dear sister,

Your affectionate brother.

To Thomas Hartley

In 1764 Thomas Hartley, Rector of Winwick, Northants, published *Paradise Restored: or a Testimony to the Doctrine of the Blessed Millennium, or Christ's Glorious Reign with His Saints on Earth*. To which is added *A Short Defence of the Mystical Writers*, written against *The Doctrine of Grace*, issued by Bishop Warburton in 1763. Hartley was a friend of Lady Huntingdon, a scholar, and a devout Christian. Wesley began to read his work on February 5, and gives his impressions in the *Journal*, v. 46. See Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 518-25; and letter of November 26, 1762.

DERBY, *March 27, 1764.*

DEAR SIR,—Your book on the Millennium and the Mystic writers was lately put into my hands. I cannot but thank you for your strong and seasonable confirmation of that comfortable doctrine, of which I cannot entertain the least doubt as long as I believe the Bible. I thank you likewise for your remarks on that bad performance of the Bishop of Gloucester, which undoubtedly tears up by the roots all real, internal religion. Yet at the same time I cannot but bewail your vehement attachment to the Mystic writers; with whom I conversed much for several years, and whom I then admired perhaps more than you do now. But I found at length an absolute necessity of giving up either them or the Bible. So after some time I fixed my choice, to which I hope to adhere to my life's end. It is only the extreme attachment to these which can account for the following words in your *Defence*: 'Mr. Wesley does in several parts of his Journals lay down some marks of the new birth, not only doubtful but exceptionable, as particularly where persons appeared agitated or convulsed under the ministry, which might be owing to other causes rather than any regenerating work of God's Spirit' (page 385).

Is this true? In what one part of my Journals do I lay down any doubtful, much less exceptionable, marks of the new birth? In no part do I lay down those agitations or convulsions as any marks of it at all; nay, I expressly declare the contrary in those very words which the Bishop himself cites from my Journal. I declare, 'These are of a disputable nature: they may be from God; they may be from nature; they may be from the devil.' How is it, then, that you tell all the world Mr. Wesley lays them down in his Journals as marks of the new birth?

Is it kind? Would it not have been far more kind, suppose I had spoken wrong, to tell me of it in a private manner? How much more unkind was it to accuse me to all the world of a fault which I never committed!

Is it wise thus to put a sword into the hands of our common enemy? Are we not both fighting the battle of our Lord against the world as well as the flesh and the devil? And shall I furnish them with weapons against you, or you against me?

Fine diversion for the children of the devil! And how much more would they be diverted if I would furnish my quota of the entertainment by falling upon you in return! But I bewail the change in your spirit: you have not gained more lowliness or meekness since I knew you. O beware! You did not use to despise any one. This you have gained from the authors you admire. They do not express anger toward their opponents, but contempt in the highest degree. And this, I am afraid, is far more antichristian, more diabolical, than the other. The God of love deliver you and me from this spirit and fill us with the mind that was in Christ. So prays, dear sir,  
Your still affectionate brother.

To Mr. —

SHEFFIELD, March 29, 1764.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—Is it true that you have baptized several children since the Conference? If it is, I cannot but interpret it as a clear renunciation of connexion with us. And if this be the case, it will not be proper for you to preach any longer in our Societies. But the land is wide. You have room enough to turn to the right hand or to the left.—I am  
Your affectionate brother.

### To Various Clergymen

Wesley says in his *Journal* for April 19, 1764: 'I wrote a letter to-day, which after some time I sent to forty or fifty clergymen, with the little preface annexed.' A list is given in the *Journal*, v. 63*n*; and also, on pages 63-6, the answers received from Richard Hart, Vicar of St. George's, Bristol, W. S. (Walter Sellon<sup>1</sup>), and Vincent Perronet. At the Conference in Leeds on August 4, 1769, Wesley read a paper in which he says: 'Out of fifty or sixty to whom I wrote, only three vouchsafed me an answer. So I give this up. I can do no more. They are a rope of sand; and such they will continue.' Edward Perronet says the original letter was sent to Lord Dartmouth; and this is confirmed by the one to Lady Huntingdon. See *Minutes*, i. 87-9; *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, 1849, p. 1297; and letter of August 4, 1769.

SCARBOROUGH, April 19, 1764.

REVEREND SIR,—Near two years and an half ago<sup>2</sup> I wrote the following letter. You will please to observe (1) that

<sup>1</sup> Edward Perronet says it was Walter Sellon.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Marriott dates it 'Lewisham, 16-19 Nov. 1761.'



labourers who are ministers of the Church of England. These are chiefly :

Mr. Perronet, Romaine, Newton, Shirley ;

Mr. Downing, Jesse, Adam ;

Mr. Talbot, Riland, Stillingfleet, Fletcher ;

Mr. Johnson, Baddiley, Andrews, Jane ;

Mr. Hart, Symes, Brown, Rouquet ;

Mr. Sellon, [Cooper, Harmer, Gwen] ;

Mr. Venn, Richardson, Burnett, Furly ;

Mr. Conyers, Bentley, King ;

Mr. Berridge, Hicks, John Wesley, Charles Wesley, John Richardson, Benjamin Colley<sup>1</sup> : not excluding any other clergyman who agrees in these essentials,—

I. Original Sin.

II. Justification by Faith.

III. Holiness of Heart and Life, provided their life be answerable to their doctrine.

‘But what union would you desire among these?’ Not an union in opinions: they might agree or disagree touching absolute decrees on the one hand and perfection on the other. Not an union in expressions: these may still speak of the imputed righteousness and those of the merits of Christ. Not an union with regard to outward order: some may still remain quite regular, some quite irregular, and some partly regular and partly irregular. But, these things being as they are, as each is persuaded in his own mind, is it not a most desirable thing that we should—

i. Remove hindrances out of the way? not judge one another, not despise one another, not envy one another? not be displeased at one another’s gifts or success, even though greater than our own? not wait for one another’s halting, much less wish for it or rejoice therein?

Never speak disrespectfully, slightly, coldly, or unkindly of each other? never repeat each other’s faults, mistakes, or infirmities, much less listen for and gather them up? never say or do anything to hinder each other’s usefulness either directly or indirectly?

<sup>1</sup> The first edition includes Mr. Edward Perronet adds, ‘Cooper, Crook, Mr. Eastwood, and ‘G. W.’ Harmer, Gwen.’



Is it not a most desirable thing that we should—

2. Love as brethren? think well of and honour one another? wish all good, all grace, all gifts, all success, yea greater than our own, to each other? expect God will answer our wish, rejoice in every appearance thereof, and praise Him for it? readily believe good of each other, as readily as we once believed evil?

Speak respectfully, honourably, kindly of each other? defend each other's character? speak all the good we can of each other? recommend one another where we have influence? each help the other on in his work, and enlarge his influence by all the honest means he can?

This is the union which I have long sought after; and is it not the duty of every one of us so to do? Would it not be far better for ourselves? a means of promoting both our holiness and happiness? Would it not remove much guilt from those who have been faulty in any of these instances? and much pain from those who have kept themselves pure? Would it not be far better for the people, who suffer severely from the clashings and contentions of their leaders, which seldom fail to occasion many unprofitable, yea hurtful, disputes among them? Would it not be better even for the poor, blind world, robbing them of their sport, 'Oh they cannot agree among themselves'? Would it not be better for the whole work of God, which would then deepen and widen on every side?

'But it will never be; it is utterly impossible.' Certainly it is with men. Who imagines we can do this? that it can be effected by any human power? All nature is against it, every infirmity, every wrong temper and passion; love of honour and praise, of power, of pre-eminence; anger, resentment, pride; long-contracted habit, and prejudice lurking in ten thousand forms. The devil and all his angels are against it. For if this takes place, how shall his kingdom stand? All the world, all that know not God, are against it, though they may seem to favour it for a season. Let us settle this in our hearts, that we may be utterly cut off from all dependence on our own strength or wisdom.

But surely 'with God all things are possible'; therefore

'all things are possible to him that believeth': and this union is proposed only to them that believe, that show their faith by their works.

When Mr. Conyers was objecting the impossibility of ever effecting such an union, I went upstairs, and after a little prayer opened Kempis on these words: *Expecta Dominum: Viriliter age: Noli diffidere: Noli discedere; sed corpus et animam expone constanter pro gloria Dei.*<sup>1</sup>—I am, dear sir,

Your affectionate servant.

### To the Countess of Huntingdon

The previous letter was sent by Wesley the next day to Lady Huntingdon, with a special opening and closing paragraph. Six names are added to the list of clergy:—Madan, Haweis, Hartley, Baddiley<sup>2</sup> (of Hayfield), Crook, Eastwood. Four are omitted: Newton, J. Richardson, Rouquet, B. Colley. Symes is probably the Sims of the Huntingdon letter. For the full letter, which differs in some details, see *W.H.S.* xii. 29–34.

WHITBY, April 20, 1764.

MY LADY,—Since I had the pleasure of seeing your Ladyship, I have had many thoughts upon the subject of our conversation; the result I here send to your Ladyship, which I have as yet communicated to none but my Lord Dartmouth.

Who knows but it may please God to make your Ladyship an instrument in this glorious work? in effecting an union among the labourers in His vineyard? That He may direct and bless you in all your steps is the prayer of, my Lady,

Your Ladyship's affectionate and obedient servant.

### To Mrs. Ryan

In answer to Mrs. Ryan's letter of April 5 Wesley sent another set of questions. See letter of March 25.

<sup>1</sup> *Imitation*, III. xxxv. 3: 'Wait for the Lord. Quit thyself like a man. Yield not to distrust. Be unwilling to depart (desert); but con-

stantly expose body and soul for the glory of God.'

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Oct. 31, 1755.

HUTTON RUDBY, April 23, 1764.

Do you always find a *direct witness* that you are saved from sin? How long have you had this? Have you as *clear* and *strong* an evidence of eternal as of temporal things? Do you never find what they call 'lowness of spirits'? How far do you find *wandering thoughts*?

Mrs Ryan replied on May 4: 'From the day I wrote last to you my time has been a time of love indeed . . . I do love God with all my heart. My will and affections never wander from Him, and He does give me a *direct witness* that He has saved me *thus*. I first received this near eight years ago, but through my inexperience of human nature it has not always remained unclouded, though it is so now.' She answers wisely as to lowness of spirits and wandering thoughts. Then she turns to Wesley. 'You are apt to worship God in His children. I mean you *cleave* too much to those whom you believe to be dear to God. You do not let the help you receive from them raise your heart to God Himself, that, while you love for His sake, you may be free from them, finding Jesus *nearest* to your heart . . . I think you should not speak of yourself but to *real friends* and such as know the temptations you are exposed to.' In a letter on October 31 she says, 'The depth of your questions surpasses my understanding', and replies concerning lowness of spirits and wandering thoughts.

### To Mrs. Woodhouse

Elizabeth, only daughter of John Harvey, Vicar of Finningley, six or seven miles from Epworth, was from her 'early years a model of every virtue.' She had been well trained by her aunt, Miss Harvey, of Hinxworth, near Biggleswade, to whom Wesley paid many visits, and at whose house he met Charles Simeon. Her niece married Gervase Woodhouse, of Owston, three miles from Epworth. Wesley preached several times in Finningley Church, and gives an interesting account of 'Mr. Harvey's domain' in the *Journal*, vii. 414. See Sutcliffe's manuscript *History of Methodism*, p. 973, *W H.S.* v 203, and letter of December 26, 1789

HUTTON RUDBY, April 23, 1764.

MY DEAR SISTER,—I have often thought of you since I saw you. Your openness gave me much pleasure, and I found I could speak as freely to you as if we had been acquainted for many years. You seem to me to have suffered loss for want of Christian conversation. Your mind was open to instruction or advice. You did not shun it; rather you panted after it. But, alas, how few had you to advise with! how

few to lead you on in the royal way ! I believe I do not wrong you when I say your heart is panting after Christ. You desire all that He has purchased for you :

A pardon written in His blood,  
The favour and the peace of God ; . . .  
The speechless awe that dares not move,  
And all the silent heaven of love.<sup>1</sup>

And all things are ready ! Behold the Lamb of God ! Is He not at your right hand ? Look unto Jesus ! Take the blessing ! Do not delay ! *Now* is the accepted time ! Believe, and all is yours !—I am, my dear sister,  
Your affectionate brother.

I shall stay two or three weeks at Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

To Mrs. Woodhouse, At Mr. Hutton's,  
In Epworth, Near Thorne, Yorkshire.

*To George Merryweather*

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, May 7, 1764.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I thank you for the receipts. There is nothing more sure than that God is able and willing to give always what He gives once. And it is most certainly His design that whatever He has given you should abide with you for ever. But this can only be by simple faith. In this, reasoning is good for nothing. See that both of you be as little children ! Your help is all laid up above in the hand of Him that loves you. Look unto Him, and receive what you want ! Believe yourselves to heaven !—I am  
Your affectionate brother.

*To Thomas Newall*

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, May 7, 1764.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—Pray tell Brother Johnson<sup>2</sup> I am satisfied about the horse. I don't know what rules they are which he speaks of.

<sup>1</sup> From *Hymns and Sacred Poems*.  
See *Poetical Works of J. and C. Wesley*, v. 64.

<sup>2</sup> John or Thomas Johnson. See notes in letters of Sept. 3, 1756 (to Samuel Walker), and June 23, 1760.

I suppose the Conference will begin at Bristol the second week in August.<sup>1</sup>

I have often complained that most of our preachers were unfaithful to each other, not [saying] freely to each other what they thought amiss. I doubt that has been the case between you and John Atlay.<sup>2</sup> 'Tis well if you have spoke freely to him. You don't know what good you might do thereby. An hint or two will do nothing. Take the opportunity when you give him my letter, and your labour will not be in vain.

Press all our believers strongly and explicitly to go on to perfection.—I am  
Your affectionate brother.

For the present *you* must act as an Assistant.

To Mr. Newall, At Mr. John Hall's,  
In Newgate Street, London.

### *To Cradock Glascott*

Cradock Glascott, M.A., afterwards Vicar of Hatherleigh, Devon, was probably the son of Thomas Glascott, of Cardiff, who was present at the Conferences of 1746 and 1756, and brother of John Glascott, who found peace at Kingswood School in 1768. See *Journal*, ii. 294d, iii. 241n, v. 259, and letter of December 6, 1739.

John Crosse, son of Hammond Crosse, a Middlesex magistrate, was converted under the preaching of Alexander Coates in London, and joined the Society at West Street. He went to Oxford, then in 1765 travelled for three years on the Continent with John Thornton, cousin of the Clapham philanthropist, afterwards he was Curate of Cross Stone and Todmorden, then ten years at Whitechapel, in the parish of Birstall, near Leeds. In 1784 his father purchased the advowson of Bradford, and he was vicar there till 1816. See *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, 1844, pp. 1-9, 89-105, W Morgan's *The Parish Priest*, 1841.

This letter was given in 1833 to the Wesleyan Church at Stroud by the Rev. Thomas Glascott, son of Cradock Glascott.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, May 13, 1764.

DEAR SIR,—It is an unspeakable blessing that God has given you to taste of the powers of the world to come. And He is willing to give always what He gives once. You need lose nothing of what you have received; rather expect to receive

<sup>1</sup> The Conference began on Aug. 6. Book Steward. See letter of May

<sup>2</sup> Atlay was afterwards Wesley's 6, 1774, to him.

more every moment, grace upon grace. And be not content till you are a Christian altogether, till your soul is all love, till you can rejoice evermore and pray without ceasing and in everything give thanks.

If you are not already, it might be of use to you to be acquainted with Mr. Crosse, of Edmund Hall. He has a sound judgement and an excellent temper ; and you have need of every help, that you may not lose what God hath wrought, but may have a full reward.

A little tract wrote by Bishop Bull, entitled *A Companion for Candidates for Holy Orders*,<sup>1</sup> was of much service to me. In order to be well acquainted with the doctrines of Christianity you need but one book (beside the New Testament)—Bishop Pearson *On the Creed*. This I advise you to read and master throughly : it is a library in one volume. But above all be much in prayer, and God will withhold no manner of thing that is good !—I am

Your affectionate servant.

To Mr. Cradock Glascott,  
Jesus College, Oxon.

### *To the Countess of Huntingdon*

Wesley had sent his letter of April 20 to Lady Huntingdon. The Conference referred to met in Bristol on August 6. Wesley writes in his *Journal*, v. 91 : 'The great point I now laboured for was a good understanding with all our brethren of the clergy who are heartily engaged in propagating vital religion.' John Pawson says : 'Twelve of those gentlemen attended our Conference in Bristol, in order to prevail with Mr. Wesley to withdraw the preachers from every parish where there was an awakened minister ; and Mr. Charles Wesley honestly told us that if he was a settled minister in any particular place we should not preach there. To whom Mr. Hampson replied, "I would preach there, and never ask your leave, and should have as good a right to do so as you would have." Mr. Charles Wesley's answer was in a strain of High Church eloquence indeed ! But I leave it. His prediction was never accomplished, nor can be. However, these gentlemen failed in their attempt that time ; Mr. Wesley would not give up his Societies to them.'

<sup>1</sup> Wesley's father says in his *Advice to a Young Clergyman* : 'Bishop Bull comes next for their subject and way of thinking and

arguing : a strong and nervous writer, whose discourses and addresses to his clergy can scarce be too often read.' See letter of Feb. 19, 1755.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, May 16, 1764.

MY DEAR LADY,—I am much obliged to your Ladyship for your encouraging answer, which plainly speaks an heart devoted to God and longing for the furtherance of His kingdom. I have likewise received an exceeding friendly letter from Mr. Hart,<sup>1</sup> testifying a great desire of union between the preachers of the gospel. Only he carries the point considerably farther than I do, proposing a free debate concerning our several opinions. Now this, I fear, we are not yet able to bear: I fear it might occasion some sharpness of expression, if not of spirit too, which might tear open the wounds before they are fully closed. I am far from being assured that I could bear it myself, and perhaps others might be as weak as me. To me, therefore, it still seems most expedient to avoid disputings of every kind—at least, for a season, till we have tasted each other's spirits and confirmed our love to each other. I own freely I am sick of disputing; I am weary to bear it. My whole soul cries out 'Peace! Peace!'—at least, with the children of God, that we may all unite our strength to carry on the war against the 'rulers of the darkness of this world.' Still, I ask but one thing; I can require no more,—'Is thy heart right, as my heart is with thine? If it be, give me thy hand, let us take sweet counsel together and strengthen each other in the Lord.'

If it should be (God forbid) that I should find none to join with me therein, I will (by God's help) comply with it myself. None can hinder this. And I think my brother will be like-minded—yea, and all who act in connexion with us. Probably it might contribute much to this end, if those of our brethren who have opportunity would be at Bristol on Thursday, the 9th of August. We might then spend a few hours in free conversation, either apart from or in conjunction with the other preachers. I apprehend, if your Ladyship could then be near, it might be of excellent service in confirming any kind and friendly disposition which our Lord might plant in the hearts of His servants. Surely, if this can be effectually done, we shall again see Satan as lightning fall from heaven.

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal*, v. 63-4; and letter of July 11, 1763.

Then

The children of thy faith and prayer  
Thy joyful eyes shall see,  
Shall see the prosperous Church, and share  
In her prosperity !<sup>1</sup>

—I am, my dear Lady,  
Your Ladyship's most affectionate and obedient servant.

To his Brother Charles

HADDINGTON, May 25, 1764.

DEAR BROTHER,—Is there any reason why you and I should have no farther intercourse with each other ? I know none ; although possibly there are persons in the world who would not be sorry for it. I hope you find peace and unity in the South, as we do in the North. Only the Seceders and Mr. Sandeman's friends are ready to eat us up. And no wonder ; for these, as well as Deists and Socinians, I oppose *ex professo*. But how do Thomas Maxfield and his friends go on ? Quietly, or *gladiatorio animo* ? And how are John Jones, Downes, and Richardson ? and my best friend,<sup>2</sup> and yours ?

The frightful stories wrote from London had made all our preachers in the North afraid even to mutter about perfection ; and, of course, the people on all sides were grown good Calvinists in that point. 'Tis what I foresaw from the beginning—that the devil would strive by T. Maxfield and company to drive perfection out of the kingdom.

O let you and I hold fast whereunto we have attained, and let our yea be yea and our nay be nay ! I feel the want of some about me that are all faith and love. No man was more profitable to me than George Bell while he was simple of heart. Oh for heat and light united ! My love to Sally. Adieu.

To Dorothy Furlly

EDINBURGH, May 28, 1764.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Certainly it would be right to spend some time in setting down both the outward providences of God and the inward leadings and workings of His Spirit as far

<sup>1</sup> *Poetical Works of J. and C.*    <sup>2</sup> His wife.  
Wesley, viii. 245.



as you can remember them. But observe withal you are called to be a good steward of the mammon of unrighteousness. You must therefore think of this too in its place, only without anxiety. Otherwise that neglect of your calling will hinder the work of God in your heart. You are not serving mammon by this, but serving Christ : it is part of the task which He has assigned you. Yet it is true your heart is to be free all the time ; and see that you stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free.

I thought your name had been altered before now.<sup>1</sup> In a new station you will have need of new watchfulness. Still redeem the time, be steadily serious, and follow your own conscience in all things.—I am, my dear sister,

Your affectionate brother.

In my return from the Highlands, I expect to spend a day at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, the 18th or 19th of June.

### To Matthew Errington

Wesley had found no supply of his books in Edinburgh, and takes immediate steps to repair what he deems a grave omission. The words and figures in brackets were written by Errington to show what numbers he had in stock. See letter of September 11, 1765.

EDINBURGH, May 30, 1764.

O Matthew, how is this ? There is not one *Milton* here, nor one set of the *Philosophy*. Pray send immediately twelve sets of the *Philosophy* and twenty *Miltons*<sup>2</sup> (if you have more than twenty at Newcastle, for you must not be left without some) ; and see that they be here before I return, which I expect will be on Saturday fortnight. So on Tuesday fortnight, June 19, you will (if God permit) see me at Newcastle.

The word of God has free course in North Britain, even among honourable and right honourable sinners.—I am, with love to all, dear Matthew, Your affectionate brother.

I hope to spend two days with you and to preach at the Fell at three on Thursday, 21st.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of July 16, 1763, about her marriage to John Downes.

<sup>2</sup> Wesley's *Extract from Milton's 'Paradise Lost,'* 18mo, 322 pp.,

printed in 1763. Errington has written a figure 8 over the word *Miltons*.

- Send also 24 *Plain Accounts*. [None.]  
 50 *Character of a Methodist*.  
 100 *Rules of Society*. [60.]  
 30 *Primitive Physick* (if you have them).  
 12 *Earnest Appeals*. [None.]  
 30 *Answer to Bp. Warburton*. [20.]  
 20 *Kempis*. Lose not a day.  
 40 *Short Hymns*.

To Mr. Matthew Errington, At the  
 Orphan House, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Answered.<sup>1</sup>

### To Margaret Lewen

Miss Lewen, whom Wesley met on May 2, 1764, is described in his *Journal* as 'a remarkable monument of divine mercy. She is about two-and-twenty, and has about six hundred pounds a year in her own hands. Some months since, God spoke peace to her soul while she was wrestling with Him in private prayer. This was never entirely taken from her, even while she was almost alone. But she was often dull and faint, till she broke through all hindrances and joined heart and hand with the children of God.' She gave Wesley a chaise and a pair of horses, and was his devoted friend till she died at Miss Bosanquet's in Leytonstone on October 30, 1766. See letters of July 9 (to his brother Charles) and November 7, 1766.

Wesley here gives his friend the same careful advice as he once gave Ann Granville and was now giving Samuel Furlly. See also letter of September 8, 1781, to his niece Sarah Wesley.

[June 1764.]

1. You want to know God, in order to enjoy Him in time and in eternity.

2. All that you want to know of Him is contained in one book, the Bible. Therefore your one point is to understand this. And all you learn is to be referred to this, as either directly or remotely conducive to it.

3. Might it not be well, then, to spend at least two hours every day in reading and meditating upon the Bible? reading every morning (if not every evening too) a portion of the Old and then of the New Testament? If you would save yourself the trouble of thinking, add Mr. Henry's *Comment*: if you would only be assisted in thinking, add the *Explanatory Notes*.

<sup>1</sup> Errington's note.

Your whole soul is diseased, or rather dead—dead to God, dead in sin. Awake, then, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give you light. To seek for a particular deliverance from one sin only is mere labour lost. If it could be attained, it would be little worth, for another would arise in its place. But, indeed, it cannot before there is a general deliverance from the guilt and power of sin. This is the thing which you want, and which you should be continually seeking for. You want to be justified freely from all things, through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ. It might be of use if you should read over the first volume of *Sermons* seriously and with prayer. Indeed, nothing will avail without prayer. Pray, whether you can or not. When you are cheerful, and when you are heavy, still pray; pray with many or with few words, or with none at all: you will surely find an answer of peace, and why not now?—I am

Your servant for Christ's sake.

To his Brother Charles

LONDON, March 1, 1764.

DEAR BROTHER,—If the parties require it, I will re-hear the cause of William Warren and Abraham Ore<sup>1</sup>; but I do not apprehend there is anything to be said more than what you have heard already.

I read Rollin's *Belles-Lettres*<sup>2</sup> several years ago. Some things I liked; some I did not. Mark in him what you admire, and I will give it a second reading and a farther consideration.

You 'have no thoughts of venturing to London before May'! Then I must indeed 'do the best I can.' So I will comply with the advice of the Stewards, as well as my own judgement, and insist upon John Jones's assisting me on Sunday.<sup>3</sup> I have delayed all this time purely out of tenderness to you. Adieu!

<sup>1</sup> Evidently some disputed matter in Bristol.

<sup>2</sup> The publication of extracts from the French historian was probably under consideration, but nothing was done.

<sup>3</sup> He was compelled to ask Jones to assist in the heavy sacramental services. See *Journal*, v. 47*n*; and letter of Sept. 3, 1756, to Nicholas Norton.

Glasgow [Edinburgh] abridgement of Mr. Hutchinson's *Works*.<sup>1</sup> The abridgers give not only all his sense, but all his spirit. You may add to these the beautiful tracts of Lord Forbes; and, if you would go a little farther, Mr. Baker's ingenious *Treatise on the Microscope*.

12. With any or all of the foregoing studies you may intermix that of History. Geography and Chronology are termed the two eyes of history. Geography has been mentioned before; and I think all you want of Chronology may be learned from Marshall's *Chronological Tables*.

13. You may begin with Rollin's *Ancient History*; and afterwards read in order, Puffendorf's *Introduction to the History of Europe*, the *Concise Church History*, Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, the *Concise History of England*, Clarendon's *History of the Great Rebellion*, Neal's *History of the Puritans*, his *History of New England*, and Solis's *History of the Conquest of Mexico*.

14. Whitby's *Compendium of Metaphysics* will introduce you to that science. You may go on with Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding*; Bishop Browne on the *Nature, Procedure, and Limits of Human Understanding*; and Malebranche's *Search after Truth*.

15. For Poetry you may read Spenser's *Faery Queen*; Fairfax's or Hoole's *Godfrey of Bulloigne*; select parts of Shakespeare; *Paradise Lost*; the *Night Thoughts*; and *Moral and Sacred Poems*.

16. You are glad to begin and end with Divinity. But I must not expatiate here. I will only recommend to your careful perusal Bishop Pearson *On the Creed*, Mr. Nelson's *Sermons*, and the *Christian Library*.

This course of study, if you have the resolution to go through it, will, I apprehend, take you up three, four, or five years, according to the degree of your health and of your application. And you will then have knowledge enough for any reasonable Christian. But remember, before all, in all, and above all, your great point is to know the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent.—I am, dear Miss Lewen,

Your affectionate brother.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Nov. 26, 1756.

*To Lady Maxwell*

Miss Darcy Brisbane married Sir Walter Maxwell, Bart., of Pollock. Her husband died two years after, and six weeks later she lost her son and only child. Wesley became acquainted with her in 1764. He was in Edinburgh on May 27, and again on June 16.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, June 20, 1764.

Will it be agreeable to my dear Lady Maxwell that I trouble her with a letter so soon? and that I write with so little ceremony? that I use no compliment, but all plainness of speech? If it be not, you must tell me so, and I shall know better how to speak for the time to come. Indeed, it would be displeasing to me to use reserve: the regard I feel for you strongly inclines me to 'think aloud,' to tell you every thought which rises in my heart. I think God has taken unusual pains, so to speak, to make you a Christian;—a Christian indeed, not in name, worshipping God in spirit and in truth; having in you the mind that was in Christ, and walking as Christ also walked. He has given you affliction upon affliction; He has used every possible means to un hinge your soul from things of earth, that it might fix on Him alone. How far the design of His love has succeeded I could not well judge from a short conversation. Your Ladyship will therefore give me leave to inquire, Is the heaviness you frequently feel merely owing to weakness of body and the loss of near relations? I will hope it is not. It might, indeed, at first spring from these outward pressures. But did not the gracious Spirit of God strike in, and take occasion from these to convince you of sin, of unbelief, of the want of Christ? And is not the sense of this one great cause, if not the greatest, of your present distress? If so, the greatest danger is, either that you should stifle that conviction, not suffering yourself to be convinced that you are all sin, the chief of sinners; or that you should heal the wound slightly, that you should rest before you know Christ is yours, before His Spirit witnesses with your spirit that you are a child of God. My dear Lady, be not afraid to know yourself—yea, to know yourself as you are known. How soon, then, will you know your Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous! And why not this day? why not this hour? If you feel your want, I

beseech the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ to look upon you now! O give Thy servant power to believe! to see and feel how Thou hast loved her! Now let her sink down into the arms of Thy love; and say unto her soul, 'I am thy salvation.'

With regard to particular advices, I know not how far your Ladyship would have me to proceed. I would not be backward to do anything in my power; and yet I would not obtrude. But in any respect you may command, my dear Lady,

Your Ladyship's affectionate servant.

*To Miss J. C. March*

WHITEHAVEN, *June 24, 1764.*

You give me an agreeable account of the state of things in London, and such as calls for much thankfulness. From different letters I find that there is at length a calm season, God having rebuked the wind and the seas. But I am concerned for you. I cannot doubt a moment but you was saved from sin. Your every act, word, thought was love, whatever it be now. You was in a measure a living witness of the perfection I believe and preach—the only perfection of which we are capable while we remain in the body. To carry perfection higher is to sap the foundation of it and destroy it from the face of the earth. I am jealous over you: I am afraid lest, by grasping at a shadow, you should have let go the substance—lest, by aiming at a perfection which we cannot have till hereafter, you should cast away that which now belongs to the children of God. This is love filling the heart. Surely it did fill yours, and it may do now, by simple faith. O cast not away your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward! Converse much with those who are all alive, who strive not to pull you down but to build you up. Accursed be that humility by which shipwreck is made of the faith. Look up and receive power from on high. Receive all you had once, and more than all. Give no place to evil reasoning. You have need to be guarded by a steady and yet tender hand. Be as a little child. The Lord is at hand. He is yours; therefore shall you lack nothing.—I am, &c.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See letter of March 4, 1760.

*To Sarah Moore*

Thomas Bryant had been ordained by a Greek bishop in 1760, and wore a gown in the pulpit. This offended some Sheffield Methodists. Miss Moore and her mother, with whom Bryant lodged, warmly espoused his cause. James Eastwood writes to Miss Moore on July 23 : ' It gives me pleasure to hear that the people are recovering their senses.' The case led to a division of the Society. Bryant left Sheffield in March 1765 ; and when Wesley came there on the 21st, he found ' the little differences which had been for some time among the people were now easily adjusted.' The tranquillity was soon disturbed, for Bryant returned to Sheffield on May 22. His friends rallied round him, and built a chapel in Scotland Street, where he ministered for more than thirty years. See letter of December 8.

LEEDS, July 5, 1764.

MY DEAR SISTER,—I am fully convinced that T. Bryant's staying another year in the Sheffield Circuit would neither be good for him nor for the people. I know his strength, and I know his weakness. But he shall go no farther than the Leeds Circuit, from whence he may now and then step over to Sheffield, and the Sheffield preacher to Leeds.

Sally, see that you walk circumspectfully. The eyes of many are upon you ; and, above all, the eye of God !—I am  
Your affectionate brother.

*To Lady Maxwell*

MANCHESTER, July 10, 1764.

MY DEAR LADY,—Till I had the pleasure of receiving yours, I was almost in doubt whether you would think it worth your while to write or not. So much the more I rejoiced when that doubt was removed, and removed in so agreeable a manner. I cannot but think of you often : I seem to see you just by me, panting after God, under the heavy pressure of bodily weakness and faintness, bereaved of your dearest relatives, convinced that you are a sinner, a debtor that has nothing to pay, and just ready to cry out,

Jesu, now I have lost my all,  
Let me upon Thy bosom fall.

Amen, Lord Jesus ! Speak ; for Thy servant heareth !  
Speak Thyself into her heart ! Lift up the hands that hang  
down and the feeble knees. Let her see Thee full of grace

and truth, and make her glad with the light of Thy countenance.

Do not stop, my dear Lady, one moment 'because you have not felt sorrow enough.' Your Friend above has felt enough of it for you.

O Lamb of God, was ever pain,  
Was ever love like Thine !

Look, look unto Him, and be thou saved ! He is not a God afar off ; He is now hovering over you with eyes of tenderness and love ! Only believe ! Then He turns your heaviness into joy. Do not think you are not humble enough, not contrite enough, not earnest enough. You are nothing ; but Christ is all, and He is yours. The Lord God write it upon your heart, and take you for an habitation of God through the Spirit.

Oh that you may be ever as dead to the world as you are now ! I apprehend the greatest danger from that quarter. If you should be induced to seek happiness out of Christ, how soon would your good desires vanish ! especially if you should give way to the temptation to which your person, your youth, and your fortune will not fail to expose you. If you escape this snare. I trust you will be a real Christian, having the power as well as the form of religion. I expect you will then have likewise better health and spirits ; perhaps to-morrow. But O, take Christ to-day ! I long to have you happy in Him ! Surely few have a more earnest desire of your happiness than, my very dear Lady,

Your Ladyship's most affectionate servant.

### To a Gentleman

Wesley inserted this letter in his *Journal*, v. 83-5, with the words : 'To-day I wrote the following letter, which I desire may be seriously considered by those to whom it belongs.' It is a powerful and moving appeal for membership in the Society.

WIGAN, July 13, 1764.

DEAR SIR,—There was one thing when I was with you that gave me pain : you are not in the Society. But why not ? Are there not sufficient arguments for it to move any reasonable man ? Do you not hereby make an open confession of



Christ, of what you really believe to be His work, and of those whom you judge to be in a proper sense His people and His messengers? By this means do not you encourage His people and strengthen the hands of His messengers? And is not this the way to enter into the spirit and share the blessing of a Christian community? Hereby, likewise, you may have the benefit of the advices and exhortations at the meeting of the Society, and also of provoking one another at the private meetings to love and to good works.

The ordinary objections to such an union are of little weight with you. You are not afraid of the expense. You already give unto the Lord as much as you need do then; and you are not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, even in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation. Perhaps you will say, 'I am joined in affection.' True; but not to so good effect. This joining half-way, this being a friend to but not a member of the Society is by no means so open a confession of the work and servants of God. Many go thus far who dare not go farther, who are ashamed to bear the reproach of an entire union. Either you are ashamed or you are not. If you are, break through at once; if you are not, come into the light and do what those well-meaning cowards dare not do. This imperfect union is not so encouraging to the people, not so strengthening to the preachers. Rather it is weakening their hands, hindering their work, and laying a stumbling-block in the way of others; for what can any man think who knows you are so well acquainted with them and yet do not join in their Society? What can he think but that you know them too well to come any nearer to them, that you know that kind of union to be useless, if not hurtful? And yet by this very union is the whole (external) work of God upheld throughout the nation, besides all the spiritual good which accrues to each member. O delay no longer, for the sake of the work, for the sake of the world, for the sake of your brethren! Join them inwardly and outwardly, heart and hand, for the sake of your own soul. There is something not easily explained in the fellowship of the Spirit which we enjoy with a society of living Christians. You have no need to give up your share therein and in the various blessings

that result from it. You have no need to exclude yourself from the benefit of the advice and exhortations given from time to time. These are by no means to be despised, even supposing you have yourself more understanding than him that gives them. You need not lose the benefit of those prayers which experience shows are attended with a peculiar blessing. 'But I do not care to meet a class; I find no good in it.' Suppose you find even a dislike, a loathing of it; may not this be natural, or even diabolical? In spite of this, break through, make a fair trial. It is but a lion in the way. Meet only six times (with previous prayer), and see if it do not vanish away. But if it be a cross, still bear it for the sake of your brethren. 'But I want to gain my friends and relations.' If so, stand firm. If you give way, you hurt them and they will press upon you the more. If you do not, you will probably gain them; otherwise you confirm both their wrong notions and wrong tempers. Because I love you I have spoken fully and freely; to know that I have not spoken in vain will be a great satisfaction to

Your affectionate brother.

*To Ebenezer Blackwell*

LIVERPOOL, July 14, 1764.

DEAR SIR,—My brother informs me that you have been so extremely ill that your life was hardly expected.<sup>1</sup> I really am under apprehensions lest that chariot should cost you your life. If, after having been accustomed to ride on horseback for many years, you should now exchange an horse for a carriage, it cannot be that you should have good health. It is a vain thing to expect it. I judge of your case by my own. I must be on horseback for life, if I would be healthy. Now and then, indeed, if I could afford it, I should rest myself for fifty miles in a chaise; but without riding near as much as I do now, I must never look for health.<sup>2</sup>

In the meantime I trust both Mrs. Blackwell and you are looking for health of a nobler kind. You look to be filled

<sup>1</sup> Blackwell lived till 1782.

<sup>2</sup> In 1772 Wesley's friends bought him a carriage 'to prevent my riding on horseback, which I cannot

do quite so well since an hurt which I got some months ago.' See *Journal*, v. 447.

with the spirit of love and of an healthful mind. What avails everything else? everything that passes away as an arrow through the air?

The arrow is flown!  
The moment is gone!  
The millennial year

Rushes on to the view, and eternity's here!<sup>1</sup>

You want nothing more of this world. You have enough, and (by the peculiar blessing of God) know you have. But you want a thousand times more faith. You want love; you want holiness. The Lord God supply all your wants from the riches of His mercy in Christ Jesus!—I am, dear sir,

Your very affectionate servant.

Next week I shall set my face toward Bristol.

### To Samuel Furly

Wesley had been at Bradford on June 30. His admirable counsels to his young friend agree well with his own plan for securing clearness and simplicity. Bird's monument to Sir Cloudesley Shovel in Westminster Abbey with its huge periwig of flowing curls was severely censured by Horace Walpole and Addison. The lines from Pope are the closing ones of the *Elegy to an Unfortunate Lady*, published in 1717. Mrs. Weston, sister to Viscount Gage, was separated from her husband; but the quarrel was adjusted by the poet's influence. The variations from the original show that Wesley was quoting from memory. See *Spectator*, No. 26; letters of March 6 and October 11; and *Works*, xi. 418, for his estimate of Prior in 1782.

LIVERPOOL, July 15, 1764.

DEAR SAMMY,—I have had many thoughts, since we parted, on the subject of our late conversation. I send you them just as they occur. 'What is it that constitutes a good style?' Perspicuity and purity, propriety, strength, and easiness, joined together. Where any one of these is wanting, it is not a good style. Dr. Middleton's style wants easiness: it is *stiff* to an high degree. And stiffness in writing is full as great a fault as stiffness in behaviour. It is a blemish hardly to be excused, much less to be imitated. He is *pedantic*.

<sup>1</sup> *Hymns for New Year's Day*. See *Poetical Works of J. and C. Wesley*, vi. 14.

'It is pedantry,' says the great Lord Boyle, 'to use an hard word where an easier will serve.' Now, this the Doctor continually does, and that of set purpose. It is abundantly too artificial. *Artis est celare artem*<sup>1</sup>; but his art glares in every sentence. He continually says, 'Observe how fine I speak!' Whereas a good speaker seems to forget he speaks at all. His full round curls naturally put one in mind of Sir Cloudesley Shovel's peruke, that 'eternal buckle takes in Parian stone.'<sup>2</sup> Yet this very fault may appear a beauty to you, because you are apt to halt on the same foot. There is a stiffness both in your carriage and speech and something of it in your very familiarity. But for this very reason you should be jealous of yourself and guard against your natural infirmity. If you imitate any writer, let it be South, Atterbury, or Swift, in whom *all* the properties of a good writer meet. I was myself once much fonder of Prior than Pope; as I did not then know that stiffness was a fault. But what in all Prior can equal for beauty of style some of the first lines that Pope<sup>3</sup> ever published?—

Poets themselves must die,<sup>4</sup> like those they sung,  
Deaf the praised ear, and mute the tuneful tongue;  
E'en he whose heart now melts in tender<sup>5</sup> lays,  
Shall shortly want the generous tear he pays.  
Then from his eyes thy much-loved form<sup>6</sup> shall part;  
And the last pang shall tear thee from his heart:  
Life's idle business at one gasp be o'er,  
The Muse forgot, and thou beloved<sup>7</sup> no more.

Here is style! How clear, how pure, proper, strong! and yet how amazingly easy! This crowns all; no stiffness, no hard words; no *apparent* art, no affectation; all is natural, and therefore consummately beautiful. Go thou and *write* likewise.

As for me, I never think of my style at all; but just set down the words that come first. Only when I transcribe anything for the press, then I think it my duty to see every phrase be clear, pure, and proper. Conciseness (which is now,

<sup>1</sup> 'It is the perfection of art to conceal itself.'

<sup>2</sup> Pope's *Moral Essays*, iii. 295-6:

'That life-long wig which Gorgon's self might own,

Eternal buckle takes in Parian stone.'

<sup>3</sup> *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*.

<sup>4</sup> Fall. <sup>5</sup> Mournful. <sup>6</sup> Closing eyes thy form. <sup>7</sup> Be loved.

as it were, natural to me) brings *quantum sufficit* of strength. If, after all, I observe any stiff expression, I throw it out, neck and shoulders.

Clearness in particular is necessary for you and me, because we are to instruct people of the lowest understanding. Therefore we, above all, if we think with the wise, yet must speak with the vulgar. We should constantly use the most common, little, easy words (so they are pure and proper) which our language affords. When I had been a member of the University about ten years, I wrote and talked much as you do now. But when I talked to plain people in the Castle or the town, I observed they gaped and stared. This quickly obliged me to alter my style and adopt the language of those I spoke to. And yet there is a dignity in this simplicity, which is not disagreeable to those of the highest rank.

I advise you, Sammy, sacredly to abstain from reading any *stiff* writer. A bystander sees more than those that play the game. Your style is much hurt already. Indeed, something might be said if you was a learned infidel writing for money or reputation. But that is not the case: you are a Christian minister, speaking and writing to save souls. Have this end always in your eye, and you will never designedly use an hard word. Use all the sense, learning, and fire you have; forgetting yourself, and remembering only these are the souls for whom Christ died; heirs of an happy or miserable eternity!—I am, with love to Nancy, Your affectionate friend and brother.

The Rev. Mr. Furly, At the Rev. Mr. Venn's,  
In Huddersfield, Yorks.

### *To the Earl of Dartmouth*

LAMPETER, July 26, 1764.

MY LORD,—Upon an attentive consideration, it will appear to every impartial person that the uniting of the serious clergy in the manner I proposed in a former letter<sup>1</sup> is not a matter of indifferency, but what none can reject unless at the peril of his own soul. For every article therein mentioned is undeniably contained in the royal law, the law of love; and consequently the observance thereof is bound upon every man

<sup>1</sup> See letter of April 19.

as indispensably necessary to salvation. It will appear, farther, that every single person may observe it, whether the other will or no. For many years I, for instance, have observed this rule in every article. I labour to do so now; and will by God's help, whatever others do, observe it to the end.

I rejoice that your Lordship so heartily concurs in doing what is in your power to promote a general observance of it. Certainly this is not possible to be effected by merely human means; but it seems your Lordship has taken one good step towards it by communicating it to several. I am persuaded, at the same time, your Lordship's wish is that it might take place everywhere. The same step I purpose to take, by sending to each of those gentlemen the substance of what I wrote to your Lordship, and desiring them to tell me freely whatever objections they have against such an union. As many of those as are grounded on reason, I doubt not will be easily answered. Those only which spring from some wrong temper must remain till that temper is subdued. For instance: First, 'We cannot unite,' says one, 'because we cannot trust one another.' I answer to your reason or understanding, No matter whether we can or no. Thus far we must unite, trust or not; otherwise we sin against God. Secondly, I can trust you; why cannot you trust me? I can have no private end herein. I have neither personal hopes nor fears from you. I want nothing which you can give me; and I am not afraid of your doing me any hurt, though you may hurt yourself and the cause of God. But I cannot answer your envy, jealousy, pride, or credulity. As long as those remain, objections, however cut off, will spring up again like Hydra's heads.

If your Lordship has heard any objections, I should be glad to know them. May I be permitted to ask, Have not the objections you have heard made some impression upon your Lordship? Have they not occasioned (if I may speak freely) your Lordship's standing aloof from me? Have they not set your Lordship farther and farther off, ever since I waited upon you at [Blackheath]? Why do I ask? Indeed, not upon my own account. *Quid mea? Ego in portu navigo.*<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Terence's *Andria*, III. i. 22. safe in the harbour.' Wesley adds 'But now all is at your peril. I ride *Quid mea?*'

I can truly say, I neither fear nor desire anything from your Lordship. To speak a rough truth, I do not desire any intercourse with any persons of quality in England. I mean for my own sake. They do me no good ; and I fear I can do none to them. If it be desired, I will readily leave all those to the care of my fellow labourers. I will article with them so to do rather than this shall be any bone of contention.

Were I not afraid of giving your Lordship pain, I would speak yet still farther. Methinks you desire I should—that is, to tell you once for all every thought that rises in my heart. I will then. At present I do not want you, but I really think you want me. For have you a person in all England who speaks to your Lordship so plain and downright as I do ? who considers not the peer, but the man ? not the earl, but the immortal spirit ? who rarely commends, but often blames, and perhaps would do it oftener if you desired it ? who is jealous over you with a godly jealousy, lest you should be less a Christian by being a nobleman ? lest, after having made a fair advance towards heaven, you should

Measure back your steps to earth again ?

O my Lord, is not such a person as this needful for you in the highest degree ? If you have any such, I have no more to say, but that I pray God to bless him to your soul. If you have not, despise not even the assistance which it may please God to give you by, my Lord,

Your Lordship's ready servant.

*To Lady Maxwell*

LONDON, August 17, 1764.

MY DEAR LADY,—Since I had the pleasure of yours, I have hardly had an hour that I could call my own ; otherwise I should not have delayed writing so long, as I have a very tender regard for you and an earnest desire that you should be altogether a Christian. I cannot be content with your being ever so harmless or regular in your behaviour, or even exemplary in all externals ; nay, more than all this you have received already, for you have the fear of God. But shall you stop here ? God forbid ! This is only the beginning of wisdom.

You are not to end here : fear shall ripen into love. You shall know (perhaps very soon) that love of God which passeth knowledge. You shall witness the kingdom of God within you, even righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

It is no small instance of the goodness of God towards you that you are conscious of your want, your ' want of living faith divine.' And His goodness herein is more remarkable, because almost all your neighbours would set you down for a right good believer. O beware of those flatterers ! Hold fast the conviction which God hath given you ! Faith, living, conquering, loving faith, is undoubtedly the thing you want. And of this you have frequently a taste to encourage you in pressing forward : such is the tender mercy of Him that loves you ; such His desire that you should receive all His precious promises ! Do not think they are afar off. Do not imagine you must stay long (years or months) before you receive them. Do not put them off a day, an hour ! Why not now ? Why should you not look up this instant, and see, as it were, Jesus Christ set forth, evidently set forth, crucified before your eyes ? O hear His voice !—' Daughter, be of good cheer ; thy sins are forgiven thee ! ' ' Say not in thy heart, Who shall go up into heaven, or who shall go down into the deep ? ' No ; ' the word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart.' ' Lord, I believe ; help my unbelief.'

Joy in the Holy Ghost is a precious gift of God, but yet tenderness of conscience is a still greater gift ; and all this is for you. Just ready,

The speechless awe which dares not move,  
And all the silent heaven of love.

I am no great friend to solitary Christianity ; nevertheless, in so peculiar a case as yours, I think an exception may be admitted. It does seem most expedient for you to retire from Edinburgh, at least for a season, till God has increased your strength. For the company of those who know not God, who are strangers to the religion of the heart, especially if they are sensible, agreeable persons, might quite damp the grace of God in your soul.

You cannot oblige me more than by telling me all that is in your heart ; there is no danger of your tiring me. I do



not often write so long letters myself ; but when I write to *you*, I am full of matter. I seem to see you just before me, a poor, feeble, helpless creature, but just upon the point of salvation ; upright of heart (in a measure), full of real desires for God, and emerging into light. The Lord take you whole !  
So prays, my dear Lady,                      Your affectionate servant.

### To Thomas Rankin

Rankin was appointed Assistant for Cornwall at the Conference of 1764. William Penington, a Yorkshireman, became a preacher in 1760, married Miss Teare of Athlone, and died in that city of a fever in 1767. Wesley used to stay with the two widows, Mrs. Teare and Mrs. Penington, when he visited Athlone. See letter of May 30, 1771.

William Roberts was born in the parish of Elogan, Cornwall, in 1728. He became an itinerant about 1750 ; but afterwards entered into business at Tiverton, where he died on December 8, 1797, esteemed and loved by all. A sermon of his led Thomas Olivers to 'believe more fully than ever.' He also made John Murlin a class-leader. See Atmore's *Memorial*, pp. 346-56 ; *Wesley's Veterans*, i. 214, ii. 158.

BRISTOL, *September 21, 1764.*

DEAR TOMMY,—I sometimes wonder that all our preachers are not convinced of this—that it is of unspeakable use to spread our practical tracts in every Society. Billy Penington in one year sold more of these in Cornwall than had been sold for seven years before. So may you, if you take the same method. Carry one sort of books with you the first time you go the round, another sort the second time, and so on. Preach on the subject at each place ; and, after preaching, encourage the congregation to buy and read the tract.

Neither James Mitchell nor William Thomas was without blame. We must make allowance when they tell their own story ; but if they now behave well, it is all we desire.

Some years since, there was something done in the way you mention concerning Brother Triggs. I remember two or three of our brethren from the West coming to London, recommended by Billy Roberts. The particulars he can best inform you of, as well as what success they had. Peace be with your spirit !—I am

Your affectionate friend and brother.

*To Lady Maxwell*

Lady Maxwell was brought up in the Established Church of Scotland, but had now written to tell Wesley that she had decided to join the Methodist Society.

BRISTOL, *September 22, 1764.*

MY DEAR LADY,—You need be under no manner of apprehension of writing too often to me. The more frequent your letters are the more welcome they will be. When I have not heard from you for some time, I begin to be full of fears ; I am afraid either that your bodily weakness increases or that your desires after God grow cold. I consider you are at present but a tender, sickly plant, easily hurt by any rough blast. But I trust this will not be so long ; for you have a strong Helper. And the Lord, whom you serve, though feebly and imperfectly, will suddenly come to His temple. When, Lord ? Are all things ready now ? Here is the sinner ; one whose mouth is stopped, who has nothing to pay, who pleads neither *her own harmlessness, nor works, nor good desires, nor sincerity*, but can adopt that strange word—

I give up every plea beside,  
Lord, I am damned ; but Thou hast died.

He has died ; therefore you shall live. O do not reason against Him ! Let Him take you now ! Let Him take you just as you are and make you what is acceptable in His sight.

It gives me pleasure indeed to hear that God has given you resolution to join the Society. Undoubtedly you will suffer reproach on the account ; but it is the reproach of Christ. And you will have large amends when the Spirit of glory and of God shall rest upon you. Yet I foresee a danger : at first you will be inclined to think that all the members of the Society are in earnest. And when you find that some are otherwise (which will always be the case in so large a body of people), then prejudice may easily steal in and exceedingly weaken your soul. O beware of this rock of offence ! When you see anything amiss (upon hearsay you will not readily receive it), remember our Lord's word, ' What is that to thee ? Follow thou Me.' And I entreat you do not regard the half-Methodists—if we must use the name. Do not mind them

who endeavour to hold Christ in one hand and the world in the other. I want you to be all a Christian ;—such a Christian as the Marquis De Renty or Gregory Lopez was ; such an one as that saint of God, Jane Cooper,<sup>1</sup> all sweetness, all gentleness, all love. Methinks you are just what she was when I saw her first. I shrink at the thought of seeing you what she was when I saw her last. But why should I ? What is all the pain of one that is glorifying God in the fires with ' Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit ' ?

May I not take upon me to give you one advice more ? Be very wary how you contract new acquaintance. All, even sincere people, will not profit you. I should be pained at your conversing frequently with any but those who are of a deeply serious spirit and who speak closely to the point. You need not condemn them, and yet you may say, ' This will not do for me.'

May He that loves you richly supply all your wants and answer your enlarged desires ! So prays, my very dear Lady,  
Your affectionate servant.

### To Ann Foard

The Rev. Henry J. Foster, in *W.H.S.* vii. 73–7, brings together many scattered references to ' Mrs. W.,' but is not able to identify her. Six letters from her in 1761 to Wesley are printed in the *Arminian Magazine*, 1781, pp. 52–7, 109. She signs herself ' M. W.,' and on May 2, 1761, refers to Wesley leaving town, which he did on March 9. She speaks of her daughter Jenny going to town and returning next evening. Many were blessed under her prayers, including her mother in London, her son, and others. ' My house is a heaven upon earth.' She goes by stage to Henley to see about boarding her son with Mr. Neal. Wesley adds a note to the last letter : ' I can no more doubt of her then really experiencing what she then wrote than I can doubt of her vilely casting it away.' Edward Perronet, to whom she refers as visiting her on April 29, calls her Mrs. Garbrand, ' late of Brentford, since dead, a visionary enthusiast and devotee.' Wesley met her at Bath on September 14, 1763, and again at Combe Grove near Bath on September 17 and 19, 1764. He says her prayer was ' like a flame of fire. Every sentence went through my heart, and I believe the heart of every one present. For many months I have found nothing like it.' See *Journal*, v. 30, 94, 97 ; and letter of December 23, 1762.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Sept. 11, 1765.

BRISTOL, September 29, 1764.

MY DEAR SISTER,—I am glad you wrote. You should do it oftener, and the more freely the better. None shall see your letters, so that you need be under no apprehension of any inconvenience following.

In the *Thoughts upon Perfection* and in the *Farther Thoughts* you have a *clear, consistent* account of it. Did you never hear any one *speak* of it in the *manner* I do there? Or does — speak in the same manner with —? Wherein do they differ? And does not — — Nancy, do not start, but speak freely. It may be of more service than you are aware of; and be assured you will bring no inconvenience upon *yourself*.

I was likewise grieved at the danger you was in of stopping short. Certainly you may attain that blessing *soon*. And I am throughly persuaded you *did* taste of it; though how you lost it I know not. It will be eternally true, 'If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth.' Meanwhile faith is the voice of God in the heart proclaiming Himself. Have this faith, and you have salvation. And this is the very thing you want. When this is joined with a strong understanding, it is well; but it may exist with a very weak understanding. This is the case with Mrs. W., whose understanding is extremely weak. And yet she has strong faith, and such as exceedingly profits *me*; though I take knowledge the treasure is in an earthen vessel. I see *all* that is of nature; and this does not hinder my rejoicing in *all* that is of God. This is one branch of *simplicity*. While *reason*, assisted from above, enables me to discern the precious from the vile, I make my full use of the former without losing one moment in thinking upon the latter. Perhaps reason (enlightened) makes me simple. If I *knew less* of human nature (forgive me for talking so much of myself), I should be more apt to stumble at the weakness of it, and if I had not (by nature or by grace) some *clearness* of apprehension. It is owing to this (under God) that I never staggered at the reveries of George Bell. I saw it instantly, at the beginning and from the beginning, what was right and what was wrong. But I saw withal, 'I have many things to speak, but you cannot bear them now.' Hence

many imagined I was *imposed* upon, and applauded themselves in their greater perspicacity; as they do at this day. 'But if you knew it, says his friend to Gregory Lopez, why did not you tell me?' I answer with him, 'I do not speak all I know, but what I judge needful.'

Still, I am persuaded there is no state under heaven from which it is not possible to fall. But I wish *you* was *all love*, and then you would not need to take any thought for the morrow.

The usual preaching may be at Combe on Saturday evening, and at the Grove on Sunday morning. I *bear* the rich, and love the poor; therefore I spend *almost all* my time with them!—My dear sister, adieu!

Write to me at London, and write freely.

*To Christopher Hopper*

BRISTOL, September 29, 1764.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—My judgement is this,—that it is best for you to be at Edinburgh (but in a more airy lodging, if it can be had for love or money) before the end of next month, James Kershaw at Dundee, and Tommy Hanby at Aberdeen. If you have either love or pity for him, let him not stay too long at Dundee. His mind is by no means strong enough to bear that weight of applause. At any rate, take him out of the furnace, or he will be consumed. And you well know a change is best for the people as well as best for him. Is it not easiest for him and you to change at a day appointed, and then for you to stay at Dundee till you are relieved by James Kershaw?

Peace be with your spirits!—I am

Your affectionate friend and brother.

I hope you have been at Sir Archibald's.<sup>1</sup>

*To Samuel Furly*

YARMOUTH, October 11, 1764.

DEAR SAMMY,—I have delayed writing thus long,<sup>2</sup> because I was not inclined to draw the saw of controversy, particularly

<sup>1</sup> Sir Archibald Grant. See *Jour-  
nal*, iv. 451.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of July 15.

on a subject not very important and with a person not very easy to be convinced. I simply told you my thoughts concerning style and concerning yourself. If you can profit by them, well ; if not, there is no harm done. I wanted to have you write in the most excellent way ; if you prefer any other, you may. I have no prejudice for or against any writer : but I may say, without much vanity, I know a good style from a bad one ; and it would be a shame if I did not, after having spent five-and-forty years (with some natural understanding, much attention, and a free acquaintance with many eminent men) in reading the most celebrated writers in the English tongue.

Observing *you* to want one of the things essential to a good style, namely, *easiness*, I warned you of it, and (to make the reason of my caution more clear) enlarged a little upon the head. You reply, '*Harmony* is essential to a good style.' It may be so ; I have nothing to say to the contrary. In the very lines I quoted there is admirable harmony ; *nihil supra* ; the soul of music breathes in them : but there is no stiffness. The lines are as easy as harmonious. This is the perfection of writing.

Whether *long* periods or *short* are to be chosen is quite another question. Some of those you transcribe from Swift are long ; but they are *easy* too, entirely easy, void of all stiffness, and therefore just such as I advise *you* to copy after. The paragraphs cited from Hawksworth are far inferior to them, not more harmonious, but more stiff and artificial. That from Wharton is worst of all, stiff as a stake, all art and no nature. I know not what taste they can have who admire his style ; certainly they must prefer Statius to Virgil.

That 'poor people understand long sentences better than short' is an entire mistake. I have carefully tried the experiment for thirty years, and I find the very reverse to be true. Long sentences utterly confound their intellects ; they know not where they are. If you would be understood by them, you should seldom use a word of many syllables or a sentence of many words. Short sentences are likewise infinitely best for the careless and indolent. They strike them through and through. I have seen instances of it an hundred times.

Neither are the dull and stupid enlightened nor the careless affected by long and laboured periods half so much as by such short ones as these, 'The work is great; the day is short; and long is the night wherein no man can work.'

But the main thing is, let us be all alive to God. Let Christ reign alone in our hearts; let all that mind be in us which was in Christ Jesus; and let us walk as Christ also walked.

Peace be with you and yours!—I am

Your affectionate friend and brother.

To Ann Foard

NORWICH, October 12, 1764.

MY DEAR SISTER,—That great truth, 'that we are saved by faith,' will never be worn out; and that sanctifying as well as justifying faith is the free gift of God. Now, with God one day is as a thousand years. It plainly follows that the quantity of time is nothing to Him: centuries, years, months, days, hours, and moments are exactly the same. Consequently He can as well sanctify in a day after we are justified as an hundred years. There is no difference at all, unless we suppose Him to be such an one as ourselves. Accordingly we see, in fact, that some of the most unquestionable witnesses of sanctifying grace were sanctified within a few days after they were justified. I have seldom known so devoted a soul as Sister Hooley,<sup>1</sup> at Macclesfield, who was sanctified within nine days after she was convinced of sin. She was then twelve years old, and I believe was never afterwards heard to speak an improper word or known to do an improper thing. Her look struck an awe into all that saw her. She is now in Abraham's bosom.

Although, therefore, it usually pleases God to interpose some time between justification and sanctification, yet, as it is expressly observed in the *Farther Thoughts*, we must not fancy this to be an invariable rule. All who think this must think we are sanctified by works, or (which comes to the same)

<sup>1</sup> Ann Hooley's conversion as a girl under John Oldham is described in Smith's *Methodism in Macclesfield*, pp. 70-1. He says she was probably

'the first Methodist child who went from the Macclesfield Society to the Church in heaven.'

by sufferings ; for, otherwise, what is time necessary for ? It must be either to do or to suffer. Whereas, if nothing be required but simple faith, a moment is as good as an age.

The truth is, we are continually forming general rules from our own particular experience. Thus Sarah Ryan,<sup>1</sup> having gone about and about herself, which took up a considerable time, might very naturally suppose all who are sanctified must stay for it near as long a time as she did. Again : if God has so rooted and grounded her in love (which I neither affirm nor deny) that she cannot now fall from Him, she very naturally thinks this is the case with all that are sanctified. Formerly Sarah Crosby<sup>2</sup> drew the same inference from her own experience, and was as positive that she could not fall from that state or sin as Sarah Ryan can be now.

But ' none can be sanctified without a deep knowledge of themselves and of the devices of Satan.' They may without the latter, which God will give them in due time. And the former He can give in a moment, and frequently does, of which we have fresh instances almost every day.

In the *Thoughts on Perfection* it is observed that, before any can be assured they are saved from sin, they must not only feel no sin but ' have a direct witness ' of that salvation. And this several have had as clear as Sarah Ryan has, who afterwards fell from that salvation : although Sarah Ryan, to be consistent with her scheme, must deny they ever had it ; yea, and must affirm that witness was either from nature or from the devil. If it was really from God, is He well pleased with this ?

I know not how to reconcile speaking sharply or roughly, or even a seeming want of meekness, with perfection. And yet I am fearful of condemning whom God has not condemned. What I cannot understand I leave to Him.

How is it that you make me write longer letters to you than I do almost to any one else ? I know not how, I find a greater concern for your welfare. I want you to be exactly right. This occasions my not thinking much of any pains that may give you help or satisfaction. The Lord touch your

---

<sup>1</sup> See letter of April 23.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Oct. 5, 1765.



heart now, that all your tempers, thoughts, words, and works may be holiness unto our God.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Miss March*

NORWICH, October 13, 1764.

I do not see that you can speak otherwise than you do in your band. If you sought their approbation, that would be wrong; but you may suffer it without blame. Indeed, in these circumstances you must; since it is undeniably plain that the doing otherwise would hurt rather than help their souls. I believe Miss Foard thought she felt evil before she did, and by that very thought gave occasion to its re-entrance. You ought not to speak explicitly to many: very few would understand or know how to advise you. For some time I thought Maxfield did, and was therefore glad of your acquaintance with him, hoping he would lead you by the hand in a more profitable manner than I was able to do. But I afterwards doubted. The Lord send you help by whom He will send!

From what not only you but many others likewise have experienced, we find there is very frequently a kind of wilderness state, not only after justification, but even after deliverance from sin; and I doubt whether the sermon<sup>1</sup> upon that state might not give you light in this case also. But the most frequent cause of this second darkness or distress, I believe, is evil reasoning: by this, three in four of those who cast away their confidence are gradually induced so to do. And if this be the cause, is there any way to regain that deliverance but by resuming your confidence? And can you receive it unless you receive it freely, not of works, but by mere grace? This is the way: walk thou in it. Dare to believe! Look up and see thy Saviour near! When? to-morrow, or to-day? Nay, to-day hear His voice! At this time; at this place! Lord, speak; Thy servant heareth!

*To the Printer of the 'St. James's Chronicle'*

LONDON, October 29, 1764.

SIR,—The words inserted as mine in your last paper I absolutely disclaim. I never said, 'If any of you have any

<sup>1</sup> See the sermon on The Wilderness State in *Works*, vi. 77-91.

money in the Public Funds, it would be less sin to take it out and cast it into the depth of the sea than to let it continue there.' I believe a man may let money continue there without any sin at all.

Whoever desires to see my full deliberate thoughts on this subject may read the sermon on the Mammon of Unrighteousness.<sup>1</sup> And this I am ready to defend against any that will set his name ; but I do not love fighting in the dark.—I am

Your humble servant.

PS.—The farther Remarks of the ' Presbyterian Doctor of Physic ' I may perhaps have leisure to read by-and-by.

### *To the Societies at Bristol*

Wesley writes on October 1, 1764 : ' I left Bristol with joy, having seen the fruit of my labour.' He was not there again till August 28, 1765. His inability to visit them for so long led him to write this powerful pastoral address. For his feeling about elections, see *Journal*, vi. 40 ; and also letter of March 4, 1756.

The pressure of debt was now keenly felt. In London on November 4 the Society set themselves to clear off the debt of £900 on the chapels in London.

[*October 1764.*]

MY DEAR BRETHREN,—I was much comforted among you when I was with you last, finding my labour had not been in vain. Many of you I found rejoicing in God your Saviour, walking in the light of His countenance, and studying to have a conscience void of offence towards God and man. In order to assist you therein, suffer me to remind you of a few things, which I think are of no small concern, in order to your retaining the life of faith and the testimony of a good conscience towards God. And,—

1. For God's sake, for the honour of the gospel, for your country's sake, and for the sake of your own souls, beware of bribery. Before you see me again the trial will come at the General Election for Members of Parliament. On no account take money or money's worth. Keep yourselves pure. Give, not sell, your vote. Touch not the accursed thing, lest it bring a blast upon you and your household.

<sup>1</sup> The Use of Money. See *Works*, vi. 124-36.

2. Have nothing to do with stolen goods. Neither sell nor buy anything that has not paid the duty—no, not if you could have it at half price. Defraud not the King any more than your fellow subject. Never think of being religious unless you are honest. What has a thief to do with religion? Herein mind not men but the Word of God; and, whatever others do, keep yourselves pure.

3. Lose no opportunity of receiving the sacrament. All who have neglected this have suffered loss; most of them are as dead as stones: therefore be you constant herein, not only for example, but for the sake of your own souls.

4. To the public, constantly add the private means of grace, particularly prayer and reading. Most of you have been greatly wanting in this; and without this you can never grow in grace. You may as well expect a child to grow without food as a soul without private prayer; and reading is an excellent help to this. I advise you to read in particular, constantly and carefully, the New Testament; *Lessons for Children*, which are all the choicest parts of the Old Testament, with short notes; *Instructions for Children*, which are a body of divinity for plain people; and that golden treatise *The Christian Pattern*; the *Plain Account of the Methodists*. No Methodist ought to be without these, nor the *Primitive Physick*, which (if you have any regard for your bodies or your children) ought to be in every house. To all that can understand it, I recommend one book more, *A Preservative Against Unsettled Notions*; a book which, by the blessing of God, may help you from being tossed about with divers winds of doctrines. Permit me to give you one advice more under this head: do not encourage young raw men to exhort among you. It does little good either to you or them. Rather, in every Society, where you have not an experienced preacher, let one of the leaders read the *Notes*<sup>1</sup> or the *Christian Library*. By this the wisest among you may profit much, a thousand times more than by listening to forward youths who neither speak English nor common sense.

5. Let all of you who have faith meet in band without excuse and without delay. There has been a shameful neglect

<sup>1</sup> His *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*.

of this. Remove this scandal. As soon as the Assistant has fixed your band make it a point of conscience never to miss without an absolute necessity ; and the preacher's meeting you all together one night out of two will be an additional blessing.

6. If you constantly meet your band, I make no doubt that you will constantly meet your class ; indeed, otherwise you are not of our Society. Whoever misses his class thrice together thereby excludes himself, and the preacher that comes next ought to put out his name. I wish you would consider this. Halt not between two. Meet the brethren, or leave them. It is not honest to profess yourself of a Society and not observe the rules of it. Be therefore consistent with yourself. Never miss your class till you miss it for good and all. And when you meet it, be merciful after your power ; give as God enables you. If you are not in pressing want, give something, and you will be no poorer for it. Grudge not, fear not ; lend unto the Lord, and He will surely repay. If you earn but three shillings a week and give a penny out of it, you will never want. But I do not say this to you who have ten or fifteen shillings a week and give only a penny ! To see this has often grieved my spirit. I have been ashamed for you, if you have not been ashamed for yourself. Why, by the same rule that you give a penny, that poor man should give a peppercorn ! O be ashamed before God and man ! Be not straitened in your own bowels. Give in proportion to your substance. You can better afford a shilling than he a penny. This is more to him than that to you. Open your eyes, your heart, your hand. If this one rule was observed throughout England, we should need no other collection. It would soon form a stock sufficient to relieve all that want and to answer all occasions. Many of these occasions are now exceeding pressing, and we are nowise able to answer them ; so that the cause of God suffers and the children of God, and that without remedy.

7. This is in great measure owing to our not considering ourselves (all the Methodists) as one body. Such undoubtedly they are throughout Great Britain and Ireland ; and as such they were considered at our last Conference. We then seriously considered the heavy burthen which now lies on our brethren

in various parts. When we could hire no place that could contain the congregation, they were constrained to build; but hereby they were unavoidably involved in debt, some of them to the amount of several hundred pounds. The Assistants were desired to lay this case before all our brethren in England, and to receive what each of them were willing to give, either at that time or at Easter or Midsummer. But the greater part of them thought no more about it. Four or five of them did, and brought in all about £200 at our last Conference. This was divided among our Societies who were most distressed; and all the Assistants were desired, when they visit the classes at Christmas, to ask each particular person, poor or rich, 'What will you give towards the relief of the brethren? Give either now, or at Easter, or at Midsummer; it is all one.' If this be done in good earnest, I trust in two or three years all our Societies may be out of debt. And by this shall all men know whose disciples we are, because we love one another.

8. I mention but one thing more. Let all who are able constantly attend the morning preaching. Whenever the Methodist preachers or people leave off this, they will soon sink into nothing.—I am, my dear brethren,

Your affectionate brother.

### To Thomas Rankin

James Hervey's *The Scriptural Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness Defended* led Wesley to publish *A Treatise on Justification: Extracted from Mr. John Goodwin, 1765*, which set forth what he regarded as 'the real Scripture doctrine.' Goodwin was a London vicar at St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, 1633-45. See Green's *Bibliography*, No. 226.

LONDON, November 2, 1764.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—At the request of several of our preachers I have at length abridged Goodwin's *Treatise on Justification*. I trust it will stop the mouths of gainsayers concerning imputed righteousness, and teach them (at least the most candid) to speak as the oracles of God.

I desire you to read the proposal and preface in every Society within your circuit; then enforce it, as you see best, both in public and private conversation. Spare no pains.

Exert yourself. See what you can do. Give this proof of your love for the truth, for the people, and for

Your affectionate friend and brother.

N.B.—Be careful to keep an exact list of all the subscribers' names in each Society, and also to leave a copy thereof with the person who takes care of the books.

### *To Thomas Rankin*

John Catermole became a preacher about 1763; but he was of a gloomy disposition, and retired about 1768. He opened a school at Portsmouth Common, and preached occasionally. He died about 1799.

Wesley thought Rankin might cure Darney of his eccentric ways. 'For a season he behaved pretty well, and was ready to be advised; but he relapsed into his former conduct, and advanced opinions in public contrary to the Methodist doctrine and discipline: so that we were obliged,' says Rankin, 'to call in a young man to labour in his place, and dismiss him from the circuit, and that by Mr. Wesley's express approbation. The greatest hurt he did was in the Society at Plymouth Dock, where he nearly divided the people.' See *Wesley's Veterans*, vi. 159.

LONDON, November 6, 1764.

DEAR TOMMY,—If the Crowan or Buryan Society are able to bear the expense of building themselves, we have no objection; but we must not increase our debt this year. This is what we determined. If you do build, build large enough. In general, we do not pay rent out of the public stock, but get help from friends in the circuit. For once we may allow forty shillings.

I shall write to Plymouth Dock this post. I hope John Catermole (a sound man) will come and help you. I shall either mend William Darney or end him. He must not go on in this manner.

Spread the little tracts wherever you go. You know the solid good which results therefrom. Go on; spend and be spent for a good Master.—I am, dear Tommy,

Your affectionate friend and brother.

### *To his Brother Charles*

Wesley encloses the letter to the Mayor and Corporation of Bristol dated December 20, which he wishes his brother to show to these

friends, who had showered kindnesses upon them. Charles Wesley writes on October 4, 1777: 'T. Lewis takes care to send me home in a coach. Who would take so much thought for me in London?' Lewis died in April 1782. On July 17, 1783, Charles Wesley tells his daughter, 'I do not wonder at your partiality for Bristol. Had Thomas Lewis lived, I should have passed my last days and laid my bones there.' He wrote some memorial verses (*Poetical Works*, vi. 349-52):

Rugged howe'er his manners seemed,  
His manners were by all esteemed,  
Who truth preferred to art. . . .

A father to the sick and poor,  
For them he husbanded his store,  
For them himself denied.

Mrs. Anne Davis was one of Charles Wesley's most intimate friends in Bristol. She lived for some time in London, and died on November 5, 1775. She seems to have been blind:

The long dark hour is past,  
And, lo, to sight restored,  
She gains the dazzling prize at last,  
And sees her smiling Lord.

This letter is packed with details. John Witherspoon's (1722-94) *Serious Inquiry into the State of the Stage*, 1757, was suggested by Douglas, a tragedy written by John Home, a minister of the Church of Scotland, who became President of Princeton, New Jersey, in 1768. Simonides of Ceos spent his last days at the Court of Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse, who begged him to explain the being and nature of the Deity. Simonides asked for a day to reflect, and when the question was repeated on the morrow he asked two more days, then four, and so on: Hiero grew weary of waiting, and wanted to know the reason for his strange behaviour; Simonides replied, 'The longer I deliberate, the greater obscurity I find.' Susanna Wesley, widow of Richard Ellison, died in London in December 1764, aged sixty-nine; the Voyseys were her descendants. John Richardson had become Wesley's clerical assistant in 1763, and buried him in 1791. The Tabernacle at Norwich was taken by Wesley in 1758. In the Preface to his *Extract of Goodwin's Treatise on Justification* (see letter of November 2) Wesley says, 'All that is material in letters just published under the name of Mr. Hervey is answered.'

LONDON, December 7, 1764.

DEAR BROTHER,—Be so kind as to show this to T. Lewis and M. Davis: so I may answer theirs and yours together.

What need of a formal petition? Would it not be just as effectual for me to write a letter to the Corporation, in

the name of all the Bristol Methodists, urging, first, Mr. Witherspoon's argument against the English theatre; secondly, the matter of fact, the actual mischief done thereby; and then gently and respectfully making the application? What think you? *Ecquid novisti rectius?*<sup>1</sup> Send me word without delay.

Sister Suky was in huge agonies for five days, and then died in the full assurance of faith. Some of her last words (after she had been speechless for some time) were, 'Jesus is come! Heaven is here!'

I am like Simonides. The more I think, the less able I am to answer the King's question: to prove the necessity, expediency, or propriety of an atonement to an unconvinced sinner.<sup>2</sup>

Indeed, you ought to have said something to Thomas Maxfield's letter, had it been only what you say now. He is Thomas Maxfield still. *Cerebrum non habet.*<sup>3</sup> Mr. Richardson is better and better.

James Wheatley (the jewel!) has given me warning to quit the Tabernacle in spring: so I am preparing to build at Norwich; for no place already built can be procured for love or money.

I think verily there is no need that you and I should be such strangers to each other. Surely we are old enough to be wiser.

Come, I will give you a little work. Translate for me into good English the Latin verses that occur in the *Earnest Appeal*; and why not those three Greek ones?—

<sup>4</sup> Π, καὶ λυαίησιν ἐπ' ὀφρούσι νεύσε Κρονίωνη &c.<sup>4</sup>

I have answered poor Mr. Hervey's last tract so far as it is personal. My love to Sally. *Vivamus!* Adieu!

You should send Charles Perronet's book immediately.<sup>5</sup> The tax of the Apostolic Chamber.

<sup>1</sup> 'Do you know any better way?'

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Dec. 31.

<sup>3</sup> 'He has no brains.'

<sup>4</sup> The three lines are given in *A Farther Appeal*, Part II., Works,

viii. 150. Homer's *Iliad*, i. 528–30:

'Jove spake, and nodded his sable brow, &c.'

<sup>5</sup> *An Extract of the 'Life of Armelle Nicholas,' 1763.*



*To Sarah Moore*

LONDON, December 8, 1764.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Your business is by every possible means to calm the intemperate spirits on both sides.<sup>1</sup> There has been much ill blood, and many unkind sayings, which had been better let alone. Now, at least, let there be by general agreement an entire cessation of arms. Our God is a God of peace; and all His children should with all their might labour after it. I have heard something of the kind you mention, but not in the same manner you relate it. However, let it die and be forgotten.—I am                      Your affectionate brother.

*To Thomas Rankin*

Bryant wrote Miss Moore on March 8, 1765, from Shepton Mallet, 'Mr. Wesley has not written to me, nor I to him, since I received my discharge.' He refers to the trouble about Darney: 'What a mercy I was kept out of that fire!' Darney's name appears in London at the Conference of 1765. Bryant says Rankin and others 'preached perfection, &c., to such a degree that the people will not suffer either of them to enter the preaching-house more. . . . Richard Houghton, one that received ordination with me in London nearly two years since, left London for debt, fled to Plymouth, and Mr. Wesley, not knowing the case, suffered him to preach at the Dock; he was well received by the people, with William Darney, but has since been taken up, and is now in Exeter jail.' See Everett's *Methodism in Sheffield*, pp. 190-1; and previous letter.

LONDON, December 15, 1764.

DEAR TOMMY,—I will send a man down to W. Darney<sup>1</sup> that is as rough as himself—namely, T. Bryant. But he is much changed for the better, and I think will not now jar with you. You need not, indeed, be very near one another: Cornwall is wide enough. Otherwise let T. Bryant stay in Devonshire and Peter Price move westward.<sup>2</sup> John Catermole sticks fast at Kingswood, and can get no farther.

I wish you could conquer J. Paynter too. And who knows? Love may do the deed.

Want of sleep will occasion hoarseness. You should sleep at least six hours in twenty-four, either at once or at twice.

<sup>1</sup> See letters of July 5 and Dec. 15.<sup>2</sup> See letter of Nov. 6.<sup>3</sup> Price was admitted on trial as a preacher in Aug. 1765.

For hoarseness look into the *Primitive Physick*; and try, one after another if need be, the garlic, the apple, the conserve, and the balsam.

I know not how you will procure subscribers to Goodwin<sup>1</sup> while you are pressing the general subscription.—I am, dear Tommy,  
Your affectionate friend.

*To the Mayor and Corporation of Bristol*

LONDON, December 20, 1764.

GENTLEMEN,—Both my brother and I and all who have any connexion with us are extremely sensible of our obligations to you for the civility which you have shown us on all occasions; and we cannot but feel ourselves deeply interested in whatever we apprehend in any degree to concern your honour or the general good and prosperity of the City of Bristol. This occasions my giving you the present trouble, which (whether it has any farther effect or no) you will please to receive as a testimony of the high regard we shall ever retain for you.

The endeavours lately used to procure subscriptions for building a new playhouse in Bristol have given us not a little concern; and that on various accounts: not barely as most of the present stage entertainments sap the foundation of all religion, as they naturally tend to efface all traces of piety and seriousness out of the minds of men; but as they are peculiarly hurtful to a trading city, giving a wrong turn to youth especially, gay, trifling, and directly opposite to the spirit of industry and close application to business; and, as drinking and debauchery of every kind are constant attendants on these entertainments, with indolence, effeminacy, and idleness, which affect trade in an high degree.

It was on these very considerations that the Corporation at Nottingham lately withstood all solicitations, and absolutely forbade the building a new theatre there, being determined to encourage nothing of the kind. And I doubt not but thousands will reap the benefit of their wise and generous resolution.

It does not become me, gentlemen, to press anything upon you; but I could not avoid saying this much, both in behalf

<sup>1</sup> See letters of Nov. 2 and Dec. 31.

of myself and all my friends. Wishing you the continuance and increase of every blessing, I remain, gentlemen,  
Your obliged and obedient servant.

*To his Brother Charles*

DEAR BROTHER,—I suppose it is of little consequence in whose hand this<sup>1</sup> is transcribed. Let it be accompanied by prayer, and good must follow, one way or the other. Let us work while the day is. Adieu.

*To his Brother Charles*

Charles Wesley wrote from Blackheath on July 17, 1783: 'When Miss Freeman is here, we should strongly recommend Dr. Turner, as the first man of the Faculty for hitting the patient's case and for healing with very little physic. I have reason to praise one who, under God, has added thirty years to my life.' Mark Davis became a preacher in 1756. Thomas Walsh calls him 'a wise and good man.' Wesley visited his 'old friend' on January 5, 1790, and January 13, 1791, apparently at Leyton. See *Journal*, iv. 275*n*; viii. 36, 121.

LONDON, December 31, 1764.

DEAR BROTHER,—Pray tell T. Lewis<sup>2</sup> I believe one I spoke to yesterday will make us a good housekeeper. She is selling off her things, and can come in two or three weeks.

John Matthews<sup>3</sup> sent for me between two and three on Friday morning. One had a little before asked him how he found himself; and he answered,

'The Lord protects, for ever near.'

When I came, he was perfectly sensible. I began to pray at three, and before I had spoken many words his soul was set at liberty without a groan. Here is a subject for your pen. He has had 'the witness' in *my* sense for several months—that is, he *knew* he was in the favour of God, and had *no doubt* of going to heaven.

I hope Goodwin is above three-quarters printed.<sup>4</sup>

You know doctors differ. I could trust Dr. Turner as well as any.

<sup>1</sup> The previous letter.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Dec. 7.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of April 24, 1757.

<sup>4</sup> See letter of Dec. 15.

I shall say a word to the preachers in Ireland. I really thought Mark Davis had had more wit and more modesty. I do not yet find anything on the Atonement fit for a Deist. Pray inquire of your learned friends. My love to Sally.

I have sent you by Miss Billo the Preface to Goodwin and the *Appeals*. You will English the Latin verses, and produce the neatest and correctest edition of them which has ever appeared.

*To the Editor of the 'London Magazine'*

'This week,' says Wesley in his *Journal*, v. 104, 'I wrote an answer to a warm letter, published in the *London Magazine*, the author whereof is much displeas'd that I presume to doubt of the modern astronomy. I cannot help it. Nay, the more I consider, the more my doubts increase; so that, at present, I doubt whether any man on Earth knows either the distance or magnitude, I will not say of a fixed star, but of Saturn or Jupiter, yea, of the Sun or Moon.' The *Compendium of Natural Philosophy* was published in 1763. See Green's *Bibliography*, No. 220.

LONDON, January 1, 1765.

SIR,—If you please to insert in your *Magazine* my answer to a letter directed to me in November last, you will oblige  
Your humble servant.

SIR,—I am obliged to you for your queries and remarks; and so I shall be to any who will point out anything wherein they think I have been mistaken. It would not be strange if there should be many mistakes in the *Compendium of Natural Philosophy*, as philosophy is what for many years I have only looked into at leisure hours. Accordingly in the Preface of that treatise I said, 'I am thoroughly sensible there are many who have more ability as well as leisure for such a work than me; but as none of them undertakes it, I have myself made some little attempt in the following volumes.'

Q. 1. 'You say the Sun revolves upon his axis once in twenty-seven hours. Should it not be once in twenty-seven days nearly?' Yes, it should. This was an error of the press.

Q. 2. 'You say he is supposed to be abundantly larger

than the Earth. Is it not demonstrable that he is so?' I do not know whether it is or no.

Q. 3. 'You tell us the Moon turns always the same side to the Earth. Should it not be nearly the same?' Yes.

Q. 4. 'You say it does not appear that she moves round her own axis. How, then, do you account for her turning always the same side to the Earth?' I think, full as well without the supposition as with it. But I do not undertake to account for anything.

Q. 5. 'Why do you say the Moon is supposed to be forty-five times smaller than the Earth when the Moon's bulk is nicely known?' It is not known by me, nor, I doubt, by any man else.

Q. 6. 'You say Jupiter is supposed to be twenty-five times larger than the Earth, and in the next page that his diameter is supposed to be 130,655 miles. If so, is he not 4,096 times larger than the Earth?' Undoubtedly. But I do not undertake to defend either one supposition or the other.

Q. 7. 'You inform us that even a good eye seldom sees more than an hundred stars at a time. Do you mean at one look?' Yes.

Remark 1. 'You say (page 148), "Even with respect to the distance of the Sun, it is wisest to confess our ignorance, and to acknowledge we have nothing to rest upon here but mere uncertain conjecture."'

I did not say this of the distance of the Sun in particular. My words are: 'With regard to their distance from the Earth (the distance of all the bodies in the solar system), there is such an immense difference in the calculations of astronomers, even with respect to the distance of the Sun, that it is wisest to confess our ignorance'—namely, with regard to their distance (page 146).

To prove that we are not ignorant hereof you say: 'The knowledge of the Sun's distance depends on finding its parallax, or the angle that the semi-diameter of the Earth appears under at the Sun; which angle is so very minute that an error of a single second will give the distance very considerably greater or less than the true distance.' It will; and therefore I

doubt whether the distance of any heavenly body can ever be known by this means.

'But Mr. Keil says: "We are assured, by various methods made use of to obtain the Sun's parallax, that his distance from us is more than twenty-eight millions of miles." He may be assured; but I am not. He says farther: "Two eminent astronomers have since determined the Sun's distance to be about seventy-six millions of miles." Now, if the least distance possible is absolutely determined, how can it be wisest to confess our ignorance?' *If it be*: but I doubt it cannot be determined at all—at least, not by the Sun's parallax, 'seeing this is so very minute that an error of a single second will give the distance very considerably greater or less than the true.'

Remark 2. 'In page 143 you tell us'—the whole paragraph runs thus: 'It is now almost universally supposed that the Moon is just like the Earth, having mountains and valleys, seas with islands, peninsulas and promontories, with a changeable atmosphere, wherein vapours and exhalations rise and fall; and hence it is generally inferred that she is inhabited like the Earth, and, by parity of reason, that all the other planets, as well as the Earth and Moon, have their respective inhabitants.' (I take this to be the very strength of the cause. It was this consideration chiefly which induced me to think for many years that all the planets were inhabited.) 'But after all comes the celebrated Mr. Huygens, and brings strong reasons why the Moon is not, and cannot be, inhabited at all, nor any secondary planet whatever. Then' (if the first supposition sinks, on which all the rest are built) 'I doubt that we shall never prove that the primary are. And so the whole hypothesis of innumerable suns and worlds moving round them vanishes into air.'

In order to prove that there are innumerable suns you say,—

(1) 'It is found by observations on the parallax of the Earth's orbit that a fixed star is ten thousand times farther from the Sun than we are.' I can build nothing on these observations, till parallaxes can be taken with greater certainty than they are at present. Therefore I shall want proof

that any one fixed star is one thousand times farther from the Sun than we are.

(2) 'They are fiery bodies.' I suppose they are; but this cannot be proved from their distance till that distance itself is proved.

(3) 'It is demonstrable that Sirius is as big as the Sun.' Demonstrate it who can.

(4) 'Seeing the fixed stars are not much less than the Sun, they are to be esteemed so many suns.' 'Not much less'! How is this proved? To argue from the distance is to prove *ignotum per aequè ignotum*.<sup>1</sup>

'You see, sir, the hypothesis of innumerable suns is so far from vanishing into air that it is almost altogether founded on demonstration.' Indeed, I do not see one tittle of demonstration yet from the beginning to the end.

In order to prove that the planets are inhabited you say,—

(1) 'The Earth is spherical, opaque, enlightened by the Sun, casting a shadow opposite thereto, and revolving round it in a time exactly proportioned to its distance. The other planets resemble the Earth in all these particulars. Therefore they likewise are inhabited.' I cannot allow the consequence.

(2) 'The Earth has a regular succession of day and night, summer and winter. So probably have all the planets. Therefore they are inhabited.' I am not sure of the antecedent. But, however that be, I deny the consequence.

(3) 'Jupiter and Saturn are much bigger than the Earth.' Does this prove that they are inhabited?

(4) 'The Earth has a moon, Jupiter has four, Saturn five, each of these larger than ours. They eclipse their respective planets, and are eclipsed by them.' All this does not prove that they are inhabited.

(5) 'Saturn's ring reflects the light of the Sun upon him.' I am not sure of that. And, till the fact is ascertained, no certain inference can be drawn from it.

(6) 'But is it probable God should have created planets like our own and furnished them with such amazing apparatus,

---

<sup>1</sup> 'A thing unknown by one equally unknown.'

and yet have placed no inhabitants therein?' Of their apparatus I know nothing. However, if all you assert be the *probability* of their being inhabited, I contend not.

(7) 'They who affirm that God created those bodies, the fixed stars, only to give us a small, dim light, must have a very mean opinion of the divine wisdom.' I do not affirm this; neither can I tell for what other end He created them: He that created them knows. But I have so high an opinion of the divine wisdom that I believe no child of man can fathom it. It is our wisdom to be very wary how we pronounce concerning things which we have not seen.

Remark 3. 'Suppose some intelligent beings in one of the planets, who were

Slaves to no sect, who sought no private road,  
But looked through nature up to nature's God,<sup>1</sup>

viewed the Earth from thence; they would argue it must be inhabited, as we argue the other planets are. But the superstitious would oppose this doctrine, and call it mere uncertain conjecture.'

I see no argument in this; but perhaps I do not understand it. Are you applauding the supposed inhabitants of Venus for not being slaves to the Christian sect? Otherwise what has superstition to do in the case? Why is this dragged in by head and shoulders? If there be superstition here, it is on your side, who believe because you will believe; who assent to what you have no evidence for, and maintain what you cannot prove. At present you are the volunteer in faith; you swallow what chokes my belief.

Remark 4. 'You quote Dr. Rogers.' But I do not undertake to defend his hypothesis or any other. 'Our best observators could never find the parallax of the Sun to be above eleven seconds.' But I cannot depend on their observations; especially when I find one of the chief of them, in computing the distance of the Sun, to stride from twenty-eight millions to seventy-six; near fifty millions of miles at once! After this, let any impartial man judge what stress is to be laid on parallaxes.

'But Dr. Rogers supposes the parallax of the Sun to be

<sup>1</sup> Pope's *Essay on Man*, iv. 331-2



five minutes, which others cannot find to be above eleven seconds. Why, doctor, if this be true' (namely, that the parallax which lately was but eleven seconds is now increased to five minutes), 'the Earth has approximated thirty times nearer' (a little harmless tautology) 'to the Sun.' That is, if both the computation of Mr. Keil and that of Dr. Rogers be true. But who ever supposed this? If the one be true, the other is undoubtedly false.

'To conclude: since there is no arguing against facts, and since the Sun's parallax is not found to exceed eleven seconds, ought you not to give up that hypothesis as absurd and ridiculous?'

Yes; as soon as any of those facts appear. Till then, I neither espouse nor give it up. But I still look upon it as ingenious, and as probable as any other.

Before I conclude, permit me, sir, to give you one piece of advice. Be not so positive, especially with regard to things which are neither easy nor necessary to be determined. I ground this advice on my own experience. When I was young, I was sure of everything; in a few years, having been mistaken a thousand times, I was not half so sure of most things as I was before; at present I am hardly sure of anything but what God has revealed to man.

Upon the whole, an ingenious man may easily flourish on this head: 'How much more glorious is it for the great God to have created innumerable worlds than this little globe only!' But, after all, I would only ask this one plain question: Suppose there are more worlds than there are sands on the seashore, is not the universe finite still? It must be, unless it be God. And if it be finite, it can still bear no proportion to Him that is infinite—no more than this ball of earth does. How large soever it be, still, compared to Him, it is as nothing, as the small dust of the balance. Do you ask, then, 'What is this spot to the great God?' Why, as much as millions of systems. Great and little have place with regard to us; but before Him they vanish away. Enlarge the bounds of creation as much as you please; still it is as but a drop to the Creator;

And still the power of His almighty hand  
Can form another world from every sand!<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Broome's *Ecclesiasticus*, in *Moral and Sacred Poems*, ii. 60.

Yet, were this done, there would be no more proportion than there is now between Him and His creatures. In this respect, one world and millions of worlds are just the same thing. Is the Earth a cypher, a nothing, to the infinitely great, glorious, wise, and powerful God? So is any number of worlds which can be conceived: so is all finite being to the infinite.

### *To his Brother Charles*

Wesley rode on January 12 'to Mr Downing's, at Ovington, in Essex, about six-and-fifty miles from the Foundery.' The next day he preached in the church in the morning, at Titbury in the afternoon, and in Mr. Downing's house at seven. See letter of April 6, 1761.

Charles Wesley endorses this letter, 'B[rother] expelling his witnesses because ordained by J. Jones's ordainer.' For Joseph Sutcliffe's account, which throws a flood of light on Wesley's difficulties with these preachers and his own clergymen friends, see heading to letter of February 27.

LONDON, January 11, 1765.

DEAR BROTHER,—I believe Thomas Goodwin wrote that book. Pray hasten John's<sup>1</sup> tract, and give Pine the Preface.

Mr. Tooth<sup>2</sup> is not a Calvinist yet, nor Mr. Downing half an one. I have a letter from him to-day, and hope to be with him at Ovington to-morrow.

I have no objection to Mr. Trail's preaching in Weavers' Hall; but I am not rightly satisfied as to his preaching at all.

On Monday morning I desired the preachers and the stewards to meet me. It was then inquired,—

1. Can James Thwayte, B. Russen, Rd. Perry, James Satles, John Oliver, and T. Bryant,<sup>3</sup> who have *bought* an ordination in an unknown tongue, be received by us as clergymen? No.

2. Can we receive them any longer as preachers? No.

3. Can we receive them as members of our Society? No.

<sup>1</sup> Wesley's Extract of John Goodwin's *Treatise on Justification*, which William Pine, of Bristol, was printing. See letter of Dec. 31, 1764.

<sup>2</sup> Samuel Tooth. See Stevenson's *City Road Chapel*, p. 476; and

letter of Sept. 27, 1778, to him.

<sup>3</sup> Oliver was stationed in Lancashire at the next Conference. For Bryant's ordination, see letters of July 5 and Dec. 15, 1764.

And this I ordered to be signified to each of them immediately. Adieu.

To the Rev. Mr. C. Wesley,  
In Bristol.

*To Thomas Rankin*

OVINGTON, *January 13, 1765.*

DEAR TOMMY,—I will give you a month from this day to make a fair trial of William Darney whether he will walk according to our Rules or no ; if not, we must part. But if he had rather, he may go into the Wiltshire Round,<sup>1</sup> where a preacher is now wanting. T. Bryant is not now in connexion with us.<sup>2</sup> I am glad you give me warning concerning Richard Austen. I trust that you will soon set them right at the Dock. Gentleness, added to plainness of speech, will have influence upon honest Brother Jones.<sup>3</sup> I advise you gradually to remove all such leaders and stewards as do not cordially love the Methodist doctrine and discipline.—Dear Tommy,

Your affectionate friend and brother.

Pray give my love to Brother Mallon, of Mary Week Society. I thank him for his letter, and exhort him to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made him free.

To Mr. Rankin, At Mr. John Andrews',  
In Redruth, Cornwall. Per Gloucester.

*To the Printer of the ' St. James's Chronicle '*

In the issue of the *St. James's Chronicle* for January 12, 1765, appeared a letter from A. P., Oxford, about the ordinations by a Greek bishop. This led J. T. in the issue for January 29–31 to put four questions to Wesley. He adds : ' Suffer me also to call upon the Rev. Mr. T[homas] M[axfield] publicly to justify his conduct in employing as his assistant a cheesemonger, who cannot certainly know whether he is ordained or not.' This is Wesley's answer. See letters of January 11 and February 10 and 27.

LONDON, *February 5, 1765.*

SIR,—To the four questions proposed to me in your last week's paper, I answer :—

<sup>1</sup> Darney went to the London Circuit in September.

<sup>2</sup> See previous letter.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of June 9.

1. None of those six persons lately ordained by a Greek bishop were ordained with my consent or knowledge.

2. I will not, cannot, own or receive them as clergymen.

3. I think an ordination performed in a language not understood by the persons ordained is not valid.

4. I think it is absolutely unlawful for any one to give money to the Bishop (or to any one for him) for ordaining him.—I am, sir, Your humble servant.

*To Thomas Rankin*

LONDON, *February 9, 1765.*

DEAR TOMMY,—I have little more to add to my last but that I have wrote to Brother Jane and the leaders at the Dock to the same effect as I wrote to James Stevens and to you at St. Austell. You have only to go on steadily, and lovingly, and to overcome evil with good.—I am, dear Tommy, Yours affectionately.

To Mr. Rankin, At Mr. Wood's, Shopkeeper,  
In Port Isaac, Near Camelford, Cornwall.

*To the Printer of the 'St. James's Chronicle'*

[LONDON, *February 10, 1765.*]

SIR,—In the *St. James's Chronicle* published on Saturday last there was an innocent thing wrote by an hat-maker in Southwark. It may be proper to take a little more notice of it than it deserves, lest silence should appear to be an acknowledgement of the charge.

I insert nothing in the public papers without my name. I know not the authors of what has been lately inserted; part of which I have not seen yet, nor did I see any part before it was printed.

A year or two ago I found a stranger perishing for want and expecting daily to be thrown in prison. He told me he was a *Greek* bishop. I examined his credentials, and was fully satisfied. After much conversation (in Latin and Greek, for he spoke no English at all) I determined to relieve him effectively; which I did without delay, and promised to send him back to Amsterdam, where he had several friends of his own nation. And this I did, without any farther view, merely upon motives of humanity. After this he ordained Mr. John

Jones, a man well versed both in the languages and other parts of learning.

When I was gone out of town, Bishop Erasmus was prevailed upon to ordain Lawrence Coughlan, a person who had no learning at all.

Some time after, Mr. Maxfield, or his friends, sent for him from Amsterdam, to ordain Mr. S——t and three other persons, as *unlearned* as any of the Apostles, but I believe not so *much inspired*.

In December last he was sent for again, and ordained six other persons, members of our Society, but every way, I think, unqualified for that office. These I judged it my duty to disclaim (to waive all other considerations) for a fault which I know not who can excuse, *buying* an ordination in an *unknown tongue*.

As to the other tale, 'The Bishop told me himself' (I pray in what tongue? for he speaks no English, and you no Greek, any more than your interpreter so called) 'that Mr. Wesley desired Mr. Jones to know of him if he would consecrate him bishop?' Mr. Jones solemnly declares that he never told the Bishop any such thing. But, be that as it may, the point does not turn on the validity of ordination by a Greek bishop, but on the validity of ordination procured by *money* and performed in an *unknown tongue*.

My advice to you is either be silent or procure a better defender of your cause.

### To Six Preachers

Joseph Sutcliffe says that a Conference was held at the Foundery on January 7, 1765. 'Present, Rev. John Wesley, Rev. John Richardson, Rev. Benjamin Colley; John Jones, M.D., John Murlin, John Mager; and Henry Hammond, John Norton, Christian Bromley, James Ward, John Redhall, John Butcher, Robert Clemenson, and Thomas Lee, Stewards. Agreed that James Thwayte, Benjamin Russen, James Satles, Richard Perry, Thomas Bryant, and John Oliver, having acted contrary to the Word of God and the duty they owe to their ministers and their brethren,

1. Can no more be owned as clergymen,
2. Can no more be received as preachers,
3. Nor as members of the Society.'

The six names were exposed in *Lloyd's Evening Post*. Sutcliffe says the offence was that they had paid five guineas each to the Greek bishop (then in London) for ordination, and that the sentence had been required by the Rev. Messrs. Madan, Romaine, and Shirley. 'Mr. Charles, Dr. Dodd, De Coetlogon (the colleague of Madan at the Lock Chapel), were wise enough to keep back their names.'

After about a month the six brethren asked to be restored to their Plans as local preachers, when Wesley sent them the following reply :

NORWICH, February 27, 1765.

Mr. Madan, Mr. Romaine, and the good-natured Mr. Shirley are almost out of patience with me for not disowning you on the house-top. In this situation of things it would be utter madness in me to do anything which they would call contumacy. I am every way bound to my good behaviour, and obliged to move with all possible circumspection. Were I to allow your preaching now, I should be in a hotter fire than ever. That you will preach again by-and-by I doubt not ; but it is certain the time is not come yet.

### To Thomas Rankin

Party spirit was strong in Parliament. 'The Bill for laying a stamp duty in the British Colonies in America' received the Royal Assent by commission on March 22 ; and Wesley had little hope that any Bill for the relief of Nonconformists would be passed.

LONDON, March 9, 1765.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—Nothing can hurt you, if you are calm, mild, and gentle to all men, especially to the froward. I think you have done all you could do at present for poor Brother Jane.<sup>1</sup> I will send to William Atkinson<sup>2</sup> and ask him how the house is settled. I know nothing about it ; for I never saw the writings.

I suppose the Bill intended to be brought into Parliament will never see the light. The great ones find other work for one another. They are all at daggers' drawing among themselves. Our business is to go straight forward.—I am,  
 dear Tommy, Your affectionate friend and brother.

To Mr. Rankin, At Mr. John Andrews',  
 In Redruth, Cornwall.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Feb. 9.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Jan. 7, 1756.

To John Newton

John Newton (1725-1807) ; the slave-trader was ordained deacon in 1764, published the *Olney Hymns* with Cowper 1779, and became incumbent of St. Mary Woolnoth 1780. His *Narrative* was issued in 1764, the year he settled at Olney. He replied to Wesley on April 18 : ' Mr. Hervey's *Letters* have not wounded me at all. In my personal regard for you they have made no abatement, in my sentiments in other respects no alteration.' He says that, since he first met Wesley seven years before, he had seen no reason to discard his Calvinistic principles. He defends his own position, criticizes Wesley's teaching as to Perfection, and gives his view of Hervey.

LIVERPOOL, April 9, 1765.

DEAR SIR,—I have just finished your *Narrative*, a remarkable proof, as you observe, that with God all things are possible. The objection current here, that you talk too much of Mrs. Newton, seems to me of no force at all. I cannot apprehend that you could well have spoken less or any otherwise than you do. And as to what you speak concerning Particular Redemption and the points connected therewith, you speak in so calm and dispassionate a manner as cannot give offence to any reasonable man. Nothing of this kind gives any offence to me ; for I think, and let think.

I believe every one has a right to think for himself and (in some sense) to speak for himself : I mean, to use any mode of expression which appears to him most agreeable to Scripture. You yourself in time past was in the same sentiment. You did not so much inquire, ' Is a man of this or that opinion ? ' or ' Does he make use of this or the other mode of expression ? ' but ' Is he a believer in Jesus Christ ? ' and ' Is his life suitable to his profession ? ' Upon this ground commenced the acquaintance (perhaps I might say more, the friendship) between you and me. We both knew there was a difference in our opinions, and consequently in our expressions. But, notwithstanding this, we tasted each other's spirits, and often took sweet counsel together.

And what hinders it now ? I do not know that our opinions differ a jot more now than formerly. But a dying man has drawn a sword, and wounded, if not me, yet many others, and you among the rest. Poor Mr. Hervey (or Mr. Cudworth rather), painting me like an hideous monster, with exquisite

art both disfiguring my character and distorting my sentiments, has made even Mr. Newton afraid of me, who once thought me at least an harmless animal. A quarrel he could not make between us ; neither can any one else. For *two* must go to a quarrel ; and I declare to you I will not be one.

But I do not think it is enough for us not to quarrel : I am persuaded we may help each other. Why not ? O beware of bigotry ! of an undue attachment to opinions or phrases ! You of all men ought to fly from this ; as you appear to be designed by Divine Providence for an healer of breaches, a reconciler of honest but prejudiced men, and an uniter (happy work !) of the children of God that are needlessly divided from each other. Perhaps your very opinion and way of speaking may enable you to do this among those to whom I have no access ; as my opinion and way of speaking enable me to calm those who would not give you so favourable an hearing. In the name of Him that has shown *you* mercy, I beseech you show this mercy to your brethren ! Soften and sweeten as far as in you lies their rugged or bitter spirits ! Incite them everywhere to insist upon the one point—Faith that worketh by love, or (in other words) Christ enlightning, justifying, sanctifying, reigning in the believing soul.

‘ Oh, but Mr. Hervey says *you* are *half* a Papist.’ What if he had *proved it* too ? What if he had proved I was a *whole* Papist ? (though he might as easily have proved me a Mahometan). Is not a Papist a child of God ? Is Thomas à Kempis, Mr. De Renty, Gregory Lopez gone to hell ? Believe it who can. Yet still of such (though Papists) the same is my brother and sister and mother.

I have waited a fortnight for a passage to Dublin, but am now determined to move toward Scotland first. If you should favour me with a few lines, please to send direct to Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Peace be with you both.—I am, dear sir,

Your affectionate brother and servant.

To the Rev. Mr. Newton,  
At Oulney, Bucks.

#### To Dr. Erskine

John Erskine, of the Old Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh, had just republished the *Eleven Letters from the late Rev. Mr. Hervey to the*



*Rev. Mr. John Wesley*, with a caustic Preface. The volume 'made a great deal of noise,' and led Wesley to write this letter to him. Erskine asserted that Wesley had concealed his sentiments, and Wesley printed the letter to show that it was simply written 'out of love to him and concern for the cause of God.' See *Journal*, v. 111-121; Tyerman's *Wesley*, ii. 530-1; and letters of October 14, 1757, and May 23, 1768.

EDINBURGH, *April 24, 1765.*

REVEREND SIR,—Between thirty and forty years I have had the world upon me, speaking all manner of evil. And I expected no less, as God had called me to testify that its deeds were evil. But the children of God were not upon me; nor did I expect they would. I rather hoped they would take knowledge that all my designs, and thought, and care, and labour were directed to this one point—to advance the kingdom of Christ upon earth. And so many of them did, however differing from me both in opinions and modes of worship. I have the pleasure to mention Dr. Doddridge, Dr. Watts, and Mr. Wardrobe<sup>1</sup> in particular. How, then, was I surprised as well as concerned that a child of the same Father, a servant of the same Lord, a member of the same family, and (as to the essence of it) a preacher of the same gospel, should, without any provocation that I know of, declare open war against me! I was the more surprised, because you had told me, some months since, that you would favour me with a letter. And had this been done, I make no doubt but you would have received full satisfaction. Instead of this, you ushered into this part of the world one of the most bitter libels that was ever written against me;—written by a dying man (so far as it was written by poor, well-meaning Mr. Hervey), with a trembling hand, just as he was tottering on the margin of the grave. A great warrior resigned his crown, because 'there should be some interval,' he said, 'between fighting and death.' But Mr. Hervey, who had been a man of peace all his life, began a war not six months before he died. He drew his sword when he was just putting off his body. He then fell on one to whom he had the deepest obligations (as his own letters, which I have now in my hands, testify), on one who had never intentionally

---

<sup>1</sup> Minister of Hexham, and then of Bathgate. See *Journal*, iv. 116, 164.

wronged him, who had never spoken an unkind word of him or to him, and who loved him as his own child. O tell it not in Gath! The good Mr. Hervey (if these *Letters* were his) died cursing his spiritual father.

And these *Letters* another good man, Mr. Erskine, has introduced into Scotland, and warmly recommended. Why have you done this? 'Because you have concealed your principles, which is palpable dishonesty.'

When I was first invited into Scotland (about fourteen years ago), Mr. Whitefield told me: 'You have no business there; for your principles are so well known, that if you spoke like an angel none would hear you. And if they did, you would have nothing to do but to dispute with one and another from morning to night.'

I answered: 'If God sends me, people will hear. And I will give them no provocation to dispute; for I will studiously avoid controverted points, and keep to the fundamental truths of Christianity. And if any still begin to dispute, they may; but I will not dispute with them.'

I came: hundreds and thousands flocked to hear. But I was enabled to keep my word. I avoided whatever might engender strife, and insisted upon the grand points—the religion of the heart and salvation by faith—at all times and in all places. And by this means I have cut off all occasion of dispute from the first day to this very hour. And this you amazingly improve into a fault, construe into a proof of dishonesty. You likewise charge me with holding unsound principles, and with saying, 'Right opinions are (sometimes) no part of religion.'

The last charge I have answered over and over, and very lately to Bishop Warburton.<sup>1</sup> Certainly, had you read that single tract, you would never have repeated that stale objection.

As to my principles, every one knows, or may know, that I believe the Thirty-first Article of the Church of England. But can none be saved who believe this? I know you will not say so. Meantime, in the main point (Justification by Faith) I have not wavered a moment for these seven-and-twenty years. And I allow all which Mr. Hervey himself

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Nov. 26, 1762.

contends for in his entrance upon the subject,—‘Come to Jesus as a needy beggar; hang upon Him as a devoted pensioner.’ And whoever does this, I will be bold to say shall not perish everlastingly.

As to your main objection, convince me that it is my duty to preach on controverted subjects, Predestination in particular, and I will do it. At present I think it would be a sin. I think it would create still more divisions. And are there not enough already? I have seen a book written by one who styles himself *Ecclesiae direptae et gementis Presbyter*.<sup>1</sup> Shall I tear *ecclesiam direptam et gementem*?<sup>2</sup> God forbid! No: I will so far as I can, heal her breaches. And if you really love her (as I doubt not you do), why should you hinder me from so doing? Has she so many friends and helpers left, that you should strive to lessen their number? Would you wish to turn any of her friends, even though weak and mistaken, into enemies? If you must contend, have you not Arians, Socinians, Seceders, infidels to contend with; to say nothing of whoremongers, adulterers, Sabbath-breakers, drunkards, common swearers? *O ecclesia gemens!* And will you pass by all these, and single out me to fight with? Nay, but I will not. I do and will fight with all these, but not with you. I cannot; I dare not. You are the son of my Father, my fellow labourer in the gospel of His dear Son. I love your person; I love your character; I love the work wherein you are engaged. And if you will still shoot at me (because Mr. Hervey has painted me as a monster), even with arrows drawn from Bishop Warburton’s quiver (how unfit for Mr. Erskine’s hand!), I can only say, as I always did before, the Lord Jesus bless you in your soul, in your body, in your relations, in your work, in whatever tends to His own glory!—I am, dear sir,  
Your affectionate brother.

### To John Newton

Wesley says in his *Journal* of this date, ‘I wrote the following letter to a friend.’ It was sent from the house of Alexander Knox, who had invited him to stay with him on the 11th instant, and proved his steadfast supporter. William Bull quotes part of it in his *Life of Rev.*

<sup>1</sup> ‘A Presbyter of a torn-asunder and groaning Church.’

<sup>2</sup> ‘A Church torn asunder and groaning.’

*John Newton*, and says that Wesley wrote two more letters, 'controversial, but Christian and conciliatory.' These we have not been able to trace. On November 14, 1760, Newton told Wesley about his preaching in Grimshaw's parsonage in August: 'Methinks here again you are ready to say, Very well, why not go on in the same way?' He gives reasons why he could not become an itinerant (see letter in *Arminian Magazine*, 1780, pp. 441-4). Newton found it difficult to secure ordination.

LONDONDERRY, May 14, 1765.

DEAR SIR,—Your manner of writing needs no excuse. I hope you will always write in the same manner. Love is the plainest thing in the world: I know this dictates what you write; and then what need of ceremony?

You have admirably well expressed what I mean by an opinion contradistinguished from an essential doctrine. Whatever is 'compatible with a love to Christ and a work of grace' I term an opinion. And certainly the holding Particular Election and Final Perseverance is compatible with these. 'Yet what fundamental error,' you ask, 'have you opposed with half that frequency and *vehemence* as you have these opinions?' So doubtless you have heard. But it is not true. I have printed near fifty sermons, and only one of these opposes them at all. I preach about eight hundred sermons in a year; and, taking one year with another, for twenty years past I have not preached eight sermons in a year upon the subject. But, 'How many of your best preachers have been thrust out because they dissented from you in these particulars?' Not one, best or worst, good or bad, was ever *thrust out* on this account. There has been not a single instance of the kind. Two or three (but far from *the best* of our preachers) voluntarily left us after they had embraced those opinions. But it was of their own mere motion: and two I should have expelled for immoral behaviour; but they withdrew, and *pretended* 'they did not hold our doctrine.' Set a mark, therefore, on him who told you that tale, and let his word for the future go for nothing.

'Is a man a believer in Jesus Christ and is his life suitable to his profession?' are not only the *main* but the *sole* inquiries I make in order to his admission into our Society. If he is a Dissenter, he may be a Dissenter still: but if he is a Church-

man, I advise him to continue so ; and that for many reasons, some of which are mentioned in the tract upon that subject.

When you have read what I have wrote on occasion of the *Letters* lately published, I may say something more on that head. And it will then be time enough to show you why some *part* of those *Letters could not* be wrote by Mr. Hervey.

I think on Justification just as I have done any time these seven-and-twenty years, and just as Mr. Calvin does. In this respect I do not differ from him an hair's breadth.

But the main point between you and me is Perfection. 'This,' you say, 'has no prevalence in these parts ; otherwise I should think it my duty to oppose it with my whole strength—not as an opinion, but as a dangerous mistake, which appears to be subversive of the very foundations of Christian experience, and which has, in fact, given occasion to the most grievous offences.' Just so my brother and I reasoned thirty years ago. 'We think it our duty to oppose Predestination with our whole strength—not as an opinion, but as a dangerous mistake, which appears to be subversive of the very foundations of Christian experience, and which has, in fact, given occasion to the most grievous offences.'

That it has given occasion to such offences I know ; I can name time, place, and persons. But still another fact stares me in the face. Mr. Haweis and Mr. Newton hold this, and yet I believe these have real Christian experience. But if so, this is only an *opinion* ; it is not subversive (here is clear proof to the contrary) 'of the very foundations of Christian experience.' It is 'compatible with a love to Christ and a genuine work of grace.' Yea, many hold it at whose feet I desire to be found in the day of the Lord Jesus. If, then, I 'oppose this with my whole strength,' I am a mere bigot still. I leave *you* in your calm and retired moments to make the application.

But how came this opinion into my mind ? I will tell you with all simplicity. In 1725 I met with Bishop Taylor's *Rules of Holy Living and Dying*. I was struck particularly with the chapter upon Intention, and felt a fixed intention to *give myself up to God*. In this I was much confirmed soon

after by the *Christian Pattern*, and longed to *give God all my heart*. This is just what I mean by Perfection now : I sought after it from that hour.

In 1727 I read Mr. Law's *Christian Perfection and Serious Call*, and more explicitly resolved to be *all devoted to God* in body, soul, and spirit. In 1730 I began to be *homo unius libri*,<sup>1</sup> to study (comparatively) no book but the Bible. I then saw in a stronger light than ever before that only *one thing is needful*, even *faith that worketh by the love* of God and man, all inward and outward holiness ; and I groaned to love God with *all my heart* and to serve Him with *all my strength*.

January 1, 1733, I preached the sermon on the Circumcision of the Heart, which contains all that I now teach concerning salvation from *all sin* and loving God with an *undivided heart*. In the same year I printed (the first time I ventured to print anything) for the use of my pupils *A Collection of Forms of Prayer* ; and in this I spoke explicitly of giving '*the whole heart and the whole life to God.*' This was then, as it is now, my idea of Perfection, though I should have started at the *word*.

In 1735 I preached my farewell sermon at Epworth, in Lincolnshire. In this likewise I spoke with the utmost clearness of having *one design, one desire, one love*, and of pursuing the *one end* of our life in *all* our words and actions.

In January 1738 I expressed my desire in these words :

O grant that nothing in my soul  
 May dwell but Thy *pure love alone* !  
 O may Thy love *possess me whole*,  
 My joy, my treasure, and my crown !  
 Strange flames far from my heart remove !  
 My *every* act, word, thought, be love !<sup>2</sup>

And I am still persuaded this is what the Lord Jesus hath bought for me with His own blood.

<sup>1</sup> 'A man of one book.' In Preface to *Sermons*, vol. i. (1746). See *Works*, v. 3 ; *W.H.S.* v. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Gerhardt's hymn, translated by Wesley (*Hymns and Sacred Poems*, 1739). In his *Plain Account of Christian Perfection* he says : ' In

the beginning of the year 1738, as I was returning from Savannah, the cry of my heart was,

O grant that nothing in my soul  
 May dwell but Thy *pure love alone* !'

See *Works*, xi. 369.

Now, whether *you* desire and expect this blessing or not, is it not an astonishing thing that you or any man living should be disgusted at *me* for expecting it? Is it not more astonishing still 'that wellnigh all the religious world should be up in arms concerning it,' and that they should persuade one another that this hope is 'subversive of the very foundations of Christian experience'? Why, then whoever retains it cannot possibly have any Christian experience at all! then my brother, Mr. Fletcher, and I, and twenty thousand more, who *seem* both to fear and to love God, are in reality children of the devil and in the road to eternal damnation!

In God's name I entreat you make me sensible of this! Show me by plain, strong reasons what dishonour this hope does to Christ, wherein it opposes Justification by Faith or any fundamental truth of religion. But do not wrest and wiredraw and colour my words as Mr. Hervey (or Cudworth) has done in such a manner that when I look in that glass I do not know my own face! 'Shall I call you,' says Mr. Hervey, 'my father or my friend? For you have been both to me.' So I was, and you have as well requited me! It is well my reward is with the Most High. Wishing all happiness to you and yours, I am, dear sir,

Your affectionate brother and servant.

To the Rev. Mr. Newton, At Mr. Clunies',  
Harp Lane, Thames Street, London.

### *To Lady Maxwell*

When Wesley visited Lady Maxwell on April 23, he was glad to find that her mind was not hurt by the Hervey *Letters*, which had been reprinted in Edinburgh. See letter of April 24.

LONDONDERRY, May 25, 1765.

MY DEAR LADY,—It is not easy for me to express the satisfaction I received in the few hours I lately spent with you. Before I saw you I had many fears concerning you, lest your concern for the one thing should be abated, lest your desires should be cooled or your mind a little hurt by any of the things which have lately occurred. So much the greater was my joy, when all those fears were removed, when I found the

same openness and sweetness as before both in your spirit and conversation, and the same earnestness of desire after the only thing which deserves the whole strength of our affection. I believe tenderness and steadiness are seldom planted by nature in one spirit. But what is too hard for almighty grace? This can give strength and softness together. This is able to fill your soul with all firmness as well as with all gentleness. And hereunto are you called, for nothing less than all the mind which was in Christ Jesus.

It was with great pleasure that I observed your fixed resolution not to rest in anything short of this. I know not why you should—why you should be content with being half a Christian, devoted partly to God and partly to the world, or more properly to the devil. Nay, but let us be all for God. He has created the whole, our whole body, soul, and spirit. He that bought us hath redeemed the whole; and let Him take the purchase of His blood. Let Him sanctify the whole, that all we have and are may be a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving!

I am not afraid of your being satisfied with less than this; but I am afraid of your seeking it the wrong way. Here is the danger, that you should seek it, not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. See how exactly the Apostle speaks: you do not seek it directly, but as it were by works. I fear lest this should be your case, which might retard your receiving the blessing. Christ has died for you; He has bought pardon for you. Why should not you receive it now? while you have this paper in your hand? Because you have not done thus or thus? See your own works. Because you are not thus and thus? more contrite? more earnest? more sincere? See your own righteousness. O let it all go! None but Christ! None but Christ! And if He alone is sufficient, if what He has suffered and done, if His blood and righteousness are enough, they are nigh thee! in thy mouth, and in thy heart! See, all things are ready! Do not wait for this or that preparation! for something to bring to God! Bring Christ! Rather, let Him bring you, bring you home to God! Lord Jesus, take her! Take her and all her sins! Take her as she is! Take her now! Arise, why tarriest thou? Wash away her sins!



Sprinkle her with Thy blood ! Let her sink down into the arms of Thy love and cry out, ' My Lord and my God ! '

Let me hear from you as soon as you can. You do not know how great a satisfaction this is to, my dear Lady,

Your ever affectionate servant.

Be pleased to direct to the New Room in Dublin.

### To James Knox

Wesley dined with James Knox on June 26, 1760, and speaks highly of the family. But when he returned to Sligo on May 1, 1762, their spirit was quite changed, and they treated him as an entire stranger. On May 11, 1765, Alexander Knox, of Londonderry, 'accommodated me with a convenient lodging at his own house,' Wesley wrote. 'So one Mr. Knox is taken away, and another given me in his stead.' At Sligo on May 28 not a few of the hearers showed 'a total want of good sense, of good manners, yea of common decency.' Wesley missed his old friend, and wrote this letter of remonstrance on the night before he left Sligo. The last words of the letter, 'He came to nothing!' do not appear in the *Works*. See *Journal*, iv. 394-5, 502; v. 115, 127-8.

SLIGO, May 30, 1765.

DEAR SIR,—Probably this is the last trouble of the kind which you will receive from *me*. If you receive it in the same spirit wherein it is wrote, I shall be glad. If not, my record is with the Most High. I did not choose it should be delivered till I was gone, lest you should think I wanted anything from you. By the blessing of God I want nothing, only that you should be happy in time and in eternity.

Still, I cannot but remember the clear *light* you had with regard to the nature of real scriptural Christianity. You saw what heart-religion meant, and the gate of it—Justification. You had earnest *desires* to be a partaker of the whole gospel blessing. And you evidenced the sincerity of those desires by the *steps* you took in your *family*. So that in everything you was hastening to be not almost but altogether a Christian.

Where is that *light* now ? Do you now see that true religion is not a negative or an external thing, but the life of God in the soul of man, the image of God stamped upon the heart ? Do you now see that, in order to this, we are justified freely

through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ? Where are the *desires* after this which you once felt, the hungering and thirsting after righteousness? And where are the outward marks of a soul groaning after God and refusing to be comforted with anything less than His love?

Will you say, 'But if I had gone on in that way, I should have lost my friends and my reputation'? This is partly true. You would have lost most of those friends who neither love nor fear God. Happy loss! These are the men who do you more hurt than all the world besides. These are the men whom, if ever you would be a *real* Christian, you must avoid as you would avoid hell-fire. 'But then they will censure me.' So they will. They will say you are a fool, a madman, and what not. But what are you the worse for this? Why, the Spirit of glory and of Christ shall rest upon you. 'But it will hurt me in my business.' Suppose it should, the favour of God would make large amends. But very probably it would not. For the winds and the seas are in God's hands as well as the hearts of men. 'But it is inconsistent with my duty to the *Church*.' Can a man of understanding talk so? and talk so in earnest? Is it not rather a copy of his countenance? Indeed, if you can mean 'inconsistent with my pleasing this or that clergyman,' I allow it. But let him be pleased or displeased, please thou God! But are these clergymen *the Church*? Unless they are *holy men*, earnestly loving and serving God, they are not even members of the Church; they are no part of it. And unless they preach the doctrines of the Church contained in her Articles and Liturgy, they are no true ministers of the Church, but are eating her bread and tearing out her bowels.

'But you will not leave the Church.' You never will by my advice. I advise just the contrary. I advise you to lose no opportunity of attending the services of the Church, of receiving the Lord's supper, and of showing your regard to all her appointments. I advise you steadily to adhere to her doctrine in every branch of it; particularly with respect to the two fundamental points, Justification by Faith and Holiness. But, above all, I cannot but earnestly entreat you not to rest till you experience what she teaches; till (to sum up all in

one word) God 'cleanses the thoughts of your heart by the inspiration of His Holy Spirit, that you may perfectly love Him and worthily magnify His holy name.' Unless this be done, what will it profit you to increase your fortune, to preserve the fairest reputation, and to gain the favour of the most learned, the most ingenious, the most honourable clergymen in the kingdom? What shall it profit a man to gain all these and to lose his own soul?

I know to God all things are possible. Therefore it is possible you may take this kindly. If so, I shall hope to receive a line from you directed to Mr. Beauchamp's in Limerick. If not, let it be forgotten, till we meet at the judgement-seat of Christ.—I am, dear sir, Your affectionate servant.

To Mr. James Knox.

He came to nothing!

### *To Peggy Dale*

Wesley's friend Miss Lewen (whom he first met on May 2, 1764) took him in a chaise from Birmingham to Derby on March 20, 1765. Her niece Margaret Dale was with her. She and her two sisters lived near Newcastle, under Miss Lewen's care. Their father, Edward Dale, of Tunstall, near Sunderland, married Eleanor, youngest of the three daughters of the Rev. John Lawrence, Rector of Bishop's Wearmouth. They had three daughters, Margaret, Mary, and Anne, and a son named Edward. The father died when his boy was an infant and Mary only eleven.

Peggy Dale (who was then twenty) became one of Wesley's most favoured correspondents. Thirty of his letters to her were handed down to her nephew, William Dale. It is said in the *Life and Letters of Thomas Pelham Dale*: 'It is evident that she would not have parted with these letters in her lifetime, especially to any one so religiously unsympathetic as William Dale must have been. Probably he had them from his father, her brother, not from her.' He came to London in 1780, and afterwards went to push his fortunes in the West Indies. He was never heard of again. The letters came into the hands of his son Thomas, Dean of Rochester, who gave some of them away. The rest are published in the *Life and Letters* (Nos. 2 and 12 being given in facsimile). Nos. 1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 25, 26, 27, 28 (vol. i. 7-26) are missing. For the rediscovered No. 8, see p. 321.

The Register of St. Andrew's, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, for March 4, 1773, gives the marriage of 'Edward Avison and Margaret Dale, spinster'; and on November 23, 1777, her burial appears—'Margaret,

widow of Edward Avison, Organist' The gravestone opposite the south porch reads: 'In memory of Edward Avison and Margaret his wife, who were eminent for piety and primitive simplicity of manners. Having each borne a lingering disease with the most exemplary patience and resignation, they rejoiced in the approach of death, and expired with hopes full of immortality. He died on October 1, 1776, aged twenty-nine; she in November 1777, aged thirty-three.' His younger brother, Charles, succeeded his father, Charles Avison, as organist of St. Nicholas's Church, and his son Charles was afterwards organist there. The grandfather is commemorated in Browning's 'With Charles Avison,' and is still remembered by the piece from one of his concertos, 'Sound the loud timbrel' Charles Avison's tomb was restored by public subscription in 1890.

A deeply spiritual letter from Molly Dale to Wesley, dated June 18, 1765, is given in the *Arminian Magazine*, 1783, p. 327; and another, January 1, 1772, was in the possession of Mrs. B. F. Fielding in 1928. She was made leader of a band in 1770 by Peter Jaco, who was Assistant in Newcastle. In May and June 1790 Miss Ritchie visited Newcastle, where, she says, 'I spent some time with Miss Dale, and found sweet fellowship of spirit with her, and freedom among the people, although at first I thought them rather shy and distant.' On July 12 she writes to Mrs. Thornton, of London: 'Dear Miss Dale, whom I believe you know, is a blessed follower of our Lord. She is a person of one business. We are striving to help each other to sink into the life of humble love, that we may rise into the riches of our Saviour's grace; and He condescends to smile upon us.'

Anne Dale was married at St. Andrew's Church to John Collinson, of Southwark, had five children, and died in 1812: see heading to letter of May 20, 1769.

CASTLEBAR, June 1, 1765.

MY DEAR MISS PEGGY,—Certainly you not only need not sin, but you need not doubt any more. Christ is yours. All is yours. You can give Him all your heart; and will He not freely give you all things? But you can only return what He has given by continually receiving more. You have reason to bless Him who has cast your lot in a fair ground. Even in this world He does not withhold from you any manner of thing that is good. Let your heart be always open to receive His whole blessing!

How far do you find power over your thoughts? Does not your imagination sometimes wander? Do those imaginations continue for any time? or have you power to check them immediately? Do you find continually the spirit of prayer?

and are you always happy ? I trust you will be happier every day ; and that you will not forget, my dear sister,

Your affectionate brother.

Miss Dale, At the Orphan House,  
In Newcastle-upon-Tyne.  
By Portpatrick. Pd. two pence.

### *To the Leaders and Stewards*

LIMERICK, *June 9, 1765.*

MY DEAR BRETHERN,—Yours of March evening, 28th, I received yesterday. I shall have little time to spare this autumn ; yet I will endeavour (with God's leave) to spend a few days in Cornwall. I hope to be at Tiverton on Tuesday, September 3 ; on Wednesday, 4th, at Bideford ; on Thursday evening, 5th, at Millhouse ; on Friday at Port Isaac ; on Saturday the 7th at St. Cuthbert's ; on Sunday morning and afternoon at St. Agnes ; on Monday, 9th, St. Just ; Tuesday, 10th, St. Ives ; Friday, 13th, St. Just ; Saturday, 21st, Bristol.<sup>1</sup> Let Mr. Rankin fix the time and place of the Quarterly Meetings.

Peace be multiplied upon you.—I am, my dear brethren,  
Your affectionate brother.

### *To Thomas Rankin*

George Story, who was appointed Assistant for Cornwall in August, became a gifted and devoted preacher in 1763, and from 1793 to 1808 was connected with the Book-Room as Editor and then as Manager of the Printing Office. He died in 1818.

LIMERICK, *June 9, 1765.*

DEAR TOMMY,—You see my plan on the other side.<sup>2</sup> Tell me of any alteration or addition which you think proper, and fix your Quarterly Meetings as you please, only let full notice be given.

Brother Roberts<sup>3</sup> has reunited them at the Dock ; and I have a mild, loving letter from Brother Jones.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless it is a doubt whether I ought to go to the Dock at all before the house is settled.

<sup>1</sup> The *Journal*, v. 141-8, shows how closely he kept to his plan.

<sup>2</sup> The previous letter.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of Sept. 3, 1763.

<sup>4</sup> See letter of Jan. 13.

'Tis pity, if a ready passage should offer, but one could exchange with Geo. Story. You know the man. If it cannot be, we must be content. Peace be with your spirit.—I am, dear Tommy, Your affectionate friend and brother.

*To Peggy Dale*

KILKENNY, July 5, 1765.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Although it is certain the kind of wandering thoughts which you mention are consistent with pure love, yet it is highly desirable to be delivered from them, because (as you observe) they hinder profitable thoughts. And why should not you be delivered? Indeed, in what manner this will be done we do not know. Sometimes it pleases our Lord to work a great deliverance even of this kind in a moment. Sometimes He gives the victory by degrees. And I believe this is more common. Expect this and every good gift from Him. How wise and gracious are all His ways!

Do you commonly find in yourself the witness that you are saved from sin? And is it usually clear? Or do you frequently lose it? I do not know why you should ever lose any good gift. For is not He the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever? And yet you have known but a little of Him. You are to sink a thousand times deeper into Him:

That sea of light and love unknown,  
Without a bottom or a shore.

I hope Miss Lewen and you speak to each other, not only without disguise, but without reserve. How is your lot cast in a fair ground! How well are you situated for making the best of a short life!

Secluded from the world and all its care,  
Hast thou to joy or grieve, to hope or fear?

That is, with regard to present things? No: God has given you a nobler portion. You have nothing to care for but how you may most entirely and effectually present yourself a living sacrifice to God.

When I reflect upon your earnest desire to do this and

upon your simplicity of heart, it gives an unspeakable pleasure  
to, my dear sister, Your affectionate brother.

I expect to be at Dublin till the end of this month. I send Miss Lewen's letter by Portpatrick to try which comes soonest.<sup>1</sup>

To Miss Peggy Dale, At the Orphan House,  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

To Lady Maxwell

KILKENNY, July 5, 1765.

MY DEAR LADY,—As yours was sent from Dublin to Cork, and then back again hither, I did not receive it till yesterday. I am now setting my face again towards England; but I expect to be in Dublin till the beginning of next month, and then to cross over, so as to be at Manchester (if it please God) about the middle of August. Either at Dublin or at Manchester I hope to have the pleasure of hearing from you. This is indeed a pleasure, as it is, to write to you; though sometimes I do this with fear—a fear lest I should give you any pain, as I know the tenderness of your spirit. I wish I could be of some service to you; that I could encourage you to cast yourself on Him that loves you, that is now waiting to pour His peace into your heart, to give you an entrance into the holiest by His blood. See Him, see Him! full of grace and truth! full of grace and truth for thee! I do not doubt but He is gradually working in you; but I want you to experience likewise an instantaneous work. Then shall the gradual go on swiftly. Lord, speak! Thy servant heareth! Say Thou, 'Let there be light'; and there shall be light. Now let it spring up in your heart!

It may be He that does all things well has wise reasons, though not apparent to us, for working more gradually in you than He has done of late years in most others. It may please Him to give you the consciousness of His favour, the conviction that you are accepted through the Beloved, by almost insensible degrees, like the dawning of the day. And it is all one how it began, so you do but walk in the light. Be this given in an instant or by degrees, hold it fast. Christ

<sup>1</sup> The letter to Miss Lewen is missing.

is yours ; He hath loved you ; He hath given Himself for you. Therefore you shall be holy as He is holy, both in heart and in all manner of conversation.

Give me leave, my dear friend, to add a word likewise concerning your bodily health. You should in any wise give yourself all the air and exercise that you can. And I should advise you (even though long custom made it difficult, if that were the case) to sleep as early as possible ; never later than ten, in order to rise as early as health will permit. The having good spirits, so called, or the contrary, very much depends on this. I believe medicines will do you little service : you need only proper diet, exact regularity, and constant exercise, with the blessing of God.

Your speaking or writing was never tedious to me yet ; and I am persuaded never will be. Your letters are more and more agreeable to, my very dear Lady,

Your most affectionate servant.

*To Thomas Rankin*

Joseph Hoskins (Hosken), of Cubert, was the wealthy farmer with whom John Haime lived for a time in 1766 as his domestic chaplain. Wesley paid him several visits. But in 1778 he found the venerable man scarce half alive. 'However, he made shift to go in a chaise to the preaching, and, deaf as he was, to hear almost every word.' He died on March 6, 1780. See *Journal*, v. 142 ; vi. 77, 123, 169, 208 ; and letter of September 16, 1766.

KILKENNY, July 15, 1765.

DEAR TOMMY,—I received yours yesterday. I suppose you have now my answer to your last. The Conference is to begin at Manchester on Thursday, August 20.

I have no objection to what you proposed to Mr. Hoskins, only my age. If he had left *that* gentleman trustee, I would not have given a groat for all his legacies. I wish he would not delay. A day ought not to be lost.

Yours affectionately.

I hope to set out for Cornwall (as I said before) immediately after the Conference. If possible, let the will be finished *before* I come. This would prevent much reproach.

You will carry Mr. Hoskins's letter directly.

To Mr. Rankin, At Mr. John Andrews',  
In Redruth. Per Gloucester.



*To Miss March*

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, August 9, 1765.

I have many fears concerning you, lest you should sink beneath the dignity of your calling, or be moved to the right hand or the left from the simplicity of the gospel. Is your heart still whole with God? Do you still desire and seek no happiness but in Him? Are you always or generally sensible of His presence? Do you generally, at least, find communion with Him? And do you expect all that you enjoyed once, and more; to be sanctified throughout before you go hence?

I hope no inward or outward reasonings are able to move you from walking exactly according to the gospel. O beware of voluntary humility; of thinking, 'Such an one is better than me, and why should I pretend to be more strict than her?' 'What is that to thee? follow thou Me!' You have but one pattern: follow Him inwardly and outwardly. If other believers will go step for step with you, well; but if not, follow Him!

Peace be with your spirit.

*To Miss March*

BRISTOL, August 31, 1765.

You may be assured it is not a small degree of satisfaction to me to hear that your soul prospers. I cannot be indifferent to anything which concerns either your present or future welfare. As you covet, so I want you to enjoy, the most excellent gifts. To your outward walking I have no objection. But I want you to walk inwardly in the fullness of love, and in the broad light of God's countenance. What is requisite to this but to believe always? now to believe with your whole heart, and to hold fast the beginning of this confidence steadfast unto the end? And yet a self-complaisant thought, yea, or a blasphemous one, may steal across your spirit; but I will not say that is your own thought. Perhaps an enemy hath done this. Neither will I blame you for 'feeling deeply the perverseness of others,' or for 'feeling your spirit tried with it.' I do not wish that you should not feel it (while it remains), or that you should feel it otherwise than as a trial. But this does not prove that there is sin in your heart or that

you are not a sacrifice to love. O my friend, do justice to the grace of God! Hold fast whereunto you have attained; and if you have not yet uninterrupted communion with Him, why not this moment, and from this moment? If you have not, I incline to think it is occasioned by reasoning or by some inward or outward omission.

*To Richard Walsh*

This young preacher was probably Richard Walsh, admitted on trial in August, and stationed in Wiltshire. Richard Henderson, the Assistant, was an Irishman who had come to England in 1762. He was a man of piety, good sense, and an amiable disposition, a very acceptable and useful preacher. After his retirement from the itinerancy he kept a private asylum at Hanham, near Bristol. See *Journal*, vii. 433; *Atmore's Memorial*, pp. 183-4; and letter of September 8, 1788.

REDRUTH, September 9, 1765.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I doubt very much whether either Jeremy Coombs or Sister Weyworth spoke any such thing.

I advise you to go to Mr. Henderson and relate to him what you mentioned to me. I have no objection to your speaking at those times and places which he shall think proper. On the 23rd and 24th of next month (Wednesday and Thursday) I expect, God willing, to be at Salisbury myself.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Thomas Rankin*

This letter and that of May 30, 1764, show the minute attention which Wesley gave to the life of his members and to the sale of his books. Jane Cooper died in 1762. Wesley called her 'a pattern of all holiness.' He published her *Letters* in 1764. See *Journal*, iv. 539; *Green's Bibliography*, No. 225.

ST. JOHN'S, September 11, 1765.

DEAR TOMMY,—There is a good work in Cornwall. But where the great work goes on well we should take care to be exact in little things.

I will tell you several of these just as they occur to my mind. Grace Paddy at Redruth met in the select society, though she wore a large glittering necklace and met no band.

They sing all over Cornwall a tune so full of repetitions and

flourishes that it can scarce be sung with devotion. It is to those words,

Praise the Lord, ye blessed ones.

Away with it ! Let it be heard no more.

They cannot sing our old common tunes. Teach these everywhere. Take pains herein.

The Societies are not half supplied with books ; not even with Jane Cooper's *Letters*, or the two or three Sermons which I printed last year ; no, not with the shilling Hymn-Book or *Primitive Physick*.

They almost universally neglect fasting.

The preaching-houses are miserable, even the new ones. They have neither light nor air sufficient ; and they are far, far too low and too small. Look at Yarm house.

Recommend the *Notes on the Old Testament* in good earnest. Every Society as a Society should subscribe. Remind them everywhere that two, four, or six might join together for a copy, and bring the money to their leader weekly.

We have need to use all the common sense God has given us as well as all the grace.—I am, dear Tommy,

Your affectionate friend and brother.

To Mrs. Crosby

KINGSWOOD, October 5, 1765.

MY DEAR SISTER,—You oblige me much by speaking so freely. What an admirable teacher is experience ! You have great reason to praise God for what He has taught you hereby, and to expect that He will teach you all things. But, whatever you find now, beware you do not deny what you had once received : I do not say ' a divine assurance that you should never sin or sustain any spiritual loss.' I know not that ever you received this. But you certainly were saved from sin, and that as clearly and in as high a degree as ever Sally Ryan<sup>1</sup> was. And if you have sustained any loss in this, believe and be made whole.

I never doubted but [Miss Dale] would recover her strength, though she has long walked in a thorny way.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Oct. 12, 1764.

A general temptation now is the denying what God had wrought. Guard all whom you converse with from this, and from fancying great grace can be preserved without great watchfulness and self-denial.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

*To Miss March*

BRISTOL, October 13, 1765.

A year or two ago you was pretty clear of enthusiasm: I hope you are so still. But nothing under heaven is more catching, especially when it is found in those we love; and, above all, when it is in those whom we cannot but believe to be sound of understanding in most instances, and to have received larger measures of the grace of God than we have ourselves.

There are now about twenty persons here who believe they are saved from sin (1) because they always love, pray, rejoice, and give thanks; and (2) because they have the witness of it in themselves. But if these lose what they have received, nothing will be more easy than to think they never had it. There were four hundred (to speak at the lowest) in London who (unless they told me lies) had the same experience. If near half of these have lost what they had received, I do not wonder if they think they never had it: it is so ready a way of excusing themselves for throwing away the blessed gift of God.

I no more doubt of Miss Dale's having this once than I doubt of her sister's<sup>1</sup> having it now. Whether God will restore her suddenly as well as freely I know not; whether by many steps, or in one moment. But here again you halt, as Sarah Crosby did, and Sarah Ryan does. You seem to think pain, yea much pain, must go before an entire cure. In Sarah Ryan it did, and in a very few others.<sup>2</sup> But it need not: pain is no more salutary than pleasure. Saving grace is essentially such, saving pain but accidentally. When God saves us by pain rather than pleasure, I can resolve it only into His justice or sovereign will. To use the grace we

<sup>1</sup> Miss Peggy. See letter of June 4, 1767.

<sup>2</sup> See previous letter.

have, and now to expect all we want, is the grand secret. He whom you love will teach you this continually.

*To Christopher Hopper*

Kershaw was the second preacher at Yarm. He afterwards settled at Gainsborough, where he became famous for his quack medicines. He died at Ashby-de-la-Zouch. His *Comment on the Book of Revelation* in dialogue form was 'generally esteemed as a masterly performance.' See Atmore's *Memorial*, p. 237; and letters of February 17, 1759, and March 3, 1776 (to Mrs. Woodhouse).

BRISTOL, October 16, 1765.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—So honest Sander<sup>1</sup> has outrode all the storms and got safe into the haven! The Lord does all things well. I should not wish to stay here any longer than I could be useful.

You and James Kershaw are considerate men. You must set your wits to work to find out ways and means. I will venture to answer for one fifty pounds, payable next August. Let our brethren pray in good earnest, and God will provide the rest.—I am Yours affectionately.

I am returning to London.

*To Peggy Dale*

LONDON, November 6, 1765.

MY DEAR SISTER,—By our intercourse with a beloved friend it often pleases God to enlighten our understanding. But this is only the second point: to warm the heart is a greater blessing than light itself. And this effect I frequently find from your letters. The Lord repay it sevenfold into your own bosom! Do you still remain in the persuasion that you shall not live beyond three-and-twenty?<sup>2</sup> Do you remember when or how it began? Does it continue the same, whether your health is worse or better? What a mercy is it that death has lost its sting! Will this hinder any real or substantial happiness? Will it prevent our loving one another?

Can Death's interposing tide  
Spirits one in Christ divide?

<sup>1</sup> Alexander Coates. See letter of July 7, 1761.

<sup>2</sup> See letter of Dec. 31. She died at the age of thirty-three.

Surely no ! Whatever comes from Him is eternal as Himself.  
 —My dear sister, adieu !  
 To Miss Dale, At the Orphan House,  
 Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

*To William Orpe*

William Orpe was a yeoman farmer's son at Prestwood, in Staffordshire. He became an itinerant preacher at Leeds in August 1765, after a year on trial ; and is said to have been ' one of the best Hebrew linguists of the day.' Wesley's esteem for him appears in the letters of December 14, 1765, and September 18 and December 16, 1766. He advises him as to his marriage on September 2, 1767. Wesley spelt his name ' Orp.'

LONDON, November 13, 1765.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—You must in no wise return to your father's ; it would be at the price of your soul. You have already made the experiment, and you made it long enough, till you had wellnigh quenched the Spirit. If you should leap into the furnace again, how would you expect that God would bring you out ?

As to your temptation concerning preaching, it is nothing uncommon. Many have had it as well as you, and some of them for a time gave place to the devil and departed from the work. So did John Catermole ; so did James Morgan : but God scourged them back again. Do not reason with the devil, but pray, wrestle with God, and He will give you light.  
 —I am  
 Your affectionate brother.

To Mr. Will. Orpe, At Mr. Dickenson's,  
 Near the Dolphin, In Birmingham.

*To Thomas Rankin*

LONDON, November 18, 1765.

DEAR TOMMY,—You have satisfied me with regard to the particulars which I mentioned in my letter from Cornwall. Only one thing I desire you to remember : never sit up later than ten o'clock—no, not for any reason (except a watch-night), not on any pretence whatsoever. In general, I desire you would go to bed about a quarter after nine.

Likewise be temperate in speaking—never too loud, never too long : else Satan will befool you ; and, on pretence of being *more useful*, quite disable you from being useful at all.

Rd. Henderson<sup>1</sup> desired that he might be the book-keeper this year in Wiltshire, and save me two shillings in the pound. But whoever you approve of, so do I. Write to Mr. Franks<sup>2</sup> accordingly.—I am, dear Tommy,

Your affectionate friend and brother.

To Mr. Thomas Rankin, At Mr. Joseph Garnet's,  
In Barnard Castle, County of Durham.

### To George Gidley

Wesley reached London on October 24, after a prolonged tour in Cornwall. The first letter to Bishop Lavington appeared in 1750, and the second (Wesley's reply to the Bishop's answer to the first) was issued in 1752. For details as to the registration of Methodist preaching-places, see Simon's *John Wesley and the Advance of Methodism*, pp. 57-9, 179-80; and also July 19, 1750.

LONDON, November 25, 1765.

DEAR GEORGE,—I have well considered the case of Nath. Fenton. It is certain we *can* have justice by moving the Court of King's Bench. But it would probably cost forty or fifty pounds. Now, I doubt whether this would be worth while, whether you had not better leave them to themselves for the present. Only pray send Mr. Hale (as I promised) my *Answers* to the Bishop of Exeter.

If the Justice at Exeter will grant you warrants, take them by all means; and inform him (what probably he does not know) that I have tried already with the whole Bench of Justices whether the Conventicle Act affects the Methodists, and have cast them in Westminster Hall. And if any, high or low, has a mind to fight with me again, let them begin as soon as they please.—I am

Your affectionate friend and brother.

### To Lady Maxwell

Lady Maxwell continued in this state for two years. Fear and hope alternately prevailed. Her labours for the poor and sick were unceasing, and before her death in 1810 more than eight hundred children had been trained in the school she established in Edinburgh. See Lancaster's *Life of Lady Maxwell*, p. 23.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Sept. 9.

<sup>2</sup> See letters of Oct. 5, 1763, and July 9, 1766 (to his brother).

LONDON, *December 1, 1765.*

MY DEAR LADY,—Perhaps there is scarce any child of man that is not at some time a little touched by prejudice, so far at least as to be troubled, though not wounded. But it does not hurt unless it fixes upon the mind. It is not strength of understanding which can prevent this. The heart, which otherwise suffers most by it, makes the resistance which only is effectual. I cannot easily be prejudiced against any person whom I tenderly love till that love declines. So long, therefore, as our affection is preserved by watchfulness and prayer to Him that gave it, prejudice must stand at a distance. Another excellent defence against it is openness. I admire you upon this account. You dare (in spite of that strange reserve which so prevails in North Britain) speak the naked sentiments of your heart. I hope my dear friend will never do otherwise. In simplicity and godly sincerity, the very reverse of worldly wisdom, have all your conversation in the world.

Have you received a gleam of light from above, a spark of faith? O let it not go! Hold fast, by His grace, that token of His love, that earnest of your inheritance. Come just as you are, and come boldly to the throne of grace. You need not delay! Even now the bowels of Jesus Christ yearn over you. What have you to do with to-morrow? I love you to-day. And how much more does He love you! He

Pities still His wandering sheep,  
Longs to bring you to His fold!

To-day hear His voice—the voice of Him that speaks as never man spake, the voice that raises the dead, that calls the things which are not as though they were. Hark! What says He now? ‘Fear not; only believe! Woman, thy sins are forgiven thee! Go in peace; thy faith hath made thee whole.’ Indeed, I am, my dear Lady,

Your ever affectionate servant.

*To William Orpe*

LONDON, *December 14, 1765.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—You have a clear call to go home for a short season. But let it be as short as you



can. 'Let the dead bury their dead. But follow thou Me.'

I do not know that either getting a licence or taking the oaths would signify a rush. These are things which the mob has little regard to.<sup>1</sup> Not that there is anything in those oaths that at all entangles your conscience. The very same thing which you thereby engage to do every honest man must do without that engagement. We in particular shall 'bear true allegiance to our Sovereign Lord King George,' whether we swear so to do or no. The main point is to be all devoted to God. You might begin the Sunday service at Birmingham as soon as the Church service ends.—I am

Your affectionate brother.

To Mr. Will. Orpe, At Mr. Ezekiel King's,  
In Stroud, Gloucestershir.

### To Christopher Hopper

Thomas Williams belonged to a respectable Welsh family, and graduated at one of the Universities. He became a Methodist preacher in 1741. Thomas Walsh listened to him with deep and growing interest. He had a pleasing manner, and was a popular preacher, but impatient of control and sadly lacking in moral principle. After he was excluded from the Methodist brotherhood, he received ordination and laboured for some years at High Wycombe. See Crookshank's *Methodism in Ireland*, i. 25, and index; Atmore's *Memorial*, pp. 506-7; and heading to letter of August 13, 1747.

Moseley Cheek, Hopper's colleague in Newcastle, was a preacher from 1764 to 1769, and then became minister of St. Stephen's, Salford. Wesley preached at his door at Chepstow on August 31, 1763 (*Journal*, v. 29).

LONDON, December 17, 1765.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I am glad you have been at Edinburgh, especially on so good an errand. But I wonder T. Olivers<sup>2</sup> ever disappointed them at Musselburgh. It is bad husbandry to neglect old places in order to preach at new. Yet I am informed he has been useful in Scotland. Whether he should now go to Glasgow or delay it a little longer I have

<sup>1</sup> Orpe was second of the three preachers in Staffordshire, where Methodists had to suffer much

from the mob.

<sup>2</sup> Olivers had been appointed to Glasgow in August.

left to T. Taylor's<sup>1</sup> choice. If you can spare Moseley Cheek six or eight days, let him visit poor Dunbar. If Brother Williams's affairs are not made up, he should not stay at so public a place as Edinburgh.

On one condition—that Michael<sup>2</sup> will make it a point of conscience to follow *your* directions in all things, great and small—I consent to his staying at Newcastle. *If* he is guideable, he may do well. O cure him of being a coxcomb!—I am

Yours affectionately.

To Mr. Hopper, At the Orphan House,  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

### *To Peggy Dale*

LONDON, December 31, 1765.

MY DEAR PEGGY,—Whether that persuasion<sup>3</sup> was from nature or from God a little time will show. It will be matter of great joy to me if God gives you many years to glorify Him in the body before He removes you to the world of spirits. The comfort is, that life or death, all is yours, seeing you are Christ's: all is good, all is blessing! You have only to rest upon Him with the whole weight of your soul. Temptations to pride you may have, or to anything; but these do not sully your soul. Amidst a thousand temptations you may retain unspotted purity. Abide in Him by simple faith this moment! Live, walk in love! The Lord increase it in you a thousand-fold! Take out of His fullness grace upon grace. Tell me from time [to time] just what you feel. I cannot tell you how tenderly I am, my dear sister, Your affectionate brother.

### *To Mrs. Wyndowe*

LONDON, January 7, 1766.

MY DEAR SALLY,—From the time that I first took acquaintance with you at Earl's Bridge,<sup>4</sup> I have still retained the same regard for you. Therefore I am always well pleased with hearing from you, especially when you inform me that you

<sup>1</sup> Taylor was Assistant in Edinburgh. See *Wesley's Veterans*, vii. 43-4; and letter of July 8, 1766.

<sup>2</sup> Michael Fenwick. See letter of Sept. 12, 1755, to Ebenezer Blackwell.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of Nov. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Wesley spent an hour at Byford on March 16, 1789. The Diary note is, '11 Byford, tea, within; 12 chaise' (*Journal*, vii. 478d).

are pursuing the best things. And you will not pursue them in vain if you still resolutely continue to spend some time in private every day. It is true you cannot fix any determinate measure of time because of numberless avocations. And it is likewise true that you will often find yourself so dead and cold that it will seem to be mere labour lost. No; it is not. It is the way wherein He that raises the dead has appointed to meet you. And we know not how soon He may meet you, and say, 'Woman! I say unto thee, Arise!' Then the fear of [death] which has so long triumphed over you shall be put under your feet. Look up! my friend! Expect that He who loves you will soon come and will not tarry! To His care I commit you; and am, my dear Sally,

Yours most affectionately.

Mrs. Wyndowe, Byford, Near Stroud,  
Gloucestershire.

### *To Thomas Rankin*

John Ellis was the second preacher in the Dales Circuit, in which Rankin was the Assistant. He was a Liverpool man, who became a preacher in 1762 and died in 1772. Matthew Lowes and Moseley Cheek were in the Newcastle Circuit. For John Fenwick, see letter of November 7, 1751.

COLCHESTER, *January 23, 1766.*

DEAR TOMMY,—Suppose the numbers swell to an hundred (as probably they will), consider what it would amount to to give seventy persons 50s. apiece before I am reimbursed for the expense of the edition!<sup>1</sup> Indeed, I did not think of this till my brother mentioned it. But all the preachers shall, if they desire it, have them at half price.

I am glad John Ellis takes care of the books while you are in Newcastle Circuit. When Matthew Lowes returns, let Moseley Cheek go into the Barnard Castle Circuit. At Lady Day, or within a few days after, you should return thither yourself. Speak quite freely to John Fenwick. You may trust him.—I am, dear Tommy,

Your affectionate friend and brother.

To Mr. Thomas Rankin, At the Orphan House,  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

<sup>1</sup> *Explanatory Notes upon the Old Testament*, vol. i. (4to, 852 pp.), had been published in 1765. See letter of June 20.

*To George Merryweather*

Rowell was Assistant at Yarm. He is called both Jacob and Matthew Rowell in the *Minutes*. Atmore says he was 'a plain, upright, honest, faithful, pious man; he was very zealous for God.' See *Journal*, iv. 67n, 117, 465n; v. 465, 468; and letter of March 24, 1761.

LONDON, February 8, 1766.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—Where Christian perfection is not strongly and explicitly preached there is seldom any remarkable blessing from God, and consequently little addition to the Society and little life in the members of it. Therefore, if Jacob Rowell is grown faint and says but little about it, do you supply his lack of service. Speak, and spare not. Let not regard for any man induce you to betray the truth of God. Till you press the believers to expect *full salvation* now you must not look for any revival.

It is certain God does at some times, without any cause known to us, shower down His grace in an extraordinary manner. And He does in some instances delay to give either justifying or sanctifying grace for reasons which are not discovered to us. These are some of those secrets of His government, which it hath pleased Him to reserve in His own breast. I hope you and your wife keep all you have and gasp for more.—I am                      Your affectionate brother.

*To Peggy Dale*

This is No. 8, one of the Dale letters which was missing, and has an antique figure 8 on the back. All the letters were thus numbered.

February 8, 1766.

MY DEAR SISTER,—Away with those doubts! They did not come from Him that calleth you. O let nothing induce you to cast away that confidence which hath great recompense of reward! Beware, my dear friend, of the Reasoning Devil, whose way is first to tempt, and then to accuse. There is a right temper, a sorrow for our little improvements, which exceedingly resembles envy. But the anointing of the Holy One will teach you to distinguish one from the other. You are saved of the Lord. Distrust Him not. Much less deny

what He has done for you and in you. If you did, how could [you] be thankful for it? Look unto Jesus and stand fast!—  
I am, my dear Peggy,                      Your affectionate brother.

*To his Brother Charles*

LEWISHAM, February 28, 1766.

DEAR BROTHER,—We must, we must, you and I at least, be all devoted to God! Then wives and sons and daughters and everything else will be real, invaluable blessings. *Eia, age; rumpe moras!*<sup>1</sup> Let us *this day* use all the power we have! If we have enough, well; if not, let us *this day* expect a fresh supply. How long shall we drag on thus heavily, though. God has called us to be the chief conductors of *such a work*? Alas! what conductors! If I am (in some sense) the head and you the heart of the work, may it not be said, 'The whole head is sick and the whole heart faint'? Come, in the name of God, let us arise and shake ourselves from the dust! Let us strengthen each other's hands in God, and that without delay. Have *senes sexagenarii* (who would have thought we should live to be such!) time to lose? Let you and I and our house serve the Lord in good earnest! May His peace rest on you and yours! Adieu!

I desire all the Society to meet me on Tuesday evening (March 11) after preaching.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Virgil's *Aeneid*, iv. 569: 'Come on, act; break off delay.'

<sup>2</sup> He met the Bristol Society at this time. See *Journal*, v. 159.

## CONTROVERSIAL

- I. To JOHN DOWNES, Rector of St. Michael's, Wood Street, author of *Methodism Examined and Exposed*.
- II. To DR. WARBURTON, Bishop of Gloucester, 'occasioned by his tract on *The Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit*.'



# CONTROVERSIAL

## I

### TO JOHN DOWNES, RECTOR OF ST. MICHAEL'S, WOOD STREET

This pungent and masterly reply was called forth by a pamphlet entitled '*Methodism Examined and Exposed; or, The Clergy's Duty of guarding their Flocks against False Teachers.* A Discourse lately delivered in Four Parts. By the Rev. Mr. Downes, Rector of St. Michael, Wood Street, and Lecturer of St. Mary Le Bow.' (Rivington, 1759, 1s. 6d.) The discourses were based on Acts xx. 28-30, and were afterwards included in the two volumes of Sermons published by John Downes's widow in 1761. See Green's *Bibliography*, No. 195; and letter of November 22, 1760.

LONDON, November 17, 1759.

REVEREND SIR,—I. In the tract which you have just published concerning the people called Methodists you very properly say: 'Our first care should be candidly and fairly to examine their doctrines. For, as to censure them unexamined would be unjust, so to do the same without a fair and impartial examination would be ungenerous.' And again: 'We should in the first place carefully and candidly examine their doctrines.' (Page 68.) This is undoubtedly true. But have you done it? Have you ever examined their doctrines yet? Have you examined them fairly? fairly and candidly? candidly and carefully? Have you read over so much as the Sermons they have published or the *Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*? I hope you have not; for I would fain make some little excuse for your uttering so many senseless, shameless falsehoods. I hope you know nothing about the Methodists, no more than I do about the Cham of Tartary; that you are ignorant of the whole affair, and are so bold only because you are blind. *Bold enough!* Throughout your whole tract you speak *satis pro imperio*,<sup>1</sup>—as authoritatively as if you was, not an archbishop only, but Apostolic Vicar also; as if you had the full papal power in your hands, and fire and faggot at your beck! And *blind enough*; so that you blunder on through thick and thin,

<sup>1</sup> Terence's *Phormio*, l. iv. 19: 'With authority enough.'



bespattering all that come in your way, according to the old, laudable maxim, 'Throw dirt enough, and some will stick.'

2. I hope, I say, that this is the case, and that you do not knowingly assert so many palpable falsehoods. You say: 'If I am mistaken, I shall always be ready and desirous to retract my error' (page 56). A little candour and care might have prevented those mistakes; this is the first thing one would have desired. The next is that they may be removed; that you may see wherein you have been mistaken, and be more wary for the time to come.

3. You undertake to give an account, first, of the rise and principles, then of the practices, of the Methodists.

On the former head you say: 'Our Church has long been infested with these grievous wolves, who, though no more than two when they entered in, and they so young they might rather be called wolfings' (that is lively and pretty!), 'have yet spread their ravenous kind through every part of this kingdom. Where, what havoc they have made, how many of the sheep they have torn, I need not say.' (Pages 4-5.) 'About twenty-five years ago these two bold though beardless divines' (pity, sir, that you had not taught me twenty-five years ago *sapientem pascere barbam*,<sup>1</sup> and thereby to avoid some part of your displeasure), 'being lifted up with spiritual pride, were presumptuous enough to become founders of the sect called Methodists' (page 6). 'A couple of young, raw, aspiring twigs of the ministry dreamed of a special and supernatural call to this' (page 25). No, sir; it was you dreamed of this, not we. We dreamed of nothing twenty-five years ago but instructing our pupils in religion and learning and a few prisoners in the common principles of Christianity. You go on: 'They were ambitious of being accounted missionaries, immediately delegated by Heaven to correct the errors of bishops and archbishops and reform their abuses, to instruct the clergy in the true nature of Christianity, and to caution the laity not to venture their souls in any such unhallowed hands as refused to be initiated in all the mysteries of Methodism' (pages 20-1). Well *asserted* indeed; but where is the *proof* of any one of these propositions? I must insist upon this—clear, cogent proof; else they must be set down for so many glaring falsehoods.

4. 'The Church of Rome (to which on so many accounts they

<sup>1</sup> Horace's *Satires*, II. iii. 35:

'What time, by his instructions cheered,  
He bade me train his sapient beard.'

were much obliged, and as gratefully returned the obligation) taught them to set up for infallible interpreters of Scripture' (page 54). Pray on what accounts are we 'obliged to the Church of Rome'? and how have we 'returned the obligation'? I beg you would please (1) to explain this; and (2) to prove that we ever yet (whoever taught us) 'set up for infallible interpreters of Scripture.' So far from it, that we have over and over declared, in print as well as in public preaching, 'We are no more to expect any living man to be infallible than to be omniscient.'

5. 'As to other extraordinary gifts, influences, and operations of the Holy Ghost, no man who has but once dipped into their Journals and other ostentatious trash of the same kind can doubt their looking upon themselves as not coming one whit behind the greatest of the Apostles' (page 21). I acquit you, sir, of ever having 'once dipped into that ostentatious trash.' I do not accuse you of having read so much as the titles of my Journals. I say *my* Journals; for (as little as you seem to know it) my brother has published none.<sup>2</sup> I therefore look upon this as simple ignorance. You talk thus because you know no better. You do not know that in these very Journals I utterly disclaim the 'extraordinary gifts of the Spirit,' and all other 'influences and operations of the Holy Ghost' than those that are common to all real Christians. And yet I will not say this ignorance is blameless. For ought you not to have known better? Ought you not to have taken the pains of procuring better information when it might so easily have been had? Ought you to have publicly advanced so heavy charges as these without knowing whether they were true or no?

6. You proceed to give as punctual an account of us *tanquam intus et in cute nosse*<sup>3</sup>: 'They outstripped, if possible, even Montanus for external sanctity and severity of discipline' (page 22). 'They condemned all regard for temporal concerns; they encouraged their devotees to take no thought for any one thing upon earth, the consequence of which was a total neglect of their affairs and an impoverishment of their families' (page 23). Blunder all over! We had no room for any discipline, severe or not, five-and-twenty years ago, unless college discipline; my brother then residing at Christ Church and I at Lincoln College. And as to our 'sanctity' (were it more or less), how do you know it was only

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, vi. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Extracts were published in 1793 in Whitehead's *Life of John and Charles Wesley*, and in Jackson's *Charles Wesley* in 1841. The *Journal*

itself did not appear till 1849.

<sup>3</sup> Persius' *Satires*, iii. 30 (adapted): 'As if you had the most intimate knowledge of us.'

external? Was you intimately acquainted with us? I do not remember where I had the honour of conversing with you. Or could you (as the legend says of St. Pachomius<sup>1</sup>) 'smell an heretic ten miles' off? And how came you to dream, again, that we 'condemned all regard for temporal concerns, and encouraged men to take no thought for any one thing upon earth'? Vain dream! We, on the contrary, severely condemn all who neglect their temporal concerns and who do not take care of everything on earth wherewith God hath entrusted them. The consequence of this is that the Methodists (so called) do not 'neglect their affairs and impoverish their families,' but by diligence in business 'provide things honest in the sight of all men': insomuch that multitudes of them, who in time past had scarce food to eat or raiment to put on, have now 'all things needful for life and godliness,' and that for their families as well as themselves.

7. Hitherto you have been giving an account of two wolfings only; but now they are grown into perfect wolves. Let us see what a picture you draw of them in this state, both as to their principles and practice.

You begin with a home-stroke: 'In the Montanist you may behold the bold lineaments and bloated countenance of the Methodist' (page 17). I wish you do not squint at the honest countenance of Mr. Venn, who is indeed as far from fear as he is from guile. But if it is somewhat 'bloated,' that is not his fault; sickness may have the same effect on yours or mine.

But to come closer to the point: 'They have darkened religion with many ridiculous fancies, tending to confound the head and to corrupt the heart' (page 13). 'A thorough knowledge of them would work in every rightly-disposed mind an abhorrence of those doctrines which directly tend to distract the head and to debauch the heart by turning faith into frenzy and the grace of God into wantonness' (pages 101-2). 'These doctrines are unreasonable and ridiculous, clashing with our natural ideas of the divine perfections, with the end of religion, with the honour of God, and man's both present and future happiness. Therefore we pronounce them "filthy dreamers," turning faith into fancy, the gospel into farce; thus adding blasphemy to enthusiasm.' (Pages 66-8.)

Take breath, sir; there is a long paragraph behind. 'The abettors of these wild and whimsical notions are (1) close friends to the Church of Rome, agreeing with her in almost everything but the doctrine of Merit; (2) they are no less kind to infidelity,

<sup>1</sup> Pachomius founded seven monasteries in the Theban desert.

by making the Christian religion a mere creature of the imagination ; (3) they cut up Christianity by the roots, frustrating the very end for which Christ died, which was that by holiness we might be "made meet for the inheritance of the saints" ; (4) they are enemies not only to Christianity but to "every religion whatsoever," by labouring to subvert or overturn the whole system of morality ; (5) consequently they must be enemies of society, dissolving the band by which it is united and knit together.' In a word : 'All ancient heresies have in a manner concentred in the Methodists ; particularly those of the Simonians, Gnostics, Antinomians' (as widely distant from each other as Predestinarians from Calvinists !), 'Valentinians, Donatists, and Montanists.' (Pages 101-2.) While your hand was in, you might as well have added Carpocratians, Eutychians, Nestorians, Sabellians. If you say, 'I never heard of them,' no matter for that ; you may find them, as well as the rest, in Bishop Pearson's index.

Well, all this is mere flourish, raising a dust to blind the eyes of the spectators. Generals, you know, prove nothing. So, leaving this as it is, let us come to particulars.

But first give me leave to transcribe a few words from a tract published some years ago. 'Your Lordship premises, "It is not at all needful to charge the particular tenets upon the particular persons among them." Indeed, it is needful in the highest degree. . . . Just as needful as it is not to put a stumbling-block in the way of our brethren ; not to lay them under an almost insuperable temptation of condemning the innocent with the guilty.'<sup>1</sup>

And it is now far more needful than it was then ; as that title of reproach, *Methodist*, is now affixed to many people who are not under my care nor ever had any connexion with me. And what have I to do with these ? If you give me a nickname, and then give it to others whom I know not, does this make me accountable for them ? either for their principles or practice ? In no wise. I am to answer for myself and for those that are in connexion with me. This is all that a man of common sense can undertake or a man of common humanity require.

Let us begin, then, upon even ground ; and if you can prove upon me, John Wesley, any one of the charges which you have advanced, call me not only a wolf, but an otter if you please.

8. Your first particular charge (which, indeed, runs through your book, and is repeated in twenty different places) is that we make the way to heaven too broad, teaching men may be saved

<sup>1</sup> See letter of June 11, 1747, sects. 4, 6, to Bishop Gibson.

by faith without works. Some of your words are,—‘ They set out with forming a fair and tempting model of religion, so flattering the follies of degenerate man that it could not fail to gain the hearts of multitudes, especially of the loose and vicious, the lazy and indolent. They want to get to heaven the shortest way and with the least trouble. Now, a reliance on Christ and a disclaiming of good works are terms as easy as the merest libertine can ask. They persuade their people that they may be saved by the righteousness of Christ without any holiness of their own—nay, that good works are not only unnecessary, but also dangerous ; that we may be saved by faith without any other requisite, such as gospel obedience and an holy life. Lastly : The Valentinians pretended that, if good works were necessary to salvation, it was only to animal men—that is, to all who were not of their clan ; and that, although sin might damn others, it could not hurt them. In consequence of which they lived in all lust and impurity, and wallowed in the most unheard-of bestialities. The Methodists distinguish much after the same manner.’ (Pages 52, 31, 38, 14.)

Sir, you are not awake yet. You are dreaming still, and fighting with shadows of your own raising. The ‘ model of religion with which the Methodists set out ’ is perfectly well known ; if not to you, yet to many thousands in England who are no Methodists. I laid it before the University of Oxford, at St. Mary’s, on January 1, 1733. You may read it when you are at leisure ; for it is in print, entitled *The Circumcision of the Heart*. And whoever reads only that one discourse with any tolerable share of attention will easily judge whether that ‘ model of religion flatters the follies of degenerate man ’ or is likely to ‘ gain the hearts of multitudes, especially of the loose and vicious, the lazy and indolent ’ ! Will a man choose this as ‘ the shortest way to heaven and with the least trouble ’ ? Are these ‘ as easy terms as any libertine ’ or infidel ‘ can desire ’ ? The truth is, we have been these thirty years continually reproached for just the contrary to what you dream of : with making the way to heaven too strait, with being ourselves ‘ righteous overmuch,’ and teaching others they could not be saved without so many works as it was impossible for them to perform.<sup>1</sup> And to this day, instead of teaching men that they may be saved by a faith which is without good works, without ‘ gospel obedience and holiness of life,’ we teach exactly the reverse, continually insisting on all outward as well as all inward holiness. For the notorious truth of this we appeal to the whole tenor of

<sup>1</sup> See letter of June 11, 1731, to his mother.

our sermons, printed and unprinted—in particular to those upon *Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount*,<sup>1</sup> wherein every branch of gospel obedience is both asserted and proved to be indispensably necessary to eternal salvation.

Therefore, as to the rest of the 'Antinomian trash' which you have so carefully gathered up—as 'that the regenerate are as pure as Christ Himself, that it would be criminal for them to pray for pardon, that the greatest crimes are no crimes in the saints,' &c. &c. (page 17)—I have no concern therewith at all, no more than with any that teach it. Indeed, I have confuted it over and over in tracts published many years ago.

9. A second charge which you advance is that 'we suppose every man's final doom to depend on God's sovereign will and pleasure' (I presume you mean on His absolute, unconditional decree), that we 'consider man as a mere machine,' that we suppose believers 'cannot fall from grace' (page 31). Nay, I suppose none of these things. Let those who do answer for themselves. I suppose just the contrary in *Predestination Calmly Considered*, a tract published ten years ago.<sup>2</sup>

10. A third charge is: 'They represent faith as a supernatural principle, altogether precluding the judgement and understanding, and discerned by some internal signs; not as a firm persuasion founded on the evidence of reason, and discernible only by a conformity of life and manners to such a persuasion' (page 11).

We do not represent faith 'as altogether precluding,' or at all 'precluding, the judgement and understanding'; rather as enlightening and strengthening the understanding, as clearing and improving the judgement. But we do represent it as the gift of God—yea, and a 'supernatural gift': yet it does not preclude 'the evidence of reason'; though neither is this its whole foundation. 'A conformity of life and manners' to that persuasion 'Christ loved me and gave Himself for me' is doubtless one mark by which it is discerned, but not the only one. It is likewise discerned by internal signs: both by the witness of the Spirit, and the fruit of the Spirit—namely, 'love, peace, joy, meekness, gentleness,' by all 'the mind which was in Christ Jesus.'

11. You assert, fourthly: 'They speak of grace, that it is as perceptible to the heart as sensible objects are to the senses; whereas the Scriptures speak of grace, that it is conveyed imperceptibly; and that the only way to be satisfied whether we have

<sup>1</sup> Discourses I.—XIII. See *Works*, v. 246—433.

<sup>2</sup> See *Works*, x. 204—59.

it or no is to appeal not to our inward feelings but our outward actions' (page 32).

We do speak of grace (meaning thereby that power of God which worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure), that it is 'as perceptible to the heart' (while it comforts, refreshes, purifies, and sheds the love of God abroad therein) 'as sensible objects are to the senses.' And yet we do not doubt but it may frequently be 'conveyed to us imperceptibly.' But we know no scripture which speaks of it as always conveyed and always working in an imperceptible manner. We likewise allow that outward actions are one way of satisfying us that we have grace in our hearts. But we cannot possibly allow that 'the only way to be satisfied of this is to appeal to our outward actions and not our inward feelings.' On the contrary, we believe that love, joy, peace are inwardly felt, or they have no being; and that men are satisfied they have grace, first by feeling these, and afterward by their outward actions.

12. You assert, fifthly: 'They talk of regeneration in every Christian as if it was as sudden and miraculous a conversion as that of St. Paul and the first converts to Christianity, and as if the signs of it were frightful tremors of body and convulsive agonies of mind; not as a work graciously begun and gradually carried on by the blessed Spirit in conjunction with our rational powers and faculties, the signs of which are sincere and universal obedience' (page 33).

This is part true, part false. We do believe regeneration (or, in plain English, the new birth) to be as miraculous or supernatural a work now as it was seventeen hundred years ago. We likewise believe that the spiritual life, which commences when we are born again, must in the nature of the thing have a first moment as well as the natural. But we say again and again we are concerned for the substance of the work, not the circumstance. Let it be wrought at all, and we will not contend whether it be wrought gradually or instantaneously. 'But what are the signs that it is wrought?' We never said or thought that they were either 'frightful tremors of body' or 'convulsive agonies of mind' (I presume you mean agonies of mind attended with bodily convulsions); although we know many persons who, before this change was wrought, felt much fear and sorrow of mind, which in some of these had such an effect on the body as to make all their bones to shake. Neither did we ever deny that it is 'a work graciously begun by the Holy Spirit,' enlightening our understanding (which, I suppose, you call 'our rational powers and faculties') as well

as influencing our affections. And it is certain He 'gradually carries on this work' by continuing to influence all the powers of the soul, and that the outward sign of this inward work is 'sincere and universal obedience.'

13. A sixth charge is: 'They treat Christianity as a wild, enthusiastic scheme, which will bear no examination' (page 30). Where or when? In what sermon? In what tract, practical or polemical? I wholly deny the charge. I have myself closely and carefully examined every part of it, every verse of the New Testament, in the original, as well as in our own and other translations.

14. Nearly allied to this is the threadbare charge of enthusiasm, with which you frequently and largely compliment us. But as this also is asserted only, and not proved, it falls to the ground of itself. Meantime your asserting it is a plain proof that you know nothing of the men you talk of. Because you know them not, you so boldly say, 'One advantage we have over them, and that is reason.' Nay, that is the very question. I appeal to all mankind whether you have it or no. However, you are sure we have it not, and are never likely to have. For 'reason,' you say, 'cannot do much with an enthusiast, whose first principle is to have nothing to do with reason, but resolve all his religious opinions and notions into immediate inspiration.' Then, by your own account, I am no enthusiast; for I resolve none of my notions into immediate inspiration. I have something to do with reason; perhaps as much as many of those who make no account of my labours. And I am ready to give up every opinion which I cannot by calm, clear reason defend. Whenever, therefore, you will try what you can do by argument, which you have not done yet, I wait your leisure, and will follow you step by step which way soever you lead.

15. 'But is not this plain proof of the enthusiasm of the Methodists, that they despise human learning and make a loud and terrible outcry against it?' Pray, sir, when and where was this done? Be so good as to point out the time and place; for I am quite a stranger to it. I believe, indeed, and so do you, that many men make an ill use of their learning. But so they do of their Bibles; therefore this is no reason for despising or crying out against it. I would use it just as far as it will go; how far I apprehend it may be of use, how far I judge it to be expedient at least, if not necessary, for a clergyman, you might have seen in the *Earnest Address to the Clergy*.<sup>1</sup> But in the meantime I bless

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Jan. 7, 1756, #.



God that there is a more excellent gift than either the knowledge of languages or philosophy: for tongues and knowledge and learning will vanish away; but love never faileth.

16. I think this is all you have said which is any way material concerning the doctrines of the Methodists. The charges you bring concerning their spirit or practice may be dispatched in fewer words.

And, first, you charge them with pride and uncharitableness: 'They talk as proudly as the Donatists of their being the only true preachers of the gospel, and esteem themselves, in contradistinction to others, as the regenerate, the children of God, and as having arrived at sinless perfection' (page 15).

All of a piece. We neither talk nor think so. We doubt not but there are many true preachers of the gospel, both in England and elsewhere, who have no connexion with, no knowledge of us. Neither can we doubt but that there are many thousand children of God who never heard our voice or saw our face. And this may suffice for an answer to all the assertions of the same kind which are scattered up and down your work. Of sinless perfection, here brought in by head and shoulders, I have nothing to say at present.

17. You charge them, secondly, 'with boldness and blasphemy, who, triumphing in their train of credulous and crazy followers, the spurious' (should it not be rather *the genuine*?) 'offspring of their insidious craft, ascribe the glorious event to divine grace, and in almost every page of their paltry harangues invoke the blessed Spirit to go along with them in their soul-awakening work—that is, to continue to assist them in seducing the simple and unwary' (page 41).

What we ascribe to divine grace is this: the convincing sinners of the errors of their ways, and the 'turning them from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to God.' Do not you yourself ascribe this to grace? And do not you too invoke the blessed Spirit to go along with you in every part of your work? If you do not, you lose all your labour. Whether we 'seduce men into sin' or by His grace save them from it is another question.

18. You charge us, thirdly, with 'requiring a blind and implicit trust from our disciples' (page 10), who accordingly 'trust as implicitly in their preachers as the Papists in their Pope, Councils, or Church' (page 51). Far from it: neither do we require it; nor do they that hear us place any such trust in any creature. They 'search the Scriptures,' and hereby try every doctrine whether it be of God; and what is agreeable to Scripture they embrace, what is contrary to it they reject.

19. You charge us, fourthly, with injuring the clergy in various ways: 'They are very industrious to dissolve or break off that spiritual intercourse which the relation wherein we stand requires should be preserved betwixt us and our people.' But can that spiritual intercourse be either preserved or broke off which never existed? What spiritual intercourse exists between you, the Rector of St. Michael, and the people of your parish? I suppose you preach to them once a week, and now and then read prayers. Perhaps you visit one in ten of the sick. And is this all the spiritual intercourse which you have with those over whom the Holy Ghost hath made you an overseer? In how poor a sense, then, do you watch over the souls for whom you are to give an account to God! Sir, I wish to God there were a truly spiritual intercourse between you and all your people! I wish you 'knew all your flock by name, not excepting the men servants and women servants!' Then you might cherish each, 'as a nurse her own children,' and 'train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.' Then might you 'warn every one and exhort every one,' till you should 'present every one perfect in Christ Jesus.'

'But they say our sermons contradict the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of our own Church—yea, that we contradict ourselves, saying one thing in the desk and another in the pulpit.' And is there not cause to say so? I myself have heard several sermons preached in churches which flatly contradict both the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy—particularly on the head of Justification. I have likewise heard more than one or two persons who said one thing in the desk and another in the pulpit. In the desk they prayed God to 'cleanse the thoughts of their hearts by the inspiration of His Holy Spirit': in the pulpit they said there was 'no such thing as inspiration since the time of the Apostles.'

'But this is not all. You poison the people by the most peevish and spiteful invectives against the clergy, the most rude and rancorous revilings, and the most invidious calumnies.' (Page 51.) No more than I poison them with arsenic. I make no peevish or spiteful invectives against any man. Rude and rancorous revilings (such as your present tract abounds with) are also far from me. I dare not 'return railing for railing,' because (whether you know it or no) I fear God. Invidious calumnies likewise I never dealt in; all such weapons I leave to you.

20. One charge remains, which you repeat over and over, and lay a peculiar stress upon. (As to what you talk about perverting Scripture, I pass it by as mere unmeaning commonplace declama-

tion.) It is the poor old worn-out tale of 'getting money by preaching' This you only intimate at first 'Some of their followers had an inward call to sell all that they had and lay it at their feet' (page 22). Pray, sir, favour us with the name of one, and we will excuse you as to all the rest. In the next page you grow bolder, and roundly affirm. 'With all their heavenly-mindedness, they could not help casting a sheep's eye at the unrighteous mammon. Nor did they pay their court to it with less cunning and success than Montanus Under the specious appearance of gifts and offerings, they raised contributions from every quarter Besides the weekly pensions squeezed out of the poorer and lower part of their community, they were favoured with very large oblations from persons of better figure and fortune, and especially from many believing wives, who had learned to practise pious frauds on their unbelieving husbands'

I am almost ashamed (having done it twenty times before) to answer this stale calumny again But the bold, frontless manner wherein you advance it obliges me so to do Know then, sir, that you have no authority, either from Scripture or reason, to judge of other men by yourself If your own conscience convicts you of loving money, of 'casting a sheep's eye at the unrighteous mammon,' humble yourself before God, if haply the thoughts and desires of your heart may be forgiven you But, blessed be God, my conscience is clear. My heart does not condemn me in this matter I know, and God knoweth, that I have no desire to load myself with thick clay, that I love money no more than I love the mire in the streets, that I seek it not. And I have it not, any more than suffices for food and raiment, for the plain conveniences of life I pay no court to it at all, or to those that have it, either with cunning or without For myself, for my own use, I raise no contributions, either great or small The weekly contributions of our community (which are freely given, not *squeezed* out of any) as well as the gifts and offerings at the Lord's Table never come into my hands I have no concern with them, not so much as the beholding them with my eyes They are received every week by the stewards of the Society, men of well-known character in the world, and by them constantly distributed within the week to those whom they know to be in real necessity. As to the 'very large oblations wherewith I am favoured by persons of better figure and fortune,' I know nothing of them Be so kind as to refresh my memory by mentioning a few of their names I have the happiness of knowing some of great figure and fortune,

some right honourable persons. But if I were to say that all of them together had given me seven pounds in seven years I should say more than I could make good. And yet I doubt not but they would freely give me anything I wanted; but, by the blessing of God, I want nothing that they can give. I want only more of the spirit of love and power and of an healthful mind. As to those 'many believing wives who practise pious frauds on their unbelieving husbands,' I know them not—no, not one of that kind; therefore I doubt the fact. If you know any such, be pleased to give us their names and places of abode. Otherwise you must bear the blame of being the lover if not the maker of a lie.

Perhaps you will say, 'Why, a great man said the same thing but a few years ago.' What if he did? Let the frog swell as long as he can, he will not equal the ox. He might say many things, all circumstances considered, which will not come well from you, as you have neither his wit, nor sense, nor learning, nor age, nor dignity.

Tibi parvula res est :

Mctiri se quemque suo modulo ac pede verum est.<sup>1</sup>

If you fall upon people that meddle not with you, without either fear or wit, you may possibly find they have a little more to say for themselves than you was aware of. I 'follow peace with all men'; but if a man set upon me without either rhyme or reason, I think it my duty to defend myself so far as truth and justice permit. Yet still I am (if a poor enthusiast may not be so bold as to style himself your brother), reverend sir,

Your servant for Christ's sake.

---

<sup>1</sup> Horace's *Epistles*, i. vii. 98. level with Bishop Warburton. Let Wesley here give a free and edged every man know his own size.' See translation: 'You are not upon a next letter.

## II

### TO DR. WARBURTON, BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

William Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester 1759–79, published in 1762 *The Doctrine of Grace ; or, The Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit Vindicated from the Insults of Infidelity and the Abuses of Fanaticism*. Before it was published the Bishop sent his MS. to Wesley, who corrected the false readings, improper glosses, and other errors, and returned it to him. On January 5, 1763, Wesley told his brother Charles: 'I was a little surprised to find Bishop Warburton so entirely unacquainted with the New Testament; and, notwithstanding all his parade of learning, I believe he is no critic in Greek.' Lord Oxford said on March 21, 1726: 'Warburton, with all his industry and ingenuity, came very near to being an impostor as well as a bully.' In his *Journal* for November 1762 Wesley writes, 'From Monday the 22nd to Friday the 26th I was employed in answering the Bishop of Gloucester's book'; and on Monday the 29th, 'I retired to transcribe my answer to Bishop Warburton.' See Green's *Anti-Methodist Publications* No. 342.

Carré de Montgéron was a Councillor of the French Parliament converted from extreme scepticism to full belief in Catholic teaching by his pilgrimages to St. Médard at the tomb of the Abbé Paris. He wrote a quarto volume, *La Vérité des miracles Opérés par l'intercession de M. de Paris*, describing his experience and the grounds of his faith in the miracles. Bull Unigenitus, issued by Clement XI on September 8, 1713, was directed against the Jansenist Quesnel's French translation of the New Testament with Notes. Edward Brerewood (1565 ?–1613), of Brasenose College, Oxford, was first Professor of Astronomy at Gresham College, London, 1596. His mathematical, religious, and antiquarian MSS. were published posthumously.

*November 26, 1762.*

MY LORD,—Your Lordship well observes, 'To employ buffoonery in the service of religion is to violate the majesty of truth and to deprive it of a fair hearing. To examine, men must be serious.' (Preface, p. xi.) I will endeavour to be so in all the following pages; and the rather, not only because I am writing to a person who is so far and in so many respects my superior, but also because of the importance of the subject: for is the question only, What I am? a madman or a man in his senses? a knave or an honest

man? No; this is only brought in by way of illustration. The question is of the office and operation of the Holy Spirit; with which the doctrine of the New Birth, and indeed the whole of real religion, is connected. On a subject of so deep concern I desire to be serious as death. But, at the same time, your Lordship will permit me to use great plainness. And this I am the more emboldened to do because, by naming my name, your Lordship, as it were, condescends to meet me on even ground.

I shall consider first what your Lordship advances concerning me, and then what is advanced concerning the operations of the Holy Spirit.

I. First. Concerning me. It is true I am here dealing in *crambe repetita*,<sup>1</sup> reciting objections which have been urged and answered an hundred times. But as your Lordship is pleased to repeat them again, I am obliged to repeat the answers.

Your Lordship begins: 'If the false prophet pretend to some extraordinary measure of the Spirit, we are directed to try that spirit by James iii. 17' (page 117). I answer: (1) (as I have done many times before) I do not pretend to any extraordinary measure of the Spirit. I pretend to no other measure of it than may be claimed by every Christian minister. (2) Where are we directed to 'try prophets' by this text? How does it appear that it was given for any such purpose? It is certain we may try Christians hereby whether they are real or pretended ones; but I know not that either St. James or any other inspired writer gives us the least hint of trying prophets thereby.

Your Lordship adds: 'In this rule or direction for the trial of spirits the marks are to be applied only negatively. The man in whom they are not found hath not the "wisdom from above." But we are not to conclude that he has it in whom any or all of them are found.' (Page 118.) We are not to conclude that he is a prophet, for the Apostle says nothing about prophets; but may we not conclude the man in whom all these are found has 'the wisdom from above'? Surely we may, for these are the essential parts of that wisdom; and can he have all the parts and not have the whole?

Is not this enough to show that the Apostle is here giving 'a set of marks,' not 'to detect impostor prophets,' but impostor

<sup>1</sup> Juvenal's *Satires*, vii. 154: 'Twice-cooked cabbage.'

Christians? those that impose either upon themselves or others, as if they were Christians when they are not?

In what follows I shall simply consider the argument without directly addressing your Lordship.

'Apply these marks to the features of modern fanatics, especially Mr. John Wesley. He has laid claim to almost every apostolic gift in as full and ample a manner as they were possessed of old.' (Page 119.)

The miraculous gifts bestowed upon the Apostles are enumerated in two places: (1) Mark xvi. 17-18: 'In My name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.' (2) 1 Corinthians xii. 8-10: 'To one is given the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge; to another faith; to another the gifts of healing; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another the discernment of spirits; to another tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues.'

Do I lay claim to almost every one of these 'in as full and ample a manner as they were possessed of old'?

Five of them are enumerated in the former catalogue; to three of which—speaking with new tongues, taking up serpents, drinking deadly things—it is not even pretended I lay any claim at all. In the latter, nine are enumerated. And as to seven of these, none has yet seen good to call me in question—miraculous wisdom, or knowledge, or faith, prophecy, discernment of spirits, strange tongues, and the interpretation of tongues. What becomes, then, of the assertion that I lay 'claim to almost every one of them in the most full and ample manner'?

Do I lay claim to any one of them? To prove that I do my own words are produced, extracted from an account of the occurrences of about sixteen years.

I shall set them down naked and unadorned: 1. 'May 13, 1740. The devil stirred up his servants to make all the noise they could.' 2. 'May 3, 1741. I explained to a vast multitude of people, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" The devil's children fought valiantly for their master, that his kingdom should not be destroyed; and many stones fell on my right hand and my left.' 3. 'April 1, 1740. Some or other of the children of Belial had laboured to disturb us several nights before. Now all the street

was filled with people shouting, cursing, swearing, and ready to swallow the ground with rage.' (Page 120.) 4. 'June 27, 1747. I found only one person among them who knew the love of God before my brother came. No wonder the devil was so still; for his goods were in peace.' 5. 'April 29, 1752. I preached at Durham to a quiet, stupid congregation.' (Page 121.) 6. 'May 9, 1740. I was a little surprised at some who were buffeted of Satan in an unusual manner by such a spirit of laughter as they could in no wise resist. I could scarce have believed the account they gave me had I not known the same thing ten or eleven years ago, when both my brother and I were seized in the same manner.' If any man call this hysterics, I am not concerned; I think and let think. 7. 'May 21, 1740. In the evening such a spirit of laughter was among us that many were much offended. But the attention of all was soon fixed on poor Lucretia Smith, whom we all knew to be no dissembler. One so violently and variously torn of the evil one did I never see before. Sometimes she laughed till almost strangled; then broke out into cursing and blaspheming. At last she faintly called on Christ to help her, and the violence of her pangs ceased.' Let any who please impute this likewise to hysterics; only permit me to think otherwise. 8. 'May 17, 1740. I found more and more undeniable proofs that we have need to watch and pray every moment. Outward trials, indeed, were now removed: but so much the more did inward trials abound; and "if one member suffered, all the members suffered with it." So strange a sympathy did I never observe before: whatever considerable temptation fell on any one, unaccountably spreading itself to the rest, so that exceeding few were able to escape it.' (Pages 122-3.)

I know not what these eight quotations prove, but that I believe the devil still variously tempts and troubles good men, while he 'works with energy in the children of disobedience.' Certainly they do not prove that I lay claim to any of the preceding gifts. Let us see whether any more is proved by the ten next quotations: 1. 'So many living witnesses hath God given that His hand is still stretched out to heal' (namely, the souls of sinners, as the whole paragraph fixes the sense) 'and that signs and wonders are even now wrought' (page 124) (namely, in the conversion of the greatest sinners). 2. 'Among the poor colliers of Placey, Jo. Lane, then nine or ten years old, was one of the first that found peace with God' (ibid.). 3. 'Mrs. Nowers said her little son appeared to have a continual fear of God and an awful sense



of His presence. A few days since, she said he broke out into prayers aloud and said, "I shall go to heaven soon." This child, when he began to have the fear of God, was, as his parents said, just three years old. 4. I did receive that 'account of the young woman of Manchester from her own mouth.' But I pass no judgment on it, good or bad; nor, 5. On 'the trance' (page 126), as her mother called it, of S—— T——,<sup>1</sup> neither denying nor affirming the truth of it. 6. 'You deny that God does work these effects—at least, that He works them in this manner: I affirm both. I have seen very many persons changed in a moment from the spirit of fear, horror, despair, to the spirit of love, joy, and praise. In several of them this change was wrought in a dream, or during a strong representation to their mind of Christ either on the cross or in glory.' (Page 127.)

'But here the symptoms of grace and of perdition are interwoven and confounded with one another' (page 128). No. Though light followed darkness, yet they were not interwoven, much less confounded with each other. 7. 'But some imputed the work to the force of imagination, or even to the delusion of the devil' (ibid.). They did so; which made me say, 8. 'I fear we have grieved the Spirit of the jealous God by questioning His work' (ibid.). 9. 'Yet he says himself, "These symptoms I can no more impute to any natural cause than to the Spirit of God. I make no doubt it was Satan tearing them as they were coming to Christ."' (Page 129.) But these symptoms and the work mentioned before are wholly different things. The work spoken of is the conversion of sinners to God; these symptoms are cries and bodily pain. The very next instance makes this plain. 10. 'I visited a poor old woman. Her trials had been uncommon; inexpressible agonies of mind, joined with all sorts of bodily pain; not, it seemed, from any natural cause, but the direct operation of Satan.' (Page 130.)

Neither do any of those quotations prove that I lay claim to any miraculous gift.

'Such was the evangelic state of things when Mr. Wesley first entered on this ministry; who, seeing himself surrounded with subjects so harmoniously disposed, thus triumphantly exults.' To illustrate this let us add the date: 'Such was the evangelic state of things, August 9, 1750' (on that day I preached that sermon), 'when Mr. Wesley first entered on this ministry.' Nay, that was in the year 1738. So I triumphed because I saw what would be twelve years after!

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal*, iii. 254-6.

Let us see what the ten next quotations prove. 1. 'In applying these words, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance," my soul was so enlarged that methought I could have cried out (in another sense than poor vain Archimedes<sup>1</sup>), "Give me where to stand, and I will shake the earth"' (page 130). I meant neither more nor less (though I will not justify the use of so strong an expression) than I was so deeply penetrated with a sense of the love of God to sinners that it seemed, if I could have declared it to all the world, they could not but be moved thereby.

'Here, then, was a scene well prepared for a good actor, and excellently fitted up for the part he was to play' (page 131). But how came so good an actor to begin playing the part twelve years before the scene was fitted up?

'He sets out with declaring his mission. 2. "I cried aloud, All things are ready; come ye to the marriage. I then delivered my message." ' And does not every minister do the same whenever he preaches?

But how is this? 'He sets out with declaring his mission.' Nay, but this was ten years after my setting out.

3. 'My heart was not wholly resigned; yet I know He heard my voice' (page 132). 4. 'The longer I spoke the more strength I had, till at twelve I was as one refreshed with wine' (page 133). 5. 'I explained the nature of inward religion, words flowing upon me faster than I could speak' (ibid.). 6. 'I intended to have given an exhortation to the Society; but as soon as we met, the Spirit of supplication fell upon us' (on the congregation as well as me), 'so that I could hardly do anything but pray and give thanks' (ibid.). I believe every true Christian may experience all that is contained in these three instances. 7. 'The Spirit of prayer was so poured upon us all that we could only speak to God' (ibid.). 8. 'Many were seated on a wall, which in the middle of the sermon fell down; but not one was hurt at all: nor was there any interruption either of my speaking or of the attention of the hearers' (page 134). 9. 'The mob had just broke open the doors, and while they burst in at one door we walked out at the other; nor did one man take any notice of us, though we were within five yards of each other' (page 135). The fact was just so. I do not attempt to account for it, because I cannot. 10. 'The next miracle was on his friends.' They were no friends of mine. I had seen few of them before in my life. Neither do

<sup>1</sup> See letter in Dec. 1751, sect. 3, to Bishop Lavington, vol. iii. p. 296.

I say or think it was any miracle at all that they were all 'silent while I spake,' or that 'the moment I had done the chain fell off and they all began talking at once.'

Do any or all of these quotations prove that I 'lay claim to almost every miraculous gift'?

Will the eight following quotations prove any more? 1. 'Some heard perfectly well on the side of the opposite hill, which was sevenscore yards from the place where I stood '(ibid.). I believe they did, as it was a calm day, and the hill rose gradually like a theatre. 2. 'What I here aver is the naked fact. Let every one account for it as he sees good. My horse was exceeding lame, and my head ached much. I thought, Cannot God heal man or beast by means or without? Immediately my weariness and headache ceased, and my horse's lameness in the same instant.' (Page 136.) It was so; and I believe thousands of serious Christians have found as plain answers to prayer as this. 3. William Kirkman's case<sup>1</sup> proves only that God does what pleases Him, not that I make myself either 'a great saint or a great physician' (page 137). 4. 'R—— A——' was freed at once without any human means from a distemper naturally incurable' (page 138). He was; but it was before I knew him. So what is that to me? 5. 'I found Mr. Lunell in a violent fever. He revived the moment he saw me, and began to recover from that time. Perhaps for this also was I sent.' (Ibid.) I mean, perhaps this was one end for which the providence of God brought me thither at that time. 6. 'In the evening I called upon Ann Calcut. She had been speechless for some time. But almost as soon as we began to pray, God restored her speech. And from that hour the fever left her.' 7. 'I visited several ill of the spotted fever, which had been extremely mortal. But God had said, "Hitherto shalt thou come." I believe there was not one with whom we were but he recovered.' (Page 139.) 8. 'Mr. Meyrick had been speechless and senseless for some time. A few of us joined in prayer. Before we had done his sense and his speech returned. Others may account for this by natural causes. I believe this is the power of God.' (Ibid.)

But what does all this prove? Not that I claim any gift above other men, but only that I believe God now hears and answers prayer even beyond the ordinary course of nature; otherwise the clerk was in the right who, in order to prevent the fanaticism

<sup>1</sup> See letter in Dec. 1748, sect. XII.  
4, to Vincent Perronet.

<sup>2</sup> Is this Richard Annesley, Wesley's uncle? See *Journal*, IV. 101.

of his rector, told him, 'Sir, you should not pray for fair weather yet; for the moon does not change till Saturday.'

While the two accounts (pages 143, 146) which are next recited lay before me, a venerable old clergyman calling upon me, I asked him, 'Sir, would you advise me to publish these strange relations or not?' He answered, 'Are you sure of the facts?' I replied, 'As sure as that I am alive.' 'Then,' said he, 'publish them in God's name, and be not careful about the event.'

The short of the case is this. Two young women were tormented of the devil in an uncommon manner. Several serious persons desired my brother and me to pray with them. We with many others did; and they were delivered. But where meantime were 'the exorcisms in form, according to the Roman fashion'? I never used them; I never saw them; I know nothing about them.

'Such were the blessings which Mr. Wesley distributed among his friends. For his enemies he had in store the judgements of Heaven.' (Page 144.) Did I then ever distribute or profess to distribute these? Do I claim any such power? This is the present question. Let us calmly consider the eight quotations brought to prove it.

1. 'I preached at Darlaston, late a den of lions. But the fiercest of them God has called away by a train of surprising strokes.' (Ibid.) But not by me; I was not there. 2. 'I preached at Roughlee, late a place of furious riot and persecution, but quiet and calm since the bitter rector is gone to give an account of himself to God' (page 145). 3. 'Hence we rode to Todmorden, where the minister was slowly recovering from a violent fit of the palsy with which he was struck immediately after he had been preaching a virulent sermon against the Methodists' (page 145). 4. 'The case of Mr. Weston was dreadful indeed, and too notorious to be denied' (ibid.). 5. 'One of the chief of those who came to make the disturbance on the 1st instant hanged himself' (page 146). 6. 'I was quite surprised when I heard Mr. Romley<sup>1</sup> preach; that soft, smooth, tuneful voice, which he so often employed to blaspheme the work of God, was lost, without hope of recovery' (ibid.). 7. 'Mr. Cowley spoke so much in favour of the rioters that they were all discharged. A few days after, walking over the same field, he dropped down and spoke no more.' (Page 147.)

And what is the utmost that can be inferred from all these passages? That I believe these things to have been judgements.

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal*, iii. 359, 525.

What if I did? To believe these things to have been judgements is one thing; to claim a power of inflicting judgements is another. If, indeed, I believe things to be judgements which are not, I am to blame. But still this is not 'claiming any miraculous gift.'

But 'you cite one who forbid your speaking to some dying criminals, to answer for their souls at the judgement-seat of Christ' (*ibid.*). I do; but, be this right or wrong, it is not 'claiming a power to inflict judgements.'

'Yes, it is; for these judgements are fulminated with the air of one who had the divine vengeance at his disposal' (page 147). I think not; and I believe all impartial men will be of the same mind.

'These are some of the extraordinary gifts which Mr. Wesley claims' (page 149). I claim no 'extraordinary gift' at all; nor has anything to the contrary been proved yet, so much as in a single instance.

'We come now to the application of this sovereign test, James iii. 17.' But let us see that we understand it first. I beg leave to consider the whole: 'Who is a wise and knowing man among you? Let him show his wisdom,' as well as his faith, 'by his works,' not by words only. 'But if ye have bitter zeal and strife in your heart, do not glory and lie against the truth'; as if any such zeal, anything contrary to love, could consist with true wisdom. 'This wisdom descendeth not from above; but is earthly, sensual, devilish: for where bitter zeal and strife are, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom which is from above' (which every one that hath is a real Christian, and he only) 'is first pure,' free from all that is earthly, sensual, devilish; 'then peaceable,' benign, loving, making peace; 'gentle,' soft, mild, yielding, not morose or sour; 'easy to be entreated,' to be persuaded or convinced, not stubborn, self-willed, or self-conceited; 'full of mercy,' of tenderness and compassion; 'and good fruits,' both in the heart and life. Two of these are immediately specified: 'without partiality,' loving and doing good to all, without respect of persons; 'and without hypocrisy,' sincere, frank, open.

I desire to be tried by this test. I try myself by it continually; not, indeed, whether I am a prophet (for it has nothing to do with this), but whether I am a Christian.

1. The present question, then, is not What is Mr. Law? or What are the Moravians? but What is John Wesley?

And (1) Is he pure or not? 'Not pure; for he separates reason

from grace' (page 156). A wonderful proof! But I deny the fact. I never did separate reason from grace. 'Yes, you do; for your own words are, "The points we chiefly insisted on were four: (1) That orthodoxy, or right opinion,<sup>1</sup> is at best but a very slender part of religion, if it can be allowed to be any part of it at all"' (page 157).

After premising that it is our bounden duty to labour after a right judgement in all things, as a wrong judgement naturally leads to wrong practice, I say again, Right opinion is at best but a very slender part of religion (which properly and directly consists in right tempers, words, and actions), and frequently it is no part of religion: for it may be where there is no religion at all; in men of the most abandoned lives; yea, in the devil himself.

And yet this does not prove that I 'separate reason from grace,' that I 'discard reason from the service of religion.' I do continually 'employ it to distinguish between right and wrong opinions.' I never affirmed 'this distinction to be of little consequence,' or denied 'the gospel to be a reasonable service' (page 158).

But 'the Apostle Paul considered right opinions as a full third part at least of religion: for he says, "The fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth." By goodness is meant the conduct of particulars to the whole, and consists in habits of social virtue; and this refers to Christian practice. By righteousness is meant the conduct of the whole to particulars, and consists in the gentle use of Church authority; and this refers to Christian discipline. By truth is meant the conduct of the whole, and of particulars to one another, and consists in orthodoxy or right opinion; and this refers to Christian doctrine.' (Page 159.)

My objections to this account are, first, it contradicts St. Paul; secondly, it contradicts itself.

First. It contradicts St. Paul. It fixes a meaning upon his words foreign both to the text and context. The plain sense of the text, taken in connexion with the context, is no other than this: (Eph. v. 9) 'The fruit of the Spirit' (rather 'of the light,' which Bengelius proves to be the true reading—opposite to 'the unfruitful works of darkness' mentioned verse 11) 'is,' consists, 'in all goodness, kindness, tenderheartedness' (iv. 32)—opposite to 'bitterness, wrath, anger, clamour, evil-speaking' (verse 31); 'in all righteousness,' rendering unto all their dues—opposite to 'stealing'

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Sept. 18, 1756, sect. 7.

(verse 28); 'and in all truth,' veracity, sincerity—opposite to 'lying' (verse 25).

Secondly. That interpretation contradicts itself; and that in every article. For, 1. If by 'goodness' be meant 'the conduct of particulars to the whole,' then it does not consist in habits of social virtue: for social virtue regulates the conduct of particulars not so properly to the whole as to each other. 2. If by 'righteousness' be meant 'the conduct of the whole to particulars,' then it cannot consist in the gentleness of Church authority; unless Church governors are the whole Church, or the Parliament the whole Nation. 3. If by 'truth' be meant 'the conduct of the whole and of particulars to one another,' then it cannot possibly consist in orthodoxy or right opinion: for opinion, right or wrong, is not conduct; they differ *toto genere*. If, then, it be orthodoxy, it is not 'the conduct of the governors and governed toward each other.' If it be their conduct toward each other, it is not orthodoxy.

Although, therefore, it be allowed that right opinions are a great help and wrong opinions a great hindrance to religion, yet, till stronger proof be brought against it, that proposition remains unshaken, 'Right opinions are a slender part of religion, if any part if it at all' (page 160).

As to the affair of Abbé Paris, whoever will read over with calmness and impartiality but one volume of Monsieur Montgéron will then be a competent judge. Meantime I would just observe that if these miracles were real they strike at the root of the whole Papal authority, as having been wrought in direct opposition to the famous Bull Unigenitus. (Page 161.)

Yet I do not say, 'Errors in faith have little to do with religion,' or that they 'are no let or impediment to the Holy Spirit' (page 162). But still it is true that 'God generally speaking begins His work at the heart' (ibid.). Men usually feel desires to please God before they know how to please Him. Their heart says 'What must I do to be saved?' before they understand the way of salvation.

But see 'the character he gives his own saints! "The more I converse with this people the more I am amazed. That God hath wrought a great work is manifest by saving many sinners from their sins. And yet the main of them are not able to give a rational account of the plainest principles of religion." They were not able then, as there had not been time to instruct them. But the case is far different now.

Again : Did I ' give this character,' even then, of the people called Methodists in general ? No, but of the people of a particular town in Ireland, where nine in ten of the inhabitants are Romanists.

' Nor is the observation confined to the people. He had made a proselyte of Mr. Drake,<sup>1</sup> Vicar of B[awtry?]. And, to show he was no discredit to his master, he gives him this character : " He seemed to stagger at nothing, though as yet his understanding is not opened." ' (Page 162.)

Mr. Drake was never a proselyte of mine ; nor did I ever see him before or since. I endeavoured to show him that we are justified by faith. And he did not object ; though neither did he understand.

' But in the first propagation of religion God began with the understanding, and rational conviction won the heart ' (page 163). Frequently, but not always. The jailer's heart was touched first, then he understood what he must do to be saved. In this respect, then, there is nothing new in the present work of God. So the lively story from Molière is just nothing to the purpose.<sup>2</sup>

In drawing the parallel between the work God has wrought in England and in America I do not so much as ' insinuate that the understanding has nothing to do in the work ' (page 165). Whoever is engaged therein will find full employment for all the understanding which God has given him.

' On the whole, therefore, we conclude that wisdom which divests the Christian faith of its truth, and the test of it, reason, and resolves all religion into spiritual mysticism and ecstatic raptures, cannot be the wisdom from above, whose characteristic is purity ' (page 166).

Perhaps so. But I do not ' divest faith either of truth or reason ' ; much less do I resolve all into ' spiritual mysticism and ecstatic raptures.' Therefore, suppose purity here meant sound doctrine (which it no more means than it does a sound constitution),

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Sept 25, 1755.

<sup>2</sup> ' But, for this discordancy, between his Mission and St Paul's, he has a salvo. He observes occasionally, in several places of his Journal, that God *now* not only does a *new work*, but by new ways. This solution of our spiritual empiric will perhaps put the reader in mind of the quack in Mohère, who, having

placed the *liver* on the left side and the *heart* on the right, and being told that the structure of the parts was certainly otherwise, replied : *Oui, cela étoit autre fois ainsi ; mais nos avons changé tout cela, et nous faisons maintenant la médecine d'une méthode toute nouvelle* '—*The Doctrine of Grace*, pp 163-4 ; p 126, 2nd Edn



still it touches not me, who, for anything that has yet been said, may teach the soundest doctrine in the world.

(2) 'Our next business is to apply the other marks to these pretending sectaries. The first of these, purity, respects the nature of "the wisdom from above," or, in other words, the doctrine taught.' (Page 167.) Not in the least. It has no more to do with 'doctrine' than the whole text has with 'prophets.' 'All the rest concern the manner of teaching.' Neither can this be allowed. They no farther concern either teaching or teachers than they concern all mankind.

But to proceed: 'Methodism signifies only the manner of preaching; not either an old or a new religion: it is the manner in which Mr. Wesley and his followers attempt to propagate the plain old religion' (page 168). And is not this sound doctrine? Is this 'spiritual mysticism and ecstatic raptures'?

'Of all men, Mr. Wesley should best know the meaning of the term; since it was not a nickname imposed on the sect by its enemies, but an appellation of honour bestowed upon it by themselves.' In answer to this, I need only transcribe what was published twenty years ago:—

'Since the name first came abroad into the world, many have been at a loss to know what a Methodist is; what are the principles and the practice of those who are commonly called by that name; and what the distinguishing marks of this sect, "which is everywhere spoken against."

'And it being generally believed that I was able to give the clearest account of these things (as having been one of the first to whom that name was given and the person by whom the rest were supposed to be directed), I have been called upon, in all manner of ways and with the utmost earnestness, so to do. I yield at last to the continued importunity both of friends and enemies; and do now give the clearest account I can, in the presence of the Lord and Judge of heaven and earth, of the principles and practice wherein those who are called Methodists are distinguished from other men.

'I say those who are called Methodists; for let it be well observed that this is not a name which they take to themselves, but one fixed upon them by way of reproach without their approbation or consent. It was first given to three or four young men at Oxford by a student of Christ Church; either in allusion to the ancient sect of physicians (so called from their teaching that almost all diseases might be cured by a specific *method* of diet

and exercise), or from their observing a more regular *method* of study and behaviour than was usual with those of their age and station.'<sup>1</sup>

I need only add that this nickname was imposed upon us before 'this manner of preaching' had a being—yea, at a time when I thought it as lawful to cut a throat as to preach out of a church.

'Why, then, will Mr. Wesley so grossly misrepresent his adversaries as to say that, when they speak against Methodism, they speak against the plain, old doctrine of the Church of England?' (Tract, p. 169.) This is no misrepresentation. Many of our adversaries all over the kingdom speak against us *eo nomine* for preaching these doctrines, Justification by Faith in particular.

However, 'a fanatic manner of preaching, though it were the doctrine of an apostle, may do more harm to society at least than reviving old heresies or inventing new. It tends to bewilder the imaginations of some, to inflame the passions of others, and to spread disorder and confusion through the whole community.' (Page 169.) I would gladly have the term defined. What is a 'fanatic manner of preaching'? Is it field-preaching? But this has no such effect, even among the wildest of men. This has not 'bewildered the imagination' even of the Kingswood colliers or 'inflamed their passions.' It has not spread disorder or confusion among them, but just the contrary. From the time it was heard in that chaos,

Confusion heard the voice, and wild uproar  
Stood ruled, . . . and order from disorder sprung.<sup>2</sup>

'But St. James, who delivers the test for the trial of these men's pretensions' (the same mistake still), 'unquestionably thought a fanatic spirit did more mischief in the mode of teaching than in the matter taught; since of six marks, one only concerns doctrine, all the rest the manner of the teacher' (page 170). Nay, all six concern doctrine as much as one. The truth is, they have nothing to do either with doctrine or manner.

'From St. Paul's words, "Be instant in season, out of season," he infers more than they will bear; and misapplies them into the bargain' (page 171). When and where? I do not remember applying them at all.

'When seasonable times are appointed for holy offices, to fly

<sup>1</sup> Preface to *The Character of a* and letter of Aug. 24, 1758.  
*Methodist*. See *Works*, viii. 339;   <sup>2</sup> *Paradise Lost*, iii. 710-13.

to unseasonable is factious' (page 172). But it is not clear that five in the morning and seven in the evening (our usual times) are unseasonable.

2. We come now directly to the second article. "The wisdom from above is peaceable." But the propagation of Methodism has occasioned many and great violations of peace. In order to know where the blame hereof lies, let us inquire the temper which "makes for peace." For we may be assured the fault lies not there, where such a temper is found.' (Page 173.) Thus far we are quite agreed. 'Now, the temper which makes for peace is prudence.' This is one of the tempers which make for peace; others are kindness, meekness, patience. 'This our Lord recommended by His own example' (pages 174-7). 'But this Mr. Wesley calls "the mystery of iniquity and the offspring of hell"' (page 178). No, not this; not the prudence which our Lord recommends. I call that so, and that only, which the world, the men who know not God, style Christian prudence. By this I mean subtlety, craft, dissimulation; study to please man rather than God; the art of trimming between God and the world, of serving God and mammon. Will any serious man defend this? And this only do I condemn.

But you say, "Good sort of men," as they are called, are "the bane of all religion"' (pages 179-80). And I think so. By this 'good sort of men' I mean persons who have a liking to but no sense of religion, no real fear or love of God, no truly Christian tempers. 'These steal away the little zeal he has—that is, persuade him to be peaceable.' No; persuade me to be like themselves—without love either to God or man.

'Again, speaking of one, he says, "Indulging himself in harmless company"' (vulgarly so called), "he first made shipwreck of his zeal, then of his faith." In this I think he is right. The zeal and faith of a fanatic are such exact tallies that neither can exist alone. They came into the world together to disturb society and dishonour religion.'

By zeal I mean the flame of love or fervent love to God and man; by faith, the substance or confidence of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Is this the zeal and faith of a fanatic? Then St. Paul was the greatest fanatic on earth. Did these come into the world to 'disturb society and dishonour religion'?

'On the whole, we find Mr. Wesley by his own confession entirely destitute of prudence. Therefore it must be ascribed to the want of this if his preaching be attended with tumult and

disorder.' (Page 181.) 'By his own confession'? Surely no. This I confess, and this only: what is falsely called prudence I abhor; but true prudence I love and admire.

However, 'You set at naught the discipline of the Church by invading the province of the parochial minister' (page 182). Nay, if ever I preach at all, it must be in the province of some parochial minister. 'By assembling in undue places and at unfit times.' I know of no times unfit for those who assemble; and I believe Hanham Mount and Rose Green were the most proper places under heaven for preaching to the colliers in Kingswood. 'By scurrilous invectives against the governors and pastors of the national Church.' This is an entire mistake. I dare not make any 'scurrilous invectives' against any man. 'Insolences of this nature provoke warm men to tumult.' But those insolences do not exist; so that, whatever tumult either warm or cool men raise, I am not chargeable therewith.

'To know the true character of Methodism.' The present point is to know the true character of John Wesley. Now, in order to know this we need not inquire what others were before he was born. All, therefore, that follows of old Precisians, Puritans, and Independents may stand just as it is. (Pages 184-6.)

But 'Mr. Wesley wanted to be persecuted' (page 187). As this is averred over and over, I will explain myself upon it once for all. I never desired or wanted to be persecuted.

Lives there who loves his pain?

I love and desire to 'live peaceably with all men.' 'But persecution would not come at his call.' However, it came uncalled; and more than once or twice it was not 'mock persecution.' It was not only the huzzas of the mob: showers of stones are something more than huzzas. And whosoever saw the mob either at Walsall or Cork (to instance in no more) saw that they were not 'in jest,' but in great earnest, eagerly athirst, not for sport, as you suppose, but for blood.

But though I do not desire persecution, I expect it. I must, if I believe St. Paul: 'All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution' (2 Tim. iii. 12); either sooner or later, more or less, according to the wise providence of God. But I believe 'all these things work together for good to them that love God.' And from a conviction of this they may even rejoice when they are 'persecuted for righteousness' sake.'

Yet, as I seldom 'complain of ill treatment,' so I am never 'dissatisfied with good' (page 188). But I often wonder at it;

and I once expressed my wonder nearly in the words of the old Athenian—'What have we done that the world should be so civil to us?'<sup>1</sup>

You conclude the head: 'As he who persecutes is but the tool of him that invites persecution' (I know not who does), 'the crime finally comes home to him who set the rioter at work' (page 191). And is this all the proof that I am not peaceable? Then let all men judge if the charge is made good.

3. 'The next mark of the celestial wisdom is, it is "gentle and easy to be entreated," compliant and even obsequious to all men.' And how does it appear that I am wanting in this? Why, he is 'a severe condemner of his fellow citizens and a severe exactor of conformity to his own observances.' Now the proof: (1) 'He tells us this in the very appellation he assumes' (page 192). Nay, I never assumed it at all. (2) But 'you say, "Useless conversation is an abomination to the Lord." And what is this but to withstand St. Paul to the face?' Why, did St. Paul join in or condemn useless conversation? I rather think he reproves it. He condemns as *σαπρὸς λόγος*, 'putrid, stinking conversation,' all that is not good, all that is not 'to the use of edifying,' and meet to 'minister grace to the hearers' (Eph. iv. 29). (3) Mr. Wesley 'resolved never to laugh nor to speak a tittle of worldly things' (page 193)—'though others may, nay must.' Pray add that with the reason of my so resolving—namely, that I expected to die in a few days. If I expected it now, probably I should resume the resolution. But, be it as it may, this proves nothing against my being both gentle and easy to be entreated. (4) 'He says Mr. Griffith was a clumsy, overgrown, hardfaced man' (page 194). So he was. And this was the best of him. I spare him much in saying no more. But he is gone: let his ashes rest. (5) 'I heard a most miserable sermon, full of dull, senseless, improbable lies.' It was so from the beginning to the end. I have seldom heard the like. (6) "'The persecution at St. Ives'" (which ended before I came; what I saw I do not term persecution) "'was owing to the indefatigable labours of Mr. Hoblyn and Mr. Symonds, gentlemen worthy to be had in everlasting remembrance.'" Here he tells us—it is his purpose to gibbet up the names of his two great persecutors to everlasting infamy.' (Page 195.) These gentlemen had occasioned several innocent people to be turned out of their livelihood; and others to be outraged in the most shocking manner, and beat only not to death. My purpose is, by setting down their

<sup>1</sup> See letter of July 18, 1747.

names, to make others afraid so to offend. Yet I say still, God forbid that I should rail either at a Turk, infidel, or heretic. But I will bring to light the actions of such Christians to be a warning to others. And all this I judge to be perfectly consistent with 'the spirit of meekness' (page 196).

4. 'The fourth mark is "full of mercy and good fruits." Let us inquire into the "mercy and good fruits" of Mr. Wesley.' (Page 198.)

(1) And, first: 'He has no mercy on his opposers. They pass with him under no other title than that of the devil's servants and the devil's children.' (Ibid.) This is far from true. Many have opposed and do oppose me still, whom I believe to be children and servants of God. 'We have seen him dispatching the principal of these children of the devil without mercy to their father' (page 199). No, not one. This has been affirmed over and over, but never proved yet. I fling about no exterminating judgements of God; I call down no fire from heaven. 'But it would be for the credit of these new saints to distinguish between rage and zeal.' That is easily done. Rage is furious fire from hell; zeal is loving fire from heaven. (2) 'If what has been said above does not suffice, turn again to Mr. Wesley's Journals: "Mr. Simpson, while he was speaking to the Society against my brother and me, was struck raving mad"' (page 200). He was so before an hundred witnesses, though I was the last to believe it. 'But it seems God is at length entreated for him, and has restored him to a sound mind.' And is my relating this fact an instance of 'dooming men to perdition'? (3) 'John Haydon cried aloud, "Let the world see the just judgement of God"' (page 201). He did. But let John Haydon look to that. It was he said so, not I. (4) 'I was informed of an awful providence. A poor wretch, who was here the last week, cursing and blaspheming, and labouring with all his might to hinder the word of God, had afterwards boasted he would come again on Sunday, and no man should stop his mouth then. But on Friday God laid his hand upon him, and on Sunday he was buried.' (Page 202.) And was not this an awful providence? But yet I do not doom even him to perdition. (5) 'I saw a poor man, once joined with us, who wanted nothing in this world. A day or two before, he hanged himself, but was cut down before he was dead. He has been crying out ever since, God had left him because he had left the children of God.' This was his assertion, not mine. I neither affirm nor deny it. (6) The true account of Lucy Godshall is this: 'I buried the body of Lucy Godshall.

After pressing toward the mark for more than two years, since she had known the pardoning love of God, she was for some time weary and faint in her mind, till I put her out of the bands. God blessed this greatly to her soul, so that in a short time she was admitted again. Soon after, being at home, she felt the love of God in an unusual manner poured into her heart. She fell down upon her knees and delivered up her soul and body into the hands of God. In the instant the use of all her limbs was taken away and she was in a burning fever. For three days she mightily praised God and rejoiced in Him all the day long. She then cried out, "Now Satan hath desired to have me that he may sift me as wheat." Immediately darkness and heaviness fell upon her, which continued till Saturday, the 4th instant. On Sunday the light shone again upon her heart. About ten in the evening one said to her, "Jesus is ready to receive your soul." She said, "Amen! Amen!" closed her eyes, and died.' (*Journal*, iii. 44-5.) Is this brought as a proof of my inexorableness, or of my dooming men to perdition?

(7) 'I found Nicholas Palmer in great weakness of body and heaviness of spirit. We wrestled with God in his behalf; and our labour was not in vain. His soul was comforted, and a few hours after he quietly fell asleep.' A strange proof this likewise, either of inexorableness or of 'dooming men to perdition.' Therefore this charge too stands totally unsupported. Here is no proof of my unmercifulness yet.

'Good fruits come next to be considered, which Mr. Wesley's idea of true religion does not promise. He saith' (I will repeat the words a little at large, that their true sense may more clearly appear), "'In explaining those words, *The kingdom of God*, or true religion, *is not meats and drinks*, I was led to show that religion does not properly consist in harmlessness, using the means of grace, and doing good, that is, helping our neighbours, chiefly by giving alms; but that a man might both be harmless, use the means of grace, and do much good, and yet have no true religion at all.'" (Tract, p. 203.) He may so. Yet whoever has true religion must be 'zealous of good works.' And zeal for all good works is, according to my idea, an essential ingredient of true religion.

'Spiritual cures are all the good fruits he pretends to' (pages 204-5). Not quite all, says William Kirkman with some others. 'A few of his spiritual cures we will set in a fair light: "The first time I preached at Swalwell"' (chiefly to colliers and workers in the ironwork) "'none seemed to be convinced, only stunned.'"'

I mean amazed at what they heard, though they were the first principles of religion. 'But he brings them to their senses with a vengeance.' No, not them. These were different persons. Are they lumped together in order to set things in 'a fair light'? The whole paragraph runs thus: 'I carefully examined those who had lately cried out in the congregation. Some of these, I found, could give no account at all how or wherefore they had done so; only that of a sudden they dropped down, they knew not how; and what they afterward said or did they knew not. Others could just remember they were in fear, but could not tell what they were in fear of. Several said they were afraid of the devil, and this was all they knew. But a few gave a more intelligible account of the piercing sense they then had of their sins, both inward and outward, which were set in array against them round about; of the dread they were in of the wrath of God, and the punishment they had deserved, into which they seemed to be just falling without any way to escape. One of them told me, "I was as if I was just falling down from the highest place I had ever seen. I thought the devil was pushing me off, and that God had forsaken me." Another said, "I felt the very fire of hell already kindled in my breast; and all my body was in as much pain as if I had been in a burning fiery furnace." What wisdom is this which rebuketh these, that they should hold their peace? Nay, let such an one cry after Jesus of Nazareth till He saith, "Thy faith hath made thee whole."' (*Journal*, iii. 59-60.)

Now follow the proofs of my driving men mad: (1) 'Another of Dr. Monro's patients came to ask my advice. I found no reason to believe she had been any otherwise mad than every one is that is deeply convinced of sin.' (Tract, p. 208.) Let this prove all that it can prove. (2) 'A middle-aged woman was really distracted.' Yes, before I ever saw her or she me. (3) 'I could not but be under some concern with regard to one or two persons, who were tormented in an unaccountable manner, and seemed to be indeed lunatic as well as sore vexed.' True; for a time. But the deliverance of one of them is related in the very next paragraph. (4) 'Two or three are gone quite distracted' (page 209)—'that is, they mourn and refuse to be comforted till they have redemption.' (5) 'I desired one to visit Mrs. G—— in Bedlam, put in by her husband as a madwoman.' But she never was mad in any degree, as he himself afterwards acknowledged. (6) 'One was so deeply convinced of her ungodliness that she cried out day and night, "Lord, save, or I perish!" All the neighbours agreed she was



stark mad.' But I did not make her so. For this was before she ever saw my face. Now let every one judge whether here is yet a single proof that I drive men mad.

'The time when this spiritual madness was at its height he calls a glorious time' (page 210). I call that a glorious time when many notorious sinners are converted to God (whether with any outward symptoms or none, for those are no way essential), and when many are in the triumph of faith greatly rejoicing in God their Saviour.

'But though Mr. Wesley does so well in turning fools into madmen, yet his craftmaster is certainly one Mr. Wheatley, of whom he gives this extraordinary account' (page 211):—

"A poor woman" (on Wednesday, September 17, 1740) "said it was four years" (namely, in September 1736, above a year before I left Georgia) "since her son, by hearing a sermon of Mr. Wheatley's, fell into great uneasiness. She thought he was ill, and would have sent for a physician. But he said, No, no; send for Mr. Wheatley. He was sent for, and came; and, after asking a few questions, told her, The boy is mad: get a coach, and carry him to Dr. Monro: use my name; I have sent several such to him." Who this Mr. Wheatley is I know not.' He was lecturer at Spitalfields Church. The event was, after the apothecary had half murdered him, he was discharged, and the lad soon recovered his strength. His senses he never had lost. The supposing this was a blunder from the beginning.

'These are the exploits which Mr. Wesley calls blessings from God' (page 212). Certainly I do, both repentance and faith. 'And which therefore we may call the good fruits of his ministry.' May God increase them an hundredfold! 'What the Apostle calls "good fruits," namely, doing much good, Mr. Wesley tells us belongs not to true religion.' I never told any man so yet. I tell all men just the contrary.

I may then safely leave all mankind to judge whether a single article of the charge against me has yet been made good. So much for the first charge that I am a madman. Now for the second that I am a knave.

5. The proof is short: 'Every enthusiast is a knave: but he is an enthusiast; therefore he is a knave.' I deny both the first and second proposition. Nay, the first is proved thus: 'Enthusiasm must always be accompanied with craft and knavery' (page 213). It is often so, but not always; for there may be honest enthusiasts. Therefore the whole account of that odd

combination which follows is ingenious, but proves nothing. (Pages 214-18.)

Yet I must touch upon one or two parts of it. 'An enthusiast thinks he is dispensed with in breaking, nay that he is authorized to break, the common laws of morality.' Does every enthusiast? Then I am none; for I never thought any such thing. I believe no man living is authorized to break, or dispensed with in breaking, any law of morality. I know whoever (habitually) breaks one of the least of these 'shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven.'

'Can any but an enthusiast believe that he may use guile to promote the glory of God?' Yes, ten thousand that are no enthusiasts firmly believe thus. How few do we find that do not believe it! that do not plead for officious lies! How few will subscribe to St. Augustine's declaration (to which I assent with my whole heart), 'I would not tell a wilful lie to save the souls of the whole world!'

But to return: "'The wisdom from above is without partiality and without hypocrisy.'" Partiality consists in dispensing an unequal measure in our transactions with others; hypocrisy, in attempting to cover that unequal measure by prevarication and false pretences.'

The former of these definitions is not clear; the latter neither clear nor adequate to the defined.

But let this pass. My partiality is now the point. What are the proofs of it? (1) 'His followers are always the children of God, his opposers the children of the devil' (page 220). Neither so, nor so. I never affirmed either one or the other universally. That some of the former are children of God and some of the latter children of the devil I believe. But what will this prove?

'His followers are directed by inward feelings, the impulses of an inflamed fancy' (no more than they are directed by the Alcoran); 'his opposers by the Scripture.' What, while they are cursing, swearing, blaspheming, beating and maiming men that have done them no wrong, and treating women in a manner too shocking to be repeated? (2) The next proof is very extraordinary. My words are, 'I was with two persons, who, I doubt, are properly enthusiasts: for, first, they think to attain the end without the means, which is enthusiasm properly so called. Again, they think themselves inspired of God, and are not. But false imaginary inspiration is enthusiasm. That theirs is only imaginary inspiration appears hence—it contradicts the law and the testimony.' (Page 221.)

Now, by what art of man can this be made a proof of my par-

tiality? Why, thus: 'These are wise words. But what do they amount to? Only to this—that these two persons would not take out their patents of inspiration from his office.' But what proof is there of this round assertion? Truly, none at all.

Full as extraordinary is the third proof of my partiality. 'Miss Gr——' told Mrs. Sparrow Mr. Wesley was a Papist. Upon this Miss Gr—— is anathematized. And we are told that in consequence she had lately been raving mad, and as such was tied down in her bed. Yet all these circumstances of madness have befallen his favourite saints, whom he has vindicated from the opprobrium.' (Page 222.)

The passage in my Journal stands thus: 'Mrs. Sparrow told me two or three nights since, "Miss Gr—— met me and said, *I assure you Mr. Wesley is a Papist.*" Perhaps I need observe no more upon this than that Miss Gr—— had lately been raving mad in consequence of a fever (not of an anathema, which never had any being); that as such she was tied down in her bed; and as soon as she was suffered to go abroad went to Mr. Whitefield to inquire of him whether she was not a Papist. But he quickly perceived she was only a lunatic, the nature of her disorder soon betraying itself.' Certainly, then, my allowing her to be mad is no proof of my partiality. I will allow every one to be so who is attended with 'all these circumstances of madness.'

(4) 'He pronounces sentence of enthusiasm upon another, and tells us wherefore without any disguise: "Here I took leave of a poor, mad, original enthusiast, who had been scattering lies in every quarter."'<sup>2</sup> It was the famous John Adams, since confined at Box, whose capital lie (the source of the rest) was that he was a prophet greater than Moses or any of the Apostles. And is the pronouncing him a madman a proof of my partiality?

(5) 'I had much conversation with Mr. Simpson, an original enthusiast. I desired him in the evening to give an exhortation. He did so, and spoke many good things in a manner peculiar to himself—without order or connexion, head or tail, and in a language very near as Mystical as that of Jacob Behmen. 'When he had done, I summed up what he had said, methodizing and explaining it. Oh what pity it is this well-meaning man should ever speak without an interpreter!' (Page 223.)

<sup>1</sup> Probably Miss Gregory. See *Journal*, ii. 430d, iii. 46-7.

<sup>2</sup> See *Journal*, iii. 181-2. The asylum in Box (Wilts.) adjoined the

churchyard. The parson's fee for the burial of a lunatic was one penny; three pence for a sane person.

Let this passage likewise stand as it is, and who can guess how it is to prove my partiality? But by a sleight of hand the thing is done. 'How differently does Mr. Wesley treat these two enthusiasts! The first is accused of spreading lies of his master.' No, he never was any disciple of mine. 'On which Mr. Wesley took his leave of him;—a gentle expression, to signify the thrusting him out head and shoulders from the society of saints.' It signifies neither more nor less than that I went out of the room and left him. 'The other's enthusiasm is made to consist only in want of method.' No. His enthusiasm did not consist in this: it was the cause of it. But he was quite another man than John Adams; and I believe a right honest man.

(6) 'I was both surprised and grieved at a genuine instance of enthusiasm. John Brown, who had received a sense of the love of God a few days before, came riding through the town, hallooing and shouting, and driving all the people before him, telling them God had told him he should be a king and should tread all his enemies under his feet. I sent him home immediately to his work; and advised him to cry day and night to God that he might be lowly in heart, lest Satan again "get an advantage over him."'

What this proves, or is intended to prove, I cannot tell. Certainly neither this nor any of the preceding passages prove the point now in question—my partiality. So this likewise is wholly unproved still.

'We shall end, where every fanatic leader ends, with his hypocrisy' (page 227). Five arguments are brought in proof of this. I shall take them in their order. (1) 'After having heaped up miracles one upon another, he sneaks away under the protection of a puffy wonder: "About five I began near the Keelmen's Hospital, many thousands standing round. The wind was high just before, but scarce a breath was felt all the time we assembled before God. I praise God for this also. Is it enthusiasm to see God in every benefit we receive?" It is not; the enthusiasm consists in believing those benefits to be conferred through a change in the established course of nature. But here he insinuates that he meant no more by his miracles than the seeing God in every benefit we receive.' (Pages 228–9.) That sudden and total ceasing of the wind I impute to the particular providence of God. This I mean by seeing God therein. But this I knew many would count enthusiasm. In guarding against it, I had an eye to that single incident, and no other. Nor did I insinuate anything more than I expressed in as plain a manner as I could.

A little digression follows: 'A friend of his advises not to establish the power of working miracles as the great criterion of a divine mission, seeing the agreement of doctrines with Scripture is the only infallible rule' (page 230). 'But Christ Himself establishes the power of working miracles as the great criterion of a divine mission' (page 231). True, of a mission to be the Saviour of the world; to put a period to the Jewish and introduce the Christian dispensation. And whoever pretends to such a mission will stand in need of such credentials.

(2) 'He shifts and doubles no less' (neither less nor more) 'as to the ecstasies of his saints. Sometimes they are of God, sometimes of the devil; but he is constant in this—that natural causes have no hand in them.' This is not true: in what are here termed ecstasies, strong joy or grief, attended with various bodily symptoms, I have openly affirmed again and again that natural causes have a part; nor did I ever shift or double on the head. I have steadily and uniformly maintained that, if the mind be affected to such a degree, the body must be affected by the laws of the vital union. The mind I believe was in many of those cases affected by the Spirit of God, in others by the devil, and in some by both; and in consequence of this the body was affected also. (3) 'Mr. Wesley says, "I fear we have grieved the Spirit of the jealous God by questioning His work, and by blaspheming it, by imputing it to nature, or even to the devil"' (pages 232-3). True; by imputing the conviction and conversion of sinners, which is the work of God alone (because of these unusual circumstances attending it), either to nature or to the devil. This is flat and plain. No prevarication yet. Let us attend to the next proof of it: 'Innumerable cautions were given me not to regard visions or dreams, or to fancy people had remission of sins because of their cries or tears or outward professions. The sum of my answer was, You deny that God does now work these effects—at least, that He works them in this manner. I affirm both. I have seen very many persons changed in a moment from a spirit of fear, horror, despair, to a spirit of love, joy, peace. What I have to say touching visions and dreams is this: I know several persons in whom this great change was wrought in a dream, or during a strong representation to the eye of their mind of Christ either on the cross or in glory. This is the fact; let any judge of it as they please. And that such a change was then wrought appears, not from their shedding tears only, or falling into fits, or crying out (these are not the fruits, as you seem to suppose, whereby I

judge), but from the whole tenor of their life, till then many ways wicked, from that time holy and just and good.' 'Nay, he is so convinced of its being the work of God, that the horrid blasphemies which ensued he ascribes to the abundance of joy which God had given to a poor mad woman' (page 234). Do I ascribe those blasphemies to her joy in God? No; but to her pride. My words are: 'I met with one who, having been lifted up with the abundance of joy which God had given her, had fallen into such blasphemies and vain imaginations as are not common to men. In the afternoon I found another instance, nearly, I fear, of the same kind—one who set her private revelations (so called) on the selfsame foot with the written Word.' (Page 235.)

But how is this to prove prevarication? 'Why, on a sudden he directly revokes all he had advanced. He says: "I told them they were not to judge of the spirit whereby any one spoke, either by appearances, or by common report, or by their own inward feelings—no, nor by any dreams, visions, or revelations supposed to be made to the soul, any more than by their tears or any involuntary effects wrought upon their bodies. I warned them that all these things were in themselves of a doubtful, disputable nature; they might be from God or they might not, and were therefore not simply to be relied on any more than simply to be condemned, but to be tried by a farther rule, to be brought to the only certain test, *the law and the testimony.*"' Now, is not this a formal recantation of what he had said just above?' (Page 235.) Nothing less, as I will show in two minutes to every calm, impartial man. What I say now I have said any time this thirty years; I have never varied therefrom for an hour: 'Everything disputable is to be brought to the only certain test, "the law and the testimony."' 'But did not you talk just now of visions and dreams?' Yes; but not as of a test of anything: only as a channel through which God is sometimes pleased to convey 'love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance,' the indisputable fruit of His Spirit; and these, we may observe, wherever they exist, must be inwardly felt. Now, where is the prevarication? where the formal recantation? They are vanished into air.

But here is more proof: 'At length he gives up all these divine agitations to the devil. "I inquired," says he, "into the case of those who had lately cried out aloud during the preaching. I found this had come upon every one of them in a moment, without any previous notice. In that moment they dropped down, lost all their strength, and were seized with violent pain. Some said

they felt as if a sword were running through them ; others as if their whole body was tearing in pieces. These symptoms I can no more impute to any natural cause than to the Spirit of God. I make no doubt but it was Satan tearing them as they were coming to Christ." (Page 236.)

' Now, these were the very symptoms which he had before ascribed to the Spirit of God ' (page 237). Never in my life. Indeed, some of them I never met with before. Those outward symptoms which I had met with before, bodily agitations in particular, I did not ascribe to the Spirit of God, but to the natural union of the soul and body. And those symptoms which I now ascribe to the devil I never ascribed to any other cause. The second proof of my prevarication or hypocrisy is therefore just as conclusive as the first.

3. Now for the third : ' Mr. Wesley before spoke contemptuously of orthodoxy to take in the sectaries. But when he would take off Churchmen, then orthodoxy is the *unum necessarium*.' Did I ever say so ? No more than, in the other extreme, speak contemptuously of it. ' Yes, you say, " I described the plain, old religion of the Church of England, which is now almost everywhere spoken against under the new name of Methodism." ' Very well ; and what shadow of prevarication is here ? May I not still declare the plain, old religion of the Church of England, and yet very consistently aver that right opinion is a very slender part of it ?

4. The next passage, I am sorry to say, is neither related with seriousness nor truth : ' We have seen him inviting persecution.' Never ; though I ' rejoiced,' in the instance alleged, at having an opportunity of calling a multitude of the most abandoned sinners to repentance.

What is peculiarly unfair is the lame, false account is palmed upon me by ' So he himself tells the story.' I must therefore tell the story once more in as few words as I can :—

' Sunday, August 7, 1737. I repelled Mrs. Williamson from the communion. Tuesday, 9. I was required by Mr. Bailiff Parker to appear at the next court. Thursday, 11. Mr. Causton, her uncle, said to me, " Give your reasons for repelling her before the whole congregation." I answered, " Sir, if you insist upon it, I will." But I heard no more of it. Afterward he said (but not to me) " Mr. Wesley had repelled Sophy out of revenge, because he had made proposals of marriage to her, which she rejected." Tuesday, 16. Mrs. Williamson made affidavit of it. Thursday,

September 1. A Grand Jury prepared by Mr. Causton found that "John Wesley had broken the laws of the realm, by speaking and writing to Mrs. Williamson against her husband's consent, and by repelling her from the communion."

'Friday, 2, was the third court-day at which I appeared, since my being required so to do by Mr. Parker. I moved for an immediate hearing, but was put off till the next court-day. On the next court-day I appeared again, as also at the two courts following, but could not be heard. Thursday, November 3, I appeared in court again; and yet again on Tuesday, November 22, on which day Mr. Causton desired to speak with me, and read me an affidavit in which it was affirmed that I "abused Mr. Causton in his own house, calling him liar, villain, and so on." It was likewise repeated that I had been reprimanded at the last court by Mr. Causton as an enemy to and hinderer of the public peace.

'My friends agreed with me that the time we looked for was now come. And the next morning, calling on Mr. Causton, I told him I designed to set out for England immediately.

'Friday, December 2. I proposed to set out for Carolina about noon. But about ten the Magistrates sent for me, and told me I must not go out of the province; for I had not answered the allegations laid against me. I replied, "I have appeared at six or seven courts in order to answer them. But I was not suffered so to do." After a few more words, I said, "You use me very ill; and so you do the Trustees. You know your business, and I know mine."

'In the afternoon they published an order forbidding any to assist me in going out of the province. But I knew I had no more business there. So as soon as Evening Prayer was over, the tide then serving, I took boat at the Bluff for Carolina.'

This is the plain account of the matter. I need only add a remark or two on the pleasantry of my censurer. 'He had recourse as usual to his revelations: "I consulted my friends whether God did not call me to England"' (page 242). Not by revelations—these were out of the question; but by clear, strong reasons. 'The Magistrate soon quickened his pace by declaring him an enemy to the public peace.' No; that senseless assertion of Mr. Causton made me go neither sooner nor later. 'The reader has seen him long languish for persecution.' What, before November 1737? I never languished for it either before or since. But I submit to what pleases God. 'To hide his poltroonery in a bravado, he gave public notice of his apostolical intention' (page 243). Kind and



civil! I may be excused from taking notice of what follows. It is equally serious and genteel.

'Had his longings for persecution been without hypocrisy.' The same mistake throughout. I never longed or professed to long for it at all. But if I had professed it ever since I returned from Georgia, what was done before I returned could not prove that profession to be hypocrisy. So all this ribaldry serves no end; only to throw much dirt, if haply some may stick.

Meantime how many untruths are here in one page! (1) 'He made the path doubly perplexed for his followers. (2) He left them to answer for his crimes. (3) He longed for persecution. (4) He went as far as Georgia for it. (5) The truth of his mission was questioned by the Magistrate, and (6) decried by the people, (7) for his false morals. (8) The gospel was wounded through the sides of its pretended missionary. (9) The first Christian preachers offered up themselves.' So did I. 'Instead of this, our paltry mimic' (page 244). *Bona verba!* Surely a writer should reverence himself, how much soever he despises his opponent. So, upon the whole, this proof of my hypocrisy is as lame as the three former.

5. 'We have seen above how he sets all prudence at defiance.' None but false prudence. 'But he uses a different language when his rivals are to be restrained.' No; always the same, both with regard to false prudence and true.

'But take the affair from the beginning. He began to suspect rivals in the year thirty-nine; for he says, "Remembering how many that came after me were preferred before me." ' The very next words show in what sense. They 'had attained unto the law of righteousness': I had not. But what has this to do with rivals?

However, go on: 'At this time, December 8, 1739, his opening the Bible afforded him but small relief. He sunk so far in his despondency as to doubt if God would not lay him aside and send other labourers into His harvest.' But this was another time. It was June 22; and the occasion of the doubt is expressly mentioned: 'I preached, but had no life or spirit in me, and was much in doubt' on that account. Not on account of Mr. Whitefield. He did not 'now begin to set up for himself.' We were in full union; nor was there the least shadow of rivalry or contention between us. I still sincerely 'praise God for His wisdom in giving different talents to different preachers' (page 250), and particularly for His giving Mr. Whitefield the talents which I have not.

6. What farther proof of hypocrisy? Why, 'he had given innumerable flirts of contempt in his Journals against human learning' (pages 252-3). Where? I do not know. Let the passages be cited; else, let me speak for it ever so much, it will prove nothing. 'At last he was forced to have recourse to what he had so much scorned; I mean prudence' (page 255). All a mistake. I hope never to have recourse to false prudence; and true prudence I never scorned.

'He might have met Mr. Whitefield half-way; but he was too formidable a rival. With a less formidable one he pursues this way. "I laboured," says he, "to convince Mr. Green"' (my assistant, not rival) "'that he had not done well in confuting, as he termed it, the sermon I preached the Sunday before. I asked, Will you meet me half-way?"' (The words following put my meaning beyond all dispute.) "'I will never publicly preach against you: will not you against me?"' Here we see a fair invitation to Mr. Green to play the hypocrite with him.' (Ibid.) Not in the least. Each might simply deliver his own sentiments without preaching against the other. 'We conclude that Mr. Wesley, amidst his warmest exclamations against all prudence, had still a succedaneum, which indeed he calls prudence; but its true name is craft' (page 257).

Craft is an essential part of worldly prudence. This I detest and abhor. And let him prove it upon me that can. But it must be by better arguments than the foregoing. Truly Christian prudence, such as was recommended by our Lord and practised by Him and His Apostles, I reverence and desire to learn, being convinced of its abundant usefulness.

I know nothing material in the argument which I have left untouched. And I must now refer it to all the world whether, for all that has been brought to the contrary, I may not still have a measure of the 'wisdom from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.'

I have spoke abundantly more concerning myself than I intended or expected. Yet I must beg leave to add a few words more. How far I am from being an enemy to prudence I hope appears already. It remains to inquire whether I am an enemy to reason or natural religion.

'As to the first, he frankly tells us the father of lies was the father of reasonings also. For he says, "I observed more and more

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal*, iv. 94; and for a letter to William Green, October 25, 1789.

the advantage Satan had gained over us. Many were thrown into idle reasonings." (Page 289.) Yes, and they were hurt thereby. But reason is good, though idle reasonings are evil. Nor does it follow that I am an enemy to the one because I condemn the other.

' However, you are an enemy to natural religion. For you say, " A Frenchman gave us a full account of the Chicasaws. They do nothing but eat and drink and smoke from morning till night, and almost from night till morning. For they rise at any hour of the night when they awake, and, after eating and drinking as much as they can, go to sleep again. Hence we could not but remark what is the religion of nature, properly so called, or that religion which flows from natural reason unassisted by revelation." (Page 290.) I believe this dispute may be cut short by only defining the term. What does your Lordship mean by natural religion? a system of principles? But I mean by it in this place men's natural manners. These certainly 'flow from their natural passions and appetites' with that degree of reason which they have. And this in other instances is not contemptible, though it is not sufficient to teach them true religion.

II. I proceed to consider, in the second place, what is advanced concerning the operations of the Holy Spirit.

' Our blessed Redeemer promised to send among His followers the Holy Ghost, called " the Spirit of truth " and " the Comforter," which should co-operate with man in establishing his faith and in perfecting his obedience, or (in other words) should sanctify him to redemption ' (page 2).

Accordingly ' the sanctification and redemption of the world man cannot frustrate nor render ineffectual. For it is not in his power to make that to be undone which is once done and perfected.' (Page 337.)

I do not comprehend. Is all the world sanctified? Is not to be sanctified the same as to be made holy? Is all the world holy? And can no man frustrate his own sanctification?

' The Holy Ghost establishes our faith and perfects our obedience by enlightening the understanding and rectifying the will ' (page 3).

' In the former respect, 1. He gave the gift of tongues at the day of Pentecost.

' Indeed, enthusiasts in their ecstasies have talked very fluently in languages they had a very imperfect knowledge of in their sober intervals.' I can no more believe this on the credit of Lord Shaftesbury and a Popish exorcist than I can believe the tale of

an hundred people talking without tongues on the credit of Dr. Middleton.<sup>1</sup>

'The other gifts of the Spirit St. Paul reckons up thus: "To one is given the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another the gifts of healing, to another working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another the discerning of spirits"' (page 23). But why are the other three left out—faith, divers kinds of tongues, and the interpretation of tongues?

I believe the 'word of wisdom' means light to explain the manifold wisdom of God in the grand scheme of gospel salvation; the 'word of knowledge,' a power of explaining the Old Testament types and prophecies. 'Faith' may mean an extraordinary trust in God under the most difficult and dangerous circumstances; 'the gifts of healing,' a miraculous power of curing diseases; 'the discerning of spirits,' a supernatural discernment whether men were upright or not, whether they were qualified for offices in the Church, and whether they who professed to speak by inspiration really did so or not.

But 'the richest of the fruits of the Spirit is the inspiration of Scripture' (page 30). 'Herein the promise that "the Comforter" should "abide with us for ever" is eminently fulfilled. For though His ordinary influence occasionally assists the faithful of all ages, yet His constant abode and supreme illumination is in the Scriptures of the New Testament. I mean, He is there only as the Illuminator of the understanding.' (Page 39.)

But does this agree with the following words?—'Nature is not able to keep a mean: but grace is able; for "the Spirit helpeth our infirmities." We must apply to the Guide of truth to prevent our being "carried about with divers and strange doctrines."' (Page 340.) Is He not, then, everywhere to illuminate the understanding as well as to rectify the will? And, indeed, do we not need the one as continually as the other?

'But how did He inspire the Scripture? He so directed the writers that no considerable error should fall from them.' (Page 45.) Nay, will not the allowing there is any error in Scripture shake the authority of the whole?

Again: what is the difference between the immediate and the virtual influence of the Holy Spirit? I know Milton speaks of 'virtual or immediate touch'<sup>2</sup>; but most incline to think virtual touch is no touch at all.

<sup>1</sup> See letter of Jan. 4, 1749, sect. VI. 12-14, p. 367.

<sup>2</sup> *Paradise Lost*, viii. 617.

'Were the style of the New Testament utterly rude and barbarous and abounding with every fault that can possibly deform a language, this is so far from proving such language not divinely inspired that it is one certain mark of this original' (page 55).

A vehement paradox this! But it is not proved yet, and probably never will.

'The labours of those who have attempted to defend the purity of Scripture Greek have been very idly employed' (page 66).

Others think they have been very wisely employed, and that they have abundantly proved their point.

Having now 'considered the operations of the Holy Spirit as the Guide of truth, who clears and enlightens the understanding, I proceed to consider Him as the Comforter who purifies and supports the will' (page 89).

'Sacred antiquity is full in its accounts of the sudden and entire change made by the Holy Spirit in the dispositions and manners of those whom it had enlightened; instantaneously effacing their evil habits and familiarizing them to the performance of every good action' (page 90).

'No natural cause could effect this. Neither fanaticism nor superstition, nor both of them, will account for so sudden and lasting a conversion.' (Ibid.)

'Superstition never effects any considerable change in the manners. Its utmost force is just enough to make us exact in the ceremonious offices of religion or to cause some acts of penitence as death approaches.' (Page 91.)

'Fanaticism, indeed, acts with greater violence, and, by influencing the will, frequently forces the manners from their bent, and sometimes effaces the strongest impressions of custom and nature. But this fervour, though violent, is rarely lasting; never so long as to establish the new system into an habit. So that when its rage subsides, as it very soon does (but where it drives into downright madness), the bias on the will keeps abating till all the former habitudes recover their relaxed tone.' (Page 92.)

Never were reflections more just than these. And whoever applies them to the matters of fact which daily occur all over England, and particularly in London, will easily discern that the changes now wrought cannot be accounted for by natural causes;—not by superstition, for the manners are changed, the whole life and conversation; not by fanaticism, for these changes are so lasting 'as to establish the new system into an habit'; not by mere

reason, for they are sudden : therefore they can only be wrought by the Holy Spirit.

As to Savonarola's being a fanatic or assuming the person of a prophet, I cannot take a Popish historian's word. And what a man says on the rack proves nothing, no more than his dying silent. Probably this might arise from shame and consciousness of having accused himself falsely under the torture.

' But how does the Spirit as Comforter abide with us for ever ? He abides with the Church for ever, as well personally in His office of Comforter, as virtually in His office of Enlightener.' (Page 96.)

Does He not, then, abide with the Church personally in both these respects ? What is meant by abiding virtually ? And what is the difference between abiding virtually and abiding personally ?

' The question will be, Does He still exercise His office in the same extraordinary manner as in the Apostles' days ? ' (page 97).

I know none that affirms it. ' St. Paul has determined this question. " Charity," says he, " never faileth : but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail ; whether there be tongues, they shall cease ; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away " (1 Cor. xiii. 8, &c.).'

' The common opinion is that this respects another life, as he enforces his argument by this observation : " Now we see through a glass darkly ; but then face to face : now we know in part ; but then shall we know, even as also we are known " ' (page 99).

' But the Apostle means charity is to accompany the Church in all its stages, whereas prophecy and all the rest are only bestowed during its infant state to support it against the delusions and powers of darkness ' (page 100).

' The Corinthians abounded in these gifts, but were wanting in charity. And this the Apostle here exposes by proving charity to be superior to them all both in its qualities and duration. The first three verses declare that the other gifts are useless without charity. The next four specify the qualities of charity. The remaining six declare its continuance,—" Charity never faileth : but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail ; whether there be tongues, they shall cease ; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." In the next verse he gives the reason,—" For we know in part, and we prophesy in part ; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away " : that is, when that Christian life, the lines of which are marked out by the gospel, shall arrive to its full vigour and maturity.

then the temporary aids, given to subdue prejudice and to support the weak, shall, like scaffolding, be removed. In other words, when that Christian life, wherein the Apostles and first Christians were but infants, shall arrive to its full vigour and maturity in their successors, then miracles shall cease.' (Page 102.) But I fear that time is not yet come. I doubt none that are now alive enjoy more of the vigour and maturity of the Christian life than the very first Christians did.

'To show that the loss of these will not be regretted when the Church has advanced from a state of infancy to manhood' (alas the day! Were the Apostles but infants to us?), 'he illustrates the case by an elegant similitude,—“When I was a child, I spake as a child; . . . but when I became a man, I put away childish things.” His next remark, concerning the defects of human knowledge, is only an occasional answer to an objection. And the last verse shows that the superior duration of charity refers to the present life only,—“Now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.” That is, you may perhaps object, Faith and hope will likewise remain in the Church, when prophecy, tongues, and knowledge are ceased: they will so; but still charity is the greatest, because of its excellent qualities.' (Page 107.)

'The last verse shows'! Is not this begging the question? How forced is all this! The plain natural meaning of the passage is, Love (the absolute necessity and the nature of which is shown in the foregoing verses) has another commendation—it 'never faileth,' it accompanies and adorns us to eternity. 'But whether there be prophecies, they shall fail,' when all things are fulfilled and God is all in all. 'Whether there be tongues, they shall cease': one language shall prevail among all the inhabitants of heaven, while the low, imperfect languages of earth are forgotten. The 'knowledge,' likewise, we now so eagerly pursue shall then 'vanish away.' As starlight is lost in that of the midday sun, so our present knowledge in the light of eternity. 'For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.' We have here but short, narrow, imperfect conceptions, even of the things round about us, and much more of the deep things of God; and even the prophecies which men deliver from God are far from taking in the whole of future events. 'But when that which is perfect is come,' at death and in the last day, 'that which is in part shall be done away.' Both that low, imperfect, glimmering light, which is all the knowledge we can now attain to; and these slow and unsatisfactory methods

of attaining, as well as of imparting it to others. 'When I was a child, I talked as a child, I understood as a child, I reasoned as a child.' As if he had said, In our present state we are mere infants compared to what we shall be hereafter. 'But when I became a man, I put away childish things'; and a proportionable change shall we all find when we launch into eternity. 'Now we see' even the things which surround us by means of 'a glass' or mirror, in a dim, faint, obscure manner, so that everything is a kind of riddle to us; 'but then' we shall see, not a faint reflection, but the objects themselves, 'face to face,' directly and distinctly. 'Now I know but in part.' Even when God reveals things to me, great part of them is still kept under the veil. 'But then shall I know even as I also am known'—in a clear, full, comprehensive manner; in some measure like God, who penetrates the centre of every object, and sees at one glance through my soul and all things. 'And now,' during the present life, 'abide these three, faith, hope, love; but the greatest of these,' in its duration as well as the excellence of its nature, 'is love.' Faith, hope, love, are the sum of perfection on earth; love alone is the sum of perfection in heaven.

'It appears, then, that the miraculous powers of the Church were to cease upon its perfect establishment' (page 107). Nothing like it appears from this scripture. But supposing it did, is Christianity perfectly established yet? even nominal Christianity? Mr. Brerewood took large pains to be fully informed; and, according to his account,<sup>1</sup> five parts in six of the known world are Mahometans or Pagans to this day. If so, Christianity is yet far from being perfectly established, either in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America.

'Having now established the fact' (wonderfully established!), 'we may inquire into the fitness of it. There were two causes of the extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit—one to manifest His mission (and this was done once for all), the other to comfort and instruct the Church.' (Page 110.)

'At His first descent on the Apostles, He found their minds rude and uninformed, strangers to all heavenly knowledge, and utterly averse to the gospel. He illuminated their minds with all necessary truth. For, a rule of faith not being yet composed' (No! Had they not 'the Law and the Prophets'?) 'some extraordinary infusion of His virtue was still necessary. But when this rule was perfected, part of this office was transferred upon the

<sup>1</sup> *Enquiries touching the Diversity of Languages and Religions through the chiefe parts of the World* (1614), p. 118.



Sacred Canon ; and His enlightening grace was not to be expected in such abundant measure as to make the recipients infallible guides.' (Page 112.)

Certainly it was not. If this is all that is intended, no one will gainsay.

' Yet modern fanatics pretend to as high a degree of divine communications as if no such rule were in being ' (I do not) ; ' or, at least, as if that rule needed the farther assistance of the Holy Spirit to explain His own meaning.' This is quite another thing. I do firmly believe (and what serious man does not ?) *omnis scriptura legi debet eo Spiritu quo scripta est* : ' We need the same Spirit to understand the Scripture which enabled the holy men of old to write it.'

' Again, the whole strength of human prejudices was then set in opposition to the gospel, to overcome the obstinacy and violence of which nothing less than the power of the Holy One was sufficient. At present, whatever prejudices may remain, it draws the other way.' (Page 113.) What, toward holiness ? toward temperance and chastity ? toward justice, mercy, and truth ? Quite the reverse. And to overcome the obstinacy and violence of the heart-prejudices which still lie against these, the power of the Holy One is as necessary now as ever it was from the beginning of the world.

' A farther reason for the ceasing of miracles is the peace and security of the Church. The profession of the Christian faith is now attended with ease and honour.' ' The profession,' true ; but not the thing itself, as ' all that will live godly in Christ Jesus ' experience.

' But if miracles are not ceased, why do you not prove your mission thereby ? ' As your Lordship has frequently spoke to this effect, I will now give a clear answer. And I purposely do it in the same words which I published many years since. . . .<sup>1</sup>

' But " why do you talk of the success of the gospel in England, which was a Christian country before you was born " ? Was it indeed ? Is it so at this day ? I would explain myself a little on this head also.

' And (1) None can deny that the people of England in general are called Christians. They are called so, a few only excepted, by others as well as by themselves. But I presume no man will

---

<sup>1</sup> See sect. v of the letter of June 17, 1746, to Thomas Church, which Wesley quotes here.

say the name makes the thing, that men are Christians barely because they are called so. It must be allowed (2) That the people of England generally speaking have been christened or baptized; but neither can we infer, "These were once baptized, therefore they are Christians now." It is allowed (3) That many of those who were once baptized, and are called Christians to this day, hear the word of God, attend public prayers, and partake of the Lord's Supper. But neither does this prove that they are Christians. For, notwithstanding this, some of them live in open sin; and others, though not conscious to themselves of hypocrisy, yet are utter strangers to the religion of the heart, are full of pride, vanity, covetousness, ambition, of hatred, anger, malice, or envy, and consequently are no more spiritual Christians than the open drunkard or common swearer.

'Now, these being removed, where are the Christians from whom we may properly term England a Christian country? the men who have "the mind which was in Christ" and who "walk as He also walked"? whose inmost soul is renewed after the image of God, and who are outwardly holy, as He who hath called them is holy? There are doubtless a few such to be found. To deny this would be "want of candour." But how few! how thinly scattered up and down! And as for a Christian visible Church, or a body of Christians visibly united together, where is this to be seen?

Ye different sects, who all declare,  
Lo, here is Christ! or, Christ is there!  
Your stronger proofs divinely give,  
And show me where the *Christians* live!

'And what use is it of, what good end does it serve, to term England a Christian country? Although it is true most of the natives are called Christians, have been baptized, frequent the ordinances; and although here and there a real Christian is to be found, "as a light shining in a dark place,"—does it do any honour to our great Master among those who are not called by His name? Does it recommend Christianity to the Jews, the Mahometans, or the avowed heathens? Surely no one can conceive it does. It only makes Christianity stink in their nostrils. Does it answer any good end with regard to those who are called by this worthy name? I fear not, but rather an exceeding bad one. For does it not keep multitudes easy in their heathen practice? Does it not make or keep still greater numbers satisfied with their heathen

tempers? Does it not directly tend to make both the one and the other imagine that they are what indeed they are not, that they are Christians while they are utterly without Christ and without God in the world? To close this point: if men are not Christians till they are renewed after the image of Christ, and if the people of England in general are not thus renewed, why do we term them so? "The god of this world hath" long "blinded their hearts." Let us do nothing to increase their blindness, but rather to recover them from that strong delusion, that they may no longer believe a lie.

' Let us labour to convince all mankind that to be a real Christian is to love the Lord our God with all our heart and to serve Him with all our strength; to love our neighbour as ourselves, and therefore to do unto every man as we would he should do unto us.'<sup>1</sup>

To change one of these heathens into a real Christian, and to continue him such, all the ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit are absolutely necessary.

' But what are they? ' I sum them up (as I did in the *Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*) in the words of as learned and orthodox a divine as ever England bred:—

' Sanctification being opposed to our corruption, and answering fully to the latitude thereof, whatsoever of holiness and perfection is wanting in our nature must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore, we being by nature totally void of all saving truth and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God, this " Spirit searcheth all things, yea even the deep things of God," and revealeth them unto the sons of men; so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of God. The same Spirit which revealeth the object of faith generally to the universal Church, doth also illuminate the understanding of such as believe, that they may receive the truth. For faith is the gift of God, not only in the object, but also in the act. And this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us. And as the increase of perfection, so the original of faith, is from the Spirit of God by an internal illumination of the soul.

' The second part of the office of the Holy Ghost is the renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his soul. For our natural corruption consisting in an aversation of our wills and a depravation

---

<sup>1</sup> See letter of June 17 1746, sect. vi. 3-4.

of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God.

' The third part of this office is to lead, direct, and govern us in our actions and conversations. " If we live in the Spirit," quickened by His renovation, we must also " walk in the Spirit," following His direction, led by His manuduction. We are also animated and acted by the Spirit of God, who giveth " both to will and to do."

' And " as many as are thus led by the Spirit of God are the sons of God " (Rom. viii. 14). Moreover, that this direction may prove more effectual, we are guided in our prayers by the same Spirit, according to the promise, " I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and supplication " (Zech. xii. 10). Whereas, then, " this is the confidence we have in Him, that, if we ask anything according to His will, He heareth us " ; and whereas " we know not what we should pray for as we ought, the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered " (Rom. viii. 26). " And He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God " (verse 27). From which intercession (made for all true Christians) He hath the name of the Paraclete given Him by Christ, who said, " I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Paraclete " (John xiv. 16, 26). For " if any man sin, we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," saith St. John. " Who maketh intercession for us," saith St. Paul (Rom. viii. 34). And we have " another Paraclete," saith our Saviour (John xiv. 16), " which also maketh intercession for us," saith St. Paul (Rom. viii. 27). A Paraclete, then, in the notion of the Scriptures, is an Intercessor.

' It is also the office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of sons, to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God towards us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. " The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. And, because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father. For we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father ; the Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." As, therefore, we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from Him our regeneration, so we

are also by the same Spirit assured of our adoption. Because, being "sons, we are also heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ," by the same Spirit we have the pledge, or rather the earnest, of our inheritance. "For He which establisheth us in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and hath given us the earnest of His Spirit in our hearts; so that we are sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance." The Spirit of God, as given unto us in this life, is to be looked upon as an earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, and, upon performance of the covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received.<sup>1</sup>

It now rests with your Lordship to take your choice, either to condemn or to acquit both: either your Lordship must condemn Bishop Pearson for an enthusiast, or you must acquit me; for I have his express authority on my side concerning every text which I affirm to belong to all Christians.

But I have greater authority than his, and such as I reverence only less than the oracles of God: I mean that of our own Church. I shall close this head by setting down what occurs in her authentic records concerning either our receiving the Holy Ghost or His ordinary operations in all true Christians.

In her Daily Service she teacheth us all to 'beseech God to grant us His Holy Spirit, that those things may please Him which we do at this present, and that the rest of our life may be pure and holy'; to pray for our sovereign Lord the King, that God would 'replenish him with the grace of His Holy Spirit'; for all the Royal Family, that 'they may be endued with His Holy Spirit and enriched with His heavenly grace'; for all the clergy and people, that He would 'send down upon them the healthful Spirit of His grace'; for the catholic Church, that 'it may be guided and governed by His good Spirit'; and for all therein, who at any time make their common supplications unto Him, that 'the fellowship' or communication 'of the Holy Ghost may be with them all evermore.'

Her Collects are full of petitions to the same effect. 'Grant that we may daily be renewed by Thy Holy Spirit' (Collect for Christmas Day). 'Grant that in all our sufferings here, for the testimony of Thy truth, we may by faith behold the glory that shall be revealed, and, being filled with the Holy Ghost, may love

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, viii. 99-101; Pearson's *An Exposition of the Creed*, art. viii. ii. on The Office of the Spirit.

and bless our persecutors' (St. Stephen's Day). 'Send Thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity' (Quinquagesima Sunday). 'O Lord, from whom all good things do come, grant to us Thy humble servants that by Thy holy inspiration we may think those things that are good, and by Thy merciful guidance may perform the same' (Fifth Sunday after Easter). 'We beseech Thee, leave us not comfortless, but send to us the Holy Ghost to comfort us' (Sunday after Ascension Day). 'Grant us by the same Spirit to have a right judgement in all things, and evermore to rejoice in His holy comfort' (Whit Sunday). 'Grant us, Lord, we beseech Thee, the Spirit to think and do always such things as be rightful' (Ninth Sunday after Trinity). 'O God, forasmuch as without Thee we are not able to please Thee, mercifully grant that Thy Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts' (Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity). 'Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name' (Communion Office).

'Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant (or this person), that he may be born again. Give Thy Holy Spirit to these persons' (N.B. already baptized), 'that they may continue Thy servants.'

'Almighty God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these persons by water and the Holy Ghost, strengthen them with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them the manifold gifts of Thy grace' (Office of Confirmation).

From these passages it may sufficiently appear for what purposes every Christian, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, does now receive the Holy Ghost. But this will be still more clear from those that follow; wherein we may likewise observe a plain, rational sense of God's 'revealing' Himself to us, of the 'inspiration' of the Holy Ghost, and of a believer's 'feeling' in himself the 'mighty working' of the Spirit of Christ:—

'God gave them of old, grace to be His children, as He doth us now. But, now by the coming of our Saviour Christ, we have received more abundantly the Spirit of God in our hearts.' (Homily on Faith, Part II.)

'He died to destroy the rule of the devil in us, and He rose again to send down His Holy Spirit to rule in our hearts' (Homily on the Resurrection).

'We have the Holy Spirit in our hearts as a seal and pledge of our everlasting inheritance' (ibid.).

'The Holy Ghost sat upon each of them, like as it had been

cloven tongues of fire, to teach that it is He that giveth eloquence and utterance in preaching the gospel, which engendereth a burning zeal towards God's Word, and giveth all men a tongue, yea a fiery tongue.' (N.B.—Whatever occurs, in any of the Journals, of God's 'giving me utterance' or 'enabling me to speak with power' cannot therefore be quoted as enthusiasm without wounding the Church through my side.) 'So that if any man be a dumb Christian, not professing his faith openly, he giveth men occasion to doubt lest he have not the grace of the Holy Ghost within him.' (Homily on Whit Sunday, Part I.)

'It is the office of the Holy Ghost to sanctify; which the more it is hid from our understanding' (that is, the particular manner of His working), 'the more it ought to move all men to wonder at the secret and mighty workings of God's Holy Spirit, which is within us. For it is the Holy Ghost that doth quicken the minds of men, stirring up godly motions in their hearts. Neither does He think it sufficient inwardly to work the new birth of men, unless He does also dwell and abide in them. "Know ye not," saith St. Paul, "that ye are the temples of God, and that His Spirit dwelleth in you? Know ye not that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost, which is within you?" Again he saith, "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit." For why? "The Spirit of God dwelleth in you." To this agreeth St. John: "The anointing which ye have received" (he meaneth the Holy Ghost) "abideth in you" (1 John ii. 27). And St. Peter saith the same: "The Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you." Oh what comfort is this to the heart of a true Christian, to think that the Holy Ghost dwelleth in him! "If God be with us," as the Apostle saith, "who can be against us?" He giveth patience and joyfulness of heart in temptation and affliction, and is therefore worthily called "the Comforter" (John xiv. 16). He doth instruct the hearts of the simple in the knowledge of God and His Word; therefore He is justly termed "the Spirit of truth" (John xvi. 13). And (N.B.) where the Holy Ghost doth instruct and teach, there is no delay at all in learning.' (Ibid.)

From this passage I learn (1) that every true Christian now 'receives the Holy Ghost' as the Paraclete or Comforter promised by our Lord (John xiv. 16); (2) that every Christian receives Him as 'the Spirit of all truth' (promised John xvi. 13) to 'teach him all things'; and (3) that the anointing mentioned in the First Epistle of St. John 'abides in every Christian.'

'In reading of God's Word, he profiteth most who is most

inspired with the Holy Ghost' (Homily on Reading the Scripture, Part I.).

' Human and worldly reason is not needful to the understanding the Scripture; but the "revelation of the Holy Ghost," who inspireth the true meaning unto them who with humility and diligence search for it' (Part II.).

' Make him know and feel that there is no other name given under heaven unto men whereby we can be saved.' ' If we feel our conscience at peace with God, through remission of our sins, all is of God.' (Homily on Rogation Week, Part III.)

' If you feel such a faith in you, rejoice in it, and let it be daily increasing by well working' (Homily on Faith, Part III.).

' The faithful may feel wrought, tranquillity of conscience, the increase of faith and hope, with many other graces of God' (Homily on the Sacrament, Part I.).

' Godly men feel inwardly God's Holy Spirit inflaming their hearts with love' (Homily on Certain Places of Scripture, Part I.).

' God give us grace to know these things, and feel them in our hearts! This knowledge and feeling is not of ourselves. Let us therefore meekly call upon the bountiful Spirit, the Holy Ghost, to inspire us with His presence, that we may be able to hear the goodness of God to our salvation. For without His lively inspiration we cannot so much as speak the name of the Mediator: "No man can say Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." Much less should we be able to believe and know these great mysteries that be opened to us by Christ. "But we have received," saith St. Paul, "not the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God"; for this purpose, "that we may know the things which are freely given to us of God." In the power of the Holy Ghost resteth all ability to know God and to please Him. It is He that purifieth the mind by His secret working. He enlighteneth the heart to conceive worthy thoughts of Almighty God. He sitteth on the tongue of man to stir him to speak His honour. He only ministereth spiritual strength to the powers of the soul and body. And if we have any gift whereby we may profit our neighbour, all is wrought by this one and selfsame Spirit.' (Homily for Rogation Week, Part III.)

Every proposition which I have anywhere advanced concerning those operations of the Holy Ghost, which I believe are common to all Christians in all ages, is here clearly maintained by our own Church.

Being fully convinced of this, I could not well understand for



many years how it was that, on the mentioning any of these great truths, even among men of education, the cry immediately arose, 'An enthusiast, an enthusiast!' But I now plainly perceive this is only an old fallacy in a new shape. To object enthusiasm to any person or doctrine is but a decent method of begging the question. It generally spares the objector the trouble of reasoning, and is a shorter and easier way of carrying his cause.

For instance: I assert that 'till a man "receives the Holy Ghost" he is without God in the world; that he cannot know the things of God unless God reveal them unto him by His Spirit—no, nor have even one holy or heavenly temper without the inspiration of the Holy One.' Now, should one who is conscious to himself that he has experienced none of these things attempt to confute these propositions either from Scripture or antiquity, it might prove a difficult task. What, then, shall he do? Why, cry out, 'Enthusiasm! Fanaticism!' and the work is done.

'But is it not mere enthusiasm or fanaticism to talk of the new birth?' So one might imagine from the manner in which your Lordship talks of it: 'The Spirit did not stop till it had manifested itself in the last effort of its power—the new birth. The new birth began in storms and tempests, in cries and ecstasies, in tumults and confusions. Persons who had no sense of religion—that is, no ecstatic feelings, or pains of the new birth. What can be the issue of the new birth, attended with those infernal throes? Why would he elicit sense from these Gentiles, when they were finally to be deprived of it in ecstasies and new births? All these circumstances Mr. Wesley has declared to be constant symptoms of the new birth.' (Pages 123, 126, 180, 170, 225, 222.)

So the new birth is throughout the whole tract the standing topic of ridicule.

'No, not the new birth itself, but your enthusiastic, ridiculous account of it.' What is, then, my account of the new birth? I gave it some years ago in these words:—

'It is that great change which God works in the soul when He brings it into life; when He raises it from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. It is the change wrought in the whole soul by the almighty Spirit of God, when it is "created anew in Christ Jesus," when it is "renewed after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness; when the love of the world is changed into the love of God, pride into humility, passion into meekness, hatred, envy, malice into a sincere, tender, disinterested

love to all mankind. In a word, it is that change whereby the earthly, sensual, devilish mind is turned into "the mind which was in Christ Jesus."<sup>1</sup>

This is my account of the new birth. What is there ridiculous or enthusiastic in it?

'But what do you mean by those tempests, and cries, and pains, and infernal throes attending the new birth?' I will tell you as plainly as I can, in the very same words I used to Dr. Church, after premising that some experience much, some very little, of these pains and throes:—

"When men feel in themselves the heavy burthen of sin, see damnation to be the reward of it, behold with the eye of their mind the horror of hell, they tremble, they quake, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart, and cannot but accuse themselves, and open their grief unto Almighty God, and call unto Him for mercy. This being done seriously, their mind is so occupied, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, that all desire of meat and drink is laid apart, and loathing of worldly things and pleasures comes in place, so that nothing then liketh them more than to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour of body to show themselves weary of life."

'Now, permit me to ask, What, if, before you had observed that these were the very words of our own Church, one of your acquaintance or parishioners had come and told you that, ever since he heard a sermon at the Foundery, he saw damnation before him, and beheld with the eye of his mind the horror of hell? What, if he had trembled and quaked, and been so taken up, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from the danger of hell and damnation, as to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour to show himself weary of life? Would you have scrupled to say, "Here is another deplorable instance of the Methodists driving men to distraction"?'

I have now finished, as my time permits, what I had to say, either concerning myself or on the operations of the Holy Spirit. In doing this I have used great plainness of speech, and yet I hope without rudeness. If anything of that kind has slipped from me, I am ready to retract it. I desire, on the one hand, to 'accept

---

<sup>1</sup> Sermon on the New Birth. See *Works*, vi. 71.

no man's person'; and yet, on the other, to give 'honour to whom honour is due.'

If your Lordship should think it worth your while to spend any more words upon me, may I presume to request one thing of your Lordship—to be more serious? It cannot injure your Lordship's character or your cause. Truth is great, and will prevail.

Wishing your Lordship all temporal and spiritual blessings,  
I am, my Lord,                      Your Lordship's dutiful son and servant.

∴ A MS. of 205 pages by Dr. Warburton, *The True Methodist, or Christian in Earnest*, has recently come into the possession of the Methodist Book Room. He revised it on July 6, 1755, 'after reading Mr. Hervey's *Dialogues between Theron and Aspasio*, which savours strongly of Methodism.' The MS., which was regarded as one of his lost works, describes what he regards as the true Methodist in opposition to the Methodist of the Wesley and Whitefield type. It begins with 'his first setting out' and considers him in Private Life with respect to age and natural temper; in Public Life as a Learner and a Teacher, as a Churchman, and Master of a Family, and as engaged in a Secular Calling, &c.

END OF VOLUME IV.

