



# Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

A  
Review of all the Doctrines  
TAUGHT BY  
The Rev. Mr. JOHN WESLEY;  
CONTAINING,  
A FULL AND PARTICULAR ANSWER  
TO A BOOK ENTITLED,  
"A Second Check to Antinomianism."  
In SIX LETTERS to the Author of that Book.

Wherein the DOCTRINES of  
A TWOFOLD JUSTIFICATION, FREE WILL, MAN'S  
MERIT, SINLESS PERFECTION, FINISHED SAL-  
VATION, and REAL ANTINOMIANISM,  
ARE PARTICULARLY DISCUSSED;  
AND  
The PURITAN DIVINES Vindicated from the Charges brought  
against them of holding MR. WESLEY'S Doctrines.  
TO WHICH IS ADDED,  
A FARRAGO.

---

And not rather, as we be *flanderously reported*, and as some affirm  
that we say, Let us do evil that good may come; whose damna-  
tion is just. *Rom. iii. 8.*


"I would I knew where to find you; then I could take a direct  
aim. Whereas now I must rove and conjecture. To-day you are  
in the tents of the Romanists; tomorrow in ours; next day, be-  
tween both, against both. Our adversaries think you ours, we  
theirs; your conscience finds you with both and neither. I flatter  
you not; this of yours is the worst of all tempers.—WILL YOU  
BE A CHURCH ALONE? Alas! how full are you of contradictions  
to yourself! How full of contrary purposes! How oft do you chide  
with yourself! How oft do you fight with yourself!"

*Bp. Hall's Letter to W. L. expostulating with  
him on his Unsettledness in Religion.*

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed for E. and C. DILLY, in the Poultry. 1772.

5. 7. 77.




## E R R A T A.

- Page 26. The references are wrong placed.
33. l. 1. for represents, r. presents.
37. l. 7. for Shaddai, r. Emmanuel.
79. l. 25. note, *dele* confidently.
82. l. 22 for servants, r. witnesses.
85. l. 16. r. to strive.
86. l. 10. for reader, r. readers.
89. l. 27. for not, r. nor.
91. l. 30. *dele* At all events, and r. " Whether my Letters  
" were suppressed or not."
97. in the reference, add, and Papists.
114. opposite the words, "I wonder how any man can presume to exclude the *active obedience* of Christ from our justification before God," add, That Righteousness, or Justification, which believers have in or by Christ, is still attributed in the Scriptures to the death and sufferings of Christ, and NEVER to his righteousness or *active obedience*. *Treatise on Just.* p. 172.
119. transpose the last contradiction.
120. instead of " to ascribe, &c." r. " He that is fully acquitted of his sins needeth no other righteousness to give him a title to life." *Treat. on Just.*

### *Just Published.*

- A New Edition of the Five Letters to Mr. F——r, corrected and much enlarged, Price 9 d.
- The Paris Conversation concerning Mr. Wesley's Minutes, Price 3 d. As also,
- The Sixth Edition (much enlarged) of an Address to Persons of Fashion concerning Balls, Plays, Cards, &c. Price 2 s.





---

A  
R E V I E W

O F

All MR. WESLEY'S Doctrines,

&c. &c. &c.

---

L E T T E R I.

REVEREND SIR,

**A**FTER many debates with myself, and much solicitation from my friends, you now hear from me again, on the subject of your last piece, entitled; *A Second Check to Antinomianism*. I make no other apology for writing, than that I think there is an absolute necessity an answer should be given to it; and I heartily wish that the dear and worthy minister to whom your Letters are addressed (and whose superior gifts, graces, and abilities for such a work, I acknowledge with the most unfeigned respect), were to take up the pen instead of myself; but in consideration of his continual labours in the ministry, and consequently of the little leisure he has for controversial employment, I shall esteem it an honor conferred on *the least of all saints*, if he will permit me to act the part of his ally, in what I am persuaded

B

suaded

suaded is the cause of God, and of truth. But whilst I make my animadversions on your Letters, may the Divine Author of Love and Meekness preserve me from the unhappy spirit in which they are written! Oh, my dear Sir! I never could have supposed that sneer, banter, and sarcasm, yea notorious falsehood, calumny, and gross perversions, would have appeared before the world under the sanction of your venerable name: And although I thought there might be some parts of Mr. Shirley's narrative which would not entirely meet with your approbation, yet I was persuaded you would have told him so with a pen dipped in honey, but not in gall: Especially as Mr. Wesley had expunged, what he thought, *all the tart expressions* from your first book; though it is still visible that the observation of Mr. Shirley concerning it is but too well founded; viz. *If the tart expressions are expunged, many bitter ones yet remain:* And notwithstanding you would seem to make a confession for these, yet it is evidently a forced and unmeaning, if not a sarcastic one; for you say (p. 47), "For every bitter expression that may have dropped from my sharp vindicating pen, I ask you pardon, but it must be in general, for neither friends nor foes have yet particularly pointed out to me one such expression."

But not to dwell any longer on the *manner* in which you have defended your cause, I proceed to consider the *matter* of your performance. But before I do this, would beg to present you with an extract from a dear friend's letter, whose great love and attachment to Mr. F——r, must convince him that nothing but the persuasion of his having given up the most glorious truths of the Gospel, could ever have made her give up the opinion she once had of him as a minister of Christ; as also that the severe acrimonious spirit of his late *works* is not less visible to others, than to myself. The Lady I mean, writing to one of the few great and honourable among the chosen of Christ, thus expresseth herself:

"I have been looking into Mr. F——r's *Second Check to Antinomianism*; he was permitted no doubt to print it for wise ends; but indeed it is most awful to see how this mighty ~~is~~ *is fallen, how the fine gold is become dim.* O my dear friend, I can scarce refrain from dropping a tear whilst I write. My heart has been made heavy on account of this publication, by a man whom I once revered as an Angel of God, and at whose feet I have sat with great delight to hear the precious truths which flowed from his lips: but he now seems turned aside unto vain janglings. The very ludicrous manner in which he treats THE FINISHED SALVATION

OF

“ OF CHRIST, is enough to make every child of God shudder, who is convinced of the insufficiency of his own righteousness for acceptance, and whose trust is in the alone merits of Jesus the Mediator.”

Another dear friend of yours and mine, one who always esteemed you *very highly in love*, thus expresseth himself, in a letter upon the occasion: “ Who would have thought dear Mr. F——r should have been the author (of the Second Check to Antinomianism)? I did not see it till lately, and am sorry to say that it seems to me to be as full of sensible spleen, as of groundless and false arguments. Let us pray for the Author, and confute him by *spiritual motion* (A). If his axioms are untrue, unless the merciful Jesus, whose immaculate righteousness he hath so horridly set at nought, reverse the sentence, the *idle words* of that book will undo all that he has been doing. I hence learn not to be high-minded, but to fear lest I should fall after the same example.”

A third, a faithful minister of Christ, to whom you have always been peculiarly dear, thus writes: “ It really hurts me to cut off all intercourse and friendship with Mr. F——r, whom I once so highly esteemed. I sincerely pity him. He seems to be so infatuated and carried away with a false zeal to serve the cause he is engaged in, that he appears quite insensible to what lengths he has run, how widely he has deviated from the rule of truth, and in what manner he has sneered at the doctrines of grace, and exposed to contempt and censure those who stand up for them! However, if he should revoke the pernicious doctrines he has advanced, and repent of the bitter expressions in his late publications, I don't know any minister I should be more disposed to honour.”

YOUR first letter is almost wholly employed in defence of the doctrine of a *second Justification by works*. Whether or no Mr. *Wesley's* declaration made at the last Bristol conference, be compatible with such a doctrine, is not much to the purpose; saying and unsaying is nothing new with one who has only shewn himself consistent by a regular series of inconsistencies. But I venture to appeal to the integrity of the pious worthy men, who signed it after Mr. *Wesley*, whether they had the least idea at that time that the declaration would

(A) Alluding to the philosopher who denied there was any such thing as motion; which one hearing, got up and confuted him by walking in his presence.

or could stand with any such system as that contended for by Mr. Oliver, and since defended by Mr. F——r? It is plain that Mr. Oliver thought it would not, and therefore he very properly refused to sign it; and if the rest of the preachers then assembled had been of Mr. Oliver's opinion in the matter of a second Justification by works, (notwithstanding you have so peremptorily answered for them all) I dare say they would every one of them have followed his example, and would not have set their hands to that which in their hearts they could never assent to.

With regard to the doctrine itself, I may safely affirm, that as it has no existence in the word of God, so neither in any Protestant church under Heaven; and therefore we find that all the awakened Divines, who lived at or near the time of the Reformation, as well among the Puritans, as of our own communion, whenever they combated the notion of a second Justification by works, always took it for granted that such notion was only held within the Romish pale (B), and that all Protestants were unanimous in asserting the one complete, final, everlasting Justification of sinners by faith only in Jesus Christ. That this is the case, will appear from the following extract from that sound, learned, holy, and evangelical Prelate of our church, Bishop Cowper, who, in his Comment on Rom. viii. 30, stating the controversy between us and the Papists relative to a first and second Justification, thus writes: " Their third  
 " evasion is by a distinction of the first and second Justification;  
 " the first whereof (say they) is *by faith*, but the second is *by*  
 " *works*; but this twofold Justification is also forged; for  
 " *Justificatio est actus individuus & simul totus*; there is no  
 " first and last in the act of Justification: He that is once con-  
 " demned judicially stands so; and he that is absolved stands so.  
 " Again, this distinction confounds two benefits, Justification  
 " and Sanctification, which *to them* is the second Justification.  
 " That they are distinct benefits the Apostle doth teach, say-  
 " ing, *Christ is made unto us righteousness and sanctification*;

(B) Dr. Fulke (on Rom. ii. 13) tells the Rhemish Jesuits, " As for  
 " your distinction of a first and second Justification before God, it  
 " is but a new device, not three score years old, utterly unheard of  
 " among the antient fathers."

In like manner good old Mr. Perkins, who lived in the time of Queen Elizabeth, tells the Papists; that " they were forced to cast  
 " about for that as false as new distinction of Justification into the *first*  
 " and *second*, never heard of for the space of fifteen hundred years  
 " after Christ." Perkins, vol. iii. p. 599.

" but



but they inconsiderately confound them; for if these new qualities infused by grace into the soul of man, and good works flowing therefrom, be the matter (as they say) of man's second Justification, then let them tell us, what is the matter of his Sanctification."

What the good bishop here advances upon the confounding Justification with Sanctification is well worth attending to; especially as this doctrine must necessarily make way for another exploded heresy of the Romish church; viz. *the increase of the second Justification*, according to the degrees and measures of holiness and good works which are produced in the heart and life. And hence it is that we find, when Mr. Hervey asserts in his *Theron and Aspasio*, "That Justification is complete the first moment we believe, and is incapable of augmentation," Mr. Wesley answers, "Not so; *there may be as many degrees in the favor, as in the image of God (C).*" And Mr. F——r, (p. 9.) where he is attempting to prove, that in the last day *we shall not be justified by faith, but by the fruits of faith; viz. love and good works*, declares in still more forcible terms, "*That love and good works are the ETERNAL MEASURES, according to which God DISTRIBUTES JUSTIFICATION and glory in the world to come (D).*"

But if this doctrine be true, then there must be a certain period in every believer's experience between his first and second Justification, until he shall have produced such a DEGREE and MEASURE of sanctification and good works as shall be necessary

(C) Mr. Hervey well observes upon this assertion of Mr. Wesley, that "Justification is one single act of divine grace, and must therefore be either done or undone. If done, in the very idea of the act it includes completeness; so that to speak of incomplete Justification is a contradiction in terms; like speaking of a dark sunshine, or a round square." He then proceeds to shew, that this sentiment naturally makes way for a gradual, a variable, and even a half Justification; and that by turning upon a supposition, that the favor of God towards us is occasioned by the image of God in us, it is the doctrine of the law, the very language of Heathenism, and has not the least favor of the Gospel, in which CHRIST IS ALL. Letter iv. p. 78.

(D) Though neither our Lord nor the Apostles, nor Prophets, have ever said a single syllable of this notion, yet Mr. Wesley and Mr. F——r have the whole council of Trent on their side, one of whose canons thus dogmatizes: "If any shall affirm that righteousness received is not preserved, and *increased* likewise by good works; but that good works are only the fruits and evidences (*signa*) of Justification obtained, not the means of *increasing* it also, let him be accursed." Sess. vi. can. 24.



to bring him into the state of second Justification. If you deny this, and say there is no such intermediate state, then you overthrow your own argument, and your distinction is utterly needless. For instance, let us suppose a sinner freely justified by faith only in Christ; is that sinner the same hour partaker of a second Justification by works? If you say *no*, you allow the intermediate state between the two Justifications which I affirm your doctrine must end in. If you say *yes*, then you immediately level to the ground all the Babel you have been erecting.

The case of the penitent thief appeared a formidable rampart against your doctrine, therefore you have endeavoured to scale this rampart as well as you could, by attempting to prove that this thief was justified by his *reproofs, exhortations, prayers, patience and resignation, all of which plainly evidenced the liveliness of his faith, as there was time and opportunity, and by his love to God and man he fulfilled all the Law, and did all good works in one.* You then sum up the argument by asking, *Is not the fulfilling of ALL the law of Christ work enough to justify the converted thief by that law?* Work enough indeed! But of all the millions of souls now in glory, perhaps this poor thief had the least thought of ever being produced as an example of Justification by the merit of his own good works. And that the Primitive Fathers, and the Reformers of our own church did ever esteem this as one of the most glorious instances of free grace recorded in the Scriptures, and therefore would have been equally shocked and astonished to see it perverted to countenance the new-fangled conceit of a twofold Justification, is most evident from the following quotation out of the Homily of Salvation, which I choose to transcribe from Mr. Wesley's extract, the words themselves being taken from St. Chrysostom. "I can shew a man that by faith without works lived and came to Heaven: But without faith never man had life. The thief that was hanged when Christ suffered, did BELIEVE ONLY, and the most merciful God justified him. *Faith by itself saved him, but works by themselves never justified any man.*" *Hom. of Salvation (E).*

But to follow you in this example yet further. You ask, *Could he go into Paradise without being born again?* I answer, certainly he could not. And in my turn permit me to ask, if

(E) See also Mr. Wesley's sermon on Eph. ii. 8, where he affirms, that the thief was justified without bringing forth fruits meet for repentance; and is much displeas'd at a late writer, who would make this thief "a very honest and respectable person."

he could be born again without being justified? If you also answer in the negative, then I reply, that his free Justification by faith in Christ, and his being born from above were both effected at once, and therefore he could not be justified a second time, either by love or his new birth, which both took place at his Justification. It is true, all holy habits were infused into his soul upon his believing; and had he lived he would no doubt have brought them into act; but to talk of his being justified a second time, by *the fulfillment of all the law of Christ*, is a perversion not less notorious than bringing the instance of our Lord's raising Lazarus, in your first Pamphlet (p. 41), to support the doctrine of man's natural abilities and free will (F).

But you will tell me, I have not yet answered the texts of Scripture which you have produced in favor of a second Justification by works. I own, I am glad to have an opportunity of laying them plainly before the eyes of my candid reader, that he may judge, without prejudice, how very feebly they support your doctrine. You introduce them indeed with a very confident preface, as if they were originally intended for the service into which you have pressed them; but a small degree of discernment will restore them to their true meaning.

Your words are these: "Neither you, Rev. Sir, nor any divine in the world, have, I presume, a right to blot out of the sacred records those words of Jesus Christ, St. James, and St. Paul: Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have *right* (G) to the tree of life. Not every one that says to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven, but he that does the will of my Father. Be ye therefore doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving yourselves. For as we are under the law to Christ, not the hearers of the law shall be just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. Every man's work shall be made

(F) Mr. F——r says that, "Instead of imitating Lazarus, who, when our Lord had called him, and restored life to his putrefying body, came forth out of his grave, though he was bound hand and foot, these mistaken men indolently wait till the Lord drags them out." But Mr. F——r should have considered, that Lazarus would have lain till this time if he who called him had not given both life and power to come forth.

(G) The word in the Greek is ἐξουσία, which properly signifies *privilege*; and therefore even bishop Hoadly, speaking on this passage, could say, "Such as allow themselves to pick single texts of Scripture, without comparing them with the whole, and with each other, may from these places collect *the Romish doctrine of merit.*"

Terms of Acceptance.

"ma-

“ manifest: For the day shall declare it, because it shall be  
 “ revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man’s work of  
 “ what sort it is. *His very words shall undergo the severest*  
 “ *scrutiny*: I say unto you (*O how many will insinuate the con-*  
 “ *trary?*) that every idle word that men shall speak they shall  
 “ give account thereof in the day of judgment, for by thy words  
 “ shalt thou then be justified, and by thy words shalt thou  
 “ then be condemned.”

Now, Sir, is it possible that you can build the system of a  
 second Justification by works upon the above Scriptures? For  
 my own part, I can no more admit your hypothesis from them;  
 than I would deny their force when brought to affirm that  
 sanctification and good works are the certain fruits and evidences  
 of a justified state, both here and at the day of judgment. You  
 attempt, indeed, to make a distinction between a second Justi-  
 fication by the merit, and by the evidence of works (H), and you  
 would illustrate this distinction by the examples of Curling  
 Tom the Collier and Mr. Shirley’s sensible boy. “ Give me  
 “ leave, Sir, (say you, p. 29) to answer this objection by two  
 “ appeals, one to the most ignorant Collier in my Parish, and  
 “ the other to your own sensible Child; and if they can at  
 “ once understand my meaning, you will see that my meta-  
 “ physical distinctions, as you are pleased to call them, are  
 “ nothing but the dictates of common sense. I begin with the  
 “ Collier.

“ Thomas, I stand here before the judge, accused of hav-  
 “ ing robbed the Rev. Mr. Shirley, near Bath, last month, on  
 “ such an evening: Can you speak a word for me?” Thomas  
 “ turns to the judge, and says, “ Please your honor, the accu-  
 “ sation is false; for our parson was in Madely-Wood, and I  
 “ can make oath of it; for he even reproved me for swearing  
 “ at our pit’s mouth that very evening.” By his evidence the  
 “ judge acquits me. Now, Sir, ask Curling Tom, whether  
 “ I am acquitted and justified by his merits, or by the simple  
 “ evidence he has given? and he will tell you, “ Aye, to be  
 “ sure, by the evidence: Though I am no scholar, I know  
 “ very well, if our Methodist Parson is not hanged, it is none  
 “ of my deserving.” Thus, Sir, an ignorant Collier, as great  
 “ a stranger to your metaphysics as you are to his mandrel,  
 “ discovers at once a material difference between Justifica-  
 “ tion by the evidence, and Justification by the merits of a  
 “ witness.

(H) If Mr. F——r here calls the works of believers *evidences* only,  
 why does he in other places so strongly plead for the *merit* of them?

“ My



“ My second appeal is to your sensible child. By a plain  
 “ comparison, I hope to make him at once understand both  
 “ the difference there is between our first and second Justifica-  
 “ tion, and the propriety of that difference. The lovely boy  
 “ is old enough, I suppose, to follow the gardener and me to  
 “ yonder nursery. Having shewn him the operation of graft-  
 “ ing, and pointing at the crab-tree newly grafted, “ My  
 “ dear child, would I say, though hitherto this tree has pro-  
 “ duced nothing but crabs, yet by the skill of the gardener,  
 “ who has just fixed in it that good little branch, it is now  
 “ made an apple tree: I justify and warrant it such. [Here  
 “ is an emblem of our first Justification by faith!] In three  
 “ or four years, if we live, we will come again and see it: If  
 “ it thrives and bears fruit, well; we shall then by that mark  
 “ justify it a second time; we shall declare that it is a good  
 “ apple-tree indeed, and fit to be transplanted from this wild  
 “ nursery into a delightful orchard. But if we find that the  
 “ old crab-stock, instead of nourishing the graft, spends all its  
 “ sap in producing wild shoots and four crabs; or if it is a tree  
 “ whose fruit withereth without fruit, twice dead (dead in the  
 “ graft and in the stock) plucked up by the root, or quite  
 “ cankered, far from calling it a good tree, we shall pass sen-  
 “ tence upon it, and say, Cut it down; why cumbereth it the  
 “ ground? For every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is  
 “ hewn down and cast into the fire. Here is an emblem of  
 “ our second Justification *by works*, or of the condemnation  
 “ that will infallibly overtake those Laodicean professors and  
 “ wretched apostates, whose faith is not shewn by works where  
 “ there is time and opportunity.”

Now permit me to say that both these instances rather over-  
 throw than support your favorite scheme. For is not the Vicar  
 of Madeley as much *not guilty* of the crime of robbery, before  
 his parishioner Tom gives his evidence as after? His testimony  
 indeed *proves* your innocence, but does in no *measure* or *degree*  
 constitute that innocence, which is as complete and full before  
 the witness is called in, as after he has given his deposition.

So in the case of the ingrafted tree; no sooner is the cyon  
 put in by the skillful hand of the Gardener, than immediately  
 its nature is changed, and from the apples which it afterwards  
 produces, we have undoubted *evidence* that the stem which was  
 originally wild, partakes of the fatness of the graft which was  
 put into it. But what more do these familiar instances prove  
 in spirituals, than that all those who are absolved from the curse  
 of the law, and are by faith ingrafted into Christ by the un-  
 erring hand of the divine husbandman, will bring forth much

fruit to the glory of God, and that such fruit will *prove* before men here, and before assembled angels and men at the day of judgment, that they were not dead, withered branches, but such as were fed and nourished by sap from the true and living vine? but neither the texts you have cited, nor your examples in support of them, any more prove a second Justification than they prove a second glorification (I).

However, as you have quoted one text no less than five or six times in the first letter, and seem to lay an uncommon stress upon it, I shall pay a more particular attention to it. Mat. xii. 36. *Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account of at the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt then be justified, and by thy words thou shalt then be condemned.* We will take no notice of your interpolation of the word *then*; but, giving the passage its full scope, if you will please to compare it with the context, you will find that our Lord spoke the words to the Pharisees when they impiously affirmed that he wrought his miracles by the power of the wicked one. After confuting their argument, or rather indeed shewing how their argument confuted itself, he proceeds to point out the danger not only of blasphemous words, but even of vain and idle words; and affirms that as every tree is known by its fruit, so may the true state of the heart be known by the evil or good things which proceed out of the mouth; and having laid down this rule of judgment, he adds the words which you have so often cited in defence of your doctrine, *By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy*

(I) It is not a little remarkable, that Mr. Hervey, in his eleven excellent Letters to Mr. Wesley, after having shewn that the doctrines of a second Justification by works, and of an increase of Justification, were confirmed by that famous Popish synod the council of Trent, against the Protestants, brings the very same example to prove our one, complete, present, and final Justification by faith alone, and that works are only the fruits, evidences, and effects of that Justification, as Mr. F——r brings to prove that we are really justified a second time by works at the day of judgment. The following are Mr. Hervey's words: " Shall I send you to a familiar  
" illustration? I view from my window a young tree. The gar-  
" dener, when he planted it, told me, it was a fruit-tree; a pear-  
" tree; a right *beauté du roy*. It may be such a tree, and have its  
" respective seed in itself, but this did not then appear. If, when  
" autumn appears, its branches are laden with fruit, with pears,  
" with that delicious kind of pears, this will be a *demonstration* of  
" all those properties. This will not make it such a particular tree;  
" but only shew it to be of that fine sort, or *make its nature or per-  
" fections evident.*" Letters to Mr. Wesley, p. 95.

words

*words thou shalt be condemned; (i. e.)* As words and works are the streams which flow from the spring of the heart, so by these it will appear whether that fountain was ever cleansed and purified by grace, or whether it still remains in its natural corrupt state; the actions of a man being the *declarative evidences* both here and at the great day whether or no he was among the trees of righteousness which the Lord hath planted (K). This is the plain easy sense of the passage; and indeed our Reformers seem to have had an eye to these words of the context, “*Either make the tree good, and his fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt; for the tree is known (i. e. is evidenced) by its fruit,*” when they drew up our 12th article, which asserts, that “*A lively faith may be as evidently known by its works, as a tree discerned by its fruit;*” but the doctrine of a twofold Justification is not to be found in any part of the liturgy or offices of our church.

Much to the purpose is the following quotation from excellent Bishop Cowper. “*As every tree is known by the fruit, so works of grace prove those that have them to be trees planted by predestination in the Paradise of God, by that river of the water of life; and that therefore thy leaf shall not fade, and thy root shall not perish, because thou art rooted and grounded in Christ Jesus, and growest in him, who shall for ever conserve the sap of grace in thy soul,*

“*The adversaries (the Papists) calumniate us, and call us enemies to good works; but God forbid we were so. We*

(K) The judicious Dr. Guise gives us the same interpretation. Paraphrasing on the place, he says, “*Your words as well as actions shall be produced in EVIDENCE for or against you, to prove whether you are a saint or a sinner, a true believer or not; and according to their EVIDENCE you shall be either publicly acquitted or condemned in the great day.*” *Guise in loco.*

The testimony of one more commentator shall be produced, in order to shew that this text hath nothing at all to do with a second Justification, and that works are to be considered only as the proofs and evidences of true faith, both here and at the day of judgment. As this commentator is in your opinion *the greatest minister in the world*, I hope his decision will end the controversy between us. The Rev. Mr. John Wesley, in his notes on the New Testament, thus elucidates this portion of holy writ: “*Your words as well as actions shall be produced IN EVIDENCE for or against you, to prove whether you was a true believer or not; and according to that EVIDENCE you will either be acquitted or condemned in the great day.*” In the mouth of these two witnesses may the truth be firmly established. *Wesley in loco.*



“ condemn no good works, only we condemn their presump-  
 “ tuous opinion of the *merit* of good works. *Meriting causes*  
 “ of our salvation they are not, yet are they *witnessing effects*  
 “ thereof; without which a man cannot be saved; not that  
 “ we are saved by them, but because that justifying faith,  
 “ whereby we *are* saved, cannot be without them; for faith  
 “ works by love. In the act of Justification, we affirm, good  
 “ works have no place; for a man must first be justified, before  
 “ he do any good; *Nam sequuntur justificatum.*

“ For that assertion of the Apostle, *We conclude that a man*  
 “ *is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law,* is equivalent  
 “ to this, that a man *is justified by faith only.* And from the  
 “ Apostle, the ancient fathers have drawn this position, *Sola*  
 “ *fide justificamur.* Basil, in his Treatise *De Confessione Fidei,*  
 “ hath it, *Nos non habemus unde quicquam gloriemur de justitia,*  
 “ *cum ex solâ fide in Christum justificamur.* We have not  
 “ whereof to glory of righteousness, seeing we are justified by  
 “ faith only in Christ Jesus, and more notable is that testimony  
 “ of Ambrose, *Justificantur gratis quia nihil operantes, neque*  
 “ *vicem reddentes, sola fide justificati sunt, dono Dei.* By this one  
 “ sentence he cuts away from Justification their works, both  
 “ of congruity and condignity, and ANNULLETH THEIR  
 “ VAIN DISTINCTION OF A FIRST AND SECOND  
 “ JUSTIFICATION; and, in plain terms, he ascribes our  
 “ Justification to faith only in Christ.

“ But leaving this, I wish *disputing* about good works were  
 “ turned into *doing*: We have all learned in this age to put  
 “ good works out of the chair of *merit* (L); and justly, for  
 “ none should sit in that chair but Christ Jesus; but we have  
 “ not all learned to give them their due place in the matter of  
 “ salvation; though they be not, as I said, *meriting causes,*  
 “ yet are they *witnesses* of thy faith; thou art not now justifi-  
 “ fied by them, yet shalt thou be judged by them, and tried  
 “ whether thou wert justified in Christ Jesus or not. O,  
 “ that our fruitless professors would consider this?” Thus  
 far Bishop Cowper, in his Sermon preached at the Installation  
 of the Abp. of St. Andrews.

Having, as I hope, fully confuted the ideal opinion of a  
 first and second Justification, what shall I say to your assertions  
 in favor of a third? I say of a *third?* for if your words have  
 any meaning at all, you have not only attempted to make out  
 three Justifications, but have affirmed at least a possibility of  
 threescore; for you say (p. 6), “ That a man is justified by

(L) I wish all had learned to do so in this age also.

“ faith at his conversion, and when his backslidings are healed. But he is justified by works.”——“ 1st. In the hour of trial, as Abraham when he offered up Isaac.”——“ 2dly. In a court of spiritual or civil judicature, as St. Paul at the bar of Festus.”——“ 3dly. Before the judgment-seat of Christ, as every one will be whose faith when he goes hence is found working by love.” Now besides this threefold Justification, you have mentioned a former Justification by faith at a man’s conversion, as also a fresh Justification every time his backslidings are healed.

I will not stop to make any remarks on these strange assertions; but must proceed to express my astonishment at your bold declaration, that “ the doctrine (of a second Justification by works) is so obvious in the Scriptures, so generally received in all the churches of Christ, and so deeply engraven on the consciences of sincere professors, that the most eminent Christians perpetually allude to it.” In proof of what you allege, you most ungenerously bring the testimony of the late Mr. Whitefield, as well as of all the old Puritan divines; though if that venerable man Mr. Whitefield had been now living, and if his heart-felt grief and floods of tears, on account of the Minutes and the Vindications of them, would have suffered him to express his sentiments, I doubt not but he would have told you, that if need should be, he was ready to offer himself among the foremost of *those true Protestants*, who you tell us (but alas! with an unfeeling sneer at their supposed rejection) *could have burned against* the doctrine of a second Justification by works. And as to the Puritan divines, there is not one of the many hundreds of them, from the beginning of queen Elizabeth’s time, till the act of toleration under king William, but what abhorred the doctrine of a second Justification by works, as full of rottenness and deadly poison; neither is the least trace of it to be found in any of the confessions of faith among the reformed churches of Christ, either at home or abroad. As to the quotation you have brought from Mr. Henry in defence of this doctrine (though you always attempt to seize him in an unguarded hour) for any good it does your cause, it might as well have been urged in defence of *extreme unction*.

Surely then it is not without justice, that I accuse you of the grossest perversions and misrepresentations that perhaps ever proceeded from any author’s pen. The ashes of that laborious man of God, Mr. Whitefield, you have raked up in order to bring him in as a coadjutor to support your tottering fabric of a second Justification by works; though the following abstracts from

from his Sermons will evidence how cordially he abhorred that Christ-degrading scheme.

“ The righteousness of Jesus Christ, my brethren, must  
 “ be imputed to you, or you never can have ANY interest in  
 “ him; your own works are but as *filthy rags*, for you are  
 “ *justified before God, without any respect to your works*, PAST,  
 “ PRESENT, OR TO COME.” 1st Sermon on Eccles.  
 “ vii. 16. intitled, *The Folly and Danger of being not righteous*  
 “ *enough*.

Again. “ Christ’s righteousness, or that which Christ has  
 “ done in our stead without us, is the *sole* cause of our accep-  
 “ tance in the sight of God, and of all holiness wrought in us.  
 “ To this, and not to *the light within*, should poor sinners seek  
 “ for Justification in the sight of God. For the sake of Christ’s  
 “ righteousness alone, and *not any thing wrought in us*, does  
 “ God look favorably upon us. Our sanctification at best in  
 “ this life is not complete; though we are delivered from the  
 “ *power*, we are not freed from the *in-being* of sin. But not  
 “ only the *dominion*, but the *in-being* of sin, is forbidden by  
 “ the perfect law of God: For it is not said, thou shalt not  
 “ *give way* to lust, but *thou shalt not lust*; so that whilst the  
 “ principle of lust remains in the least degree in our hearts,  
 “ though we are otherwise never so holy, yet we cannot, on  
 “ account of that, hope for acceptance with God. We must  
 “ first therefore look for a righteousness, even the righteous-  
 “ ness of our Lord Jesus Christ. AND WHOSOEVER  
 “ TEACHETH ANY OTHER DOCTRINE, DOTH  
 “ NOT PREACH THE TRUTH AS IT IS IN JESUS.”  
 Serm. on 1 Cor. i. 30.

Let me add, that Mr. Whitefield’s Sermon upon *the Lord*  
*our Righteousness*, is from the beginning to the end levelled  
 against the doctrine of a second Justification by works; though  
 he all along insists upon good works as being the *declarative evi-*  
*dences* of our one, complete, free Justification by faith alone in  
 Christ. Speaking expressly of the proceedings at the great day,  
 as recorded Mat. xxv. and of those to whom those joyful  
 words, *Come ye blessed*, &c. are addressed, he represents them as  
 filled with an holy shame on thinking what unprofitable ser-  
 vants they had been, and how far they fell short of what was  
 their duty to have done. “ Sensible of this (saith Mr. White-  
 “ field) they were so far from depending on their works for  
 “ Justification in the sight of God, that they were filled as it  
 “ were with an holy blushing to think our Lord should con-  
 “ descend to mention, much more to reward them, for their  
 “ poor works of faith and labours of love. I am persuaded,  
 “ their

“ their hearts would rise with an holy indignation against those  
 “ who urge this passage as an objection against the assertion  
 “ of the Prophet in the words of the text, that *the Lord is our*  
 “ *Righteousness.*”

Again, mentioning the effects which this doctrine, rightly received, will produce in the hearts of believers, he thus goes on:

“ I appeal to the experience of the present, as well as past  
 “ ages, if iniquity did and does not abound where the doctrine  
 “ of Christ’s whole personal righteousness is most cried down,  
 “ and most seldom mentioned. *Arminian* being Antichristian  
 “ principles, always did, and always will, lead to Antichristian  
 “ practices; and never was there a reformation brought about  
 “ in the church, but by the preaching the doctrine of an im-  
 “ puted righteousness. This, as that man of God Luther  
 “ calls it, is *Articulus stantis, aut cadentis ecclesie, the article*  
 “ *by which the church stands or falls.* And though the preachers  
 “ of this doctrine are generally branded by those on the other  
 “ side with the opprobrious names of Antinomians, deceivers,  
 “ and what not, yet I believe, if the truth of the doctrine on  
 “ both sides was to be judged of by the lives of the preachers  
 “ and professors of it, theirs on our side the question would  
 “ have the advantage every way.”

In the same Sermon, shewing from what source the denial of our one perfect Justification by the personal imputed righteousness of Christ springs, he says, “ We are all *Arminians* and  
 “ *Papists* by nature, as one observes, *Arminianism is the*  
 “ *back way to Popery.*” And here I venture to affirm, that if  
 “ we deny the doctrine of an imputed righteousness, whatever  
 “ we may stile ourselves, we are really *Papists in our hearts,*  
 “ and deserve no other title from men.”

But now for your proof that Mr. Whitefield was a main-  
 tainer of a second Justification by works. “ He has often said  
 “ to his immense congregations, You are warned; I am clear  
 “ of your blood; I shall rise as a swift witness against you, or  
 “ you against me, in the terrible day of the Lord: O remem-  
 “ ber to clear me then.”

Now is it possible that you can infer from these expressions, (supposing them to be *verbatim* as you say) that Mr. Whitefield held the doctrine of a second Justification by works? Surely all that can be gathered from them, is that Mr. Whitefield believed there would be a great and awful day in which all who sit under the sound of the gospel, shall be called to give a solemn account of what they hear, and every minister who preaches as solemn an account of the doctrine delivered by him.

But what shall I say to your putting an objection into Mr.  
 Shirley’s



Shirley's mouth against his dearly-beloved friend Mr. Whitefield; which I am sure Mr. Shirley would not have used upon any account. Yet the more to engage your readers to believe that the words were really Mr. Shirley's, you mark them with commas, as is usual in quotations. " Say not, Sir (say you) that " Such expressions were only *flights of oratory*, and prove " nothing ;" if you do, *you touch the apple of God's eye*. Mr. " Whitefield was not a flighty orator, but spoke the words of " soberness and truth, &c. &c." And do you ever remember, Sir, that Mr. Shirley did call Mr. Whitefield *a flighty orator*? Did he ever intimate any such thing, either in writing or in conversation? If not, where was your authority for so injurious a supposition? " Say not, *these were only flights of oratory*." What is this more or less than, " Let not Mr. Shirley say that " Mr. Whitefield was a poor flighty enthusiast, who neither " meant nor knew what he affirmed. I undertake to vindicate " his character against any such foul aspersions which Mr. " Shirley may raise, and therefore declare *that he was not a " flighty orator, but spoke the words of soberness and truth,*" &c. &c. But permit me to say, that however you may think to maintain your cause by artful insinuations, as if you were defending Mr. Whitefield's principles, your defence comes with the same impropriety as an eulogy would come from his Holiness upon Martin Luther and John Calvin; for it is certain that the doctrine held by the pope is not more distant from these reformers, than that of the late Mr. Whitefield from the doctrine of the Minutes, or of their Vindicator. If therefore, as you affirm, " Mr. Whitefield really *spoke the words of soberness " and truth,*" then what have Mr. Wesley and the Vindicator spoken? Two opposites can never both of them be truth; and if you believe what you say to Mr. Shirley, that Mr. Whitefield really delivered *to his immense congregations the truth as it is in Jesus*, is not this at least a tacit, though an undesigned acknowledgment that certain other persons do *not* preach the truth as it is in Jesus? However, we will say no more on this subject.

Among the Puritan divines pressed into your service, John Bunyan is more than once mentioned by name, though I declare I cannot find the smallest traces of your system in any of his works, except where he is describing the faith of one *Mr. Ignorance*, in his *Pilgrim's Progress*. Here indeed I confess that the very doctrine of the Minutes and of both the Vindications is most visible, unless it should be thought that the creed of *Mr. Ignorance* is the more evangelical of the two. But to the proof *Ignorance* being asked by *Christian* concerning the way of acceptanc

acceptance with God; very readily replies, "I must believe in Christ for Justification." But when the nature of his faith comes to be inquired into, then the analogy between his name and his creed very plainly appears; for after *Christian* hath endeavored to convince him that he was upon a false foundation, because (like Mr. Baxter and Mr. Wesley) he never saw the necessity of Christ's personal righteousness to justify him before God, he answers, "I believe well enough for all that; for I believe that Christ died for sinners, and that I shall be justified before God from the curse, through his gracious acceptance of my obedience to his law; or thus, Christ makes my duties that are religious acceptable to his Father by virtue of his merits, and so shall I be justified."

In this answer of young *Ignorance* we have the very quintessence, not only of the *Minutes*, but of all Mr. Wesley's writings, except when he leans too much towards Calvinism (M). The grand fundamental error which Bunyan drives at in the confession

(M) Mr. Wesley, in his *Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion*, p. 183, says, "Our obedience to Christ is THE CAUSE of his becoming the Author of eternal salvation to us."—Again, "Our obeying Christ is THE CAUSE of his giving us eternal life." *Ibid.*—Again, "The breast-plate of righteousness is the righteousness of a spotless purity, in which Christ will present us faultless, through the merit of his own blood." *Note on Eph. vi. 14.* Sometimes he makes the act of faith itself our evangelical righteousness, whereby we are accepted; and this notion he has also adopted by his publication of Mr. Baxter's *Aphorisms*, and of John Goodwin's (the furious Arminian regicide) book, which asserts that faith, or the act of believing, is our gospel righteousness, and not the personal perfect righteousness of Christ imputed. In the same letter to Mr. Hervey he however acknowledges, that "the foundation is already laid in the merits of Christ; yet we obey (says he) IN ORDER to our final acceptance through his merits." I shall make no observations of my own on this unevangelized system, but beg leave to transcribe the words of Mr. Hervey, in his answer to Mr. Wesley upon the point in hand.

"What a coalition is here, between Mr. Wesley and the subjects of the triple crown! I find the whole council of Trent establishing his sentiments by their anathematizing decree. These are their words: "If any one shall say that the righteous ought not, for their own good works, to expect the eternal reward, through the merit of Jesus Christ, let him be accursed." Do you speak of the merit of Christ? So do they. Do you in some sense allow Christ to be the foundation? So do they. Are your works to rear the edifice, and perform the most respectable part of the business? So are theirs." *Mr. Hervey's Letters to Mr. Wesley*, p. 56.



of Ignorance, is his denial of Justification through the personal imputed righteousness of Christ, and therefore he puts the following answer into the mouth of his Pilgrim.

“ Thy faith (*Ignorance*) is deceitful, even such as will leave thee under wrath in the day of God Almighty; for true justifying faith puts the soul (as sensible of its lost condition by the law) upon flying for refuge unto Christ’s righteousness; (which righteousness of his is not an act of grace, by which he maketh for Justification thy obedience accepted with God, but his personal obedience to the law, in doing and suffering for us what that required at our hands) this righteousness, I say, true faith accepteth; under the skirt of which the soul being shrouded, and by it presented as spotless before God, it is accepted, and acquitted from condemnation.”

To *Christian’s* reply *Ignorance* thus objects.

*Ignorance*. “ What! would you have us trust to what Christ in his own person hath done without us? this conceit would loosen the reins of our lust, and tolerate us to live as we list; for what matter how we live, if we may be justified by Christ’s personal righteousness, from all, when we believe it (N).”

*Christian*. “ *Ignorance* is thy name; and as thy name is, so art thou; even this thy answer demonstrateth what I say. *Ignorant* thou art of what justifying righteousness is, and as ignorant how to secure thy soul through the faith of it from the heavy wrath of God. Yea, thou also art ignorant of the true effects of saving faith in this righteousness of Christ,

(N) How, to the most minute tittle, does Mr. Wesley agree with *Ignorance* in this point? Hear his own words, “ Doth not this way of speaking naturally tend to make Christ the minister of sin? for if the very personal obedience of Christ be mine, the moment I believe, can any thing be added thereto? Does my obeying God add any value to the perfect obedience of Christ? On this scheme, then, are not the holy and unholy on the very same footing?” Mr. Wesley’s *Thoughts on Imputed Righteousness*.

In like manner Socinus himself, speaking of the doctrine of Justification through the imputed righteousness of Christ, calls it, “ A filthy, cursed, pernicious, detestable doctrine.” Upon which Mr. Jenks observes, “ That the man was so full of bitterness and vengeance against the only way of his salvation, that he knew not what to say bad enough of it.” Jenks’s submission to the Righteousness of God, p. 75, 4th edit.

So also the council of Trent: “ If any man shall say that we are (formally) righteous by the righteousness of Christ, let him be accursed.” See Mr. Hervey’s *Letters to Mr. Wesley*, p. 106.

“ which

“ which is to bow and win over the heart to God in Christ,  
 “ to love his name, his word, ways, and people, and not as  
 “ thou ignorantly imaginest.”

And now, Sir, I must inform you, that Mr. John Wesley has published several editions of an Abridgment of the Pilgrim's Progress, in which he has had the great disingenuity not only to leave out the principal part of the conversation between *Ignorance* and *Christian*, concerning Justification through the personal imputed righteousness of Christ; but absolutely to alter Bunyan's words for several lines together, and thereby to make both *Ignorance* and *Christian* speak quite another language from what the evangelical author of the piece puts into their mouths. Mr. Wesley's reason for this is clear. He did not choose to have his followers see the exact harmony between his own faith and that of *Ignorance*; but I am sorry that the purchasers of the book should be so imposed upon as to have that palmed upon them for the Pilgrim's Progress which in reality is no such thing; and therefore hope they will compare the true Bunyan with the false one.

Upon the whole, Sir, I think you would have acted more prudently in not endeavoring to impose upon your unwary readers, by bringing up the names of Mr. *Whitefield* and good old *Bunyan* as abettors of your errors; since this manner of acting has at once confirmed the charge of perversion which I have brought against you, and laid me under the absolute necessity of exposing to view, the exact harmony between the creed of young *Ignorance* and old *Mordecai* (O). And indeed I should as soon have expected that the petitioners against the 39 articles and liturgy would have quoted the Athanasian creed in support of *Arianism*, as that my friend Mr. F——r would have fled to *John Bunyan*, Mr. *Whitefield*, and to the old Calvinist divines, for weapons to defend a second Justification by works, free-will, or sinless perfection.

I must now beg leave to give your first letter another review, in order to insert some particulars, which, without interrupting my plan, could not be attended to before.

## [ I. ]

You give us to understand (p. 2), “ There is but one step  
 “ between the denial of a second Justification by works, and the  
 “ very center of Antinomianism; and that if the preachers who  
 “ signed the declaration at the last conference had then tamely

(O) The name given to Mr. Wesley by Mr. F——r, in his Vindication.

renounced (what appears to you) a truth of so much importance as the doctrine of a second Justification, you yourself, without waiting for another conference, would have borne (what you call) your legal testimony against their Antinomian error. Nay, you declare that though you reverence Mr. Wesley as the greatest minister you know, yet you would plainly withstand him to the face, were he really guilty of rejecting the doctrine of a second Justification." This is the substance of your paragraph.

As to any danger you may be in of withstanding Mr. Wesley, I fancy, Sir, you may be pretty easy on that score, as he seems well contented that you should settle his creed; and if you can but accomplish this, you will do in the space of a few months what neither he himself, nor any other person has been able to effect in the long period of near forty years; for, what between his leaning sometimes *too much towards* CALVINISM, at others *too much towards* PELAGIANISM and ARMI-  
NIANISM, sometimes *too much towards* POPY, at others, by his own confession, too much towards MYSTICISM and MORAVIANISM, sometimes *too much towards* SINLESS PERFECTION, at others too much towards the contrary opinion; I say, on account of this fluctuating ocean on which the reverend author of the *Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion* has been tossed for so many years together, I have collected the annexed heterogenous *Farrago* out of his own works, which he wrote at various times, and under various leanings to his various *isms*, particularly when he drew lots whether or no he should *preach and print* against the doctrine of election (P).

Be this as it will; whoever denies the doctrine of a second Justification by works, is in Mr. Fletcher's account a rank Antinomian; but then he has the comfort of being one in the best of company, in that of the Apostles and Prophets, and even of Jesus Christ himself, all the good old bishops of the church of England, all the Protestant churches, and Puritan divines, with that laborious man of God George Whitefield, and the honest author of the *Pilgrim's Progress*; all of whom I have fully proved bear their united testimonies against the *Minutes* and the *Vindicator*, who on his part has the happiness of holding what he calls the evangelical doctrine of a second Justification, 1st. With his *Holiness*, or the *man of sin*; 2dly. with cardinal *Bellarmino*; 3dly. with the Jesuits who put out the *Rhemish*

(P) See Mr. Whitefield's letter to Mr. Wesley, dated Bethesda in Georgia, Dec. 24, 1740.



Testament; 4thly. with Bishop Hoadly; 5thly. with Mr. Thomas Oliver; and lastly, with almost all the *careless and unawakened clergy* in the nation.

## [ II. ]

You ask (p. 9), "Who, but Dr. Crisp, could affirm, that in the day of judgment, if I am accused of being actually an hypocrite, Christ's sincerity will justify me?"

Again. "Suppose I am charged with being a drunkard, a thief, a whoremonger, a covetous person, a fretful, impatient, ill-natured man, or, if you please, *a proud bigot, an implacable zealot, a malicious persecutor, who notwithstanding fair appearances of godliness, would raise disturbances even in Heaven itself if I were admitted there*; will Christ's sobriety, honesty, chastity, generosity, or will his gentleness, patience, and meekness justify me from such dreadful charges?" &c. &c.

Though no one be here mentioned by name except Dr. Crisp, yet I shrewdly suspect that under these general queries some more *particular* intimations are couched, especially where I have marked the words in Italics. But although you have been pleased to start these objections by way of scarecrows to the unwary, I really cannot think that you believe in your heart, there are any such persons as hold the tenets above-mentioned. I am persuaded you don't think this the case with dear Mr. Shirley, though you address him so personally on this head; and that even the grand object of your acrimonious sneer (THE HONEST DOCTOR) was utterly untainted with any such leaven, let his own words declare. Speaking on the article of justification, he says, "It is faith alone justifies; works have no hand in that business: yet that faith that justifies alone, stands not alone without works, as if there could be faith in men without a renovation of life. Now such as wrest the scriptures to their own perdition, dream of a faith that hath no fruits at all; St. James calls them vain and dead, certainly true faith will make a man deny himself for Christ." *Dr. Crisp's Sermon on Self-denial.*

But permit me now, Sir, in return, to put the following questions to you.

If I myself be found a slanderer of God's people and ministers; if I scruple not to descend to the meanest quibbles, that I may support a favourite friend or opinion; if I can contend for doctrines, yea even for that of sinless perfection, with a bitter, railing, acrimonious, sarcastic spirit; and perhaps in the next breath, talk of *reverencing and lying in the dust at the feet of* those

those I villify; will Christ's veracity, gentleness, charity and forbearance justify me? Have I not cause to fear that in my furious zeal to attack those whom I may *falsely* stigmatize for Antinomians, my own *real* Antinomian tempers, uninfluenced by the law of love, shall rise against me in the great day, when I myself shall be made to tremble at that text which I have so often brandished in defence of a second Justification; "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned?"

## [ III. ]

I observe that you are very fond of bringing up that expression, "I have nothing to do with the law," as if it were generally received as a truth among all the assertors of free grace, that, because they are indeed *dead to the law*, and have nothing to do with it as a *covenant of works*, they may therefore live lawless and disobedient, and are "not under the law to Christ." But in this also, to adopt the apostle's manner of speech against the objectors of your stamp in his day; *we are slanderously reported of*. And *Dr. Crisp* himself shall be produced, to confute what you have disingenuously advanced. The Doctor in his sermon on the use of the law, vol. II. p. 590, thus expresseth himself. "In respect of the rules of righteousness, or the matter of obedience, *we are under the law still*, or else we are lawless, to live every man as seems good in his own eyes, which I know no *true Christian* dares so much as *think*; for Christ hath given no new law diverse from this, to order our conversation by; besides, we are under the law to know what is transgression, and what is the desert of it." But although Doctor Crisp, and the preachers of free grace, be totally free from any such delusive and dangerous principles, yet there are some in the religious world that do, in the fullest sense of the word, cry out, "We have nothing to do with the law;" as appears from the testimony of the author of the queries to those who profess sinless perfection. This gentleman positively affirms, that he has more than once heard the Perfectionists use this very expression when pressed by the nature and extent of the law; and to support what they have said, they have quoted that much-abused text, *We are not under the law, but under grace*.

The querist then asks Mr. Wesley, "Whether it is not rank Antinomianism to call *sins infirmities*?" Mr. Wesley answers, "It is little better." [Pray, reader, remember this when you come to my third letter; there you will find by this

this answer of Mr. Wesley, that he includes himself, and the Vindicator, in the number of the rankest Antinomians.] Again, what does Mr. Wesley mean by *the repeal of the Adamic law*? Was not the law given to Adam in innocence, the same moral law which was given to Moses upon Mount Sinai? If therefore the Adamic law be repealed, the moral law is of necessity repealed also. And thus we may see who it is has opened the way for that dangerous assertion, "We have no-  
" thing to do with the law."

Again, What are the principles deducible from that expression of yours (p. 69), concerning *breaking the law in the most trifling points*, and your intimation, that it is accusing God of *partiality* to suppose, that for such breaches the soul comes under the curse, when eternal truth hath declared, that the wages of sin (of every sin, even in thought) is death; and that cursed is every one who continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them; and that not one jot or tittle of the law shall pass away till all be fulfilled; and that he that keepeth the whole law, and yet offendeth in **ONE POINT**, is guilty of all? Is not this, to say the least, a most unguarded manner of speaking? Does it not evidently tend to weaken the authority of the law, and of the law-giver himself? How can that be called a *trifling* matter, which hath doomed millions to everlasting perdition, and which, if the blood of Christ did not interpose, would destroy every believer whatsoever? O, Sir, you may think as you please of Doctor Crisp, but I am certain you can find no such licentious position as this in all his works. A *trifling transgression of the law*! Sure I am (to use Mr. Wesley's exclamation to Mr. Hervey) that this is Antinomianism without a mask. O syren song! O pleasing sound to every decent Formalist and self-righteous Pharisee, who can thank God he is not as other men are, but has only *broken the law in the most trifling points*, perhaps by *sins of surprize* (Q), and the *innocent infirmities incident to flesh and blood* (R). But bad, yea shocking as this expression is, I have the charity to believe you did not mean thereby to give handle to the lawless and disobedient. Let me intreat you, therefore, to shew the same charity to others; and may the following words of the great Bishop Reynolds be graven on both our hearts! "When the

(Q) See Mr. Wesley's Sermons, vol. I. p. 152, where he says, we cannot say either that men are or that they are not condemned for sins of surprize in general.

(R) Mr. F——r's Vindication, p. 12.



“ commandment comes it shews how the least atom doth  
 “ spot the soul; the smallest omission qualify for hell; make  
 “ the conscience see those infinite sparkles and swarms of  
 “ lust that rise out of the heart; and that God is all eye to  
 “ see, and all fire to consume every unclean thing; that the  
 “ smallest sins require the precious blood of Christ to expiate  
 “ and wash them out.”—Sermon on the Sinfulness of Sin,  
 p. 50.

## [ IV. ]

Under the old specious pretence of standing up for the interests of virtue and morality, you give us to understand, (p. 14), that “ every neglect of duty will rob us of a degree of glory, and every wilful sin will rob us of a jewel in our crown, if not our crown itself.” I agree with you that we cannot express ourselves too strongly against sin, nor be watchful enough to prevent it: But let us take care that our zeal against this monster flow in a right channel, and that under the notion of fighting *against* sin, we be not found fighting *against* the only propitiation for sin, and making it of none effect: for if every sin, yea even every wilful sin, *will rob a believer* (and of such you here speak) *of a jewel in his crown, if not of the crown itself*; then what benefit have we by the atonement, and what becomes of the following scriptures, as well as of a thousand others of the like import? *The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from ALL sin.—If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins.—Who shall lay ANY THING to the charge of God's elect?—He ever liveth to make intercession for us.—All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men.—If this be the case, “ that every neglect of duty will rob us of a degree of glory, and every wilful sin of a jewel of our crown, if not of our crown itself;” if, after all, a believer is to be responsible for his own offences, then what becomes of Christ's office as a mediator? Where is the excellency of his priesthood? How hath he redeemed us from the curse of the law? How, under his type of the scape-goat, hath he carried our sins into the land of forgetfulness? and how can he be said to have *put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*, and to have **BLOTTED OUT** *as a cloud our sins, and as a thick cloud our transgressions?* You will pardon me, Sir, if I say that this assertion of yours has an evident, though I hope an undesigned, tendency towards Socinianism; and that I am sorry to find, that  
 some*

some who seem *dreadfully afraid of under-valuing themselves*, take no small pains to under-value the glorious everlasting finished salvation of the Lord Jesus Christ (S). But I conclude this point with the following extract from that glorious champion of the Reformation; (I am not ashamed to mention him, though you may deem him a worse Antinomian than Doctor Crisp) the blessed *Martin Luther*. " This acceptance, or  
 " *imputation*, is very necessary; first, because we are *not yet*  
 " *perfectly righteous*, but *while we remain in this life, sin*  
 " *dwellleth in our flesh*; and this remnant of sin God purgeth in  
 " *us*. Moreover, we are sometimes left of the Holy Ghost,  
 " and fall into sins, as did *Peter, David*, and other holy  
 " men, notwithstanding we have always recourse to this  
 " *article*, that our sins are covered, and that God will not  
 " lay them to our charge. (Psal. xxxii. Rom. iv.) Not that  
 " sin is not in us, as the Papists (T) have taught, saying, We  
 " must be always working well, until we feel there is no  
 " guilt of sin remaining in us; the godly do feel it, but it is  
 " covered, and is *not imputed* to us of God for Christ's sake;  
 " whom because we do apprehend by faith, all our sins are  
 " now no sins. Wherefore if sin vex thee, and death terrify  
 " thee, think that it is, (as it is indeed) but an imagination,  
 " and a false illusion of the Devil; for in very deed there is  
 " now no sin, no curse, no death, no devil to hurt us any more,  
 " for Christ hath vanquished and abolished all these things."

LUTHER ON THE GALATIANS.

(S) Before Mr. Hervey knew the way of God more perfectly, he thought with the Vindicator, that our good works and duties were to be so many studs or jewels in our crown; and that from *having the witness in ourselves, that we have done what God commanded, we might* (without hereby) *humbly demand the promised reward*. While he was rocking himself in this cradle of self-applause, he wrote the following lines to the memory of a generous benefactor, for which he tells us he "now willingly takes shame to himself, they being the very reverse of that belief in which he hoped to persevere as long as he had any being." The lines are these:

Our wants reliev'd by thy indulgent care,  
 Shall give thee courage at the dreadful bar,  
 And stud the crown thou shalt for ever wear.

Tenth Letter to Mr. Wesley, P. 230.

(T) Behold the sink from which the doctrine of sinless perfection is drained.

## [ V. ]

You seem much displeas'd with that expression, *the love of Christ constraineth us*; for you not only twice introduce it with a sneer, but you object vehemently against the important truth which it conveys; and though it comes in St. Paul's own words, yet you tell us, (to use your own phrase) *with an air of positiveness and assurance*, "that St. Paul thought the contrary;" (that is, he thought the love of Christ would *not* constrain; though he has absolutely affirmed that it *would* constrain,) and then you bring some texts to prove, that the fear of punishment, and hopes of reward, ought to have at least as much influence to excite us to holiness as the love of Christ. Now, though I by no means deny that hopes and fears are collateral motives to obedience, yet I will declare upon the house-top, that where love is wanting, every work which springs from any other principle is unacceptable to God, and the doer of it no better than sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. So saith St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. (U); so prays Mr. F — r in the collect for Quinquagesima-sunday (X); and so sings Mr. Wesley (Y).

## [ VI. ]

You bring a quotation, (p. 46), which you say you give

---

(U) Love *alone* can match in fight,  
And conquer every foe;  
Saul, with all his strength and might,  
Can never sin o'erthrow.

Hymns and sacred Poems, vol. II. p. 175.

Again, 'Tis love that makes our chearful feet  
In swift obedience move;  
The devils know, and tremble too,  
But Satan cannot love.

Knowledge, alas! 'tis all in vain,  
And all in vain our fear;  
Our stubborn sins will fight and reign,  
If love be absent there.

(X) The word which we translate *charity* throughout this chapter, is in the Greek *αγαπη*, *love*.

(Y) O Lord, who hast taught us, that all our doings without charity (or love) are nothing worth, send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace and of all virtues, without which, whosoever liveth is counted dead before thee. Grant this for thine only son Jesus

us in “*the express words of the MINUTES;*” and you have marked it in commas, to distinguish it as the very expression of the Minutes themselves: but upon examining the Minutes, (though I thought I recollected them well enough before) there is really no such expression to be found. The words as they stand in the Minutes are just these: “*Not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition.*” You have expunged the latter clause, and added in the stead, “*by believing in Christ;*” and then from the sentence taken altogether as you have given it, you tell Mr. Shirley, “*that the foundation had only been shaken in his own ideas, and was perfectly secured by those express words of the Minutes, (which however are no where to be found in the Minutes) not by the merit of works, but by believing in Christ;*” the words being really as I said before, “*Not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition.*” [*Vide the Minutes themselves.*]

Forgeries of this kind have long passed for no crime with Mr. Wesley; witness the instances brought by Mr. Hervey in his eleven letters; and witness his late extract from Mr. Toplady’s translation of Zanchy. But notwithstanding your assertion, that you look upon Mr. Wesley as the greatest minister in the world, I really did not think you would have followed him in these ungenerous artifices, which, when once detected, must unavoidably sink the writer in our esteem.—But I am sorry to say, Sir, that this is not the only stratagem of the sort you have made use of: instance, your bringing Mr. Whitefield as a maintainer of a second Justification by works; John Bunyan as an advocate for free will and sinless perfection (V); and affirming, both in the body of your book, as also in your postscript, to the utter deception of all readers who doubt not of your veracity, and have not their works to refer to, that all the Puritan divines of the last century are on your side of the question, and on the side of the Minutes.

## [ VII. ]

I intended to have made several other extracts from your first letter; but as I really cannot find many lines together free from gross misrepresentations and perversions, and hardly one single paragraph exempt from cutting sneers and low sarcasms, I confess I have not patience to transcribe them; especially when I consider that they are addressed to one who, notwithstanding your former unkind behaviour, hath treated

(V) This is pretty strongly insinuated, *2d Check;* p. 68.



you with all the politeness of a gentleman, and the humility of a Christian. However, you tell us in a note, that you beg "you may not be understood to level any part of your letters at your pious Calvinist brethren; and that God only knows how highly you reverence many who are immoveably fixed (in what some call) the doctrines of grace," &c. But having informed us at whom the keen expressions in your letters are *not* levelled, be pleased to inform us at whom they *are* levelled. Tell us plainly whose are those celebrated pulpits where more is said at times for sin than against it; and in which no practical texts of scripture can be handled without disgusting the audience, unless such texts are distorted and violated to make them grateful to the Antinomian palates of the hearers. Point out, by name, those ministers who often give their congregations particular accounts of the covenant between the persons of the blessed Trinity, and who (to use your own sneering expression) speak of it as confidently, as if the King of kings had admitted them members of his privy-council, though they seldom do justice to the scriptures where the covenant is mentioned in a practical manner. Tell us who you mean by those free-grace orthodox preachers, who have deluded their thousands by singing the syren song of finished salvation, thereby making their hearers afraid of the practice of good works, "lest they should work out abominations, instead of salvation."—If such ministers as these are now existing, and particularly if they have got possession of our most celebrated pulpits, they ought to be exposed, and publicly too: It is misprision of treason against the Majesty of Heaven and earth, not to caution the world against them. I openly object against Mr. Wesley's doctrine and yours without any equivocations or "*sy stabs under the fifth rib*;" and if you, in return, do not tell us who you mean by these celebrated Antinomian preachers, and prove the accusations you have brought against them, the charges of calumny and perversion must for ever lie at your door.

## [ VIII. ]

I make a few observations on your second note, and then conclude this letter. Mr. Wesley's inconsistencies with himself having drawn upon him the observations of an anonymous writer, Mr. F——r undertakes to vindicate these inconsistencies, and to reconcile all Mr. Wesley's self-contradictory tenets, as equally agreeable to the word of God. And how does our Vindicator attempt this? Why, by the example of a physician, whose skill is demonstrated by administering



ing to his patients, under their different disorders, sometimes hot, and sometimes cooling medicines. Now, what an evasive comparison is here! So because the same physician may, with propriety, prescribe different medicines to his patients, according to their various diseases, *ergo*, truth may alter its nature, and a physician of the soul may sometimes, with propriety, administer falshood or damnable heresies:—but two direct opposites, as I observed before, can never be both of them true; for if the one be agreeable to wholesome doctrine, the other must be rank poison; therefore, unless Mr. F——r can prove, that the ability of the physician may be consistent with his sometimes administering a plentiful dose of hemlock or rats-bane, I fear that we cannot allow Mr. Wesley any other title than that of an empiric, or quack doctor.

And now, pardon me, Sir, if in the course of this letter I have caught a few sparks of your contagious satiric fire; if I have, I trust the distemper has spread no farther, and that I remain yet free from the charges of calumny and perversion.

I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your most humble Servant,

The Author of P. O.

P. S. The following words of Mr. Wesley, with two or three queries, naturally resulting therefrom, must be added, by way of Postscript, to my first Epistle, which was almost printed off before I saw the Journal from which they are taken.

“ In the afternoon I was informed, *how* many wise and  
 “ learned men (who cannot in terms *deny* it, because our ar-  
 “ ticles and homilies are not yet repealed) explain Justifica-  
 “ tion by faith. They say, 1st. Justification is twofold;  
 “ the first in this life; the second, at the last day, &c. &c.  
 “ In flat opposition to this, I cannot but maintain, (at least  
 “ till I have a clearer light) That the Justification, which  
 “ is spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our articles,  
 “ IS NOT TWOFOLD. IT IS ONE, AND NO  
 “ MORE.”

Mr. Wesley's Journal, from Nov. 1739, to Sept. 1741.

The

The queries I would put from my perusal of the above extract, are,

1st. If Mr. Wesley does not now believe in a twofold Justification, why does he give his imprimatur to Mr. F—r's book in defence of this doctrine?

2d. If he thinks the CLEARER LIGHT is come, and therefore does now believe in a twofold Justification, why does he yet reprint, and cause to be sold, his own Journals in denial of it?

However, that this CLEARER LIGHT is not yet come, we may safely conclude, from the following extract of a letter, written by Mr. Wesley, May 14, 1765, and reprinted in a new edition of his Journals, *ann.* 1768.

“ 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.*”

Journal from Oct. 1762, to May 1765, p. 115.

3d. If this doctrine of a twofold Justification, the first in *this life*, the second at *the last day*, be, as Mr. Wesley affirms, contrary to St. Paul, and to the articles and homilies of our church, will Mr. Wesley say, that a minister who maintains this doctrine, is a false teacher, or a true one?

## L E T T E R II.

REVEREND SIR,

YOUR second letter is ushered in with exclamations of sorrow and surprise, that Mr. Shirley should have *recanted his sermons in the face of the whole world*. I have little to say on this head. Mr. Shirley, as being the author of them, had certainly a right to dispose of them as he thought proper; and if he deemed them erroneous, and liable to take the readers off the true and only foundation, he acted the part of an honest man, and of a Christian divine, to renounce them *in the face of the world*: but alas! a favourite tenet of Mr. Wesley's is given up in this recantation; that great Diana, FREE WILL, is renounced *in the face of the world*. Well! blessed be God that it is so: but Mr. F——r dares not say, Amen; on the contrary, he has defended the doctrine: But how? Why, with the very same weapons that the Jesuits defended it against the Protestants at the time of the Reformation; the same that Clarke, Hoadly, Sykes, Pope, Whitby, Doctor A——s, Doctor N——l, and all the unawakened clergy of this day now make use of; weapons drawn out of the quiver of unenlightened reason, *after the rudiments of this world, and not after Christ*. For example; *by exploding free-will, you rob us of free-agency. You afford the wicked who determine to continue in sin, the best excuse in the world to do it without either shame or remorse. You make us mere machines, and indirectly reflect on the wisdom of our Lord, for saying to a set of Jewish machines, I would, and ye would not.—You represent it as an unwise thing for God to judge the world in righteousness.—A will forced is no more a will, it is mere compulsion; freedom is not less essential to it, than moral agency to man.*

These are the arguments you make use of, and what follows is the conclusion you draw from them.

“ I am

“ I am sorry, Sir, (say you) to dissent from such a *respectable*  
 “ *divine* as yourself; but as I have no taste for new refine-  
 “ ments, and cannot even conceive how our actions can be  
 “ morally good or evil, any further than our free will is con-  
 “ cerned in them, I must follow the universal experience of man-  
 “ kind, and side with the author of the Sermons, against the  
 “ author of the Narrative, concerning the *freedom* of the will.”  
 But I cannot think you are very happy in the appeal you make  
 to the *universal experience of mankind* in confirmation of *free*  
*will*. On the contrary, it appears to me that *the universal ex-*  
*perience of mankind*, proves the natural freedom of the will to  
 good, much in the same manner as the graves in every church-  
 yard prove that nobody ever did die or shall die; or as the writ-  
 ings of Lord Bolingbroke and Mr. Hume, prove that Jesus Christ  
 was the true Messiah. But you exclaim, “ If all that strongly  
 favors of *free will* must be burned, ye heavens what Smithfield  
 work will there be in your lucid plains.” True, and to the  
 bundles you have already bound up for the fire, I suppose may  
 be added more than nine out of ten of the sermons that are  
 preached in this nation every sabbath-day, and with them also  
 the decrees of the council of Trent, which clearly side with you  
 against the scriptures and our tenth article; for thus this coun-  
 cil determines on the point in hand. “ If any person shall say  
 “ that since the fall of Adam, man’s *free will* is lost and ex-  
 “ tinct let him be accursed.” Sess. vi. can. 5.

You then proceed to answer Mr. Edwards’s grand argument  
 against free will, which you consider as a *begging of the question*,  
*if not an absurdity*. For, “ What is a balance (say you) but  
 “ lifeless matter? And what is the will but the living active  
 “ soul, springing up in its willing capacity, and self-exerting,  
 “ self-determining power? O how tottering is the mighty fa-  
 “ bric raised, I shall not say upon such a fine-spun metaphysical  
 “ speculation, but upon so weak a foundation as a comparison,  
 “ which supposes that two things so widely different as spirit  
 “ and matter, a *living soul* and a *lifeless balance*, are exactly  
 “ alike with the reference to self-determination! JUST AS  
 “ IF SPIRIT, MADE AFTER THE IMAGE OF THE  
 “ LIVING, FREE, AND POWERFUL GOD, was no  
 “ more capable of determining itself, than an horizontal beam  
 “ supporting two equal copper bowls by six filken strings.”

Now it must be obvious to every reader, that this reasoning,  
 especially that part of it which I have put in capitals, amounts  
 to a direct denial of the corruption of human nature. Mr.  
 Edwards very justly supposes, that the will of man can only  
 choose or refuse, as it is influenced by the understanding, which  
 being in total darkness as to spiritual things by the fall, neces-  
 sarily



fairly represents all objects to the will through a false medium, so that the will cannot but embrace that which the understanding represents as excellent; and if the understanding be really blinded through the original apostacy, (as none but the rankest Pelagian ever denied) then it can only represent *sin* as the most desirable object to the will, which accordingly follows sin, and nothing but sin, till the eyes of the understanding are enlightened, to see the monster in its true and odious colours.

Conscious of the force of this truth, Mr. F——r is reduced to a concession, which in the twinkling of an eye throws down all the puny free-will fabrick he has been building. His words are these.

“ Nor is this freedom derogatory to free grace; for as it  
 “ was free grace that gave an upright free will to Adam at his  
 “ creation, so whenever his fallen children think or act aright,  
 “ it is because their free will is mercifully prevented, touched,  
 “ and so far rectified by free grace.”

Amazing! Here is all that the most rigid Calvinist ever contended for granted in a moment. Your words, Sir, are purely evangelical. The free will which God gave to Adam in innocence is here plainly acknowledged, and the absolute inability of any of his fallen children to act and think aright as positively asserted, till their wills are *mercifully prevented, touched and rectified by free grace*. All of which would be entirely needless, if man's will since the fall were naturally free to good.

The eight first lines of your next paragraph spoil all again; though the remaining part of it contains perhaps the most convincing forcible arguments in favor of the natural slavery of the will to evil that ever proceeded from any author's pen, as well as the most pregnant proofs of the power and sovereignty of God in working upon and changing the corrupt will, and keeping it ever afterwards wonderfully and immoveably fixed upon himself, as the center of all happiness. But I hasten to transcribe the paragraph.

“ However, it must be granted that fashionable professors,  
 “ and the large book of Mr. Edwards, are in general for you;  
 “ but when you maintained the freedom of the will, Jesus  
 “ Christ and the gospel were on your side. To the end of  
 “ the world, this plain, peremptory assertion of our Lord, *I*  
 “ *would and ye would not*, will alone throw down the sophisms,  
 “ and silence the objections of the most subtle philosophers  
 “ against free will.”

Jesus Christ and the gospel on the side of free will! An astonishing assertion for a Protestant divine, who has set his hand to the tenth article of our church, and who professes to believe and to teach, “ That the condition of man after the fall of

“ Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his  
 “ own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling  
 “ upon God: And that we have NO POWER to do good  
 “ works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace  
 “ of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good  
 “ will, and working with us when we have that good will.”  
 Art. x.

Jesus Christ and the gospel on the side of free will! What! when the Saviour himself declares in such positive terms, *Without me ye can do nothing. No man CAN come unto me except the Father draw him; that the Son quickeneth whom he will; and that we have not chosen him, but he hath chosen us.* The gospel on the side of free will! What! when Paul affirms, that it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth; that it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do, having predestinated us by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of HIS WILL; that of ourselves we are without strength, and that ALL our sufficiency is of God, who (as the Psalmist says) makes his people willing in the day of his power, and whose strength is made perfect in their weakness. The gospel on the side of free will! when the beloved Evangelist himself hath taught us (and our own experience confirmeth the witness), that the heirs of promise ARE NOT BORN OF THE WILL OF THE FLESH, nor OF THE WILL OF MAN, but of God; who (as St. James also saith) OF HIS OWN WILL begat them with the word of truth. Surely, Sir, after such an assertion as this, that Jesus Christ and the gospel are on the side of free will, I have full right to retort one of your own sneers against you, which I will attempt as nearly in your own language (p. 13) as the case will allow. “ With  
 “ the seven-fold shield of their Pelagian and Arminian faith,  
 “ they would fight the twelve Apostles round, and come off,  
 “ in their own imagination, more than conquerors. Nay,  
 “ were Christ himself to come to them *incognito*, as he did to  
 “ the disciples that went to Emmaus, and say, *All that the*  
 “ *Father hath given me shall come unto me; ye have not chosen*  
 “ *me, but I have chosen you; no man can come unto me except the*  
 “ *Father draw him; the Son quickeneth whom he will; if it*  
 “ *were possible, they shall deceive the very elect;* it is well if,  
 “ while they measured him from head to foot, with looks of  
 “ pity or surprize, some would not be bold enough to say with  
 “ a sneer, you are an Antinomian it seems; a follower of the  
 “ Crispian gospel, are you? For our parts, we will stick close  
 “ to good Mr. John (Z), to Mr. Walter Sellon, and the

(Z) Whosoever resolves to stick close to Mr. John ought first  
 to

“ Vicar of Madeley ; but you are for election and perseverance, for *bound-will*, and irresistible grace.”

Now, Sir, how do you feel your heart after reading all this unmeaning, but bitter, sneer and banter. I think (unless you have really attained to sinless perfection) that you find some small risings of old Adam, and that you condemn my way of arguing as very much calculated to irritate, but not at all to enforce conviction. And if this be the case upon your reading a single paragraph, retorted upon you *verbatim* in your own language, what must Mr. Shirley, what must every candid reader of your book think and feel, when they have laboured through more than an hundred close pages in the very same sneering spirit, and as totally void of solid scriptural argument as they are replete with calumny, gross perversions and equivocations?

Still it is your opinion, that to the end of the world this plain peremptory assertion of our Lord, *I would and ye would not*, will throw down and silence all the objections which can be raised against free will.

The text you have brought is indeed a striking demonstration of the stubbornness and aversion to good, which naturally reigns in the human will, and that it resolutely stands out against all the threats and invitations which can be laid before it. But what more does it prove? You will perhaps say, “ it proves that those to whom it was addressed might have come if they would.” Granted. Still we are but just where we were. The fault yet remains in the corruption of the will, which nothing but efficacious grace can conquer; and therefore if you battle the argument a thousand times over, all that you can say must at length end in the language of Paul’s opposer, “ Why doth he yet find fault, for who hath resisted his will?” But I go to the latter part of the paragraph under consideration.

“ When (say you) I consider what it implies, far from supposing that the will is like a lifeless pair of scales, necessarily turned by the least weight, I see it such a strong *self-deter-*

to wish that Mr. John would stick a little closer to himself, because, however Mr. F——r may think that Jesus Christ and the gospel are on the side of man’s free will, Mr. Wesley is (at intervals) of a very different opinion; as his own words clearly evince. “ Such is the freedom of his will! Free only to evil; free to drink iniquity like water. To wander farther and farther from the living God, and to do more despite to the spirit of grace.” *Mr. Wesley’s Serm. on Rom. viii. 15.* Spoke like a right orthodox free-grace preacher; a sound pillar of the church of England!



“ *mining* power, that it can resist the effect of the most amazing weights; keep itself inflexible under all the warnings, threatenings, miracles, promises, entreaties and tears of the son of God; and remain obstinately unmoved under all the strivings of his holy spirit. Yes, put in one scale the most stupendous weights, for instance, the hopes of heavenly joys, and the dread of hellish torments; and only the gaudy feather of honour, or the breaking bubble of wordly joy in the other; if the will casts itself into the light scale, the feather or bubble will instantly preponderate. Nor is the power of the rectified will less wonderful; for though you should put all the kingdoms of the world and their glory in one scale, and nothing but the reproach of Christ in the other; yet if the evil freely leaps into the infamous scale, a crown of thorns easily outweighs a thousand golden crowns, and a devouring flame makes ten thousand thrones kick the beam.”

In this one excellent paragraph you have again granted all that the most staunch Calvinist could wish; for you not only prove the absolute dominion which sin hath over the natural will, and that nothing but efficacious invincible grace can move it and make it flexible, but you likewise maintain the power of the rectified will, (i. e. as you explain yourself above, of the will *mercifully prevented, touched, and rectified by free grace*) to resist crowns and sceptres for the cross and for the stake, and to count the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt. Whatever Mr. Wesley may be, I am sure that Mr. F——r is not here afraid of *leaning too much towards Calvinism*; since we have the very quintessence of that great reformer John Calvin's system in these golden words of the Vindicator. Here man is abased indeed. His natural will proved to be what Luther calls it, a *very bond slave to evil*. Whilst all the glory of *preventing, touching and rectifying* the will is given to free grace alone. Upon this glorious plan, the comfortable doctrines of absolute predestination and final perseverance, are (indirectly at least) contended for and established; and as our great Zerubabel has all the honour of laying the foundation, so he has all the glory of finishing the superstructure. May these lines of Mr. F——r's be ever written with the pen of gratitude upon my heart! If Mr. Wesley and Mr. Sellon can answer arguments like these, they will do great things indeed. Your doctrine of the natural depravity of the will, and of the power of free grace in rectifying, and of keeping it steady in the cause of God when it is rectified, you have illustrated in Bunyan's character of *Lord Will-be-Will*. I have just turned to the place  
 you



you refer to in the Holy War; and I find that this *Lord Will-be-Will* was one of the chief generals under Diabolus, or the Devil himself. And that “*Nothing at all pleased LORD WILL-BE-WILL, but what pleased DIABOLUS his LORD(A).*”

Therefore we find, that when the town of *Man-soul* was besieged by SHADDAI, this LORD WILL-BE-WILL (who was the *strong man armed*) stood it out with all his might and power, till the *stronger than he* came into the castle, and spoiled him of all the armour wherein he trusted. How therefore you could bring this character of LORD WILL-BE-WILL in proof of the natural freedom of the will to good, is to me very amazing; yet, by so doing you have given us a striking demonstration how the natural man’s will stands it out against grace to the very last gasp, even till it is compelled to yield to the sovereign power of God; and when this is the case, then *Lord Will-be-Will* fights as zealously under his new master EMMANUEL, as he did before under his old Lord DIABOLUS.

Let good old learned Dr. Fulke, who had so deep a controversy with the Jesuits in Queen Elizabeth’s time, upon the articles of predestination, free-will, man’s inability to merit, and imputed righteousness, (all which he defended against these subtle enemies of God’s grace) now give his testimony on the point in hand; and we shall find that you (in your last Calvinistic paragraph) and he, and I, and John Bunyan, and Mr. Wesley, in the note before quoted, are all unanimous on the subject of the natural and rectified will.

(A) Bunyan’s remarks in the margin opposite these places are, *The will takes place under Diabolus. The carnal will opposeth conscience.* And so very zealous was this good old Puritan preacher against the doctrine of *free-will*, that he absolutely places all the *Election-doubters*, or those who were not clear in the belief of absolute predestination, among the numerous hosts of the *Diabolonians*, and bitter enemies to the town of *Man-soul*. One of these *Election-doubters* being brought before the judge, and pleading, that “he had always been brought up in that religion,” the judge replies, “To question election, is to overthrow a great doctrine of the gospel, (to wit) the omniscience, power, and will of God; to take away the liberty of God with his creature; to stumble the faith of the town of *Man-soul*; and to make salvation to depend upon works, and not upon grace. It also belied the word, and disquieted the minds of the men of *Man-soul*; therefore by the best of laws he (the *Election-doubter*) must die.” Mr. Whitefield’s edition of Bunyan, vol. II, p. 104.

Upon

Upon Rom. viii. 30, this great light of our reformed church thus expresseth himself. "The eternal predestination of God  
 "excludeth the merits of man, and the power of his will  
 "thereby to attain to eternal life; yet forceth not a man's  
 "will to good or ill, but altereth the will of him that is  
 "ordained to life, from evil to good, and giveth power to  
 "choose that which is good, and all means which he hath  
 "appointed unto salvation. And this is the doctrine of St.  
 "Augustin in all his books against the Pelagians, wherein he  
 "declareth the effect of God's predestination; as he that will  
 "read may easily perceive." *Fulke.*

To the very same purpose Bishop Hopkins, in his third Sermon on the new birth, whose testimony I prefer to any other, because you yourself have given us a long quotation from his works, and allow him to have been a truly converted man.

"That the liberty of the will may not violate the certainty  
 "of God's purpose and decree, he changeth it by the power  
 "of his irresistible grace; and yet that this irresistible grace may  
 "not violate the liberty of the will, he persuades it by such  
 "powerful and rational arguments that it should not act  
 "freely if it should dissent from it. Though God useth an  
 "infinite power in regenerating and converting a soul, yet he  
 "useth no violence; he *subdues* the will, but he doth not  
 "compel it. This is that victorious grace, that doth not more  
 "overcome a sinner's resistances than it doth his prejudices;  
 "it overcomes all oppositions by its own irresistible power,  
 "and it overcomes all prejudices by its attracting sweetness;  
 "and when it brings a sinner to submit to God, it makes him  
 "apprehend also, that it is his chiefest happiness and joy so to  
 "do. This is the sweet nature of regenerating grace; and it  
 "is the same winning sweetness that afterwards preserves the  
 "regenerate from a total apostacy from grace; for though  
 "there is a constant supply of grace to keep them, that they  
 "shall never certainly draw back to perdition, yet, withal,  
 "their own freedom is such that they may if they will; but  
 "how can they will it, since the will never inclines but to  
 "that which most pleaseth it, and nothing pleaseth a regenerate  
 "and sanctified will so much, as that sovereign good that  
 "comprehends in it all other good, and that is God himself?  
 "And thus you see how God disposeth of the will of man, in  
 "changing it to himself, without constraining of it, turning  
 "it, as unforcibly, so infallibly to himself, when he draws it  
 "by the sweetness of his own efficacious inspirations. And  
 "thus I have dispatched the first particular, in shewing you  
 "after what manner the spirit of God works this change on  
 "the

“ the will, by persuading it with rational arguments that it cannot gainsay, and by overcoming it by his irresistible grace that it cannot oppose. Bishop Hopkins.

With this quotation I conclude all I have to advance on the point of free will ; and I think, if it were properly attended to, it would prevent many disputes among real Christians ; for my own part, I have not the least objection to the expression *free-will*, and find it used in a very sound sense by St. Augustin, Luther and Calvin, the grand patrons for the doctrine of man's natural inability to will that which is good since the fall. God does not *force* any man to will either good or evil ; but man, through the corruption of his understanding, naturally and *freely wills* that which is evil ; but being wrought upon and enlightened by converting grace, he as *freely wills* that which is good as before he *freely willed* the evil. Take a familiar illustration. Place before a little child some toys, or sugar-plumbs, as also the title to a great estate ; say to the child, “ Chuse which you will ; ” the infant will immediately take the former, and *freely* too, no compulsion at all being laid on the will. But when this infant is grown to years of maturity, when its understanding is opened, and it no longer thinks as a child, speaks as a child, and acts as a child, then place before him the toys and the estate, and he will as freely choose the latter, as in the state of misjudging infancy he chose the former. The application is too easy to need an illustration. In this sense the Assembly of divines speak of *the natural liberty of the will*, and affirm that *it is not forced*. But it should seem as if they did not herein lean enough towards Calvinism for Mr. Wesley, who tells us, in his Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion (p. 192), *they (the assembly) say, Man hath a will which is naturally free ; we say, Man hath this freedom of will, not naturally, but by grace.*”

As the doctrine of sinless perfection is not confined to any particular part of your book, but is diffused through the whole, rather than break the chain of my arguments to controvert it wherever it occurs, I shall beg leave to make it the subject of another epistle ; however, before I conclude this, must take a review of your second letter in the same manner I did of your first.

## [ I. ]

P. 33. After some favourable insinuations in behalf of Mysticism, you point out Solomon as the chief of Mystics. But if Solomon was a Mystic, then Christ and the prophets and apostles were Mystics too ; for you will hardly affirm, that



that they taught a contrary doctrine to Solomon. Again, if Solomon was a Mystic, your elege upon Mr. Romaine is very ill bestowed, for I am sure he has entirely perverted Solomon's plan, in his Twelve Sermons on the Canticle; and though I should be as unwilling to burn Solomon's Song as yourself, yet if he were so great a Mystic as you say, it is high time that Mr. Romaine's discourses upon that song, as well as his *edifying Paraphrase on the 107th Psalm*, were either burnt or recanted, with Mr. Shirley's Sermons.

## [ II. ]

In your zeal to establish free-will, you say, "you are *grieved at the great advantage we give infidels against the gospel, by making it (what you call) ridiculous.*" But would you give up any one gospel-truth in order to make it palatable to *real* infidels, after exclaiming so much against making it palatable to those whom you *improperly* stile Antinomians? Diverst the gospel of its truths, and it is no more a gospel: but if you would preach such a gospel as infidels would not find fault with, you must immediately sweep away the doctrines of the Trinity, original sin, the atonement, the influences of the spirit, and justification by faith alone in the imputed Righteousness of Christ. But let me ask, Sir, do you really preach a gospel that infidels cannot find fault with? Then I am sure it is not Paul's gospel; for we find that *his* gospel pleased not men, and was not after man, but was liable to be perverted, abused, slandered, &c. &c. yea, that it was accounted foolishness and *ridiculousness* itself by the wise, the great, and the learned infidels of the age.

## [ III. ]

In your quotation from Baxter's Catholic Theology, in order to *establish* the merit of works, you have *established* a very false hypothesis, and then no wonder that the conclusion you have drawn from it is equally rotten. It is, that *reward and merit are relative words, as guilt and punishment, master and servant*. But surely this is not the case; because, a reward may be of *grace*, when there is no *merit* at all; but there can be no servant without a master, nor can there be any just punishment without guilt. Again, you follow Mr. Baxter in a most erroneous conclusion, when he intimates, that if there is no *merit* in good works, there is no *demerit* in bad ones. Now, for the very same reason that we speak of the *demerit* of sin, we are afraid to say there is any *merit* in the best works of the best men; *viz.* because we believe they are tainted with sin and imper-



*imperfection*; and indeed, though we render the words *καλα ἔργα* *good works*, yet the exact translation is *ornamental works*; and truly, when brought to the strictness of the law, they deserve not the name of *good*. But however grating the expressions may sound to those who hope to attain a second Justification by their works, yet we have scripture authority to call them dung, dross, and filthy rags. Instead therefore of being puffed up with a vain conceit of the *merit* even of our best performances, let us remember the words of good Bishop Cowper, who, in his piece on the prodigal son's conversion, tells us, that "the doctrine of *merit* is learned out of the school of nature, wherein all proud *Justiciars*, whatever show of external piety they have, are but con-disciples with this forlorn child."

Two quotations, one from Archbishop Leighton, (whom you would also press into your service) another from Bishop Hopkins, shall conclude this letter.

"There have been great disputes about the *merit* of good works; but I truly think, they who have laboriously engaged in them, have been very idly, though very eagerly employed about nothing; since the very schoolmen themselves acknowledge, that there can be no such thing as *meriting* from the blessed God, in the human, or to speak more accurately, in any created nature whatsoever. Nay, so far from any possibility of *merit*, there can be no room for reward any otherwise than of the sovereign pleasure, and gracious kindness of God: And the more ancient writers, when they use the word *merit*, mean nothing by it, but a certain correlate to that reward which God both promises and bestows, of mere grace and benignity; otherwise, in order to constitute what is properly called *merit*, many things must occur, which *no man in his senses* will presume to attribute to human works, though ever so excellent; particularly, that the thing done must not previously be matter of debt, and must be entirely our own act, unassisted by foreign aid; it must also be perfectly good, and bear an adequate proportion to the reward claimed in consequence of it; if all these things should not concur, the act cannot possibly arise to *merit*. Whereas, I think no one will venture to assert, that any one of these can take place in any human action whatever.

"But why should I enlarge here, when one single circumstance overthrows all those titles. The most righteous of mankind would not be able to stand, if his works were

“ weighed in the balance of strict justice ; how much less then  
 “ could they DESERVE that immense glory which is now in  
 “ question ?

“ Nor is this only to be denied concerning the unbeliever  
 “ and sinner, but CONCERNING THE RIGHTEOUS  
 “ AND PIOUS BELIEVER, who is not only free from all  
 “ the guilt of his former impenitence and rebellion, but en-  
 “ dowed with the gift of the spirit. The interrogation here  
 “ expresses the most vehement negation, and signifies that no  
 “ mortal in whatever degree he is placed, if he be called to  
 “ the strict examination of divine justice, without daily and  
 “ repeated forgiveness, could be able to keep his standing, and  
 “ much less could he be able to arise to that glorious height.  
 “ That *merit* (says Bernard) on which my hope relies, consists  
 “ in these three things, the love of adoption, the truth of the  
 “ promise, and the power of its performance.” This is the  
 “ threefold cord which cannot be broken.”

Abp. Leighton's Med. on Psa. cxxx. ver. 3.

To the same purpose Bishop Hopkins. “ It is a foolish pre-  
 “ sumption and intolerable arrogance, to think we can *deserve*  
 “ any thing at the hands of God, unless it be his wrath by our  
 “ sins.” For,

1st. “ In all proper *merit* there must be an equivalence, or  
 “ at least a proportion of worth between the work and the  
 “ reward ; which to imagine between our obedience and the  
 “ heavenly glory, is to exalt the one infinitely too high, and  
 “ to abase the other infinitely too low.

2dly. “ The very grace that enables us to do the command-  
 “ ments of God is freely bestowed upon us by himself ; and  
 “ therefore the obedience we perform unto him merely by his  
 “ own assistance, cannot be said (without a grand impropriety)  
 “ to *merit* any reward from him.”

3dly. “ All our obedience is imperfect ; and therefore, if it  
 “ *deserve* any thing, it is only punishment for the defects and  
 “ failures of it.”

4thly. “ Suppose it were perfect, which it is not, yet it is  
 “ no more than our bounden duty, and duty can never be  
 “ *meritorious*.”

I have nothing more to add at present ; but that upon look-  
 ing over Archbishop Usher's Letters, in his Life, written by  
 Dr. Parr, I find one to his friend Dr. Samuel Ward, then  
 Lady Margaret's professor of divinity, and master of Sydney-  
 College in the university of Cambridge ; wherein he tells him,  
 that he is deeply engaged in a controversy with a Jesuit, upon  
 the

the points of *free will* and man's *merit*, which doctrines this Jesuit strenuously defended in behalf of the Romish church. A pregnant proof from what source these two doctrines (which have been the subject of my present epistle) are really and truly derived. I am sorry, Sir, to find and to leave you in such company; but as I have matter enough before me for the subject of two or three more letters, I must hasten to subscribe myself,

Reverend Sir,

Your most humble Servant,

The Author of P. O.

P. S. Though I have granted Mr. F——r his own interpretation of that text, *I would and ye would not*, yet many sound and learned divines apply it to the Scribes and Pharisees; and, indeed, the context seems greatly to favor this sense of the words. Otherwise (if addressed to Jerusalem) our Lord would have said, **THOU WoulDEST NOT**, instead of, **YE WOULD NOT**. Nay, the passage is not grammatical upon any other plan. But if we read it, *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how oft would I have gathered you, and ye (Scribes and Pharisees) would not, &c.* then we not only preserve the grammar of the words (*ὅτι ἠθελήσαίτε*) but have an easy and natural elucidation of them. The reader is desired to examine the whole passage, Luke xiii. from ver. 31 to the end.

---



---

L E T T E R      I I I.

REVEREND SIR,

**A**LTHOUGH you have not made the doctrine of sinless perfection the subject of any one of your Letters, yet the scent of it is diffused throughout your whole book; I cannot say like *the lilly of the valley*, or *the rose of Sharon*, but like *dead flies*, which cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour. Pardon the force of my expression, Sir; but I cannot help entirely acquiescing with the late Mr. Whitefield (who you tell us “spoke the words of soberness and TRUTH, with divine pathos, and floods of tears declarative of his sincerity”), that “*The monstrous doctrine of sinless perfection for a while turns some of its deluded votaries into temporary monsters (C).*” However, for this doctrine you  
are

---

(C) Vol. iii p. 337. Mr. Whitefield's letter addressed to W—  
P—, Esq. dated June 2d. 1766.

Mr. Whitefield lived to see this assertion verified in many particulars; and Mr. Wesley's own Journals are not without examples of the truth of it; as might be proved from the cases of B—l, H—s, &c. &c. the former of whom assumed to himself the gift of discerning spirits; and about eight years ago pretended to have a commission from God to tell the people that the world would be at an end on the 28th day of February. The latter, H—s, a flaming teacher of sinless perfection, was seized with raving madness as he was working in his garden, and died blaspheming in a most dreadful manner.

A friend of mine lately informed me, that an eminent preacher of Perfection told him, that he had not sinned for some years, and that the Holy Ghost had descended and sat upon him and many others, in a visible manner, as upon the Apostles on the day of Pentecost. But my friend not having an implicit faith in the relation, the gentleman shewed him that no man in England was more *perfect* in rage than himself.

Last year, I myself conversed with a gentlewoman of such high perfection, that she said *no man could teach her any-thing*, upon which account she did not go to any place of worship for months or years together. However, that most unruly member, her tongue,  
was



are without disguise an advocate; though your manner of writing evinces that you are as yet far enough from the possession of the thing contended for; since you still go down to

---

was continually proving to those about her, that she was under a *perfect* delusion of the devil; whilst the black and blue marks upon the unhappy servant-maid gave ample demonstration, that if the mistress was herself *perfect in the flesh*, she had made the poor girl quite otherwise; and I am sure, if I had been called to give my evidence, I could have proved that she was a *perfect* cheat.

The Querist (before mentioned) reminds Mr. Wesley of one who told God in prayer, that he was perfect as he (God) himself was perfect; and I could also inform him of another perfect blasphemer, who prayed in a room with a few other persons in the following shocking terms: "Grant, O Lord, that all here present may be holy as I am holy, and perfect as I am perfect."

I could also tell him, where he might see a certain woman who was so very perfect that she tried to sin and could not.

Mr. Wesley must also well remember a certain *perfect* married lady, who fancied that she was to be the mother of a great prophet, by means of a *perfect* preacher for whom she had conceived a *perfect* fondness; and though they did not (as we may presume from their principles) *talk about finished salvation, and against perfection in the flesh*, like the man and woman you have instanced in the Parish of Madeley (See Mr. F——r's Vindication, p. 23), and like our naughty *orthodox free-grace celebrated* preachers, yet it is certain a *perfect* child was born; and so great was the proof that this child was the effect of this *perfect* connection, that it occasioned a separation between the lady and her husband; but unfortunately the poor little prophet proved to be of the female sex.

I hate the law of retaliation, and would not upon any account have mentioned these things, but you know, Sir, who has set me the example, even one who pleads heartily for sinless perfection. But though I am no advocate for this opinion myself, yet I would not willingly follow you in your imperfections; and therefore assure you, that I have only brought these instances to light, in order to shew you, that if you will have recourse to such weapons, you will perhaps, in the end, find yourself over-matched. You received a hint in the Paris Conversation, of the great impropriety of exposing individuals, and of blackening any system of doctrines, on account of the practices of some who hold them; and I was in hopes, that in your last piece you would have made some little acknowledgments on this head: But you have not. Should you doubt of the truth of these instances, I will at any time lead you to the fountain head of my intelligence; but as I am utterly averse to that unhandsome way of stigmatizing names and characters, which Mr. Wesley adopts in his Journals, and in his letter to Mr. Hervey, I dare not be more explicit in what will appear before public view.

the

the Philistines to sharpen the ax, the mattock, and the coulter, of sneer, sarcasm, and perversion; blaming “ the inconsistency “ (as you call it) of those who publish hymns of solemn prayer “ for perfection, whilst they explode it as a pernicious doctrine (D); and who plead for spiritual bondage, while “ they talk of gospel liberty, and affirm that *the son of the bond- “ woman shall always live with the son of the free* (E); that “ sin can never be cast out of the heart of believers, and that “ Christ and corruption shall always dwell together in this “ world; who tell their hearers one hour that the love of “ Christ sweetly constrains all believers to walk, yea to run “ the way of God’s commandments, and that they cannot “ help obeying its forcible dictates, whilst they persuade them “ the next hour that how to perform what is good they find “ not; that they fall continually into sin; for that which they “ do they allow not, but what they hate that do they.—And, “ that these inconsistencies may not shock their common sense, “ or alarm their consciences, they again touch the sweet- “ sounding string of *finished salvation*, intimate they have the “ key of *evangelical knowledge*, reflect on those who expect “ deliverance from sin in this life, and build up their congrega-

(D) This inconsistency is peculiarly applicable to Mr. Wesley, vide Appendix.

(E) The pious old bishop Cowper was one of those preachers who (to use Mr. F——r’s expression) *so whetted the Antinomian appetite of his hearers*, as that he endeavored to make them swallow some of these Anti-perfection tenets; for on Rom. viii. 9, entitled, “ *Comments against the remnants of sin*,” he thus expresseth himself; “ I compare the soul of man regenerate to the house of Abraham, “ wherein there was both a free woman, Sarah, and a bond woman, “ Hagar, with their children.”

Again, “ We have to mark for our comfort, how the Apostle calls “ them spiritual men, in whom, notwithstanding, remained fleshly “ corruption. The judgment of the Lord and Satan are contrary; “ there is in you (saith the deceiver to the weak Christian) fleshly “ corruption; therefore ye are carnal. There is in you (saith the “ Lord) through my grace, a spiritual disposition; therefore ye are “ spiritual. Satan is so evil, that his eyes see nothing in the Christian “ but that which is evil; the Lord is so good, that his eyes see no “ transgression in Israel; he judgeth not his children by the remnants “ of their old corruption, but by the beginnings of his renewing grace “ in us; *one dram of the grace of Christ in the soul of a Christian, “ makes him more precious in the eyes of God than any remnant of “ corruption in him can make him odious.*”

“ tions

“ tions in a most comfortable, I wish I could say most holy,  
“ faith.”

Now, Sir, supposing all this to be just as you represent it, yet where is the inconsistency of it? If we believe that in all the regenerate there are two principles, flesh and spirit, nature and grace, and that these two are at an irreconcilable variance, then ministers must suit their discourses to their hearers (who are believers) as having both these principles dwelling in them, and in so doing they strictly follow the apostolic doctrine, which teacheth, that even in the best of God's children (for to such the epistle is addressed) *the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; so that they cannot do the things that they would.* And, to adopt the words of excellent Mr. Jenks before mentioned (once rector of a parish not very far distant from Madely), “ I must see better arguments than ever I have  
“ yet seen, to convince me that St. Paul does not speak his own  
“ experience in the seventh chapter to the Romans, when he says,  
“ with the mind I MYSELF *serve the law of God; but with*  
“ *the flesh the law of sin.* And I am certain that any minister  
“ of the church of England gives but a very *imperfect* proof  
“ of his own *perfection* who can maintain with his lips and pen,  
“ that the very *in-being* of sin is taken out of any believer  
“ whatsoever, whilst he has already with his hand (and ac-  
“ cording to his own declaration, with *his heart* also) subscribed  
“ the ninth article of that church which declares in such posi-  
“ tive terms, that “ the flesh lusteth ALWAYS contrary to the  
“ spirit; and that this infection of nature doth remain, yea,  
“ in them that are regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh  
“ is not subject to the law of God;” &c. &c. (F).

If, therefore, we are to abide by the testimonies of Scripture and of our own church on this head, as well as that of all the Saints both of the Old and New Testament, (not one of whom can be produced as totally free from indwelling sin,) it were much to be wished that you had *recanted*, or rather, that you had never advanced, that unauthorized position, that there are very few of our *celebrated pulpits*, where more has not been said at times for sin than against it. Grant that in these *celebrated pulpits* it is often said, that “ *sin will humble us;*” how is this *pleading*

---

(F) Mr. Wesley very properly blames Doctor Dodd, when editor of the Christian Magazine, for inserting a paper into that work in vindication of sinless perfection; which Mr. Wesley (like a true minister of the church of England) observes is directly contrary to our ninth article. See the note in Mr. Wesley's Sermon on ii. Cor. v. 17.



for that murderer of souls with an air of positiveness and assurance? It is surely a very strange way of pleading in the behalf of any thing, to represent it as that which ought to cause the deepest shame and humiliation of spirit; and if you are exasperated at any celebrated ministers (for it is not the pulpit which speaks) and call them Antimonians, or *pleaders for sin*, because they assert that *sin will humble us*, then you will be found to reflect upon God himself, who left king Hezekiah to his sin which he committed, in shewing the king of Babylon his treasures, expressly that he might *try him, and shew him all that was in his heart*. Nay, if a celebrated preacher should even say, that *sin will endear Christ*, the expression (properly taken) is perfectly agreeable to the analogy of faith; for did not our Lord himself tell the proud Pharisee, who despised a poor creature bowed down and laden with sins, even a *five hundred pence debtor*, that “*to whom much is forgiven the same loveth much.*” And what is this more than your favourite practical writer, as well as mine, Bishop Hopkins, hath asserted in his Sermon on Psalm xix. 13, where, laying down various reasons why God leaves a proneness to sin in his own children, among others he gives the two following; “*That the prevalency of Christ’s intercession is hereby glorified,*” and “*the graces of his people the more exercised?*” “Some graces, saith he, are graces of war, if I may so call them, which would never be exercised if we had not enemies to encounter with; and therefore as it is said in Judges iii. 2, that God would not utterly drive out all the nations before the children of Israel, but left some of them among them, that by continual fighting with them *they might learn war*; so neither hath God utterly expelled the spiritual Canaanites out of the hearts of his people, to this end, that by daily conflicting with them, they might learn the wars of the Lord, and grow expert in handling and using every piece of their spiritual and Christian armour. How should we keep up a holy watch and ward if we had no enemies to beat up our quarters? How should we exercise faith, which St. John tells us is our victory, if we had no enemies to conquer? How should we exercise repentance and godly sorrow, whereby the soul is recruited and it’s graces reinforced, if we were never foiled nor overcome by our spiritual enemies? Part of our spiritual armour would soon rust, but that our corruptions and sinful inclinations put us daily upon a necessity of using it. And therefore, as he says in another place, in the same sermon, The holiest Christian hath, and shall have, as long as he

“ lives



“ lives in this world, cause to complain with the Apostle (C),  
 “ I see another law in my members warring against the law in  
 “ my mind. There is a carnal, sensual inclination in him;  
 “ strongly swaying him to sin, contrary to the bent and in-  
 “ clination of his renewed part; and therefore he shall have  
 “ cause still to cry out, *O wretched man that I am, who shall*  
 “ *deliuer me from the body of this death!*”

Now, Sir, will you depreciate the memory of this good man, as you have done the living CELEBRATED ministers of this day, by representing him as a *pleader for sin*, because he speaks comfortable words to God's poor children who groan under the remains of it? I hope you have too much politeness to call him; with *an air of positiveness and assurance*, one of the *Devil's factors* and an *advocate for sin*, as a certain clergyman, whom you esteem as *the greatest minister in the world*, has already called all those who teach that indwelling sin remains in the heart as long as we continue in the body (D).

But not to dwell any longer on this point, I proceed to shew from whence this doctrine of sinless perfection is also derived: For it was not (as some suppose) originally broached by Mr. John Wesley, but crept into the church first among the Pelagians, in the fifth century, and has been since almost generally received in the church of Rome, particularly by the Jesuits, as we may very readily perceive by the following extract from Bishop Cowper, who in his excellent comment on the eighth chapter to the Romans thus writes (E).

“ There are some, saith St. Augustin, like unto vessels  
 “ blown up with wind, filled with a haughty spirit, not so-  
 “ lidly great, but swelled with the sickness of pride, who dare  
 “ be bold to say, that men are found on earth without sin: of  
 “ such as these he demands in that same place; “ *Interrogo*  
 “ *te, O homo, sancte, iuste, sine macula, oratio ista, Dimitte no-*  
 “ *bis debita nostra, fidelium est, an catechumenorum? Certé*  
 “ *regeneratorum est, immo filiorum: nam si non est filiorum,*  
 “ *qua fronte dicitur, Pater noster qui es in cælis? Ubi ergo estis,*  
 “ *O iusti, sancti, in quibus peccata non sunt?*” “ I demand of  
 “ thee, O man, thou who art just and holy, this prayer, *Forgive*  
 “ *us our sins, whether it is a prayer to be said by catechists only,*  
 “ *or to be said also of such as are believers and converted Chris-*

(C) Bishop Hopkins is clear that the Apostle spoke in his own person.

(D) Hymns and Sacred Poems, by J. and C. Wesley, vol. II. p. 286.

(E) The doctrine of sinless perfection was also commonly received among that ranting set of people called Anabaptists (very different from the present Baptists) in Luther's time; and under the notion of their being without sin, they worked all manner of iniquity.

" tians? Surely it is the prayer of men regenerated; yea, it is  
 " the prayer of the sons of God; for if it be not, with what  
 " assurance can they call God, Our father who art in hea-  
 " ven? Where then are ye, O ye just and holy ones, in whom  
 " are no sins (F)? If the regenerate and sons of God have need  
 " to crave remission of sins, what are ye who say ye have no  
 " sin? If we say we have no sin, we lie, and the truth is not  
 " in us: and our blessed Saviour, to let us see how far we are  
 " from doing that which we should do, saith, *When ye have*  
 " *done all that ye can do, yet say ye are unprofitable servants.*  
 " Where, because they have a silly subterfuge, that albeit we  
 " were never so righteous, yet for humility sake, we should  
 " say we are unprofitable, I answer them, as Augustine an-  
 " swered the same objection in his time, "*Propter humilitatem*  
 " *ergo mentiris; then for humility's sake thou liest;*" but it is cer-  
 " tain, Christ never taught any man to lie for humility: this is  
 " therefore but a forged falshood. And to join the third wit-  
 " nefs with the former two, *Bernard*, who lived in a very cor-  
 " rupt time, yet retained this truth: "*Quis est melior Propheta?*  
 " *de quo dixit Deus, Inveni virum secundum cor meum; & ta-*  
 " *men ipse necesse habuit dicere Deo, " Ne intres in judicium*  
 " *cum servo tuo?" " Who is better than the Prophet David?*  
 " *of whom the Lord said, I have found a man after mine*  
 " *own heart; yet had he need to say, Lord, enter not into*  
 " *judgment with thy servant."* And again, "*Sufficit mihi*  
 " *ad omnem justitiam solum habere propitium, cui soli peccavi:*  
 " *non peccare Dei justitia est, hominis justitia indulgentia*  
 " *Dei."* "*It sufficeth me for all righteousness to have him only*  
 " *merciful to me whom I have only offended: to be without sin*  
 " *is the righteousness of God, man's righteousness is God's indul-*  
 " *gence pardoning his sin."* We conclude therefore with him:  
 " *Vae generationi huic miseræ, cui sufficere videtur sua insuffi-*  
 " *cientia; immo inopia tanta, quis enim ad perfectionem illam*  
 " *quam scripturæ tradunt, vel aspirare videtur? Woe to this*  
 " *miserable generation, to whom their own insufficiency seems suffi-*  
 " *cient: for who is it that hath so much as aspired to that per-*  
 " *fection which the holy scripture commands us? But to main-*  
 " *tain their error, they enforce those places of holy scripture*  
 " *wherein mention is made of innocency, justice and perfection*  
 " *in the godly; whereupon they simply infer, that the law is*  
 " *fulfilled. Their paralogismes shall easily be discovered, if we*  
 " *keep Augustine's rule, " When the perfection of any man*

(F) Permit me here to ask the following question. Was it not proposed at a certain conference, Whether a believer might not be in such a state as not to need the intercession of Christ; and whether such an one had any cause to pray for forgiveness of sins?

“ is mentioned, we must consider wherein, for a man may  
 “ be righteous in comparison of others; so Noah was a righ-  
 “ teous man in comparison of that generation wherein he  
 “ lived, yet was he not without sin.”—A man may be also  
 “ so called in comparison of himself, the Lord judging a  
 “ man according to that whereunto the greater part of his  
 “ disposition is inclined; for the Lord doth repute and ac-  
 “ count his children, not after the remnants of the old man,  
 “ but according to the new workmanship of his grace in  
 “ them; whereof it cometh to pass, that albeit, in a great  
 “ part they be sinful, yet the Lord giveth unto them the  
 “ names of saints and righteous men.”

“ Again, in handling of the Apostle’s words, *Let us, as*  
 “ *many as are perfect, be thus minded,* he moves the ques-  
 “ tion, seeing that the Apostle hath said immediately before,  
 “ that he was not perfect, How doth he now rank himself  
 “ among those who are perfect? How agree these two, that  
 “ he is perfect, and that he is not perfect? He answers, the  
 “ Apostle was perfect, *secundum intentionem, non secundum*  
 “ *præventionem*; that is, *perfect in regard of his intention and*  
 “ *purpose, not in regard of prevention, and obtaining of his*  
 “ *purpose.*—And hereunto agrees that of Bernard, *Magnum*  
 “ *illud electionis vas perfectum abnuat, profectum fatetur;*  
 “ *That great chosen vessel of election grants perfection, that is,*  
 “ *a going forward, but denies perfection*; for, *τελειος* is not only  
 “ he who hath come to the end, but he also who is walking  
 “ toward it: We are so imperfect in this life, that we are yet  
 “ but walking to perfection: therefore (saith *Ambrose*) “ *Apos-*  
 “ *tolus aliquando quasi perfectis loquitur, aliquando quasi per-*  
 “ *fecturis; hoc est, aliquando laudat, aliquando commonet;*”  
 “ *The Apostle speaketh unto Christians, sometime as unto men*  
 “ *that are perfect, other times as unto men who are to perfect*  
 “ *that which is required of them; that is, sometimes he praises*  
 “ *them for the good they have done, and other whiles he ad-*  
 “ *monishes them of the good they have to do.* We conclude,  
 “ therefore, with *Augustine*, “ *Perfectio hominis est invenisse*  
 “ *se non esse perfectum; this is THE PERFECTION OF*  
 “ **MAN, TO FIND HE IS NOT PERFECT.**”

As you have given at least an indirect insinuation, (p. 61)  
 that the incomparable Archbishop Leighton was an advocate  
 for your sinless perfection doctrine, I now beg to present you  
 with the following abstract from his sermon on James iii. 17.  
 by which you will clearly see what was this excellent prelate’s  
 opinion of the above doctrine, and of those who professed it.

“ There is a generation indeed that is pure in their own  
 “ eyes, but they are such as are not washen from their



“ filthiness:—They that are washen, are still bewailing that  
 “ they again contract so much defilement. The *most purified*  
 “ Christians are they who are most sensible of their impurity.  
 “ Therefore, I called not this an universal freedom from pol-  
 “ lution, but an universal detestation of it: They that are thus  
 “ pure are daily defiled with many sins, but they cannot be  
 “ in love with any sin at all, nor do they willingly dispense  
 “ with the smallest sins.” *Archbishop Leighton (G).*

Again, “ The renewed man, even he that hath this law deep-  
 “ est written in his heart, yet, *while he lives here*, is still mo-  
 “ lested with that inbred Antinomian, that law of sin, which  
 “ yet dwells in his flesh, though the force of it is broken.”  
 Archbishop Leighton’s sermon on Heb. viii. 10.

To the same purpose blessed Luther, speaking of the bat-  
 tle between flesh and spirit in the godly, thus writes:

“ Of this battle, the hermits, the monks, and the school-  
 “ men, and all that seek righteousness and salvation by works,  
 “ know nothing at all.”

But, “ This battle of the flesh against the spirit all the  
 “ children of God have had and felt; and the self-same do  
 “ we also feel and prove: He that searcheth his own con-  
 “ science, if he be not an *hypocrite*, shall well perceive that  
 “ to be true in himself which St. Paul here saith, *that the*  
 “ *flesh lusteth against the spirit*. All the faithful therefore do  
 “ feel and confess that their flesh resisteth against the spirit,  
 “ and *that these two are so contrary the one to the other* in  
 “ themselves, that, do what they can, they are not able to  
 “ perform that which they would do.”

LUTHER ON THE GALATIANS, ch. v. ver. 17.

Again, “ Here not only the schoolmen, but also some of  
 “ the old fathers are much troubled, seeking how they may  
 “ *excuse* Paul; for it seemeth unto them absurd and unseem-  
 “ ly to say, that that elect vessel of Christ should have sin.  
 “ But we credit Paul’s own words, wherein he plainly con-  
 “ fesseth, *that he is sold under sin; that he is led captive of sin;*  
 “ *that he hath a law in his members rebelling against him;*  
 “ *and that in his flesh he serveth the law of sin.*—Here again  
 “ they answer, that the Apostle speaketh in the person of the  
 “ wicked. But the wicked do not complain of the rebellion  
 “ of their flesh, of any battle or conflict, or of the captivity  
 “ and bondage of sin; for sin mightily *reigneth* in them.  
 “ This is therefore the very complaint of Paul and all the

(G) This extract from Archbishop Leighton stands in Mr. Wesley’s  
 Christian Library, vol. XXXV. p. 18, as a noble testimony against  
 the arrogant doctrine of sinless perfection.

faithful.



“ faithful.—Wherefore THEY HAVE DONE VERY WICK-  
 “ EDLY, which have excused Paul and all the faithful to have  
 “ no sin; for by this persuasion, (which proceedeth of igno-  
 “ rance of the doctrine of faith) they have robbed the church  
 “ of a singular consolation;—they have abolished the forgive-  
 “ nesses of sins, and made Christ of none effect.”

“ It is very profitable for the godly to know this, and to  
 “ bear it well in mind, for it wonderfully comforteth them  
 “ when they are tempted. WHEN I WAS A MONK, I  
 “ thought by and by that I was utterly cast away, if at any  
 “ time I felt the lust of the flesh; that is to say, if I felt any  
 “ evil motion, fleshly lust, wrath, hatred, or envy against  
 “ my brother. I essayed many ways to help to quiet my con-  
 “ science, but it would not be; for the concupiscence and  
 “ lust of my flesh did always return; so that I could not rest,  
 “ but was continually vexed with these thoughts: This, or  
 “ that sin thou hast committed; thou art infected with envy,  
 “ with impatiency, and such other sins; therefore thou art  
 “ entered into this holy order in vain, and all thy good works  
 “ are unprofitable. If then I had rightly understood these  
 “ sentences of Paul, *The flesh lusteth contrary to the spirit, and*  
 “ *the spirit contrary to the flesh, and these two are one*  
 “ *against another, so that ye cannot do the things that ye*  
 “ *would do,* I should not so miserably have tormented my-  
 “ self, but should have thought and said to myself, as  
 “ now commonly I do, Martin, thou shalt not utter-  
 “ ly be without sin, for thou hast flesh; thou shalt therefore  
 “ feel the battle thereof, according to that saying of St. Paul,  
 “ *the flesh resisteth the spirit*: Despair not, therefore, but re-  
 “ sist it strongly, and fulfill not the lusts thereof; thus doing,  
 “ thou art not under the law (L).”

LUTHER on the GALATIANS, ch. v. ver. 17.

BUT, faith Mr. F——r, (p. 68) by asserting, that “ Sin  
 “ shall always dwell in *the inner chamber*, the inmost recesses  
 “ of the heart, we give unto death, that foul monster, the

(L) If Mr. F——r should think me tainted with Antinomi-  
 anism, on account of my approbation of Luther’s comment on the  
 Galatians, I must still fly for support to my never-failing ally, Mr.  
 John Wesley; who, though he tells us in his Journal, from Nov.  
 1739, to Sept. 1741, p. 89, That he is utterly ashamed of himself for  
 the high esteem in which he once held this book, (the doctrine of  
 which he even calls blasphemous) yet, in a very late edition of his  
 sermon on Eph. ii. 8. the wind changes again into its first quarter,  
 and he styles Martin Luther, “ THAT GLORIOUS CHAM-  
 PION OF THE LORD OF HOSTS,” merely on account of  
 his preaching that great doctrine, which runs throughout all his  
 comment on the Galatians, *salvation by faith.*

“ offspring

“ offspring of sin, the important honour of killing his father ;  
 “ he, he alone is to give the great, the last, the decisive  
 “ blow. This is confidently asserted by those who cry, *Nothing*  
 “ *but Christ.*”

Amazing assertion! What, Sir, do we make death the saviour, whilst we declare that death itself is under the Saviour's feet? Or did that eminent martyr Lambert make death the saviour, when he cried out in the flames, his lower parts being almost consumed, “NONE BUT CHRIST! NONE BUT CHRIST!” Surely, Sir, when you talk on this wise you do not recollect, that death itself is no longer a *foul monster* to a believer; but his sting being taken out by the blood of Christ, he is now ranked among the Christian's choicest blessings. Sin, both in its condemning and reigning power, being subdued in all the elect of God, the all-conquering JESUS enables them to face death in its most dreadful forms, as that welcome messenger which gives them their happy dismissal from these tabernacles of clay in which *they groan, being burdened*. But we have just as much right to say, that you give death all the honour of saving you from bodily pain and sickness, (which are the consequences of sin, though no punishments, but blessings to the believer) because you acknowledge, that pain and sickness will endure whilst we are on this side the grave, as you have to accuse us of making death the saviour from sin, because we affirm, that whilst we are in the body, sin is there also. Unless, therefore, you will prove that the sinless state you contend for is free from all the effects of sin, viz. pain, sickness, and even temporal death itself, your argument really proves too much, and absolutely overthrows itself; upon which account, I think that the most consistent Perfectionist was G——e B——l, who put himself at the head of a sinless class in Mr. Wesley's societies, and affirmed, *That the truly perfect should never die, and that he himself is to be translated as were Enoch and Elijah*. But although I would not charge the reverend authors of certain hymns with any such extravagancies as these, yet I am sure that if the doctrine of some of those hymns be true, there is not a soul now upon earth that will ever see the face of God in glory. To instance only the following stanza:

Gifts, alas! cannot suffice,  
 And comforts all are vain;  
 WHILE ONE EVIL THOUGHT CAN RISE,  
 I AM NOT BORN AGAIN (M).

---

(M) Hymns and Sacred Poems by J. and C. Wesley, vol. II. p. 216, printed at London.

I cannot conclude this letter without taking notice of an evasion which the Perfectionists run to when pressed by the authority of the moral law. If they are asked, "Do you keep the whole moral law in all its extent and spirituality? and if not, is not sin the transgression of the law, and are not you a sinner?" they will answer, "We trust we keep the whole law of love (N), and the whole law of Christ;" and then they fly to the old Popish distinction between infirmities and sins, allowing that they have the former, but not the latter. This distinction Mr. Wesley contends for again and again, particularly in the preface to the before-mentioned hymns, in his sermon on Eph. ii. 8. and on Rom. viii. 1. in his preface to Mr. Halyburton's life, and in his letter to Mr. Hervey; as does Mr. F——r in his first letter of the Vindication (p. 12); where he says, that "though the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus will not deliver them from the *innocent infirmities of flesh and blood*, it will nevertheless make them free from the law of sin and death." So likewise in many parts of his last piece, he speaks of *the law of Christ*, as if it were not the same with the moral law, particularly (p. 17), he says, St. Paul declares, *not the hearers, but the doers of the law (of Christ) shall be justified*; and (p. 25), he asks, "Was not the fulfilling of *the whole law of Christ* work enough to justify the converted thief by that law?" Now, the Apostle is most clearly speaking of the moral law in both these places; therefore, what other law Mr. F——r means by *the law of Christ*, must be left to himself to resolve. However, it is evident enough from whence the doctrine between sins and *the innocent infirmities of flesh and blood* is derived, even from the very same nauseous fountain

---

(N) Upon the question being put home to those who profess sinless perfection, "Do you keep the whole law without offending in one point?" Mr. Wesley, in his answer, dated Dec. 28, 1762, replies, "I believe some would answer, We trust we do keep the whole law of love." Being asked again, "Do you defy God himself to find any sin in you?" he answers, "We humbly hope (pray, Reader, mind the word *humbly*) God does not find sin in us."—Again, "Do you love God as well as you ought to love him, and serve him as he ought to be served?" To this Mr. Wesley HUMBLY replies, "I love him with ALL my heart, and serve him with ALL my strength." But I am sure if he does this, he had no occasion to soften the moral law, by calling it the law of love, for he fulfills its highest demands.

which

which fendeth out the muddled waters of a twofold Justification, and the denial that we are righteous through the imputation of Christ's personal righteousness. You will easily perceive, Sir, that I mean the Romish church, two of whose devoted champions, Lindenus and Andradius, (the latter of whom was interpreter to the council of Trent) thus distinguish between infirmities and sins, in order to establish the doctrine of a sinless perfection in this life.

“ The LITTLE TRIFLING FAULTS which are owing to our daily slips and mistakes, are like specks, or almost imperceptible moles upon the body, which of themselves do not stain or defile; but as it were with small particles of fine dust, lightly sprinkle the Christian life; so that, nevertheless, the works of the regenerate may be of themselves perfect, and in all respects immaculate, even in this life.” *Lindenus.*

“ Venial sins are so minute and trivial, that they do not oppose the *perfection of our love*, nor can they hinder our obedience from being absolutely perfect.” *Andradius.*

And is this the doctrine which is preached to more than 30,000 souls, of which Mr. Wesley has the care? Then I am sure it is high time that not only the Calvinist ministers, but all who reverence the sanctions of the moral law, and wish well to the interests of Protestantism, should *in a body protest* against such licentious Antinomian tenets; which are by far the more dangerous as they come disguised under the specious garb of Christian perfection. Our Lord, jealous to maintain the authority of his own law, says, that *whosoever shall break the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so to do, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven.* And all his faithful ambassadors, after the example of their divine master, whenever they speak of the law, are careful not to leave the least loop-hole for sin, by extenuating the rigor and spirituality of its requirements, and accommodating it to the frailties of the poor fallen children of men. They know that the law was given as well to convince the unregenerate of sin, as to be a rule of life to all justified believers, and that both of these ends must be entirely superseded by talking of *little failures, the innocent infirmities incident to flesh and blood, trifling breaches of the law, meaner sins, and sins of surprize, which we cannot affirm do or do not bring the soul under condemnation.* But let the besom of Dr. Crisp sweep away all this Antinomian dust and rubbish; and may it never, never, never rise again, to the dishonor of God's law, the disannulling of the use of the gospel  
itself,



Itself, and the delusion of the misguided 30,000 who sit under the ministry of Mr. Wesley; though many of them I am persuaded (as well hearers as lay preachers) are the truly excellent of the earth, and can say with David, " Though hast made me wiser than my teachers."

Dr. Crisp's words are these. " If this self-denial must be, then buckle thyself to it, and let it be universal, as the Apostle's rule is, to deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts. Be not partial; favour neither SMALL nor great; say not of this, OH, THIS IS BUT A SMALL ONE, or of that, it does nobody any hurt: But be alike resolute, cast out SMALL and great, quench the SPARKLES as well as the great coals, the COVERED FIRE as well as the flame; for a spared sparkle may set the whole course of nature on fire, as well as the greatest coals, and consume all to ashes. Say not, it will go out of itself; for the least sin allowed, or the allowance of any thing that is against the will of Christ, is as a sparkle lighting upon tinder. Such is man's nature therefore, not likely to go out, but to grow. The very Gibeonites only being left, and all the rest of the Canaanites destroyed, prove pricks in the sides and thorns in the eyes. One knot of couch-grass being left in the ground, will soon overgrow, and choak the choice herbs." Dr. Crisp's Serm. vol. II. p. 579.

How zealous was this minister of Christ, to give the law its due honor, and to establish the practice of it in the life and conversation of the believer? He well knew that such doctrine as would undermine the spirituality of the law, and soften any breach of it into a meer *peccadillo*, so far from being of God, contains the very essence of that horrid and real Antinomian delusion of those blind guides, the Scribes and Pharisees of old, which our Lord came down from Heaven to bear his testimony against in his sermon upon the mount. And, indeed, it is the very doctrine of the fallen nature, which being totally ignorant of the consummate holiness of God, and of the infinite perfection of his law, can neither see the real demerit of sin, nor the justice of the law-giver in punishing every transgression of disobedience with the curse.

Again, It is the very doctrine which is preached by all the unconverted clergy of this day, and has been preached by all false teachers from the beginning even until now. Search their writings, hear their sermons, and you shall find that they, one and all, talk of a remedial law of grace, and detract from the extent and purity of the moral law (which is the eternal, and only rule of right and wrong) by splitting the  
I  
trans-

transgression of it into slips, failings, infirmities, &c. &c. thereby making thousands and millions of deluded souls perfectly satisfied with the state they are in; whilst, in the eyes of God, they are no better than whited walls, and painted sepulchres.

Again, It is the very doctrine which the devil himself is now preaching to the heart of all unregenerate souls, in order to lull them in carnal security; and not only so, but (as I once observed upon a former occasion) our divine poet Milton seems clearly of opinion, that it was by this very stratagem (of softening the law into infirmities, sins of surprize, &c.) that the old serpent first beguiled Eve in Paradise; for he thus introduces that crafty adversary accosting our primæval mother:

“ Will God incense his ire,  
“ For such a PETTY trespass?”

Though I was just going to conclude this letter, yet, rather than leave you again in so much bad company, I will beg to usher in Mr. Wesley once more; especially as you have complained in your Vindication, p. 12, that what he calls *full sanctification*, and *Christian perfection*, cannot be used by him without being made the subject of the pious sneers and godly lampoons of some. Ah, Sir, it is not to be wondered at, that those who acknowledge themselves to be full of imperfections, and have nothing to say upon their own merit, should fall into the unhappy method of controverting doctrines by *pious sneers*, and *godly lampoons*; though I wish you had given us some proof of your assertion. However, in order to support poor Mr. Wesley's spirits under the load of all this ill usage, let us examine if we cannot find some *godly lampoons* and *pious sneers* against those who hold with St. Paul and the Church of England, that, *even in the regenerate, the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh*. And I think the reverend authors of certain hymns and sacred poems, will soon be found victorious over these *godly lampooners*, and *pious sneerers*, and will repay them, with high interest, in their own coin.

Soon as Satan gives the word,  
His advocates for sin  
Witness with their lying lord,  
Ye never can be clean  
From all sin, while here below.  
Do not you the word receive;  
God's own word will tell you so,  
But do not you believe (P).

(P) Hymns and Sacred Poems by the two Mr. Wesleys, vol. II. p. 225, printed at London, 1756.

*O ye orthodox divines, ye ludicrous versifiers of awful scripture truths, (or to use Mr. Charles Wesley's own expression) Ye bawling witnesses of perfection, let me now put your pious sneers, and godly lampoons into plain prose, and the sense of them will be just this. " All those ministers who deny the doctrine of sinless perfection, (or that believers are not freed from the very in-being of sin here below) have no other commission to preach but what they receive from the devil himself, the father of lies, who is their lord and master, and they are advocates for his cause." But as you believe Mr. Wesley to be the greatest minister in the world, and as he has not yet RECENTED the hymns (or, if you please, the godly lampoons), in question, but has published several editions of them, what must I think of your offers to lend your pulpit, and of your wishes to lie at the feet of those ministers, who, in flat contradiction to the above sacred poem, constantly maintain in the apostolic language, that even in the most advanced Christians, " the law in the members warreth against the law in the mind; and that when they would do good evil is present with them?" I am sure if I could adopt Mr. Wesley's creed concerning them, I would as soon think of lying at the feet of the devil himself, or of lending my pulpit to Simon Magus, as of lying at the feet of these advocates for sin, these Satan-sent ministers, these children of the old roaring hellish murderer, who believe his lie (Q), lest I myself should partake of their plagues, and lest my flock should be poisoned with the heretical delusions of their lying lord; and rather than go thirty miles to read prayers for them, I would imitate the example of St. John, who only seeing Cerinthus in a public bath with him, immediately left it, and desired his followers to do the same, lest the building should fall upon their heads. Parker's Abridgment of Eusebius's Eccles. Hist. p. 72. (R).*

Now, my dear Sir, I have given you a little in your own way; but notwithstanding you have set me the example in this manner of writing, I shall be glad to set you the example

(Q) An expression borrowed from Mr. Wesley's Hymns on God's everlasting Love.

(R) Mr. Wesley has given us this anecdote in his Christian Library, vol. II, p. 241. His words are these:

" St. John going at Ephesus to be washed, and seeing Cerinthus in the bath, leaped out, because he feared the bath should have fallen, seeing such an enemy to the truth was within. Such fear had the Apostles, (saith Irenæus) that they would not exchange a word with them that adulterate the truth."

of mutual forgiveness. By cutting and slashing we shall never convince each other of our errors; and the end of our controversy will be, that the world will laugh at you for taking the sword of banter, the shield of perversion, the helmet of prejudice, and the breast-plate of acrimony, in order to fight for the doctrine of sinless perfection; and I myself shall be laughed at in my turn for losing so much precious time in answering you.

I am, Reverend Sir,

Your sincere Wellwisher, &c.

The Author of P. Q.

Let me add the following queries to Mr. Wesley himself, by way of Postscript to this letter.

P. S. Did not you, Sir, in administering the sacrament a few years ago to a Perfect Society in West-street chapel, leave out the confession of sin: no doubt, as ill suiting so angelic a company?

Did not one of the enthusiasts, then present, get up and say, "he had heard a voice whilst he was at prayer tell him, *he was all holiness to the Lord?*"

Did not a second declare the same thing?

Did not G——e B——l then say, "That he walked with God as did Enoch, and should never die?"

Did not some one present reply, "I think what brother B——l says is very true; for Christ declares, *whosoever liveth and believeth in him shall never die?*" To this you very properly objected; and declared in confutation of it, that though sister [somebody] believed in Christ, she died on Wednesday last.

After all this, did not another perfect brother get up and say, "He believed we were very near the Millenium, for *there had been more constables sworn in that year than heretofore?*"

This I have put down *verbatim* from the mouth of a judicious Christian friend who was then present; but from that time has been heartily sick of sinless perfection.

Again, Do not you know a clergyman, once closely connected with you, who refused a great witness for perfection the sacrament, because he had been detected in bed with a perfect sister? And did not he urge in his behalf, that he did it to try *whether all evil desire was taken away?*

Once



Once more, Did not you, Sir, a few years ago preach a sermon in defence of the imputed Righteousness of Christ in West-street chapel; and afterwards (when the congregation was dismissed) bid the society who staid, BEWARE OF THAT SMOOTH DOCTRINE OF IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS? [This anecdote was also told me by a person of undoubted reputation and piety, who heard you say the words, and to whom I will accompany you if you deny them.] Upon which my relator, who was much attached to you before, was so struck as to be hardly able to refrain speaking to you in the chapel; and, from that hour, gave up all connections with you.

Now, Sir, as there is a possibility of interpreting even this conduct of yours in a favourable manner, I will, by all means, put the most candid construction upon your words. I hope your meaning was, that although you had been holding forth the imputed Righteousness of Christ as the only foundation of a sinner's hope, to a mixed multitude or congregation (for that expression you also made use of) yet you thought it right to caution your society, very particularly, how they abused that doctrine of imputed righteousness, which to some, who turned it into licentiousness, was a *smooth doctrine* of which they ought to beware. However, it is certain your words struck my friend, who gave me this account in quite another light; viz. as the effect of great inconsistency and duplicity of conduct in you; and, therefore, this circumstance has been the means of a separation from you ever since.

LETTER

---

 L E T T E R    I V .

REVEREND SIR,

**W**HOSOEVER has given your book but a cursory perusal, must have perceived that the grand fortress against which all your artillery is played, and at which your heavy bombs of bitter sneer and cutting sarcasm are thrown, is, *THE FINISHED SALVATION OF CHRIST*. *This is the expression in which all Antinomianism centers; this the stalking-horse (S) of every wild ranter; this the smooth Syren-song which has deluded thousands upon earth, and which will be made the faltering plea of damned spirits at the day of judg-*

---

(S) I beg leave to hint to my friend Mr. F——r, that the *Trojan Horse* of *Arminianism* has ever been esteemed among *real Protestants* to be full as dangerous as the *stalking-horse* of *finished salvation*. A proof of this assertion may be gathered from Mr. Rous's speech in the house of Commons, an. 1628. His words are as follow: "I desire that we may consider the increase of Arminianism; an error that makes the grace of God lackey it after the will of man; that makes the sheep to keep the shepherd, and makes a mortal seed spring from an immortal God. I desire we may look into the very belly and bowels of this *TROJAN HORSE*, to see if there be not men in it ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny and Spanish monarchy.—An Arminian is the spawn of a Papist." Rushworth's Collections, vol. I. p. 645.

I own I think the expression rather harsh, that "an Arminian is the spawn of a Papist;" and yet it is very certain, that the Papists have always rejoiced at the progress of Arminianism as what was most likely to promote their cause. Witness the Jesuit's letter sent to the rector at Brussels in the reign of Charles the first, wherein are the following words; "We have planted the sovereign drug Arminianism, which we hope will purge the Protestants from their heresy." Again, "I am at this time transported with joy to see how happily all instruments and means co-operate unto our purposes. But our foundation is Arminianism."

A copy of this letter was found among the papers of a nest of priests and Jesuits at Clerkenwell.

ment.

ment. Yet this very expression, in it's full extent, I undertake to vindicate; and, in so doing, shall fly to no other arsenal for my weapons but that of eternal truth itself. I will take the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God; and the Lord enabling me to wield it aright, I doubt not but I shall put to flight the armies of the aliens.

I have observed in a former piece, that when the Lord of glory bowed his head upon the cross, and gave up the ghost, he cried, *It is finished*. And what was finished? Not merely his life; but *the work which was given him to do*. And what was this work, but the salvation of his people?—One would have imagined, that our Lord's own use of this expression might have silenced every cavil which could be raised against it. But not so. Mr. F——r still objects, “If the salvation of the elect was finished upon the cross, then was their justification finished, their sanctification finished, their glorification finished; for justification, sanctification, and glorification finished, are but the various parts of our finished salvation.” P. 81.

Now as all events are present unto God, and were so from eternity to eternity; so when there is a certainty of their accomplishment, he frequently calls things that are not as though they were; and hence it is that St. Paul actually represents the glorification of the elect to be as much *finished* as their predestination: for, saith he, Rom. viii. 29, *Whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified*.

The same Apostle, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, speaking to believers who were just called out of darkness into marvellous light, yet addresses them as already (virtually) *seated in heavenly places in Christ Jesus*; and that for this plain reason, because Christ and his Church are always represented as one; and where the head is, there the members must be also, forasmuch as they are *bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh*. For the same reason are they said to be *quickened with Christ, dead with him, buried with him, raised together with him*; and because he liveth, they shall live also, being kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.

But does not this supersede the necessity of watchfulness and mortification of sin? Just the very reverse. For it is a principal part of Christ's *finished salvation*, that he has purchased the spirit to work these graces in the hearts of his children; and, in this respect, (viz. as a matter which shall infallibly take place) their sanctification is really as much *finished* as their justification; the one is not the work of Christ, and the other left

left to themselves; but both the one, and the other, are equally provided for in that *everlasting covenant which is ordered in all things and sure.*

Again, *Salvation is finished*, in that it is made as sure to all the seed as the oath and promise of an immutable God can make it. Now, even to men (as saith the Apostle, Heb. vi. 16, &c.) *an oath for confirmation is an end of all strife.* Wherefore God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath, that, by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us. Now, let it be supposed that I had an estate left me by the last will and testament of some near and dear friend; that the person who left it had an undoubted right and power to make the bequest. Let it be further supposed, that I knew this will and testament to be signed, sealed, and properly attested; might I not reasonably look upon myself as sure of the inheritance as if I already enjoyed it: might I not justly say, "*the whole affair is finished; there remains nothing for me to do, but to take possession!*" Inasmuch, therefore, as *all the promises of God are Yea and Amen in Christ Jesus*; inasmuch as the inheritance is not only bequeathed by Christ himself, but ratified, signed, and sealed by his own most precious blood; certain it is, that the salvation of every soul given by the Father to the Son in the eternal covenant of redemption, is as firmly secured, as if those souls were now in glory: and, therefore, to scruple the use of that expression, *finished salvation*, argues at once the greatest mistrust of the Mediator's power, and casts the highest reflection upon his infinite wisdom, by supposing that he did not count the cost before he began to build; and, therefore, that either his own personal work, or that which he does in his members, (for they are only parts of the same salvation) is left *unfinished.*

But if this were the case, he himself would never have said, *He that believeth hath everlasting life; not shall have, but now hath everlasting life*; it is already begun in the soul, and is so certain in reversion that nothing shall deprive him of it.— Again, The beloved disciple saith, under the glorious views which he had of a *finished salvation*, *These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that YE HAVE eternal life.* And the chosen vessel Paul tells his beloved Timothy, that *God HATH saved us, and called us with an holy calling; not according to our works,*



works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.

But farther. Believers are said to be saved by faith, and to be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation. Now true faith and salvation being here inseparably linked by the Apostle, and Christ being styled, not only *the author*, but **THE FINISHER** of our faith, he must be, consequently, *the finisher of our salvation*; and, therefore, no Christian minister ought to be ashamed to speak of him as such.

Now I appeal to any candid judges, whether I have not brought sufficient authority, from the best of all authorities, God's unerring word, for the use of that phrase *finished salvation*? And that you may not think I am for referring the matter to such as would be partial to my side of the question, I make choice of the two Mr. Wesleys to determine the controversy between us. If these gentlemen declare, that the expression is dangerous and heterodox, I cheerfully submit to their decision; but I think I have them both in my favour. However, let us examine.

Mr. Hervey, in the second and third of his eleven letters, brings the following lines from Mr. Wesley's hymns. As Mr. Hervey was a very accurate writer, I doubt not but the quotations are just; therefore shall not search for them any farther.

For every man,  
IT'S FINISH'D, it's past.  
The world is forgiven  
For Jesus's sake.

Again,

Let us for this faith contend;  
Sure Salvation is it's end,  
Heaven already is begun,  
Everlasting life is won.

If this verse does not preclude all, and more than all, the objections you have raised against a *finished salvation*, there is no meaning in words. If, therefore, Mr. Wesley can sing this *Siren-song*, that *everlasting life is already won*, I am sure he will be much displeas'd that Mr. F——r should call *finished salvation*, "THE STALKING-HORSE OF EVERY WILD RANTER."

In a volume of hymns and sacred poems by Messrs. J. and C. Wesley, I find the two following lines taken from the excellent Dr. Watts.

K

Love's

Love's redeeming work IS DONE,  
Fought the fight, the battle won!

Now, where is the difference between *redemption* from the guilt and dominion of sin, and *salvation* from these? And where the difference between being *done* and being *finished*?

In the same volume is the following stanza.

Jefus, the Lamb of God, hath bled;  
He bore our fins upon the tree;  
Beneath our curse he bow'd his head:  
'TIS FINISH'D! He hath died for me.

The under-written excellent doxology is also usually attributed to Mr. Charles Wesley; but if it be not his, I shall be very willing to give up the use I make of it, as I have quite ammunition enough without it from the two reverend divines I have called in to be my allies against all such as would deprive the church of that truly scriptural expression, **THE FINISHED SALVATION OF CHRIST.**

The Father blefs, the Son adore,  
The Spirit praise for evermore;  
**SALVATION'S GLORIOUS WORK IS DONE,**  
We welcome thee, great Three in One.

What the two Mr. Wesleys have jointly advanced in behalf of *finished Salvation* in verse, Mr. John has thoroughly established in prose: for, in his *Christian Library*, which, he tells us in the preface, (he believes to be *all true, all agreeable to the word of God*), he says, "Christ carried on the great work of my *salvation*, being himself both the author and *finisher* of it." And how this was done, he thus explains;—"While Christ  
" was on the earth, he **FINISHED** that work which was  
" committed to him to **FINISH** here, having purchased all  
" that was to be bought by his blood, paying all the price  
" that justice did ask; by which price, he hath purchased a  
" people to himself; so that his work, cause and interest, is  
" a purchased work, *bought with blood.*

" The Father standeth engaged to make good to him all  
" that was promised, and to give him all that he purchased.  
" Christ, having now fulfilled his undertaking, by making his  
" soul an offering for sin, and so satisfying justice, which is  
" openly declared by his resurrection and admission to glory,  
" is to expect the accomplishment of what was conditioned  
" unto him. His work, therefore, on the earth *must* prosper,  
" and the Father hath undertaken to see it prosper."

" Christ

“ Christ himself is now thoroughly furnished and enabled  
 “ for the carrying on of his work, over the belly of all ad-  
 “ versaries; for, *all power in heaven and earth is given to him.*  
 “ *Every knee must bow to him. All judgment is committed*  
 “ *unto him. Angels, powers, and authority are made subject*  
 “ *unto him: yea, all things are under him.* How then can  
 “ his work miscarry?

“ Christ is actually at work, employing his power for the  
 “ carrying forward his design, for the glory of the Father,  
 “ and for his own glory, and for the good of his poor people.  
 “ The Father worketh by him, and he by the spirit, who is  
 “ his great vicegerent, sent from the Father and from him;  
 “ and his work is to glorify the Son; and he shall receive of  
 “ his, and shew it unto us.”

“ Christ, upon many accounts, standeth engaged to PER-  
 “ FECT this work which he hath begun, and is about. His  
 “ honour is engaged to go through, seeing he is now fully  
 “ furnished for it, and hath all the creation at his command.  
 “ He MUST then PERFECT his work as to the *application,*  
 “ as well as he DID PERFECT it as to the *purchase.* His  
 “ love to his Father’s and his own glory, and to his own  
 “ peoples good and salvation, may assure us, that *he will not*  
 “ *leave the work unperfected;* and his power may give us  
 “ full security, that no stop which his work meeteth with  
 “ shall be able to hinder it.”

“ This is an undoubted truth, which, if firmly believed,  
 “ would do much to settle our staggering souls in a stormy  
 “ day.” Mr. Wesley’s Christian Library, vol. XXXVI.  
 p. 123, 124, 125.

These, Sir, are exactly my sentiments relative to Finished  
 Salvation; these are the sentiments of Mr. Wesley, and the  
 sentiments of all Calvinists that I am acquainted with. On  
 these blessed truths I build all my salvation; and hope, living  
 and dying, to be found in the experimental possession of them.  
 If you have any objection to them, I refer you to Mr.  
 Wesley; and remain,

Reverend Sir,

Your sincere Friend and Well-wisher,

The Author of P. O.

## L E T T E R V.

REVEREND SIR,

S O far as you have borne your testimony against real Antinomianism, you have done well; so far as you have endeavoured to rouse religious professors out of their Laodicean lukewarmness, you are entitled to the thanks of every sincere Christian: But, so far as you have defended your cause with improper weapons, especially so far as you have traduced all the most celebrated ministers of the gospel in this day, and thereby thrown stumbling-blocks into the way of thousands, you have done very ill. Indeed, Sir, if any indifferent person were to read, and to credit the accounts you give of the doctrine of the *celebrated preachers of free-grace* in this day, and of the state of their congregations, if he had the least regard for the welfare of his own soul, he would flee from every church and place where any such preacher stood up, as he would flee from *the noisome pestilence*, or even from *the wrath to come*. And with good reason too; since what these preachers constantly affirm to be the whole foundation of a sinner's acceptance, you repeatedly make the language of a damned soul at the day of judgment; and, O shocking to tell! even this awful scene cannot be introduced by you, without doing it in the same wretched spirit of low sarcasm and slanderous banter, which runs throughout your whole book. For God's sake, Sir, consider what you have done. Is damnation so trivial a thing, so light a matter, that you can even sneer at the woe of those on whom it is inflicted? Consider again what those expressions are, which you have put into the mouths of your supposed Antinomian reprobates; many of them the very words of scripture, and others containing the plea of the most eminent saints that ever lived. But I choose to transcribe your own words, only making some marginal notes and observations upon them.—The scene is the day of judgment; and what is spoken contains the reply of a damned spirit,



spirit, to whom the Redeemer has just said, "Depart, thou  
" *curfed.*" The trembling soul answers,

" Lord, when saw we thee hungry, or a-thirst, or a  
" stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not mi-  
" nister to thee? Had we seen thee, dear Lord, in any di-  
" stress, how gladly would we have relieved thy wants!  
" Numbers can witness how well we spoke of thee, and thy  
" righteousness; it was all our boast. Bring it out in this  
" important hour. Hide not the gospel of thy free grace.  
" We always delighted in pure doctrine, in "salvation with-  
" out any condition, especially *without the condition of*  
" *works* (R)." Stand, gracious Lord, stand by us, and the  
" preachers of thy free grace (S), who made us hope thou  
" wouldst confirm their words."

" While they taught us to call thee Lord, Lord, they  
" assured us, that *love would constrain us to do good works* (T);  
" but finding no inward constraint to entertain strangers,  
" visit the sick, and relieve prisoners, we did it not, suppos-  
" ing we were not called thereto (U). They continually told  
" us, "human righteousness was mere filth before thee; and  
" we could not appear but to our everlasting shame in any  
" righteousness but thine in the day of judgment (X)." As to

(R) That the reverend Mr. Wesley also once greatly delighted in  
this doctrine, is clear from the following quotation out of his own  
Journals.—"I believe no works can be previous to Justification, nor  
" *consequently a condition of it.*"

(S) Here the preachers of free grace are all introduced as standing  
at the left hand; and, as blind leaders of the blind, are to suffer the  
doom of those they have deceived, by *making them believe that*  
*God would confirm their word.* Heaven forbid that Mr. F——r  
should again offer his pulpit to such ministers, or talk any more of  
lying in the dust at their feet!

(T) Another sneer at the very words of St. Paul.

(U) Did ever any of our eminent free-grace preachers suppose or  
assert any such thing. I declare I know none of them, but, after  
having laid the foundation in faith, raise the superstructure in good  
works; therefore this is again vile slander.

(X) Here is not only the language, but almost the very words of  
Isaiah and St. Paul, sincerely put into the mouth of a damned soul.  
The words of the prophet are, *All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags.*  
Those of the Apostle, *I count all things but dung, that I may be*  
*found in Christ, not having my own righteousness, which is of the*  
*law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness*  
*which is of God by faith.*

" works,

“ works, we were afraid of doing them, lest we should have  
 “ worked out abominations instead of our salvation (Y).”

“ And indeed, Lord, what need was there of our working  
 “ it out? For they perpetually assured us it was finished;  
 “ saying, if we did any thing towards it, we worked for  
 “ life, fell from grace like the bewitched Galatians, spoiled  
 “ thy perfect work, and exposed ourselves to the destruction  
 “ which awaits yonder trembling Pharisees.”

“ They likewise assured us, that all depended on thy de-  
 “ crees; and if we could but firmly believe our election, it  
 “ was a sure sign we were interested in thy salvation (Z). We  
 “ did so; and now, Lord, for want of a few dung-works  
 “ we have omitted, let not our hope perish! Let not electing  
 “ and everlasting love fail! Visit our offences with a rod,  
 “ but take not thy loving kindness altogether from us; and  
 “ break not David’s covenant, ordered in all things and sure,  
 “ of which we have so often made our boast (A).”

“ May it please thee also to consider, that if we did not  
 “ love and assist some of those whom thou callest thy brethren,  
 “ it was because they appeared unto us so exceedingly legal,  
 “ so strongly set against free grace, that we judged them to  
 “ be obstinate Pharisees, and dangerous reprobates; we there-  
 “ fore thought, that in hating and opposing them we did thee  
 “ service, and walked in thy steps. For thou hast said, it is  
 “ enough if the servant is as his Lord; and supposing thou  
 “ didst hate them, as thou dost Satan, we thought we need

(Y) Shocking slander again! And this will be the burden of my complaint till you confirm your charges against the preachers of finished salvation. O, Sir, with what an ill grace do you find fault with others for censuring ministers, when you yourself do the same thing in so notorious a manner? Surely the Apostle’s reasoning, Rom. ii. 1, 2, 3, is but too applicable to you in this particular.

(Z) You must be very sensible, Sir, that every Calvinist minister so far from telling their hearers, that “ If they can but firmly believe their election, it is a sure sign of their being interested in the salvation of Christ,” always tell them to prove their election by their conversion or calling. Why do you not bring some quotations from their writings, in order to confirm these heavy charges? Do this, and we shall have no cause to complain of your most unkind treatment. But you have managed the matter so very artfully, that whilst every one of your readers can see as plainly as you could wish, who they are that the snake has bitten, the snake itself lies so hidden in the grass, that it is not very easy to catch hold of it.

(A) Another sneer, almost in the very words of scripture.

“ not

“ not be more righteous than thou, by loving them more than thou didst (B).”

“ O suffer us to speak on and tell thee, we were champions for thy free grace; like true Protestants, we could have burned against the doctrine of a second Justification by works. Let then grace *justify us freely without works* (C). Shut those books filled with the account of our deeds; open the arms of thy mercy, and receive us just as we are.”

“ If free grace cannot justify us alone, let faith do it, together with free grace: We do believe *finished salvation*, Lord; we can join in the most evangelical creeds, and are ready to confess the virtue of thy atoning blood: But if thou sayest, we have trampled it under foot, and made it a common thing, grant us our last request, and it is enough.”

“ (D) Cut out the immaculate garment of thy righteousness into robes that may fit us all, and put them upon us by imputation; so shall our nakedness be gloriously covered. We confess we have not dealt our bread to the hungry, but impute to us thy feeding 5000 people with loaves and fishes. We have seldom given drink to the thirsty, and often put our bottle to those who were not a-thirst; but impute to us thy turning water into wine, to refresh the guests at the marriage-feast in Canaan, and thy loud call in the last day of the feast of Jerusalem, If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink. We never supposed it was our duty to be given to hospitality; but impute to us thy loving invitations to strangers; thy kind assurances of receiving all that come to thee; thy comfortable promises of

(B) Abominable beyond all the rest—I dare say you cannot produce any one instance of a Calvinist who refused to assist a needy brother because he was legal, and not clear in the gospel.

(C) Another sneer in the Apostle's own words.

(D) What follows in the four or five next Paragraphs is all of the same stamp; containing nothing but bitter and low sneers, levelled (at least indirectly) at the doctrine of imputed righteousness, in order to make it appear ridiculous in the eyes of the reader. And I must do the reverend Author the justice to say, that he has succeeded in his attempts, by bringing up such a confused heap of absurdities, as I believe no man ever thought of before, and putting them into the mouths of those whom he sends without mercy to Hell for pleading *imputed righteousness, free grace, and finished salvation*. And indeed poor David himself seems (according to the Vindicator) to be but in evil case; for that very thing which he avows to be *all his salvation and all his desire*, even that *everlasting covenant which is ordered in all things and sure*, is here made the vain plea of a reprobate; as is also that self-abasing, but Christ-exalting expression of the same eminent saint, *I will make mention of thy righteousness, even of thine only*.

“ casting



“ calling out none, and with feeding them even with thy  
 “ flesh and blood. We did not clothe the naked as we had  
 “ opportunity and ability; impute to us thy parting with  
 “ thy seamless garment, for the benefit of thy murderers,  
 “ We did not visit sick-beds and prisons, we were afraid of  
 “ fevers, and especially of the jail distemper; but impute to  
 “ us thy visiting Jairus’s daughter, and Peter’s wife’s mother,  
 “ who lay sick of a fever; and put to our account thy visiting  
 “ putrefying Lazarus in the offensive prison of the grave.”  
 “ Thy imputed righteousness, Lord, can alone answer all  
 “ the demands of thy law and gospel. We did not dare to  
 “ fast; we should have been called legal and Papists if we  
 “ had (E); but thy forty days fasting in the wilderness, and  
 “ thy continual abstinence imputed to us, will be self-denial  
 “ enough to justify us ten times over. We did not take up  
 “ our cross; but impute to us thy carrying thine; and even  
 “ fainting under the oppressive load. We did not mortify  
 “ the deeds of the flesh, that we might live:” This would  
 “ have been evidently “ working for life;” but “ impute to us  
 “ the crucifixion of thy body, instead of our crucifying our flesh,  
 “ with its affections and lusts. We hated private prayer; but  
 “ impute to us thy love of that duty, and the prayer thou didst  
 “ offer up upon a mountain all night. We have been rather  
 “ hard to forgive; but that defect will be abundantly made  
 “ up, if thou imputeest unto us thy forgiving of the dying  
 “ thief: and if that will not do, add, we beseech thee, the  
 “ merit of that good saying of thine, Forgive, and you shall  
 “ be forgiven. We have cheated the king of his customs;  
 “ but no matter; only impute to us thy exact paying of the  
 “ tribute-money, together with thy good advice, Render unto  
 “ Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s.”  
 “ It is true, we have brought up our children in vanity,  
 “ and thou never hadst any to bring up; may not thy mercy  
 “ find out an expedient, and impute to us, instead of it, thy  
 “ obedience to thy parents? And if we have received the sa-  
 “ crament unworthily, and thou canst not cover that sin  
 “ with thy worthy receiving, indulge us with the imputation  
 “ of thy worthy institution of it, and that will do yet better.”  
 “ In short, Lord, own us freely as thy children; impute to  
 “ us thy perfect righteousness; cast it as a cloke upon us, to  
 “ cover our filthy souls, and polluted bodies. *We will have*  
 “ *no righteousness but thine.* Make no mention, we beseech

(E) However, I know several ministers who preach *imputed righte-*  
*ousness*, that have fasted so rigorously as thereby to injure their  
 health.

“ thee,



“ thee, of our righteousness and personal holiness; they are  
 “ but filthy rags, which thy purity forbids thee to take into  
 “ Heavens; therefore, accept us without, and we shall shoue  
 “ free grace, imputed righteousness, and finished salvation, to  
 “ eternity.”

“ While the bold Antinomian offers, or prepares to offer  
 “ this most impious plea (F), the Lord, who is of purer eyes  
 “ than to behold the least iniquity, casts a flaming look upon  
 “ all the obstinate violaters of his law. It pierces their con-  
 “ science, rouses all its drowsy powers, and restores their  
 “ memory to its original perfection. Not one with passed their  
 “ heart, or thought their brain, but is instantly brought to  
 “ their remembrance; the books are opened in their own  
 “ breast, and every character has a voice which answers to the  
 “ voice of the lion of the tribe of Judah.

“ Shall I pervert judgment, says he, and justify the wicked  
 “ for a bribe? The bribe of your abominable praises? Think  
 “ you, by your base flatteries, to escape the righteous judg-  
 “ ment of God? Is not all my wrath revealed from Heaven  
 “ against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who  
 “ hold the truth in unrighteousness? Much more against you,  
 “ ye vessels of wrath, who hold an impious absurdity, in  
 “ matchless insolence.” “ Said I not to Cain himself, at the  
 “ beginning, If thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted?  
 “ Personal holiness, which ye scorned, is the wedding gar-  
 “ ment (G) I now look for. I swear in my wrath, that with-  
 “ out it, none shall taste of my heavenly supper. Ye reject

---

(F) Here, *horresco referens!* the doctrines of free grace, imputed righteousness, and finished salvation, are called a most impious plea.

(G) This point does not yet seem to be properly settled between Mr. F—— and Mr. Wesley; nor indeed, between Mr. Wesley when he writes to Mr. Hervey, and Mr. Wesley when he comments on the New Testament; for in his letter to Mr. Hervey, he says expressly, that, *The wedding garment means HOLINESS.* But, in his notes on the New Testament, he tells us, that, *The wedding garment is the righteousness of Christ, first imputed, then implanted.* Had he stopped at the word *imputed*, (for there are not two wedding garments) though he would still have manifested his inconsistency with himself, yet he would have given us the true explanation of our Lord's words. I might here also make some remarks on Mr. Wesley's inconsistency with himself, in so material a point of doctrine; but I expect that his Vindicator would tell me in answer, that Mr. Wesley is only acting like a skilful physician, who administers different medicines to his patient, by sometimes making this wedding garment to be the Righteousness of Christ, sometimes our own inherent holiness.

“ my word and commandment, and I reject you from being  
 “ kings: Ye cried unto me, and I delivered you: Yet have  
 “ ye forsaken me and followed other gods, therefore, I will  
 “ deliver you no more: Go, and cry unto the gods whom ye  
 “ have chosen. I wound the hairy scalp of such as have gone  
 “ on still in their wickedness. Whosoever have sinned against  
 “ me to the last, him do I blot out of my book: And this  
 “ you have done, ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! Awake  
 “ to everlasting shame!”

THAT you might *shoot out your arrows, even bitter words*, with the greater security, you tell us (p. 64), that you first level them at yourself; that you will not be partial; that you will confess your sin, and that of many of your brethren.

But when you come to the confession itself, then your *partiality* shews itself; your own sin is entirely omitted, and that which, in your idea, is the sin of your brethren, alone is mentioned. For instance, You express great dissatisfaction, that the doctrines of *free will, sinless perfection, and second justification by works*, are exploded in our celebrated pulpits. But how are you to blame here; since you mainly contend for these tenets, both from the pulpit and the press; and mainly cry out against the opposite doctrines, as *bound will, Antinomianism, Crispianity, Ranterism*, and what not? It is therefore too plain, that your introduction of your own name, as bearing a part in this universal Antinomian corruption, is as much without any design of bringing yourself under the lash, as the fowler is without design of wounding himself, when he points his piece at the bird marked out for destruction.

Again, Do you reckon yourself among the number of those free-grace preachers, who, (as you tell us) represent *God's commandments as the needless and impracticable sanctions of that superannuated legalist Moses; who put Dr. Crisp's coat upon the Apostle; who villify the moral law, and make it contemptible; who represent it as an intolerable yoke of bondage, and dress it up as a scarecrow; and who sing the syren-song of finished salvation?* Again, Do you rank yourself among the number of those preachers who choose comfortable subjects to please their hearers; and who (being unwilling to *lose your reputation as an evangelical preacher*), *dare not preach upon some important scriptures, unless it be to explain away or enervate their meaning; who select smooth texts in order to gratify an Antinomian audience* (H); who  
 help

---

(H) Mr. F——r, p. 61, 62, says, “ It is a doubt whether we could preach in some celebrated pulpits on *the good man who is merciful*”

help unregenerate hearers to believe they may be God's children, without God's image, provided they get evangelical phrases concerning

ciful and lendeth, &c. &c. &c. without giving general disgust; unless, to keep in the good grace of our Nicolaitan hearers, we were to dissent from all sober commentators, by putting a wrong interpretation upon such texts;" and, with one of his usual sneers at our evangelical congregations, says we may open our service with the following words: "When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive: but woe unto us, if we handle that scripture in the pulpit, unless we wrest it [I almost tremble to write what follows] by representing Christ as the wicked man, who does that which is lawful and right, to save our souls alive, without any of our doings."

For the full confutation of this base slander, I shall produce the heads of a discourse on this very text, preached in one of the most celebrated pulpits, and by one of the most strenuous free grace orthodox ministers of the present century; though, alas! in Mr. Wesley's esteem, one whose doctrine of finished salvation and imputed righteousness tended to throw wide open the flood-gates of Antinomian licentiousness; and therefore he addresses him, without ceremony, with, "O syren-song!" "O pleasing sound!" "Antinomianism without a mask!" You readily perceive, Sir, that the gentleman I mean is the late humble, holy, and learned Mr. Hervey. Yes, Sir, Mr. Hervey himself had the courage to lose his reputation by preaching upon this text, and even to publish his sermon after he had preached; yea, though he does not make Christ the wicked man, but divides his heads in the following order.

First, What the wicked man should turn from—*Wickedness.*

Secondly, What he should turn to—to do that which is lawful and right.

Thirdly, What will be the effect of such turning—*He shall save his soul alive.*

This he farther enforces by exhortations, to turn from

A Thoughtless	}	State.
A Prayerless		
An Insensible		

O Sir, when will you forbear, when will you acknowledge your rash censures? It is true, the faithful ministers of Christ usually choose such portions of scripture to preach upon, as give them opportunity of speaking largely upon the freeness, fullness and all-sufficiency of the gospel salvation, and herein they strictly adhere to the Apostle's example, who determined to know nothing but Jesus Christ, and him crucified. Like a wise master-builder, he first laid the foundation in faith, and then raised the superstructure in holiness; and every one who is an ambassador, commissioned by God himself, will go and do likewise.



cerning Jesus's love in their mouths, and a warm zeal for party on their hearts.

Again,

---

But it should seem by what follows, that to preach upon the covenant of grace, and upon the distinct offices which each of the Persons in the Trinity sustains in this covenant, gives particular disgust to the Vindicator, who cannot mention the subject without a sneer at the boldness of such preachers; who, he tells us, *“speak of it as confidently as if the King of Kings had admitted them members of his privy-council.”* But though they make no pretensions of this sort, yet they believe, that whatever was decreed in God's council from all eternity, concerning his church and people, is now revealed in his word, from which, by the help of his spirit, his mind and will may be evidently known; and from the discoveries they there meet with concerning that glorious covenant which is ordered in all things and sure, they believe that necessity is laid upon them to speak of it to their hearers, as what should be all their salvation and all their desire. And I think this cannot be done in a clearer manner than by Mr. Romaine, in what you justly style his *edifying paraphrase on the 107th Psalm*; from which, (as you express so great a liking for it), I beg to present you with the following abstract: “The holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, out of infinite love and compassion, were pleased to agree upon this plan, and to sustain distinct offices in the œconomy of it; and as their persons are equally infinite, their œconomical actions must consequently be equally infinite. God the father covenanted to demand perfect satisfaction for sin, and to accept the perfect satisfaction made by the obedience and sufferings of God the son, which he covenanted to make in our stead, and as our representative in the human nature. And God the holy spirit covenanted to render the obedience and sufferings of Christ effectual to believers, and by his grace to carry on the whole work of redemption in their hearts. St. Paul assures us, that the covenant of grace, which is the fountain of all mercy, was made before the foundation of the world, &c.” *Mr. Romaine on the 107th Psalm.*

This Mr. F——r and I both agree to be an *edifying* account of the covenant of grace. However, I fear we shall not get Mr. Wesley to be of our opinion; for, in his letter to Mr. Hervey, he absolutely denies, over and over, that there ever was any such covenant between the persons in the Trinity; and that the new covenant was not made with Christ, but with David (which therefore must mean David according to the flesh). However, Mr. Hervey, in his eleven letters in answer to Mr. Wesley, has admirably proved this important doctrine, by the most irrefragable testimony of scripture; to which letters, for brevity's sake, I refer the reader. But did I say, I was fearful we should not get Mr. Wesley to be of our opinion? Surely, it was because I did not well consider what Mr. Wesley has affirmed in his note on Isa. lv. 3, where speaking expressly on the covenant of grace  
and



Again, Are you in the number of those who give their congregations particular accounts of the covenant between the persons of

---

and peace made between God and David, he says, "David here seems to be put for the son of David;" and, in his note on the next verse, positively asserts, that "This David is Christ."

In his Christian Library, vol. XLVII. p. 62, Mr. Wesley is still more explicit on this head; for he there says, "That Christ may be looked upon not only as a surety, but as a party in this covenant of grace, being not only bound to God, but likewise covenanting with him for us."

But how shall I reconcile your high approbation of Mr. Romaine's Paraphrase on the 107th Psalm, with your saying, "How rarely do the ministers who are fond of preaching upon the covenant between God and David speak of it in a practical manner, or dwell upon such scriptures as these!" *Because they continued not in my covenant, I regarded them not; because they have transgressed the law, changed the ordinances, and broken the everlasting covenant, therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, &c. &c. They kept not the covenant of God, and refused to walk in his law; therefore, a fire was kindled in Jacob, the wrath of God came upon them, he slew the fattest of them, and smote down the chosen of Israel.*

Now, Sir, are you not aware that this is not the new covenant, the covenant of grace, which is spoken of in these texts; but that very covenant which the Apostle tells us was *not faultless*, and which giveth place to that second and better covenant which was established upon *better promises*? "Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: And I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." Heb. viii. Here, Sir, is Christ in all his offices: 1st. As a Prophet, to teach his people; "They shall not teach every man his brother, for they all shall know me;" 2dly. As a Priest, to atone for them: "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness and their sins, &c." 3dly. As a King, to change their hearts, and to rule over them and in them: "I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts."

But you may say, how can the old covenant, which was broken and which *vanisheth away*, be called the *everlasting covenant*? I answer, because the law is *everlasting*, both in its nature and in its demands.

of the blessed Trinity; and speak of it as confidently as if the King of Kings had admitted them members of his privy-council? You know, Sir, that you have no need to fear the scourge of your own pen in these particulars; therefore, whilst you would make weak bigots admire your *voluntary humility* in not excepting yourself from the charges which you bring against your brethren in the ministry, it is well if you feel nothing of the ticklings of self-applause, which would constrain you to *go up to the Temple*, and thank God that you are totally free from the fashionable shibboleth of that *finished salvation*, which is the *stalking-horse of every wild raxter*.

But as you would seem, at least, to wish that your own sin, as a minister, should be confessed, with that of your brethren, let me exhort you to begin that confession *with tears of shame*. 1st, For the bitter spirit in which you have attacked a person of Mr. Shirley's amiable and meek character. 2dly, For the great misrepresentations and perversions which you have been guilty of. 3dly, For handling the word of God deceitfully, and villifying the doctrines of free sovereign grace; such as election, perseverance, that man has naturally no free-will to good, and justification by Christ's imputed Righteousness. 4thly, For flying in the face of the tender mother that nourishes you, the church of England, and writing against almost all her doctrinal articles to which you have solemnly set your hand (I). And when you have done this, I shall believe that your

---

demands. — But for farther satisfaction on this point, see Vitringa on Isa. xxiv. 5. See also Isa. lix. 1—15. Ezek. xxii. 7—14, &c.

I hope this is sufficient apology for ministers to preach upon the covenant of grace, and to declare that it is indeed ordered in all things and sure.

I know nothing of what Mr. F——r alludes to by Mr. Wesley being attacked in the Gospel Magazine; but this I remember, that some strictures were made in that magazine upon Mr. Wesley's sermon on Mr. Whitefield's death; and that thereupon Mr. Wesley began a very hot attack upon Mr. Romaine in the public papers; though Mr. Romaine declared, that, so far from being the author or inserter of the strictures, he did not so much as see them till after their publication.

(I) Our ninth article, setting forth the total apostacy of human nature, is contradicted by supposing there is any power left in man to do conditional works, in order to obtain favor with God. It is also peremptorily contradicted by the doctrine of sinless perfection; forasmuch as the article teacheth, "That the flesh lusteth ALWAYS  
" contrary to the spirit; and that this infection of nature doth re-  
" main,

your reproofs are levelled at yourself, as well as at others of your brethren.

“ main, yea, in them that are regenerate, whereby the lust of the flesh (*απόρρητα σαρκός*) is not subject to the law of God; and that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.”

The tenth article is flatly contradicted by the doctrine of free-will.

The eleventh article is as flatly opposed by the conceit of *merit* and conditional works.

The twelfth article is again contradicted by the notion of sinless perfection; for that article affirms, that even the works of believers *cannot bear the severity of God's judgment*; but if they are without sin, they certainly *can* bear the severity of God's judgment.

The thirteenth article is cried down by teaching, that sinners are to do something in order to justification, and to obtain favour with God; whereas that article declares, that works before justification *are not pleasant to God, but have in them the nature of sin.*

Again, The fifteenth article, of *Christ alone without sin*, is contradicted, point blank, by that monstrous doctrine of sinless perfection; since this article teaches, “*That all we, though baptised, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us*.” Alas! that our Reformers should thus whet the Antinomian appetite of their hearers, by making them believe that *sin shall always dwell in the inner chamber of the heart!*

The sixteenth article, which says, “*They are to be condemned who say they can no more sin as long as they live here,*” is also positively confidently contradicted by the Perfectionists.

As to the seventeenth article, Mr. F——r and Mr. Wesley have not only *printed* and *preached* against it, but Mr. Wesley has loaded with the name of horrible blasphemers, every one who believes it; and to crown all, with the same hand which subscribed to the truth of it, as a godly doctrine, full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort, has maintained that it makes God worse than the devil. Sermon, entitled *Free Grace*.

How these gentlemen can answer it to their consciences, as ordained ministers of the Established Church, (and especially as pleaders for perfection) thus to oppose all her most essential doctrines, I leave to their own mature consideration.

And here I would also observe, that Mr. F——r gives us very wrong ideas of the case, in his *Vindication* (p. 15), when he says, that the Lambeth articles were *rejected* by our governors in church and state. The fact is simply as follows: When king James the first was moved by Dr. Reynolds, at the Hampton-Court Conference, to insert those articles, his majesty replied, that there was no want of them, “*as the doctrine they contained was already sufficiently established by the 17th article.*” A pregnant-proof this, in what light our governors, in church and state, would have looked upon any man who should endeavour to put an Arminian interpretation upon that article.

All



All I shall say with regard to your quotations from Dr. Crisp is, that although I firmly believe the Doctor to have been a great and a good man, (and as far from real Antinomianism as Mr. Wesley is from Calvinism,) yet it is certain, that some of his expressions are very unguarded. However, notwithstanding you have picked and culled his sentences, without any reference to what goes before, or follows after, in order to place them in the most disadvantageous light; I say, notwithstanding you have acted in this unfair manner, you have really pitched upon some places, which, if not the very words of Scripture, are at least the plain sense of it. To instance only in a few particulars, among many others which might be brought: Dr. Crisp says, "All our righteousness is filthy." The prophet Isaiah says, *All our righteousnesses are as FILTHY rags.* Isa. lxiv. 6.—"Christ does all his work for him, as well as in him that believes." Dr. Crisp. *Lord, thou wilt ordain peace FOR us; for thou hast wrought all our works IN us.* Isa. xxvi. 12. *For their sakes I sanctify myself.* John xvii. 19. *It is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure.* Phil. ii. 13.—"There is no better way to know your portion in Christ, than upon the general tender of the gospel to conclude absolutely he is yours." Dr. Crisp. *Whoever will, let him take the water of life freely.* Rev. xxii. 17.—"A man (a believer) does sin against God. God reckons not his sin to be his, he reckons it Christ's, therefore he can not reckon it his." Dr. Crisp.—Mr. Wesley says nearly the very same words in that hymn just re-published in his new collection: *Jesu, thou art my righteousness, for all my sins were thine.* David bears Dr. Crisp and Mr. Wesley both out in these expressions, by saying, *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord IMPUTETH NO sin;* and St. John affirms, *If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins.* St. Paul saith, *He hath made him sin for us.* And, indeed, if the sins of God's children are not reckoned to Christ, then he loses his character and office as their surety; and their sins being reckoned to themselves, they must necessarily come into condemnation every hour and moment of their lives, unless they are in the number of those perfect ones, in whom *no one sinful thought can rise (K); no wrinkle of infirmity, no spot of sin remains; yea, in whom in-dwell-*

---

(K) This and the following passages allude to Hymns and Sacred Poems by Mr. J. and C. Wesley, vol. II. p. 216, 233, 299, and vol. II. p. 287.



*ing sin hath no place at all, they having received Christ in a pure and sinless heart.*

But not to dwell any longer upon this point, I will let you take the strongest expressions that can be collected out of Dr. Crisp's writings, and will engage to match them, and doubly match them, from the works of Mr. Wesley, even since he has *done leaning too much towards Calvinism*, and since he drew lots whether or no he should not *preach and print* against it. Take, for instance, that very *unguarded*, though not *ill-meant*, phrase of the Doctor's, "*There is no sin that a believer ever commits that can possibly do him any hurt.*" To this expression Mr. Wesley echoes his approbation in the following lines, which a dear friend of mine, who is a zealous preacher of *finished salvation*, left out of the hymn in his own collection (we may well suppose), as favouring too highly of *Crispianity*.

No! my best actions cannot save,  
But thou must purge e'en them;  
And (for in thee I now believe,)  
MY WORST CANNOT CONDEMN.

This is certainly strong meat; and, at least, equals Dr. Crisp. But what follows goes as much beyond the Doctor as the Doctor himself goes beyond the Minutes. For whereas Dr. Crisp only says, that the sins of a particular believer can do him no hurt; Mr. Wesley holds, that the sins of the whole world *cannot hurt him*: "This alone, this receiving Christ in the heart, maketh a man both holy and happy; and evidenceth that this true justification is only through faith, not through works: I say through faith, which apprehending Christ with all his goodness, challengeth and maketh it all his own. Then sin, death, the devil, and hell, give back affrighted; and, in much confusion, vanish away. And so powerful doth the merit of Christ through faith work, that **EVEN THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD CANNOT HURT SUCH AN ONE.**" Mr. Wesley's Christian Libr. vol. I. p. 200.

I agree with you, Sir, that it argued great irreverence, and even want of common decency in the man you allude to, (p. 63), who, when you were preaching last summer, not only disturbed all around him, but accused you, after service, of being a free-willer, and of praying as if all might be saved.

A similar incident befel a friend of mine, and nearly about the same time that you met with the ill usage you complain of. He had scarcely done preaching when a woman cried out, in the congregation, "This is not the voice of my beloved."

M

My

My friend took no notice of her at that instant; but asking a person near him who she was, he was answered, "She is one who for some time fancied herself perfect, and now the poor creature is gone quite crazy." My friend gave me leave to insert his name, and the place where the fact happened; but I told him it was not worth while, as I thought it absurd to the last degree, to draw any conclusions for or against particular doctrines, on account of the follies and extravagancies of individuals, who profess to believe or disbelieve those doctrines. You cannot however, be angry with me, Sir, if for once, after the example of the Vindicator, I have disgraced my page with so trifling an anecdote, which, I confess, proves nothing more than that, in every age and among every sort of professors of religion, fools and enthusiasts are sure to be found.

But upon second thoughts, I look upon both of THESE OBJECTORS AS MODEST, in comparison of some preachers who have subscribed to the ninth article of our church, which saith in the very words of St. Paul, that (*even in the regenerate*) *the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh*, and yet will sing hymns before a whole congregation in which they call God's faithful ministers *Satan's preachers, the Devil's factors, advocates for sin, servants of their lying Lord, members of the synagogue of Satan, children of the old roaring bellish murderer*, and many other Billingsgate names of the like import, because they give credit both to the Apostle and to the church of England, and affirm, that "*whilst we are in this tabernacle we groan, being burthened.*" I am sure "*if Christ* (as you say he did (p. 63) *came down from Heaven to preach the doctrine of perfection in his sermon upon the mount,*" if we were to judge them by their own words and expressions, we might almost think that such teachers came up from another place to sing against those who deny it. And this reminds me of an anecdote which happened not many months ago at D——n in the county of Salop, where one of Mr. Wesley's preachers told the congregation, (with as much confidence and assurance as if he were come express with the news) "that there were many souls now burning in the flames of hell, for whom the precious blood of Christ was shed." He also assured them, "that there were many souls upon earth as perfect as ever they would be in glory." And to crown all, said, "I know nothing of imputed righteousness, and I pray God I never may!" The consequence of this sermon was, that the hearers requested the preacher's absence for the time to come, many declaring that they would never hear him again; whereupon, he gave a practical comment upon his *perfect doctrine*,  
by

by falling into a *perfect* passion, and from that time has greatly obliged the people by keeping himself away from them.

BUT not only are our *free-grace preachers* all condemned, but our *evangelical congregations*, without exception of a single person, must all share the same fate, particularly if God has placed any of them above the common rank, so that they come into the class of what Mr. F——r stiles *our genteel believers*, and whom he so severely censures for having their houses furnished, and their persons clothed, suitable to their station in life. Now, though I would by no means be a pleader for luxury and extravagance, and would have every believer, let his condition be what it will, to keep on the side of moderation, and rather underdo than overdo; yet I can by no means adopt the levelling scheme, or set aside those distinctions, which are no less authorised by reason itself than by the word of God. Upon which account, I can see no more sin in a lady of fortune or quality, because she wears a silk, or brocade, or even jewels, if they don't affect the state of her heart, than I see it sinful in the wife of a labourer to wear a stuff or a linsey. A very humble heart may lie under a rich stomacher, and a very proud one may hardly have a rag to cover it. What you would particularly allude to by those *brittle vessels and toys, which the heathens themselves despised*, and what by *the Chinese characters over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall, (where any man that fears the God of Daniel may make out Antinomianism)* I am at a loss to discover, unless (for you are there speaking of costly furniture) you mean foreign china, or India figures upon the paper with which the *genteel believer's* room is hung. If I have guessed right, then permit me to say, that I think those among the few noble, mighty and honourable, whom God has chosen by his grace, have no more need to be ashamed of having china in their houses, or silver candlesticks upon a mahogany table, either for use or ornament, than those of a low degree need be ashamed of their earthen ware, or of their brass candlesticks upon an oaken stool.

It is true you have quoted a text or two, which on first view seem to countenance that *neglecting of the body*, which nevertheless is little better than *will-worship* or *voluntary humility*. Let me, therefore, ask you, Sir, in the words of my favourite author, Mr. Hervey, “ Do you rightly understand St. Paul  
“ in these places? Do you not dwindle his manly and noble  
“ ideas into a meanness and littleness of sense; such as befits  
“ the superstitious and contracted spirit of a hermit, rather  
“ than the generous and exalted spirit of a believer?



“ St. Paul does not forbid the use of pearl or costly array,  
 “ when a person’s circumstances will afford them, and his situa-  
 “ tion in life may require them; he rather cautions against the  
 “ abuse, against looking upon these glittering things as any part  
 “ of their true dignity, on which they value themselves, or  
 “ by which they would be recommended to others. The  
 “ word is not *εὐσεβῆσαι*, nor *φορεῖν*, *wear*, but *κοσμεῖν*, *adorn*;   
 “ the meaning therefore is, “ Let them not place their excel-  
 “ lency in such mean distinctions; not covet to distinguish  
 “ themselves by these superficial decorations; but rather by the  
 “ substantial ornaments of real godliness and good works,  
 “ which will render both them and their religion truly ami-  
 “ able.” Letter X. p. 263.

To the same purpose Luther. “ These things sufficiently  
 “ declare who be the true Saints indeed, and which is to be  
 “ called an holy life; not the life of those which lurk in caves  
 “ and dens, which make their bodies lean with fasting, which  
 “ wear hair-cloth, and do other like things with this persua-  
 “ sion and trust, that they shall have some singular reward in  
 “ Heaven above all other Christians; but of those which be  
 “ baptized and believe in Christ, which put off the old man,  
 “ with his works, but not at once, for concupiscence and lust  
 “ remain in them as long as they live: the feeling whereof  
 “ doth hurt them nothing at all if they suffer it not to reign in  
 “ them, but subdue it to the spirit.” *Luther on Galat.*

Again, If they rightly understood these things “ they (the  
 “ monks) would not so highly esteem their own superstitions,  
 “ to go with an heavy countenance, hanging down the head,  
 “ to live unmarried, to live on bread and water, to be poorly  
 “ apparelled, &c. &c. These monstrous and superstitious  
 “ works they have devised and chosen to themselves, God  
 “ neither commanding, nor approving the same. So great  
 “ is the blindness of man’s reason, that it is unable not only to  
 “ judge rightly of the doctrine of faith, but also of external  
 “ conversation and works; wherefore, we must fight strongly  
 “ against the counterfeit visor and holy show of our own *will-*  
 “ *works*, seem they never so excellent and holy. *Ibid.*

But whatever may be your opinion of *our genteel believers*,  
 and however hardly you may censure them for severity to the  
 poor, yet, blessed be God! I know many, even in an exalt-  
 ed sphere of life, that willingly condescend to do the lowest  
 offices for the lowest of their brethen: And if it would not  
 shock their humility, and fill them with an holy shame, to  
 have their names, works and labors of love, both to the souls  
 and



and bodies of their fellow-creatures, thus publicly mentioned, I could point out to you some distinguished Dorcases and Phebes, even in this our day (and, what you will think more extraordinary, such as make their boast in a *finished salvation*), who with their own hands administer medicines to the sick and needy; who themselves make garments for the naked; and who themselves joyfully visit garrets and sick beds, that they may not only relieve the bodily wants of the distressed, but may point them to Jesus, the great physician of souls. And if you think that Mr. Wesley's Arminian doctrine produces any better effects in his societies, the testimony of one of his own friends will assure you of the contrary, as appears from the following letter, which Mr. Wesley has printed in his Journal from May 1765 to May 1768, p. 108.

“ SIR,

“ I was yesterday led to hear, what God would say to me  
 “ by your mouth. You exhorted us, *strive to enter in at the*  
 “ *strait gate*. I am willing so to do. But I find, one chief  
 “ part of my striving, must be, to feed the hungry, to clothe  
 “ the naked, to instruct the ignorant, to visit the sick, and  
 “ such as are in prison, bound in misery and iron.

“ But if you purge out all who scorn such practices, or at  
 “ least are not found in them, how many will remain in your  
 “ society? I fear, **SCARCE ENOUGH TO CARRY**  
 “ **YOUR BODY TO THE GRAVE!** Alas, how many  
 “ even among those who are called believe:s, have plenty of  
 “ all the necessaries of life, and yet complain of poverty? How  
 “ many have houses, and lands, or bags of money, and yet  
 “ cannot find in their hearts to spare now and then to God's  
 “ poor a little piece of gold? How many have linen in plenty,  
 “ with three or four suits of clothes, and can see the poor go  
 “ naked? They will change them away for painted clay, or  
 “ let the moths devour them, before they will give them to  
 “ cover the nakedness of their poor brethren, many of whose  
 “ souls are clothed with glorious robes, though their bodies  
 “ are covered with rags. Pray, Sir, tell these, you cannot  
 “ believe they are Christians, unless they imitate Christ, in  
 “ doing good to all men, and hate covetousness, which is  
 “ idolatry.”

Mr. Wesley says in answer, “ I do tell them so.”—But to use Mr. Baxter's expression, so often adopted by Mr. F——r,  
 “ See what all this over-doing tends to.”

Do

Do not mistake me, Sir; I am far from blaming you for bearing open testimony against the lukewarm state of the church in general, and of professors in particular. God knows there is need of it; and I heartily wish that more of the genuine fruits of primitive faith and love abounded among us. But I blame you for the bitter, rash, sarcastic and uncharitable spirit which you have manifested; for the very severe, and very unjust reflections which you have either directly or indirectly thrown out against the celebrated and eminent ministers of the day; thereby hardening the hearts of your reader against them, instead of shewing yourself thankful for such burning and shining lights; and for having branded with Antinomianism the most glorious truths of the gospel.

I beg leave to conclude with an extract from a letter which I have just received from a worthy minister of Christ, concerning the state of a young person in his parish, who is now on the borders of eternity; and I do this, as having been myself (in some measure) an eye-witness of the sanctifying, practical effects, which the belief of the doctrines of free grace produced in her life and conversation. The following are my friend's own words:

“ P — C — y continues much the same as to her body,  
 “ and happy as any one can be out of Heaven in her soul. She  
 “ told me, she had not the least doubt of her salvation; that  
 “ she longed to be dissolved, and to be with Christ; that her  
 “ faith grew stronger every day; and that she could set her  
 “ seal as a witness to the truth of the doctrines preached to  
 “ her. I asked her then, whether she could take any comfort  
 “ from her duties, prayers, repentance, or her patience under  
 “ her affliction? Oh, no (said she); nothing but Christ; I  
 “ plead nothing in my behalf but his blood and righteousness.  
 “ I feel the sweet promises of his word applied to my heart in  
 “ the night season. Seeing her so firmly established upon the  
 “ sure foundation, I thought I might venture to ask her, how  
 “ she would be able to bear it, if any one should tell her, It  
 “ was needful for her to look to her graces and works, in  
 “ order to procure a second Justification at the bar of God?  
 “ Oh, Sir (said she), that would be robbing me of all my  
 “ comfort. If I did not believe in the *finished salvation* of  
 “ Jesus, I should give up all, and sink into despair; but now  
 “ I long for the time of my departure.”

Here, Sir, you have one instance, among many thousands which might be produced, of a soul triumphing in the views of death as a disarmed enemy, placing all her confidence in that

that *free grace, imputed righteousness, and finished salvation,* which you make the *impious plea* of an Antinomian reprobate; and declaring, that the very thought of a second Justification by her own works would tend to sink her into despair, and to rob her of all her comfort. The worst wish I harbour towards dear Mr. F——r is, that his latter end may be like hers; and that both he and I may be happy partakers of the same faith and patience, in the same awful hour of trial. With this prayer in my mouth, and I trust in my heart also, I subscribe myself,

Reverend Sir,

Your sincere Wellwisher of Christ's Sake,

The Author of P. O.

L E T T E R

---



---

L E T T E R VI.

REVEREND SIR,

**I** AM under the necessity of charging you with a most notorious perversion and misrepresentation of facts, in affirming, that the multitude of Puritan divines in the last century, and all the churches of Christ, are on the side of the Minutes, and of the Vindicator.

This charge I have as yet only confirmed by a general denial of your assertion; and as it will be impossible to cite all the confessions of the reformed churches abroad, or to bring quotations from all or half the Puritan divines of the last century, I must content myself with a few abstracts from the Confession of Faith established by the Westminster assembly, *anno 1648*, and signed by no less than one hundred and six Puritan divines, including eight commissioners from the kirk of Scotland, who were members of that assembly; and after each head, I shall give the tenets of the church of Rome, from the accurate Alexander Ross, that the reader may clearly see, whether you adhere most closely to the good old Puritan divines, or to that *son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, and whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming* (P).

Now whereas the Minutes are introduced by saying, “We have leaned too much towards Calvinism,” on the article of Predestination the assembly thus express themselves :

---

(P) By applying this passage of scripture to the Pope, I have given the reader the most common interpretation of it; though I think they have more argument on their side who apply it to Mahomet.

I. West-



I. Westminster Assembly on *Predestination and Election.*

“ Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God,  
“ before the foundation of the world was laid, according to  
“ his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel  
“ and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto  
“ everlasting glory, out of his mere free-grace and love,  
“ without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perse-  
“ verance in either of them, or any other thing in the crea-  
“ ture as conditions or causes moving him thereto, and all to  
“ the praise of his glorious grace.” *Confession of Faith.*

I. Church of Rome on *Predestination and Election.*

“ They (the Papists) hold election mutable, because, (say  
“ they) the elect may totally fall from faith and righteousness;  
“ and some of them hold, that foreseen works were the  
“ cause of election.” *Rofs on all Religions, p. 429.*

II. Westminster Assembly on *Free-will.*

“ Man by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all  
“ ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation;  
“ so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good,  
“ and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to con-  
“ vert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto.

“ When God converts a sinner, and translates him into  
“ the state of grace, he freeth him from his natural bondage  
“ under sin, and by his grace alone enables him freely to will  
“ and to do that which is spiritually good; yet so as that,  
“ by reason of his remaining corruption, he doth not per-  
“ fectly not only will that which is good, but doth also  
“ will that which is evil.” *Confession of Faith.*

II. Church of Rome on *Free-will.*

“ They (the Papists) hold, that an unregenerate man hath  
“ freedom of will in matters of salvation, though not with-  
“ out the help of grace; so that he may hinder or further  
“ his conversion, and may, by his natural power, co-operate  
“ with grace.” *Rofs on all Religions, p. 429.*

III. Westminster Assembly on *Justification.*

“ Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifi-  
“ fieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by  
“ pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their  
“ persons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them,

“ or done by them, but for Christ’s sake alone: not by  
 “ imputing faith itself, the act of believing (M), or any other  
 “ evangelical obedience to them as their righteousness, but by  
 “ imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them,  
 “ they receiving and resting on him, and on his righteousness  
 “ by faith, which faith they have not of themselves, it is the  
 “ gift of God.” *Confession of Faith.*

### III. Church of Rome on *Justification.*

“ They (the Papists) hold, that a man is justified by  
 “ works, not in the *first*, but *second* Justification.” *Ross on*  
*all Religions*, p. 429.

### IV. Westminster Assembly on *Sanctification.*

“ Sanctification is, throughout all the whole man, yet im-  
 “ perfect in this life; there abideth still some remnants of  
 “ corruption in every part; whence ariseth a continual and  
 “ irreconcilable war. The flesh lusteth against the spirit,  
 “ and the spirit against the flesh; in which war, although  
 “ the remaining corruption for a time may very much pre-  
 “ vail, yet, through the continual supply of strength from  
 “ the sanctifying spirit of Christ, the regenerate part doth  
 “ overcome; and so the saints grow in grace, perfecting ho-  
 “ linefs in the fear of God.” *Confession of Faith.*

### IV. Church of Rome on *Sanctification.*

“ They (the Papists) hold, that the good works of just  
 “ men are absolutely just, and in a manner *perfect*.  
 “ That concupiscence and ignorance are only *infirmities*.”  
*Ross on all Religions*, p. 429.

### V. Westminster Assembly on *Perseverance.*

“ They whom God hath accepted in the beloved, effectua-  
 “ ally called and sanctified by his spirit, can neither totally nor  
 “ finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly  
 “ persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved.—This  
 “ perseverance of the saints depends not upon their own free-  
 “ will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election,  
 “ &c.” *Confession of Faith.*

---

(M) Here Mr. Baxter’s creed, and that of *Mr. Ignorance*, and of several others, is declared to be unfound and heterodox.

## V. Church of Rome on Perseverance.

“ They (the Papists) hold, that justifying faith may be totally lost in the regenerate.” *Rofs on all Religions*, p. 431.

Now, let any man who has but the right use of his senses review the foregoing extracts, and compare them with the doctrines contained in *the Minutes*, and in the *Vindication*, and *Second Check to Antinomianism*, and let him then say, whether our worthy dissenting brethren have not cause to join me in the accusations which I have brought against you. Sure I am, that you have grieved many a pious heart among them, by fathering upon their venerable ancestors such a spurious offspring, as can only trace its descent from the loins of *the man of sin*, by whom it was begotten, out of *the mother of abominations*, the *scarlet Babylonish whore*, which *sitteth upon many waters*. What a pity is it, that, before Mr. F——r took upon him to enlist Mr. Whitefield and John Bunyan, together with all the Protestant churches and multitude of Puritan divines, under Mr. Wesley's banner, he did not pay a little more regard to the assertion with which he sets out; “ I do not admire the fashionable method of advancing general charges, without supporting them by particular proofs.” But whosoever can take upon him to extol Mr. Wesley as a man of sense, and a man of honour, for subscribing the 17th article, of Predestination, as “ a godly doctrine, and full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort;” whilst he believes it to be a most ungodly doctrine, full of horrible, black, and unspeakable blasphemy, will not stick at any difficulties which may be thrown in his way. But I should have remembered your assertion, Sir; “ At all events the Minutes must be vindicated.”

As you cannot but know out of what dunghill your doctrines are raked, in order that you may evade the name which justly belongs to the abettors of such tenets, and that you may the more easily impose upon the unwary reader, you begin by crying fire first, though you yourself have kindled the flame. However, that none may have their eyes blinded by this deceitful dust, I have, in the course of these letters, shewn, (from authors of the most approved authority) that your principles are really and truly those of the Romish church, and particularly of the order of the Jesuits (N);

---

(N) Whosoever has leisure and opportunity of consulting Bishop

and sorry indeed am I to say, that your unfair manner of writing, in order to support your tottering ark, bears but too much resemblance to the practice of that crafty set of designing men.

In your first performance (p. 82), you make it your prayer to God, "That he would defend you from such friends." i. e. Such as would enter their protest against the Minutes. This severe expression I took no notice of in my former address to you, but wrote to you as to a friend, to a brother, to a father in Christ. But, indeed, Sir, you have now taken most effectual methods, by your treatment of those friends, and of many others, who once sincerely loved and honoured you, to obtain an answer to your petition: for you have dressed them up in Devil's cloaths, as the Papists did John Hufs, and then burnt them for heretics in the flames of hell. Add to this, that you have hardened the hearts of all the ungodly against them, and given much occasion (as I can tell from my own knowledge) to all the unawakened clergy into whose hands your book has fallen, to rejoice over those humble, holy, laborious men of God, whose doctrines you have so horridly misrep-

Jewell's Apology for the church of England, against Harding the Jesuit; Doctor Andrew Willet's Synopsis of Popery; Bishop Downham upon Justification by the imputed Righteousness of Christ, against Cardinal Bellarmine; Bishop Hall's "No Peace with Rome;" and Doctor Fulke, or Mr. Cartwright against the Testament put out by the Jesuits of Rhemes, will find the whole system of Mr. Wesley's divinity strenuously contended for by the Papists, and fully and satisfactorily confuted by the above able champions for the Protestant faith. Nor do the decrees of the Council of Trent itself, against the reformed churches, less harmonize, in many respects, with the Minutes, and the two Vindications of them, than the articles of the church of England bear testimony against them. However, I do not affirm, that Mr. Wesley's opinions partake only of the Popish leaven; but if I were charged upon oath, to give the most exact account of them that I could, I must say, that they are a mixture of Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism, Arminianism, Popery, Mysticism, and Quakerism. As confessed Protestant divines, Mr. Wesley and the Vindicator stand quite alone; having adopted a scheme of religion, gathered out of all the above-named sects. And I am not afraid to challenge Mr. F——r, to fix upon one Protestant minister, either Puritan, or of the church of England, from the beginning of the Reformation, to the reign of Charles the second, who held the doctrines he has been contending for; and if he cannot do this, what must we think of his repeated assertions, that all the good old Puritan divines, and all the Protestant churches, are on his side.

sented,



sented, and whose characters you have so publicly aspersed, by treating them, I shall not say with want of *respectful love*, but with want of *common decency*. Excuse the warmth of my expression, Sir; and remember I have it from your own performance, p. 26.

Thus, Sir, have you put an insurmountable bar to all future union with those good men whom you have marked out as the objects of your resentment, till it shall please God to soften your spirit and to give you repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth. The only cement of Christian union is the love of God, and the foundation of that love must be laid in believing the truths of God: for, to use the words of Dr. Owen, in his *Display of Arminianism*, "An agreement without truth is no peace, but a covenant with death, and a conspiracy against the kingdom of Christ."

With my sincere wishes and prayers that God would give you and me a right judgment in all things, and enable us not only to embrace the saving truths of the gospel, but to drink deep into the spirit of its meek and blessed Author, I conclude,

Reverend Sir,

Your sincere Well-wisher,

Both for the Gospel and its Author's Sake,

The Author of P. O.

P O S T.

---



---

P O S T S C R I P T.

SINCE the foregoing sheets were finished, I received a letter from a judicious friend, desiring me to consult the place you refer to from Mr. Flavel, in your *Vindication* (p. 46); and adding in pretty strong terms, that you had most notoriously perverted the quotation. Hereupon I borrowed the book, and when I turned to the place alluded to, I was astonished beyond measure, to find how you had endeavoured to impose upon your readers. I could no longer blame my worthy and reverend friend for the expressions which had dropped from his pen, and particularly for his putting the question to me, "Could you have expected such dissimulation from "Madeley?"

The treatise which your mangled citation is taken from, may be found in the first vol. folio, of Mr. Flavel's works, p. 707, 708, 709. It is entitled, "*A Succinct and Seasonable Discourse of the occasions, causes, nature, rise, growth, and remedies of mental errors;*" and is signed by the seven following ministers; John How, Vin. Alsop, Nath. Mather, Increase Mather, John Turner, Rich. Bures, and Thomas Powel.

I should have been glad could I have transcribed the whole discourse, but on account of its length that will be impossible. However, the scope and design of it is to acquaint the reader that they (the ministers before-mentioned) had signed a paper, testifying their firm belief that Dr. Crisp's son had faithfully published his father's works to the world; that he had not acted the part of a Falsarius (to use their own expression); and that he would not say that was his father's which was not so. They declare however, that they did not give that certificate by way of approbation of *all* that is contained in the doctor's former works, printed many years before, but are well pleased these latter writings (of his) are published, as they contain many passages in them, that may in some measure remedy the hard and hurtful construction which many expressions were more liable

to in the former works; of whom the Doctor himself (they say) seemed apprehensive, as appears from his sermons on Titus ii. 11, 12, entitled, *Free-grace the Teacher of Good Works*. As to the character given here of the author, (Dr. Crisp) not only by some but by many good men, it is "that he was a learned, pious, good man."

I fear I shall not do justice to those divines, whose meaning you have so grossly perverted, if I content myself any farther with an abridgment of their discourse; and therefore must, for fear of inaccuracy, transcribe their own words, given us p. 708.

"Upon that view of Dr. Crisp's sermons we have had since the publication, we find there are many things said in them with that good favour, quickness and spirit, as to be very apt to make good impressions upon mens hearts; and do judge, that being greatly affected with the grace of God to sinners himself, his sermons did thereupon run much in that strain. All our minds are little and incomprehensive; we cannot receive the weight and impression of all necessary things at once, but with some inequality; so that when the seal goes deeper in some part, 'tis the shallower in some others.

"If some parts of Dr. Crisp's works be more liable to exception, the danger of hurt thereby seems in some measure obviated in some other: As, when he says, p. 46, vol. I. Sanctification of life is an inseparable companion with the justification of a person by the free-grace of Christ; and, vol. IV. p. 93, that in respect of the rules of righteousness, or the matter of obedience, we are under the law still, or else we are lawless, to live every man as seems good in his own eyes, which I know no true Christian dares so much as think."

In like manner, whereas, vol. II. Sermon. XV. and perhaps elsewhere, the Doctor seems to be against evidencing our justification and union to Christ by our sanctification and new obedience: we have the truth of God in this matter plainly delivered by him, vol. IV. p. 36, when he teacheth, that our obedience is a comfortable evidence of our being in Christ; and on that, as well as on many accounts, necessary (O).

---

(O) Whosoever will consult both the places referred to, will see the Doctor is by no means against evidencing our justification by our sanctification in either; tho' he affirms, that it is the *direct act* of faith which must bring comfort to the believer's soul.

"The

“ The difference between him, and *other good men*, seems  
 “ to be not so much in the things which the one or other of  
 “ them believes, as about their order and reference to one an-  
 “ other; where, it is true, there may be very material diffe-  
 “ rence: but we reckon, that, notwithstanding what is more  
 “ controvertible in these writings, there are much more ma-  
 “ terial things wherein they cannot but agree, and would have  
 “ come much nearer each other, even in these things, if they  
 “ did take some words or terms, which come into use on the  
 “ one or the other hand, in the same sense; but when one  
 “ uses a word in one sense, another uses the same word (or un-  
 “ derstands it being used) in quite another sense, here seems a  
 “ vast disagreement, which seems, at length, to be *verbal*  
 “ only, and *really* none at all.”

At the beginning of the next paragraph, we have the two expressions out of the Doctor's works which you have brought — The one is, that *salvation is not the end of any good work we do*; the other, that *we are to act from life, and not for life*. Both these expressions are vindicated, from any licentious meaning, by the seven Puritan Divines, (or, as you style them, *the body of Puritan Divines*), whose names are annexed, and are candidly interpreted by other explanatory passages in the Doctor's own works. They then point out, in the words which you have given us, (with the addition of three lines of your own, or thereabouts, not a word of which are to be found in the book (P), the *loose*, or, as they call it, the *rigid* sense, in which these two expressions are capable of being taken by *harsh* and *uncharitable* men. And, after having done this, they add the following conclusion, drawn from the foregoing premises, which you have wholly omitted, and given your readers that very conclusion against Dr. Crisp, which these old, pious divines have affirmed (to keep still to their own words) “ *is not WITH ANY TOLERABLE CHARITY supposable.*” — Their words are these: “ But let none be so *harsh* as to think  
 “ of any *good man*, that he intended any thing of all this. If  
 “ every passage that falls from us be *stretched and tortured with*  
 “ *the utmost severity*, we shall find little to do besides accusing  
 “ others, and defending ourselves as long as we live.” p. 709.

---

(P) Mr. F — r has not, indeed, put commas to these three lines, expressly to mark them for a quotation; but he has annexed them to the extract; and then, after his own addition, (and not immediately after the real quotation,) he has written, “ Preface to Mr. Flavel's book against Antinomianism.”

Thus



Thus, Sir, all you get by bringing the quotation in question, is, that every reader cannot help condemning the unhandsome manner of your proceeding; and, in the sense of that very body of Puritan Divines you would make the world believe have ratified your censures against Dr. Crisp, you have not only stretched and tortured the words of a good man with the utmost severity, but have acted with an harshness, and want of charity, which, in their opinion, was not only INTOLERABLE, but even not supposable.—However, I assure you, Sir, I am very willing to hearken to any thing you have to offer in vindication of yourself on this head. I am inclined to hope you made the extract from some other writer who has misled you, and not from Flavel himself. And, with regard to the false quotation you have given us from the Minutes, I would flatter myself that you wrote it (as you thought) from memory, without having the original before your eyes. But then, how can we exculpate Mr. Wesley, to whom the correction of your book was submitted? Yet far be it from me to deviate so widely from the rules of politeness, as to say either to Mr. Wesley or to Mr. F——, upon this occasion, what Mr. Wesley himself once said upon a similar one to a great dignitary of the church, “ ’Tis well for you that FORGING QUOTATIONS is not a felony (Q).”

ALL I have to observe upon your Postscript, relative to the Paris conversation, is, that the very reason why you object to the Friar's testimony, as making nothing against the Minutes (viz. that in Paris 50,000 recruits might have been raised against the Bible itself) is the most forcible argument imaginable against your doctrine; for, if it be a truth, that the inhabitants of that city are all in league against the pure word of God and the doctrines of the Reformation, then how much more opposite to these must the Minutes be, when even a Popish Monk could say, “ the author of those Minutes is a Pelagian.” “ The tenets of the church of Rome are nearer to the Protestants than those contained in that paper?” Add to this, that the order of Benedictins is not one of those that embraces the opinion of the Jansenists, but abides by the decisions of the Council of Trent; and, therefore, the conclusion drawn from the dialogue is but too just; viz. that “ Popery is about the midway between Protestantism and Mr. John Wesley.” However, the poor Benedictin friar must needs be dubbed a

---

(Q) Mr. Wesley's second letter to the Author of the Enthusiasm and Methodists compared, p. 13.

Crispian heretic for dissenting from Mr. Wesley; though there is not the least tendency to Antinomian principles in any thing that he spoke.

I say no more on the subject of this dialogue: But, because some persons may have imagined, from a paragraph which appeared in the same pamphlet, that Mr. Shirley had not sufficient authority for the insertion of my name, I beg to add, that though I was not present when the circular letter was completed, yet I was in company with Mr. Shirley, and several other friends, when the rough draft of that letter, in substance the same with the printed one, was drawn up; and, therefore, if any readers have supposed that Mr. Shirley did what was done without my knowledge, I beg to undeceive such, and to throw all the blame upon myself. And, indeed, the more I consider the dreadful tendency of the Minutes, and that all serious, religious persons are indiscriminately ranked under the name of Methodists, the more am I convinced of the necessity there was that they who desire to give all the glory of their salvation to Christ alone, should openly testify their disapprobation of all such tenets as would nullify the grace of God, and turn the Gospel itself into a covenant of works.

THE

---

A  
F A R R A G O  
O F

HOT AND COLD MEDICINES.

By the Rev. Mr. JOHN WESLEY,

Author of the PRESERVATIVE against UNSETTLED  
NOTIONS IN RELIGION.

Extracted from his OWN PUBLICATIONS.

---

Doth a fountain send forth, at the same place, sweet waters  
and bitter?"

James iii. 11.

A double-minded man is unstable in all his ways. James i. 8.

Ever learning, but never able to come to the knowledge of  
the truth.

2 Tim. iii. 7.

The testimony of the Spirit is uniform, and free from con-  
tradictions.

*Mr. Wesley's Christ. Lib. vol. XXXVI. p. 138.*

Contradiction, didst thou ever know so trusty a friend, or so  
faithful a devotee? Many people are ready enough to contra-  
dict others; but it seems all one to this gentleman, whether  
it be another or himself, so he may but contradict.

*Mr. Hervey's Letters to Mr. Wesley.*

---

---

Λ

A R R I G O

o r

THE GARDEN OF EDEN

BY JOHN MILTON

IN TWO BOOKS

WITH A PREFACE

BY JOHN MILTON

---

Printed by W. Stansfeld, at the University Press, Cambridge.

1841.

Price 1s. 6d.

THE GARDEN OF EDEN

BY JOHN MILTON

IN TWO BOOKS



“The first thing, that, by the grace of God, I am resolved to do, in reference to my everlasting state, is to see my faith, that it be both rightly placed, and firmly fixed, that I may not be as a wave, tossed to and fro, with every wind of doctrine, by the cunning craftiness of those that lie in wait to deceive; but that I may be thoroughly settled in my faith concerning those things, the knowledge of which is absolutely necessary to my future happiness. Let, therefore what times soever come upon me, let what temptations soever be thrown upon me, I am resolved, by the Grace of God, stedfastly to believe as followeth.”

*Mr. Wesley's Christian Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 9.*

For Election and  
Perseverance.

**T**HE godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ, is *full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable COMFORT.*

They that be endued with so excellent a benefit walk religiously in **GOOD WORKS(R).**

I believe there is a state attainable in this life, from which a man **CANNOT FINALLY FALL.**

*Jour. from Sept. 1741, to Oct. 1743, reprinted anno 1769.*

Sav'd **BEYOND THE DREAD OF FALLING,**  
Let us rise, to the prize,  
Of our glorious calling.

*Mr. Wesley's Hymns and Spirit. Songs, published an. 1771, p. 6.*

Against Election and  
Perseverance.

**T**HE horrible blasphemous doctrine of predestination and election is not of God, for it makes him worse than the Devil. It is an **UNCOMFORTABLE** doctrine. It directly tends to destroy our zeal for **GOOD WORKS(S).**

One who is a true believer, or in other words, one who is holy and righteous in the judgment of God himself, may nevertheless **FINALLY FALL FROM GRACE.**

*Predestination calmly Considered.*

Those who live by faith *may* yet **FALL FROM GOD,** and perish everlastingly.

*Mr. Wesley's Serious Thoughts on the Perseverance of the Saints.*

(R) This article Mr. Wesley subscribes *ex animo*, from his heart, declaring, that he believes it *to be agreeable to the word of God*, can. xxxvi. I might, as I proceed, draw the same contrast in many other of our doctrinal articles, but let this suffice for a specimen.

(S) This is the language of that very sermon of Mr. Wesley's, on Rom. viii. 32, concerning which he drew lots, whether or no he should preach against what his own hand had subscribed.

For Election and  
Perseverance.

I DO NOT DENY, that all those eminently styled the Elect, will intallibly persevere (T).

*Journal from Sept. 1741, to Oct. 1743, reprinted anno 1769.*

We clap our hands, exulting  
In thine almighty favour;  
The love divine,  
That made us thine,  
Shall keep us thine for ever.

*Select Hymns, with tunes annexed, p. 120.*

From all eternity, with love  
UNCHANGABLE thou  
hast me view'd;  
Ere knew this beating heart to  
move,

Thy tender mercies me pursu'd!  
*Hymns, printed at London, 1756.*

Our glorified head,  
His Spirit hath shed,  
With his people to stay,  
And NEVER again will he  
take him away.

*Hymns and Spiritual Songs, p. 7*

Against Election and  
Perseverance.

ST. PAUL DOES NOT DENY, that a believer may fall away, and be cut off between his special calling and his glorification; NEITHER DOES HE DENY, that many are called, who never are justified.

*Wesley on N. Test. Rom. viii. 30*

“ I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee.” Do these words assert, that no righteous man ever turned from his righteousness? no such thing.

Again, He who is a child of God to-day, may be a child of the devil to-morrow.

*Thoughts on the Perseverance of the Saints.*

One, even of them whom God had given him, is lost; so far was that decree from being UNCHANGEABLE.

*Wesley's note on John xvii. 12.*

Those who have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, of the witness, and the fruits of the Spirit, may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlastingly.

*Thoughts on the Perseverance of Saints.*

He

Having

(T) By those eminently styled the Elect, I suppose, Mr. Wesley means the same as in his hymns he calls,

Th' election of peculiar grace,  
The chosen priests, the royal race.

*Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II. p. 187.*

For Election and  
Perseverance.

He will perform the work begun,  
Jesus, the sinners friend;  
Jesus, the lover of his own,  
Will love ME to the end.  
*Hymns and Sacred Poems*, vol. II.  
p. 178.

Thus is Christ among spiri-  
tual things in THE ELECT  
WORLD of his Church.  
*Christ. Lib.* vol. XXXV. p. 72.

Against Election and  
Perseverance.

*Having loved his own*, name-  
ly, THE APOSTLES, as the  
very next words, *which were in  
the world*, evidently shew, he  
loved THEM unto the end of  
of his life.

*See Mr. Wesley's note on John  
xiii. 1. and Thoughts on the  
Persev. of Saints.*

To say that the whole world,  
in St. John's words, means the  
whole WORLD OF THE  
ELECT, is a shameless sense-  
less perversion.

*Doct. of Predest. Elect. and  
Reprob.* p. 11.

For  
Sinless Perfection.

THE Son hath made them  
who are thus born of  
God free from that great root  
of sin and bitterness, PRIDE.

*Preface to Hymns and Sacred  
Poems*, vol. I. p. 159, print-  
ed at London, 1756.

They, who are thus born of  
God, are FREED FROM  
SELF-WILL; as desiring no-  
thing, no, not for one moment,  
(for perfect love casteth out all  
desire,) but the holy and per-  
fect WILL OF GOD. *Ibid.*

Evil

Against  
Sinless Perfection.

THEY (the children of  
God) are daily sensible  
of sin remaining in their hearts;  
PRIDE, &c. &c.

*Mr. Wesley's Sermon on 2 Cor.  
v. 17. entitled, In-dwelling  
Sin.*

It is the constant experience  
of the children of God, that  
they feel A WILL not wholly  
resigned to the WILL OF  
GOD. *Ibid.*

God's

For  
Sinless Perfection.

Evil shall not here abide,  
Sin shall have NO PLACE  
in me;  
From th' iniquity of PRIDE,  
And SELF I shall be free.  
*Hymns and Sac. Poems.*

They (true believers) are freed from **W A N D E R - I N G S** in prayer. Whenever they pour out their hearts in **A MORE IMMEDIATE MANNER BEFORE GOD**, they have no thought of any thing past, or absent, or to come, but of God alone; to whom their whole souls flow in one even stream, and in whom they are swallowed up. In times past they had **W A N D E R I N G T H O U G H T S** darted in, which yet fled away like smoke; but now the smoke does not rise at all.

*Pref. to Hymns and Sac. Poems.*

Christians are saved in this world **FROM ALL SIN, FROM ALL UNRIGHTEOUSNESS.**

They are now in such sense perfect as not to commit sin, and to be freed from **ALL EVIL THOUGHTS AND EVIL TEMPER.**

*Mr. Wesley's Sermon on Phil. iii. 12. Not as though I had already attained or were already perfect.*

They

Against  
Sinless Perfection.

God's children are daily sensible of sin remaining in their hearts, **PRIDE, SELF-WILL, &c.**

*Mr. Wesley's Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17, entitled, In-dwelling Sin.*

Believers in Christ feel more or less of pride, or self-will ~~stealing in, and mixing with~~ their best duties, even in **THEIR MORE IMMEDIATE INTERCOURSE WITH GOD**, when they assemble themselves in the great congregation, and when they pour out their souls in secret to him who seeth all the thoughts and intents of their hearts. They are continually ashamed of their **W A N D E R I N G T H O U G H T S**, or of the deadness and dullness of their affections.

*Wesley's Sermon on Rom. viii. 1.*

I am **ALL UNRIGHTEOUSNESS;**  
False and **FULL OF SIN** I am.

*Mr. Wesley's Hymns.*

That the corruption of nature doth still remain, even in those who are the children of God by faith, that they have in them the seeds of **PRIDE AND VANITY, OF ANGER, LUST, AND EVIL DESIRE, YEA, SIN OF EVERY KIND**, is too plain to be denied, being matter of daily experience.

*Serm. on Rom. viii. 1.*

St.



**For  
Sinless Perfection.**

They (true believers) are freed from evil thoughts, so that they cannot enter into them, no, not for one instant. Aforetime, when an evil thought came in, they looked up and it vanished away, but now it does not come in.

*Preface to Hymns and Sacred Poems.*

Our blessed Lord had no evil or sinful thought, nor indeed was capable of having any; and even hence it follows that neither have real Christians, for every one that is perfect is as his master. Therefore, if he was free from evil or sinful thoughts, so are they like wife. (R)

*Serm. on Phil. iii. 12, Not as though I had already attained.*

Mr. Wesley being asked by the querist, "Do you keep the **WHOLE LAW** without offending in one point?" replies, "I believe some would answer, **WE TRUST WE DO KEEP THE WHOLE LAW OF LOVE.**"

Being

**Against  
Sinless Perfection.**

St. Paul is speaking to believers, and describing the state of believers in general, when he says, "the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other."

Nothing can be more express: The Apostle here directly affirms that the flesh, the evil nature, opposes the spirit even in believers.

*Serm. on 2 Cor. v. 17.*

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

*Serm. on 2 Cor. v. 17.*

Believers in Christ are conscious of not fulfilling **THE PERFECT LAW**, either in their thoughts, or words, or works.

*Serm. on Rom. viii. 1.*

They

(R) Mr. Wesley might as well have said, that because Christ was God, so are they likewise.

For  
Sinless Perfection.

Being asked again, "Do you  
"love God as well as you ought  
"to love him, and serve him  
"as he ought to be served?"  
To this Mr. Wesley answers,  
"I LOVE HIM WITH  
"ALL MY HEART, AND  
"SERVE HIM WITH ALL  
"MY STRENGTH."

When he to my heart comes in  
Thou shalt there no longer  
be;  
From that hour, IN-DWELL-  
ING SIN,  
Thou hast *no place* in me.  
*Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II.*  
p. 287.

With sin and Satan ever near,  
A SINLESS LIFE WE  
LIVE.  
*Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II.*  
p. 287.

Whilst one evil thought can  
rise  
I AM NOT BORN  
AGAIN (S).  
*Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II.*  
p. 216. Printed at London,  
1756.

The

Against  
Sinless Perfection.

They (believers) know they  
DO NOT LOVE THE  
LORD THEIR GOD  
WITH ALL THEIR  
HEART, AND MIND,  
AND SOUL, AND  
STRENGTH.

*Serm. on Rom. viii. 1.*

That believers are delivered  
from the *guilt* of sin we allow,  
that they are delivered from the  
BEING of it we deny. *Ibid.*

Purified Christians are they  
that are most sensible of their  
impurity. Therefore, I called  
*not* this AN UNIVERSAL  
FREEDOM FROM POL-  
LUTION, but an universal  
detestation of it.

*Christian Library, vol. XXXV.*  
p. 19.

Though we readily acknow-  
ledge he that believeth is BORN  
OF GOD, and that he that is  
born of God doth not commit  
sin; yet, we cannot allow *that*  
*he does not feel it within.*

*Serm. on Mark i. 15.*

That

(S) We see by this and several other of the like expressions, that  
the author of these hymns did not, at the time of writing them, al-  
low any one could be a believer, even in the lowest sense of the word,  
whilst



**For  
Sinless Perfection.**

From EVERY EVIL MO-  
TION freed,  
(The Son hath made us free)  
On all the powers of hell we  
tread,  
In glorious liberty.  
*Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II.  
p. 243.*

God shall in thy flesh appear,  
And make an end of sin.  
All the struggle then is o'er,  
And wars and fighting cease;  
Israel then shall sin no more,  
But dwell in perfect peace.  
*Ibid.*

No wrinkle of infirmity,  
No spot of sin remains.  
*Ibid. p. 299.*

**Against  
Sinless Perfection.**

How naturally do those who  
experience such a change ima-  
gine that all sin is gone; that  
it is utterly rooted out of their  
hearts, and has no more any place  
therein? How easily do they  
draw that inference, *I feel no sin,*  
therefore *I have none*; it does  
not *stir*, therefore it does not  
*exist*; it has **NO MOTION**,  
therefore it has no *being*? But  
it is seldom long before they are  
undeceived, finding sin was only  
suspended, not destroyed.

*Serm. on Eph. ii. 8.*

This doctrine (that there is  
no sin in the regenerate) is at-  
tended with the most fatal con-  
sequences. It cuts off all watch-  
ing against our evil nature,  
against the Delilah, which we  
are told is gone, though she  
is still lying in our bosom.  
It tears away the shield of  
weak believers, deprives them  
of their faith, and so leaves  
them exposed to all the assaults  
of the world, the flesh, and the  
Devil.

*Serm. on 2 Cor. v. 17.*

Our

The

bable, that Mr. Wesley was the same day correcting the press both  
for and against Sinless Perfection, &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. I do not, in-  
deed, pretend to say which of these hymns were composed by Mr.  
John and which by Mr. Charles Wesley; however, as their names  
stand jointly prefixed to the volumes, (two of which were printed at  
London, two at Bristol) we are warranted to suppose that they con-  
tain their joint sentiments; unless we were to imagine that these two  
gentlemen are as contradictory to each other, as Mr. John Wesley is  
to himself.



For  
Sinless Perfection.

I WRESTLE NOT NOW, but  
trample on sin,  
For with me thou art, and shalt  
be within.

*Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II.  
p. 120.*

God is thine; disdain to fear  
**THE ENEMY WITHIN.**

*Ibid. p. 248.*

Our life is hid with Christ in  
God,

The agony is o'er;  
**WE WRESTLE NOT  
WITH FLESH AND  
BLOOD.**

We strive with sin no more.  
*Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II.  
p. 248.*

We dare not give our God the  
lie;

Saviour from sin, we thee  
receive;

Tho' SATAN'S SYNA-  
GOGUE deny,

We here a *sinless* life shall  
live.

*Ibid. vol. II. p. 292.*

Sin shall not always live,

**OR IN OUR FLESH RE-  
MAIN;**

We did not, Lord, receive  
The word of truth in vain.

*Ibid. vol. II, p. 267.*

Against  
Sinless Perfection.

The flesh, the evil nature, still  
remains (though subdued) and  
wars against the spirit. So  
much the more let us use all  
diligence in *fighting* the good  
fight of faith. So much the  
more earnestly let us watch  
and pray against **THE ENE-  
MY WITHIN**; the more  
earnestly let us take to our-  
selves and put on the whole  
armour of God, that although  
**WE WRESTLE BOTH  
WITH FLESH AND  
BLOOD**, and principalities  
and powers, and wicked spirits  
in high places, we may be able  
to stand in the evil day, and  
having done all, to stand.

*Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17.*

We must not so interpret the  
Apostle's words (*old things are  
past away; all things are be-  
come new*) as to make him  
contradict himself; and if we  
will make him consistent with  
himself, the plain meaning of  
the words is this: His old judg-  
ment (concerning Justifica-  
tion, holiness, happiness, in-  
deed, concerning the things of  
God in general) is now *past  
away*; so are his old desires,  
designs, affections, tempers and  
conversation; all these are  
undeniably become new, great-  
ly changed from what they  
were: and yet though they  
are new, they are not wholly  
new; still he feels, to his sor-  
row and shame, **REMAINS** of  
the old man. *Ibid.*

Nor

But

For  
Sinless Perfection.

Nor can, nor will I, comfort take  
In hearing SATAN's FACTORS plead;  
I cannot hug, like them, my chain,  
Or rest, if sin in me REMAIN.

Tell me no more, ye carnal faints,  
"The best must always strive with sin;  
"God will not answer *all* your wants,  
"God will not make you thoroughly clean;  
"Sin must have some unhal-  
low'd part,  
"Christ cannot fill up all the heart."

Can life and death together dwell?  
Can Christ with Belial e'er agree?  
Darkness with light, and heav'n with hell?  
Can both at once have place with me?  
Can I be Christ's and sin's abode,  
A den of thieves, and house of God?

No, Jesus, no! thou holy One;  
When thou shalt come, into my heart,  
I know that thou wilt reign alone,  
And sin for ever shall depart.  
*Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. II.*  
p. 107.

Do

Against  
Sinless Perfection.

But "they that are Christ's  
"have crucified the flesh, with  
"its affections and lusts;" they  
have so; yet it REMAINS  
in them still, and often strug-  
gles to break from the cross.  
*Sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17.*

But, (you object) a man  
cannot be clean, sanctified,  
holy, and at the same time un-  
clean, un sanctified, unholy:  
Indeed he may; so the Corin-  
thians were. Ye are washed,  
says the Apostle, ye are sancti-  
fied; and yet at the same time,  
in another sense of the word,  
they were un sanctified; they  
were not washed, nor inward-  
ly cleansed from envy, evil-  
furnishing, partiality. *Ibid.*

But sure they had not a new  
heart, and an old heart toge-  
ther. It is most sure they had.  
But could they be unholy while  
they were temples of the holy  
Ghost? Yes; that they were  
temples of the holy Ghost is  
certain; and it is equally cer-  
tain, they were in some de-  
gree carnal, that is, unholy.  
*Ibid.*

"Certainly a man cannot  
"be a new creature, and an  
"old creature at once."—Yes,  
he may; he may be partly  
renewed, which was the very  
case with those at Corinth.  
*Ibid.*

We

For  
Sinless Perfection.

Do not the best of men say, *We groan, being burdened* with the workings of in-bred corruption? "This is not the meaning of the text; the whole context shews, the cause of that groaning was their longing to be with Christ."

*Preservative, p. 224.*

He that is by faith born of God, sinneth not. Nor doth he sin by INFIRMITIES, whether in act, word, or thought; for his infirmities have no concurrence of his will; and without this, THEY ARE NOT PROPERLY SINS

*Sermon on Eph. ii. 8. p. 7.*

Against  
Sinless Perfection.

We groan, being burdened with numberless infirmities, temptations and sins.

*Mr. Wesley's note on the same text.*

If we say we have no sin now remaining, we deceive ourselves. *Many INFIRMITIES do remain, whereby we are daily subject to what are called sins of infirmity; and DOUBTLESS THEY ARE IN SOME SENSE SINS (T), as being transgressions of the perfect law; and with regard to these, it may be said of us all our lives, that in many things we offend all.*

*The same Sermon, on Eph. ii. 8. next page.*

I draw no contrast here concerning SINS OF SURPRIZE, Mr. Wesley not having yet determined, whether they bring the soul under condemnation or not. Take his own words: "It is more difficult to determine concerning those which are usually styled SINS OF SURPRIZE: As when any one,

(T) Mr. Wesley and Mr. F——r do not seem to have thoroughly settled this point yet: For whereas Mr. Wesley here says, that "they are in some sense sins;" Mr. F——r, on the contrary, calls them, "the INNOCENT INFIRMITIES INCIDENT TO FLESH AND BLOOD." *Vind. p. 12.* However, since this was written, I have seen another edition of the sermon, wherein this gross contradiction is expunged; though, in that I have in my possession, it stands exactly as I have transcribed it; and it is to be found in those lately printed, and now exposed to sale near the chapel in West-Street.

who

“ who commonly, in patience, possesses his soul, on a sudden  
 “ and violent temptation, speaks and acts in a manner not con-  
 “ sistent with the royal law, *thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy-*  
 “ *self.* Perhaps it is not easy to fix a general rule concerning  
 “ transgressions of this nature; we cannot say either that men  
 “ are or are not condemned for SINS OF SURPRIZE in gene-  
 “ ral.” *Sermon on Romans viii. 1.*

However, it is much to be wished, (for the good of society at least) that sins of surprize, and sins of infirmity too, were to be declared *mortal* at the next conference; since I am assured, upon the very best authority, that several persons who pretend to reverence Mr. Wesley, do not only fall into outrageous passions, but can even cozen and over-reach their neighbours, and then call these things *sins of surprize, little innocent infirmities of flesh and blood, and trifling transgressions of the law*, which do not destroy their perfection, and which none but mistaken Calvinists suppose will bring the soul under condemnation. But, reader, let me beg thee to weigh well the foregoing words of Mr. Wesley; “ We cannot say either that men are, or are not condemned for sins of surprize;” and yet, immediately before, he calls them *transgressions*, as here he calls them *sins*. Strange divinity this, for one, who, for near forty years past, has professed to believe, and to teach, that *sin is the transgression of the law; that the wages of sin is death; and that cursed is every one who continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.* But let us only consider what these unscriptural distinctions\* between venial and mortal sins, and the dividing and subdividing sins into “ sins of surprize, innocent infirmities of flesh and blood, trifling breaches of the law, mean sins (U), &c. &c.” must inevitably tend to; viz. to the very center of practical Antinomianism. For instance: One man provokes another by some injury, either real or imaginary; the other immediately flies into a violent passion, and knocks him down; when reprov'd for this, may he not answer, “ It is true, I have both spoken and acted unbecoming the royal law of love, but I did it in a sudden and violent temptation; therefore, I hope God will look upon it only as a *sin of surprize*, which will not bring me under condemnation?” Again, another man is rather too fond of liquor; he undesignedly falls into bad company, and there widely transgresseth the royal

---

(U) Hymns and Sacred Poems, printed at London, 1756, vol. II. p. 175.



law of temperance: being admonished of his fault, how easily may he urge, that what he did was partly through surprize, partly through infirmity?—A third, perhaps, is walking in the street, “in the twilight, in the evening, in the black and dark night;” like Bunyan’s Pilgrim, he is suddenly assaulted by *Wanton*, who desires him to treat her at the next tavern. The simple youth, void of understanding, complies; and, when warned of his danger and folly, makes the threefold plea of *surprize, infirmity, flesh and blood*.

This I say, Sir, is the evident tendency of your doctrine; and yet I still believe, that you would be grieved if you knew any persons who made such an use of it. Exercise then the same charity towards the preachers of free-grace; yea, even though you should see, that men of corrupt minds should turn that grace into lasciviousness, which *they* declare, upon scripture authority, teaches us, that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world. Again; never call the Calvinist ministers; (who, if I judge right, are pointed out by those who occupy our most celebrated pulpits; and if they are not, you will please to undeceive me) I say, never more call these ministers *Antinomians*, and pleaders for sin, after your attempts to undermine the authority of the law, which is the mind and transcript of God’s holy will, by speaking of such trifling breaches of that law, as it would argue a partiality in God, to suppose he would punish with his curse; or after talking of the *innocent infirmities of flesh and blood*, and of *sins of surprize*, which, it cannot be said, *do or do not bring a man under condemnation* (U).

Once more; what avails it that Mr. Wesley has preached and rode twenty miles before *some professors have left their downy pillow*, if this be the doctrine he teaches? Though he were to compass sea and land to make profelytes, and to rise as early as a Popish monk, or an Indian Bramin, still I venture to assert, he had much better sleep quietly, *imprisoned within his bed-curtains*, than to rise from his own pillow, in order to lull his hearers asleep upon the *pillow of false security*, by speaking in so light a manner of sin, and making the breach of God’s holy law A MERE NOTHING.

But to return to the *Farrago*.

---

(U) That Mr. Baxter was much of the same opinion is clear, by his saying, “that the law of works is not abrogated or repealed, but dispensed with, or relaxed.”

## For Imputed Righteousness.

**B**LESSED be God, we are not among those who are so dark in their conceptions and expressions. We no more deny **THE PHRASE** (of imputed righteousness) than the thing.

*Mr. Wesley's Sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

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

I wonder how any man can presume to exclude the **ACTIVE** obedience of Christ from our justification before God.

*Christ. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 54.*

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

*Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

Why should you think it a strange thing that the **RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST SHOULD BE IMPUTED.**

*Christ. Lib. vol. IX. p. 231.*

## Against Imputed Righteousness.

**F**OR Christ's sake, and for the sake of the immortal souls which he hath purchased with his blood, do not dispute for **THAT PARTICULAR PHRASE**, the imputed righteousness of Christ.

*Mr. Wesley's Letter to Mr. Hervey, as given us in his Preface, against unsettled Notions in Religion, p. 212.*

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

To hold an imputation of the **ACTIVE** obedience of Christ, amounts to no less than an abrogation of his death.

*Treatise on Justification.*

Where is the use of contending so strenuously for the imputation of Christ's righteousness? O lay aside those questionable dangerous expressions.

*Letter to Mr. Hervey.*

That expression, **IMPUTING THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST**, I dare not insist upon, because I cannot find it in the Bible.

*Thoughts on Imputed Righteousness.*

For Imputed  
Righteousness.

The *wedding garment* is  
Christ's righteousness, first im-  
puted, then implanted.

*Notes on New Test. Mat. xxii. 12*

This is fully consistent with  
our being justified through the  
imputation of Christ's righte-  
ousness.

*Ibid. on Rom. iv. 9.*

I myself frequently use THE  
EXPRESSION in question,  
Imputed Righteousness; and  
often put this, and the like ex-  
pressions, into the mouth of a  
whole congregation (X).

*Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

The Righteousness that Christ  
wrought is made ours by Im-  
putation.

*Christ. Lib. vol. IX. p. 230.*

The bride is all holy men,  
the whole invisible Church.  
*To be arrayed in fine linen white  
and clean.* This is an emblem  
of the righteousness of the Saints,  
both of their JUSTIFICA-  
TION and sanctification.

*Mr. Wesley's note on Rev. xix. 8.*

I would

Against Imputed  
Righteousness.

The *wedding garment* means  
holiness.

*Prefer. against Unsettled Notions  
in Religion, p. 234.*

A third reason against the  
imputation of Christ's righte-  
ousness, is, there is no neces-  
sity or occasion for it.

*Treatise on Justification.*

We are all agreed as to the  
meaning, but not as to THE  
EXPRESSION, the imputing  
the Righteousness of Christ;  
which, I still say, I dare not  
insist upon, neither require any  
to use.

*Thoughts on Imput. Righteousness.*

That the Scriptures no where  
countenance any such Imputa-  
tion of the Righteousness of  
Christ, I trust (the spirit of  
truth assisting) to make manifest  
in this discourse.

*Treatise on Just.*

Where it is said (Rev. xix.  
8) that it was granted to the  
Lamb's wife the church, *that  
she should be arrayed with pure  
white linen and shining,* which  
is said to be *the righteousness of  
the Saints,* it is evident, no-  
thing is meant concerning  
JUSTIFICATION by Christ  
or his righteousness.

*Treatise on Just.*

Upon

(X) Although most of these extracts from Mr. Wesley's sermon on  
Jer. xxiii. 6. have a very evangelical appearance; yet all their ex-  
cellency

## For Imputed Righteousness.

I would address myself to you who violently oppose these expressions, and are ready to condemn all that use them as ANTINOMIANS. Why should you condemn all who do not speak just as you do? Why should you quarrel with them for using the phrases they like, any more than they with you for taking the same liberty? At least allow them the liberty which they ought to allow you. And why should you be angry at an expression?

*Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

## Against Imputed Righteousness.

Upon Mr. Hervey's only using that scriptural expression, "our Saviour's obedience," in his excellent dialogues upon Imputed Righteousness, Mr. Wesley exclaims, "We swarm with ANTINOMIANS on every side. Why are you at such pains to increase their number?"

Again, Is not this (that Christ has satisfied the demands of the law) the very quintessence of ANTINOMIANISM.

Again, To say "the claims of the law are all answered," "Is not this ANTINOMIANISM without a mask?"

Once more, There are many expressions in this dialogue, (viz. the 14th, in vindication of the Imputed Righteousness of Christ) which lead directly to ANTINOMIANISM.

*Letter to Mr. Hervey.*

It

If

---

cellency vanisheth away when we are told, in the same sermon, that the Imputed Righteousness, which the author contends for, is not the divine Righteousness of Christ, as God, but his human Righteousness, as man. When we consider that the express words of the text are, THE LORD, OR JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS, one might wonder, (if any thing is to be wondered at that Mr. Wesley affirms,) how he could possibly fall into an error, which, at once, not only destroys the meritorious efficacy of the Redeemer's righteousness in behalf of his church, but undermines the virtue of his atoning blood; for, if the Righteousness, which is imputed, be not the *Righteousness* of God, neither is his blood the *blood* of God; and yet both of these are expressly asserted by the Holy Ghost; who tells us, that believers are made the righteousness of God in him; and that God purchased the church with his own blood. Not that the divine nature could shed blood; but, being united to the manhood of Christ, it stamped an infinite value



For Imputed  
Righteousness.

It is by faith that the Holy Ghost enables us to build upon this FOUNDATION; [i. e. the Imputed Righteousness of Christ.]

Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.

Against Imputed  
Righteousness.

If faith in the Imputed Righteousness of Christ is a FUNDAMENTAL principle of the Gospel, what becomes of all those who think nothing about Imputed Righteousness? How many, if this be true, must perish everlastingly?

Ibid.

But

The

value upon all that he did and suffered: and hereby, that complete Righteousness was wrought out, in which believers stand without spot of sin before God. But that this Righteousness is only a *human righteousness*, appears to me a very strange assertion. — And here I am again led to animadvert on Mr. Wesley's unfair abridgment of the Pilgrim's Progress, from which he has totally expunged the following sentence: [*which is the righteousness of God, for he himself is God.*] So that the words,

In the REAL Bunyan are,  
“ Fly to the Lord Jesus, and  
“ by his righteousness, which is  
“ the righteousness of God, for  
“ he himself is God; thou shalt be  
“ delivered from condemnation.”

In the COUNTERFEIT  
Bunyan.  
“ Fly to the Lord Jesus, and  
“ by his righteousness thou shalt  
“ be delivered from condem-  
“ nation.”

If it should be said, Surely a man may leave out what he will in an abridgment; I answer, But surely no one, who anchors all his hope upon the divinity of his Saviour, would ever take out so glorious a sentence as the above, which gives spirit and life to all that goes before and follows. Whether or no Mr. Wesley has left this out of the piece in his Christian Library, I do not pretend to say, not having examined; but the edition of the Pilgrim's Progress, from which I have made my observations, was published by Mr. Wesley some years ago, and is sold separate from his Christian Library.

For the same reason that Mr. Wesley does not chuse to have it known how nearly his faith resembles that of Mr. Ignorance, he is unwilling to be ranked by old Bunyan (whom, Mr. F——r says, all the Calvinists deservedly admire,) among the *Diabolonian armies which fought against Immanuel, belied God's word, and stumbled the faith of the men of Man-Soul*; and, therefore, with more prudence than candor, has left the whole passage, concerning the ELECTION-DOUBTERS, out of the Holy War.

However,

## For Imputed Righteousness.

But is not a believer **IN VESTED OR CLOATHED** with the Righteousness of Christ? **UNDOUBTEDLY HE IS.** And accordingly these words are the language of every believing heart :

Jesu, thy blood and righteousness

My beauty are, my glorious  
**DRESS.**

*Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

This spotless **ROBE** the same appears,  
When ruin'd nature sinks in years.

*Hymns and Sac. Poems, vol. I.  
p. 293.*

Again, Put on your beautiful **GARMENTS**, draw towards you with the hand of faith, the rich **MANTLE** of Christ's Righteousness. And it is a wonder how a sinner can rest while he is out of this **GARMENT**; for there is no other in heaven or earth can make him shine to God, and so shelter him from the stroke of justice.

*Christ. Lib. vol. XXXV. p. 63.*

The

## Against Imputed Righteousness.

The whole generation of disputers for that imputation **WHICH WE OPPOSE**, interpret the phrase of having the Righteousness of Christ imputed, by being **CLOATHED** with this Righteousness of Christ, or with the **ROBES** of his righteousness.

*Treatise on Justification.*

The righteousness of Christ is a righteousness fit for no man to **WEAR**, or assume to himself, but the person that wrought it.

*Ibid.*

To

However, that none may say I wrest Mr. Wesley's words, or put a wrong construction upon them, I am desirous of giving him an opportunity of explaining himself more fully on the head of it's being only the human Righteousness of Christ which is imputed to a sinner for justification. If, therefore, Mr. Wesley will acknowledge, that, by the Imputation of Christ's human Righteousness, he means that mediatorial Righteousness which was wrought out by God in the human nature, I entirely acquiesce with him on the point; but it must be owned, he has delivered his thoughts in a very loose, unguarded manner, by which means he has already drawn upon himself the remarks of a judicious writer on that head.

**For Imputed  
Righteousness.**

The righteousness that saveth us is **ALREADY WROUGHT** by God.

*Christ. Lib. vol. IX. p. 253.*

The sole cause of our acceptance with God, is the righteousness and death of Christ, who **FULFILLED GOD'S LAW**, and died in our stead.

*Preface to Hymns, printed anno 1756.*

Let faith and love combine  
To guard thy valiant breast;  
The plate be righteousness divine,  
Imputed and imprest.  
*Hymns and Sacred Poems.*

I no more **DENY** the righteousness of Christ, than I deny the Godhead of Christ. Neither do I **DENY IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS**. This is another unkind and unjust accusation.

*Sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

That which God requires of us for this purpose, (of Justification) is our *faith* in Christ himself, **NOT IN THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST.**

*Ibid.*

But

**Against Imputed  
Righteousness.**

To say the righteousness which justifies is **ALREADY WROUGHT** out, is a crude unscriptural expression.

*Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion, p. 214.*

I cannot prove that it was requisite for Christ to **FULLY FILL THE MORAL LAW**, in order to his purchasing redemption for us. By his sufferings alone, the law was satisfied.

*Ibid.*

*Having on the breast-plate of righteousness.* The righteousness of a spotless purity, in which Christ will present us faultless before God, through the merit of his own blood.

*Mr. Wesley on the New Test. Note on Eph. vi. 14.*

You see one main reason why we **DENY THE IMPUTATION OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS.**

*Treatise on Justification.*

Faith is imputed for righteousness to every believer; namely, **FAITH IN THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST.**

*Ibid.*

Wherefore

## For Imputed Righteousness.

But now, if we have no such obedience in our surety, (as we cannot have, if he did not live as well as die for us) let any one tell me, what **TITLE** he hath, or can have, to *eternal life*? He hath none in himself, because he hath not performed perfect obedience to the law; and he hath none in Christ, unless Christ performed that obedience for him, which none can say he did, who doth not believe his **ACTIVE** as well as **PASSIVE** obedience to be wholly on our account.

*Christ. Lib. vol. XLVII.  
P. 55.*

The righteousness of Christ is imputed to every one that believes, as soon as he believes: for if he believes according to the Scripture, he believes in the righteousness of Christ (Y).

*Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

Neither

## Against Imputed Righteousness.

Wherefore is this imputation of Christ's righteousness introduced into the business of justification? The introducers say with one mouth, the righteousness of Christ must be imputed to us, that so we may have a right and **TITLE** to life or heaven. And so *apprehending nothing else about a believer, fit to make a title of thereto*, they have compelled the righteousness of Christ to take this office upon it in a way of imputation.

*Treatise on Just.*

To ascribe pardon to Christ's **PASSIVE**, *eternal life* to his **ACTIVE** obedience is fanciful rather than judicious.

*Preserv. p. 212.*

Therefore believers are not the men that have any such righteousness imputed to them.

*Treatise on Just.*

There

(Y) Mr. Wesley cannot forget that when he preached this sermon, he told the congregation, " *It was the same doctrine which Mr. Romaine, Mr. Madan, and Mr. Whitefield preached.*" Now therefore, as Mr. Wesley well knew, that these gentlemen constantly maintained, that a sinner was justified by faith only, as apprehending the personal imputed righteousness of Christ; we are not to think that he meant to impose upon the credulity of his hearers, by making them believe that he agreed with those ministers in so important a point, when he did not. And if he really was of the same mind with them, in this article of faith, and had been so for twenty-eight years, what



## For Imputed Righteousness.

They to whom the righteousness of Christ is imputed, are made righteous by the spirit of Christ; are renewed in the image of God, after the likeness wherein they were created, in righteousness and true holiness.

*Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

Obedience is as strictly required under the New, as it was under the Old Testament; but with this difference; there, obedience in our own persons was required as absolutely necessary; here, OBEEDIENCE IN OUR SURETY IS ACCEPTED, AS COMPLETELY SUFFICIENT.

*Christ. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 55.*  
Christ

## Against Imputed Righteousness.

The nice metaphysical doctrine of imputed righteousness, leads not to repentance, but to licentiousness.

I have had abundant proof that instead of furthering mens progress in vital holiness, it makes them satisfied without any holiness at all.

*Preserv. against Unsettled Notions in Religion, p. 212, 215.*

To say, that THE OBEEDIENCE OF OUR SURETY IS ACCEPTED INSTEAD OF OUR OWN, is neither a safe nor a scriptural way of speaking.

*Ibid.*

This

what becomes of the doctrine advanced in the Treatise on Justification; in his Letter to Mr. Hervey; in his edition of Baxter's Aphorisms; and in his Thoughts on Imputed Righteousness? Did Mr. Whitefield, Mr. Romaine, or Mr. Madan, ever hold such tenets as are pleaded for in these books? Mr. Wesley knows the contrary; and that from their hearts they subscribe to Mr. Hervey's Theron and Aspasio, and to his Eleven Letters. Besides, if Mr. Wesley had constantly preached the doctrine of imputed righteousness for 28 years, and, as he tells us in one of his Journals, not less than fifty times within the twelvemonth, how came it to pass that so many testified their surprize at hearing the discourse in question, inasmuch that the doctrine appeared to them quite new, and that they pressed Mr. Wesley to print his discourse, in order to stop the mouths of gain-sayers? † Lastly, if Mr. Wesley had constantly maintained this doctrine in the manner Mr. Romaine, Mr. Madan, and Mr. Whitefield preached it, why must poor John Bunyan be *embowelled* in order to make him look like Mr. Wesley, and to prevent Mr. Wesley from looking like Mr. Ignorance.

† Journal from May 1765 to May 1768.

## For Imputed Righteousness.

Christ is now the righteousness of all them that truly believe in him; he for them paid the ransom by his death; he for them fulfilled the law in his life; so that now in him, and by him, every believer may be called a fulfiller of the law.

*Principles of a Methodist, p. 17.*

As we by faith lay hold of it (viz. Christ's active righteousness) so God through grace imputes it to us, as if it had been performed by us **IN OUR OWN PERSONS.**

*Christ. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 54.*

I know not how it is with others; but for my own part, I look upon all my *righteousness as filthy rags*, and it is in the robes only of the righteousness of the son of God that I dare appear before the Majesty of Heaven.

This, therefore, is the righteousness and the manner of that justification whereby I hope to stand before the judgment-seat of God (Z).

*Ibid.*

I cannot

## Against Imputed Righteousness.

This is the very core of the mistake, to think that we have by delegation paid the proper debt of obedience to the whole law, or that in Christ we have obeyed perfectly.

*Mr. Wesley's extract from Baxter's Apparitions.*

The Scriptures do not only no-where establish, but absolutely deny a possibility of the translation of the righteousness of Christ **FROM ONE PERSON TO ANOTHER.**

*Treatise on Just. p. 48.*

Men reading in the Scriptures of the justification of sinners, or of their being made righteous by Christ, have conceived that such a thing cannot be but by a positive righteousness, some ways put upon them: And there being no such righteousness to be found but the righteousness of Christ, hence they have apprehended that justification must needs be by this righteousness of Christ imputed unto them.

*Treatise on Just.*

Many

(Z) Since this was sent to the press, a friend of mine has informed me by letter, that about a fortnight ago, a certain Lay-Precacher of Perfection told his hearers, that the righteousness of Christ would not do for him; because Christ himself had broken the sabbath.

## For Imputed Righteousness.

I cannot look upon Christ as having made full satisfaction to God's justice for me, unless he had performed the obedience I owe to God's law, as well as borne the punishment that is due to my sins.

*Christ. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 55.*

Christ paid an ACTIVE and PASSIVE obedience, and so did not only fulfill the will of his father in obeying what he had commanded, but satisfied his justice, in suffering the punishment due to us for transgressing it.

*Ibid. p. 53.*

This I believe to be all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God (A).

There is no true faith, that is justifying faith, WHICH HATH NOT THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST FOR ITS OBJECT.

*Ibid.*

The

## Against Imputed Righteousness.

Many say, that Christ did as properly obey in our stead, as he did suffer in our stead; and that in God's esteem we were in Christ, obeying and suffering; and so in him we did both perfectly fulfill the commands of the law by obedience, and the threatenings of it by bearing the penalty. And thus, say they, is Christ's righteousness imputed to us; viz. his PASSIVE righteousness, for the pardon of our sins, and delivering us from the penalty; his ACTIVE righteousness, for the making of us righteous, and giving us a title to the kingdom.

This opinion, in my judgment, containeth a great many mistakes (B):

*Extract from Baxter's Apher.*

Neither is the Righteousness of Christ THE OBJECT OF FAITH AS JUSTIFYING.

*Treatise on Just.*

Thus

(A) In the preface to this work (viz. The Christian Library, p. 7.) Mr. Wesley, after telling us he believes it to be all true, all agreeable to the word of God, assures us, "that he hath particularly endeavoured to preserve a consistency throughout, that no part might CONTRADICT any other, but all conspire together, to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good word and work."

(B) Mr. Wesley, in his preface to this piece, says, "that he saw the wise providence of God in sending it to him; and that he thinks it expedient to republish it, as an antidote against the spreading poison of Antinomianism."

## For Imputed Righteousness.

The first thing then which admits of no dispute among reasonable men is this: To all believers the righteousness of Christ is imputed.

*Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

## Against Imputed Righteousness.

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

*Treatise on Just. p. 207.*

Notwithstanding Mr. Wesley's assertion, that he has fully answered all those arguments which have been insisted upon for the imputation of Christ's Righteousness; yet, upon the whole, I believe every reader will think he has said full as much in favour of this doctrine as he has said against it; and therefore, we will venture to sing the victory in the following words of his own hymns:

Join, earth and heaven, to bless  
THE LORD, OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Mystery of redemption this,

This the Saviour's strange design;  
Man's offence was counted his,  
Ours his righteousness divine.

In him complete we shine;  
His death, his life is mine;  
Fully am I justified.

Free from sin, and more than free;  
Guiltless, since for me he died;  
Righteous, since he liv'd for me (C).

Jesu, thou art my righteousness,  
For all my sins were thine.

Thy *death* hath bought of God my peace,  
Thy *life* hath made him mine.

Jesu,

---

(C) "To these truths (says Mr. Hervey in his Eleven Letters, p. 29), I most cordially subscribe. This is that good old wine that once made Mr. Wesley's heart glad; he has since tasted new; but I hope he will be brought to say, *the old is better.*"



Jesu, thy blood and righteousness  
My beauty are, my glorious dress;  
Midst flaming worlds in these array'd,  
With joy shall I lift up my head.

When from the dust of death I rise,  
To claim my mansion in the skies;  
E'en then shall this be all my plea,  
Jesus hath liv'd, hath died for me (D).

Let faith and love combine  
To guard thy valiant breast;  
The *plate* be **RIGHTEOUSNESS DIVINE,**  
**IMPUTED** and **imprest.**

**IMPUTE THY RIGHTEOUSNESS, &c. &c.**

Against  
Justification by the  
Act of Believing.

**B**UT do not you put faith  
in the room of Christ, or  
of his Righteousness? By no  
means; I take particular care  
to put each of these in its pro-  
per place.

*Sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

For  
Justification by the  
Act of Believing.

**B**Y faith, which is here said  
to be imputed, cannot be  
meant the Righteousness of  
Christ. The faith which is  
said to be imputed to Abraham  
for Righteousness, is faith pro-  
perly taken, and not the Right-  
eousness of Christ apprehended  
by faith (E).

*Treatise on Justification.*

But

To

(D) Who shall presume to say that Mr. Wesley hopes for a second justification by his works at the day of judgment; when he declares, that in that day Christ's blood and righteousness will be all his plea.

(E) What seems the most amazing of all is, that Mr. Wesley refers his readers to this Treatise on Justification, in confirmation of his holding the doctrine of justification thro' the imputed righteousness of Christ: Whereas, the whole design of the treatise itself, to which we are referred, is to prove that the imputation of Christ's personal righteousness is a false and dangerous doctrine; and that it is the act of believing or faith itself for which sinners are accepted of God, and not the Redeemer's righteousness imputed and received by faith. And therefore it is that this treatise, and his Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6, do so grossly contradict each other, as I have shewn from the extracts taken out of both.

Against  
Justification by the  
Act of Believing.

But let it be observed, the true sense of those words, *We are justified by faith in Christ only*, is not, that this our own act, to believe in Christ, or **THIS OUR FAITH, WHICH IS WITHIN US**, justifies; for that were to account ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue that is within us; but that, although we have faith, hope, and love within us, and do never so many good works, yet we must renounce the merit of all, of faith, hope, love, and all other virtues and good works, which we either have done, or shall do, as far too weak to deserve our Justification; for which, therefore, we must trust only in God's mercy, and the merits of Christ; for it is he *alone* that taketh away our sins: To him *alone* are we to go for this; forsaking all our virtues, good words, thoughts and works, and putting our trust **IN CHRIST ONLY, &c.**

This is what I believe, and have believed for some years, &c. &c.

*Prin. of a Methodist*, p. 8.

ONE

For  
Justification by the  
Act of Believing.

To say that faith, or believing, is imputed for Righteousness, but to mean that it is not faith, but the Righteousness of Christ that is imputed, must needs argue the speaker's design to be, that his meaning should not get out at his mouth.

The Faith which is imputed for Righteousness is **HIS**; (viz. the believer's) that is, **SOMEWHAT THAT MAY TRULY AND PROPERLY BE CALLED HIS**, before such imputation of it be made unto him, which cannot be said of the Righteousness of Christ.

*Treatise on Justification.*

Faith is the condition of the new covenant, therefore it is our righteousness in relation to that covenant.

*Mr. Wesley's Extract from Baxter's Aphorisms.*

Even so is our evangelical righteousness, or faith, imputed to us for as real righteousness as perfect obedience.

The personal performance of faith shall be imputed to us, for a sufficient personal payment, as if we had payed the full rent.

*Ibid.*

MONDAY

That Justification by Faith alone, is *Articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiae*. And that all who do not hold it must without doubt perish everlastingly.

**O**NE very considerable article of this truth is contained in the words above recited; this is his name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord our righteousness*; a truth this, which enters deep into the nature of Christianity, and, in a manner, supports the whole frame of it. Of this *undoubtedly* may be affirmed what Luther affirms of a truth closely connected with it (F);—it is **ARTICULUS STANTIS VEL CADENTIS ECCLESIAE**; the Christian church stands or falls with it. It is *certainly* the pillar and groundwork of that faith, of which **ALONE** cometh salvation; of that catholic or universal faith, which is found in all the children of God, **AND WHICH, UNLESS A MAN KEEP WHOLE AND UNDEFILED, WITOUT DOUBT HE SHALL PERISH EVERLASTINGLY.**

*Serm. on Jer. xxiii. 6.*

OUT

That Justification by Faith alone, is not *Articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiae*. And that such as do not hold it may without doubt be saved everlastingly.

**M**ONDAY the 30th (1767), I took coach for Norwich, and in the evening came to Newmarket. Tuesday, December 1st, being alone in the coach, I was considering several points of importance, and thus much appeared as clear as the day.

That a pious churchman, who has not clear conceptions even of justification by faith, may be saved; therefore, clear conceptions, even of this, are not necessary to salvation.

That a mystic who denies justification by faith, (Mr. Law for instance) may be saved; but if so, what becomes of **“ARTICULUS STANTIS VEL CADENTIS ECCLESIAE?”** If so, is it not high time for us, *projicere ampullas, et sesquipedalia verba* (G); and to return to the plain word, *he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him?*

*Jour. from 1765, to 1768, p. 112.*

HOW

(F) Justification by Faith only.

(G) To throw away these great swelling words.

That there was an everlasting Covenant between God the Father, and God the Son for Man's redemption.

**O**UT of compassion to fallen man, He (God the Son) covenants with his Father, that, if it pleased his Majesty to accept it, he would take upon him the suffering of those punishments which were due from him to man, and the performance of those duties which were due from man to him; so that whatsoever he should thus humble himself to do or suffer, should wholly be on the account of man, &c.

This motion the Father, out of the riches of his grace and mercy, was pleased to consent unto, &c.

*Christ. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 53.*

This I believe to be all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God (H).

MR.

That there never was any such Covenant between God the Father, and God the Son for Man's redemption.

**H**OW does it appear that Christ undertook this before the foundation of the world, and *that* by a positive covenant between him and the Father?

The texts you have brought do by no means prove, that there ever was any such covenant made between the Father and the Son.

Here is no mention of any covenant, nor any thing from which it can be inferred. I see not one word of the treaty itself, nor can I possibly allow the existence of it, without far other proof than this.

I have read them (the Scriptures referred to by Mr. Hervey) but cannot find a word about this grand treaty.

*Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion, p. 222.*

I Won-

(H) If the Christian Library be (as Mr. Wesley affirms) *all true, all agreeable to the word of God, then what are we to think of his other works?* If one contain the sincere milk of the word, the other must necessarily be an adulteration of man's devising.

The same may be said concerning the Minutes, and the two Vindications of them: If these be truly orthodox, upwards of forty volumes of the Christian Library must be thoroughly heterodox; and then I am sure, there is great reason to lament that so many poor people's pockets



That Mr. Wesley holds Free-will.

That Mr. Wesley wonders how any Man can hold Free-will.

MR. F——r tells Mr. Shirley, (2d Check, p. 37.) that when he maintained the freedom of the will, Jesus Christ and the Gospel were on his side, &c. &c.

To this also, Mr. Wesley gives his imprimatur. In the mean while his sermons and Christian Library continue upon sale, and bear their joint testimony against the author of the Preservative, and against the Vindicator; as what stands on the opposite side plainly demonstrates.

I Wonder as much at the doctrine that some men have advanced concerning *free-will*, as at that which others have broached in favor of good works, &c. And THIS MY FAITH IS NOT GROUNDED ON A ROVING FANCY, but on the most solid reasons. Forasmuch as of ourselves we are not able in our understandings to discern the evil from the good, much less then are we able in our wills to prefer the good before the evil, the will never settling upon any thing but what the judgment discovers to it.

*Christ. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 57.*

Again, Such is the freedom of man's will, free only to evil, free to drink iniquity like water. *Sermon on Rom. viii. 15.*

AN-

THE

pockets should be fleeced, for that which can never do their souls any manner of good. Certainly the purchase of a little tea, or snuff, is an offence of a much lighter nature, than the expending so much money for so many BAD books (to use Mr. Wesley's own expression concerning Mr. Hervey's eleven excellent Letters); and therefore, whilst he persists in recommending Mr. F——r's publications, it would be but common justice to caution his hearers against the Christian Library, and to return them what they have paid for it. Surely, I might, with great justice, adopt that language to Mr. Wesley upon this occasion, which Mr. F——r, with much unkindness, uses to Mr. Shirley, when he addresses him upon giving up his late sermons; "That these books, publicly exposed to sale, and bought perhaps by thousands, are, in one sense, no more his own; they belong to the purchasers;" who (if the Minutes, the Vindication, and the Second Check are true) have certainly and literally *spent their money for that which is not bread.*

That our Sin is Imputed to Christ, and Christ's Righteousness to us.

**A**NOTHER expression I find in II Cor. v. 21, *As Christ was made sin for us, who knew no sin, so are we made the righteousness of God in him:* That is, though Christ was a man without sin himself, yet our sin was imputed to him, and he was by God reckoned as a sinner; and then he kills him, putting our curse upon him; so to us that are free from righteousness Christ is made righteousness; so that God looks on us as if we had performed perfect righteousness, and when that is done he saves us.

*Christ. Lib. vol. I. p. 231.*

II Cor. v. 21. As he is said to be *made sin for us*, so we are said to be *made righteousness in him*: But what righteousness? our own? No, the righteousness of God, radically his, imputatively ours: And this is the only way whereby we are said to be made the righteousness of God, even by the righteousness of Christ being made ours; by which we are accounted righteous before God.

*Christ. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 54.*

AS

That our Sin is not Imputed to Christ, nor Christ's Righteousness to us.

**T**HE next Scripture that is urged is II Cor. v. 21, *He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* From hence they infer, that as our sins are imputed to Christ, so Christ's righteousness or active obedience is imputed to us. Of all the Scriptures which they take up, Mr. Gataker hath well observed, this is the most clear against themselves. There is no footing in this Scripture for the inference drawn from it; here is nothing said touching any imputation of our sins to Christ; and consequently, nothing to build a reciprocal imputation of his righteousness to us (1).

*Treatise on Just. p. 173.*

THE

(1) Mr. Wesley's note on this very same text runs as follows. *That we might be made the righteousness of God in him.*—Might thro' him be invested with that Righteousness, **FIRST IMPUTED**, then implanted in us, which is in every sense the Righteousness of God.

*Mr. Wesley on the New Testament.*

That both Adam's Sin and Christ's Righteousness are Imputed.

**A**S Adam's first unrighteousness, the first sin he committed, is communicated to men, and made theirs by imputation; and not only so, but by inherency also (for it hath bred in them original sin); after the same manner, the righteousness that Christ wrought is made ours by imputation; and this imputative righteousness of Christ worketh a righteousness which is inherent in us.

*Mr. Wesley's Christ. Lib. vol. IX. p. 230.*

This I believe to be all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God; all intelligible to plain men. This is the gold which I have extracted out of baser mixtures. This I look upon to be one of the choicest pieces of practical divinity that has been published in the English tongue.

*Title and Pref. to Christ. Lib.*

That neither Adam's Sin nor Christ's Righteousness are Imputed.

**T**HE Scripture nowhere affirms either the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, or of the righteousness of Christ to those that believe.

Either to say that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to his posterity of believers, or the sin of Adam to his, are both expressions unknown to the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures. There is neither word, nor syllable, nor letter, nor tittle of any such thing to be found there.

*Treatise on Justification p. 101, 103.*

The conclusion resulting from these particulars is, that neither the imputation of Adam's sin or of Christ's righteousness have any footing either in reason or religion.

*Ibid. p. 108.*

This I believe to be the *real Scripture doctrine.*

*Mr. Wesley's Pref. to the Treat. on Justification.*

**I** Might now draw a contrast concerning Mr. Wesley's notions of justifying faith, whether or no it can exist without the knowledge of it, or without assurance; and might animadvert on those strange assertions of his, *That it is often a long time after a man is justified, before Christ is formed in his heart; and that he believes it sound divinity, agreeable to Scripture and experience, that a soul may be justified who has not the indwelling of the spirit (K).* But as my book is already swelled much beyond its intended size, I must avoid all possible prolixity.

That  
Suffering the Penalty  
is not all the Law  
requires.

**S**uffering the penalty is not what the law primarily requireth; for the law of God requires perfect obedience, the penalty being only threatened to, not properly required of the breakers of it: For let a man suffer the penalty of the law in never so high a manner, he is not therefore accounted obedient to it; his punishment doth not speak his innocence, but rather his transgression of the law.

*Christ. Lib. vol. XLVII. p. 55.*

That  
Suffering the Penalty  
is all the Law  
requires.

**I**N case a man hath transgressed the law, and suffered (whether by himself or some other for him) the full punishment of it, he is no farther a debtor to it, either in point of obedience or of punishment, nor hath any thing to do with the law more or less for his justification; because the punishment which hath been so suffered, is of equal consideration to the law with the most absolute conformity to it's precepts.

*Treat. on Just. p. 195.*

For the  
Doctrine of Merit.

**A**S to *merit* itself, of which we have been so dreadfully afraid, we are rewarded according to our works, yea, because of our works. How does this differ from, for the sake of our works? And how differs this from *secundum merita operum*, as OUR WORKS DESERVE? Can you split the hair? I doubt I cannot.

*Minutes of 1770.*

Against the  
Doctrine of Merit.

**T**HERE IS NO MERIT but in the blood of Christ.  
*Mr. Wesley's Serm. vol. I. p. 249.*

[Salvation is] "not by the merit of works," &c.

*Minutes of 1770.*

There is nothing we are, or have, or do, which can DESERVE the least thing at God's hands.

*Mr. Wesley's Serm. vol. I. p. 3.*

MR.

IN



For a Twofold  
Justification.

**M**R. Shirley having expressed his thankfulness to God, that Mr. Wesley and his preachers do not hold the doctrine of a second Justification by works, the Vindicator begs him to reserve his public praises for a more proper occasion; tells him, he wrongs Mr. Wesley and his preachers; and having, in pretty warm terms, DEFIED Mr. Shirley to produce, out of Mr. Wesley's declaration, one single word or tittle denying or excluding a second Justification by works; gives it under his own hand, that if Mr. Wesley and his preachers had really denied the doctrine of a second Justification by works, one step more would have carried them into Dr. Crisp's eternal Justification, which is the very center of Antinomianism; and without waiting the return of the next conference, he would have borne his *legal* testimony against their Antinomian error (L). All this Mr. Wesley revises and corrects; and to all this he gives his imprimatur, and recommends the purchase of it to his hearers. In the mean while his Journals continue to be exposed to sale, from one of which I have extracted that which stands in the opposite column.

MR.

Against a Twofold  
Justification.

**I**N the afternoon I was informed how many wise and learned men, who cannot in terms deny it, because our articles and homilies are not yet repealed, explain justification by faith,

They say, First, Justification is twofold; the *first* in this life; the *second* at the last day, &c. &c.

In flat opposition to this I cannot but maintain, (at least till I have a clearer light) that the justification spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our articles, IS NOT TWO-FOLD. IT IS ONE AND NO MORE.

*Jour.* 1739 to 1741, reprinted 1769.

Now (to use Mr. F—r's expression) I think a man must not only be a *bold metaphysician*, but a *magician* indeed, who can prove, that ONE AND NO MORE, means TWO AND NO LESS.

MR.

That Works are a  
Condition of Jus-  
tification.

**M**R. Wesley, in his Mi-  
nutes of 1770, speak-  
ing of our justification and ac-  
ceptance with God, saith, that  
salvation is "not by the merit  
of works, but by works as a  
CONDITION."

*Minutes of 1770.*

We have received it as a  
maxim, that a man is to do no-  
thing in order to justification.  
Nothing can be more false:  
Whoever desires to find favor  
with God should cease from  
evil, and learn to do well.  
Whoever repents should do  
works meet for repentance;  
and if this be not in order to  
find favor, what does he do  
them for?

*Ibid.*

That Works are not  
a Condition of Jus-  
tification.

**M**R. Wesley, in his Jour-  
nal from Aug. 12, to  
Nov. 1769, p. 81, thus speaks;  
"I believe no works can  
be previous to justification,  
"NOR CONSEQUENTLY  
"A CONDITION OF IT."

Again, The condition of our  
acceptance with God is not  
our holiness, either of heart or  
life.

*Prof. to Hymns.*

If a man could possibly be  
made holy before he was justi-  
fied, it would entirely set his  
justification aside; seeing he  
could not, in the very nature  
of the thing, be justified, if he  
were not at that very time un-  
godly.

*Mr. Wesley's note on Rom. iv. 5.*

Whosoever thou art who  
desirest to be forgiven and re-  
conciled to the favor of God,  
do not say in thine heart, *I must  
first do this*: Knowest thou  
not, that thou canst do nothing  
but sin till thou art reconciled.

*Mr. Wesley's Serm. vol. I. 119.*

We allow that God justifies  
the ungodly; him that till that  
hour is totally ungodly; full of  
all evil, void of all good. 2dly,  
That he justifies the ungodly  
that worketh not, that till that  
moment worketh no goodness;  
neither can he; for an evil tree  
cannot bring forth good fruit.

*Sermons, vol. III. p. 111.*

That  
Mr. Wesley never adopted Mr. Law's scheme.

IT is asserted, that Mr. Law's system was "The Creed of the Methodists." But it is not proved. I had been eight years at Oxford before I read any of Mr. Law's writings; and when I did, I was so far from making them my creed, that I had objections to almost every page.

*Principles of a Methodist.*

That  
Mr. Wesley highly approves of Mr. Law.

ONE recovering from a dangerous illness, desired to be instructed in the nature of the Lord's Supper. I thought it concerned her to be first instructed in the nature of Christianity; and, accordingly, fixed an hour a day to read with her in Mr. Law's Treatise on Christian Perfection.

*Journal from Oct. 1735 to Sept. 1738, p. 4.*

Again, Wed. July 6, another little company of us met. We sung, read a little of Mr. Law, and then conversed (M).

*Ibid. p. 20.*

MR.

BY

(M) But how agrees all this with what Mr. Wesley says in his Journal, from Feb. 1738, till his return from Germany, p. 27.

"I declare, in my cool judgment, and in the presence of the most high God, that I believe the mystic writers to be one great Anti-Christ."

According to this solemn declaration, instead of instructing the poor dying woman in the *true nature of Christianity*, he was proping her up in the delusions of Anti-Christ.

Again, If Solomon be *the chief of Mystics*, as Mr. F——r affirms, (and Mr. Wesley acquiesces in the affirmation) and if the mystic writers (collectively) are *one great Anti-Christ*; then, if there be any meaning in words, do not Mr. Wesley, and the Vindicator together, make it out that Solomon is the head of this great body of Anti-Christ, as clearly as, in another place, we shall see that they concur in proving Solomon to be the *chief of soul-destroying poisoners*. But whether the *Mystic writers* be *one great Anti-Christ* or not, it is certain, that Mr. Wesley (since this declaration) has published many extracts from them, for the edification of his readers, not only out of Mr. Law's works (to every page of which he says he objects) but even out of that famous *French Mystic Madam Bourignon*.

## For a Single Life.

**M**R. Wesley, in his Journal from 1762 to 1765, printed an. 1768, p. 102, says, that his *Thoughts on a single life* are just the same they have been these thirty years (N).

That wearing no gay coloured cloaths, made in the height of the fashion, will increase our reward, and brighten our crown in Heaven.

**L**ET a single intention to please God prescribe both what cloathing you shall buy, and the manner wherein it shall be made, and how you shall put it on, and wear it, &c. so that, consequently, it may increase your reward, and brighten your crown in heaven. *Wear nothing of a glaring COLOUR, or which is in any kind gay, glistening, showy; nothing made in the very height of the fashion.*

*Advice to the people called Methodists, with regard to dress.*

MR.

## Against a Single Life.

**B**Y what unaccountable accident was Mr. Wesley persuaded to marry, after writing these *Thoughts on a single life!*

That to mind the fashion or colour of our apparel, is mere superstition.

**T**O make it a point of conscience to differ from others, as to the SHAPE or COLOUR of your apparel, is mere superstition.

*Mr. Wesley's Letter to a Person lately joined with the people called Quakers.*

MR.

(N) Mr. Wesley, in these *Thoughts*, an edition of which, reprinted in 1770, is before me, gives the following reasons for celibacy: "That we may employ every hour in what we judge to be the most excellent way; but, if we were married, we must ask leave of our company."



For Baptism by  
Sprinkling.

**M**R. Wesley, in his Pre-  
servative against Un-  
settled Notions in Religion,  
treating upon Baptism, says,  
“As there is no clear proof of  
“DIPPING in Scripture, so  
“there is very probable proof  
“of the contrary.”

With regard to the mode of  
baptizing, I would only add,  
*Christ no where, as far as I can  
find, requires DIPPING, but  
only baptizing; which word,  
many most eminent for learn-  
ing and piety have declared  
signifies to pour on, or sprinkle,  
as well as to dip. As our  
Lord has graciously given us a  
word of such extensive mean-  
ing, doubtless the parent, (or  
the person to be baptized, if he  
be adult) ought to choose which  
way he best approves. What  
God has left indifferent, it be-  
comes not man to make ne-  
cessary.*

*Thoughts on Infant Bapt. p. 19.*

For Baptism by  
Dipping.

**M**R. Wesley has lately  
been put in mind, that  
when he baptized a certain  
gentlewoman, Mrs. L. S. he  
DIPPED her so heartily, and  
held her so long under water in  
a bathing-tub, that her friends  
screamed out, thinking she had  
been drowned; and it was with  
much difficulty she recovered  
the operation.

*Mr. Toplady's letter to Mr. Wesley.*

Wednesday, May 5, I was  
asked to baptize a child of Mr.  
Parker, second bailiff of Sa-  
vannah; but Mrs. Parker told  
me, neither Mr. P. nor I will  
consent to it's being DIPPED.  
I answered, “If you certify  
“that your child is weak, it  
“will suffice (the rubric says)  
“to pour water upon it.” She  
replied, “Nay, the child is  
“not weak; but I am resolv-  
“ed it shall not be dipped.”  
This argument I could not con-  
fute; so I went home, and the  
child was baptized by another  
person.

*Journ. from Oct. 1735 to Feb.  
1737-8.*

“nion, otherwise what complaints or disgusts would follow.” “And  
how hard is it,” says he, “even to know how far you ought to give  
“way for peace sake, and where to stop.” He exhorts the unmar-  
ried to prize the advantages they enjoy; to know the value of  
them; to esteem them as highly while they have them, as others  
do after they have lost them. He advises, that we should pray against  
marriage; and concludes with, “Blessed are they who have made  
“themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven's sake.” I only  
give Mr. Wesley's own words, and make no remarks upon them.

T

Mr. Wesley

Mr. Wesley is no stranger to a certain gentleman who published a Treatise against Tea-drinking, as being highly pernicious both to soul and body ; and drew up a familiar catechism in that Treatise for the use of such as were pressed to drink tea. And does he not also know, that the writer of this treatise himself re-commenced a tea-drinker, after he had expatiated on the benefits which he found from leaving off tea, and after he had told the readers of the Treatise, that he himself would be the first to set them the example in that piece of self-denial?— This Treatise is lately reprinted, and sold at the Foundery, and in West-street, London, Price One Penny.

That Enoch and  
Elijah are in Heaven.

**E**NOCH and Elijah entered at once into the highest degree of glory, without first waiting in Paradise.

*Notes on the New Test. John iii. 13, 1st edition, published an. 1755.*

That Enoch and  
Elijah are not in  
Heaven.

**E**NOCH and Elijah are not in heaven, but only in Paradise.

*Note on Rev. xix. 20.*

That  
St. Paul speaks of the  
Law as a Person.

**T**HE law is here spoken of by a common figure, as **A PERSON**, to which, as to an husband, life and death are ascribed.

*Mr. Wesley's notes on the New Test. Rom. vii. 1.*

That  
St. Paul does not speak  
of the Law as a  
Person.

**T**HIS way of speaking of the law as **A PERSON** injured, and to be satisfied, seems hardly defensible.

*Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion.*

For a  
Justified State.

**T**HE STATE of a justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious.  
*Serm. on 2 Cor. v. 17.*

Against a  
Justified State.

**D**OES not talking of a justified or sanctified STATE tend to mislead men?  
*Minutes of 1770.*

That they who are once justified are justified for ever.

**C**HRISt continues a priest for ever, so we continue to be justified for ever. There is hereby a full security given us of justification to be continued for ever (O).  
*Christ. Lib. vol. II. p. 167.*

WHY

That they who are *at least* once justified may become total Apostates.

**C**HRISt died for him also (a wilful, total apostate) and he was at least justified once.  
*Mr. Wesley's note on Heb. x. 29.*

MR.

(O) The great comfort arising to a believer from this doctrine, is well expressed by Mr. Wesley in his Christian Library, vol. XXXVI. p. 87.

“ Faith should eye Christ as hanging upon the cross, and offering up himself, through the eternal spirit, a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice for all our sins. We cannot think that Christ bore but some of our sins, or only sins committed before conversion; and if he bore all as the father laid upon him, the believer is to lay hold on him by faith, as hanging on the cross, as well for taking away the guilt of sins committed after conversion as before. This sacrifice was a sacrifice for all, and he bare our sins without distinction or exemption, in his own body on the tree.”

In this one excellent passage, Mr. Wesley maintains the whole of the doctrine insisted on in my fourth Letter in answer to Mr. F—r's first Vindication.

That Mr. Wesley does  
approve the ex-  
pression, " Why  
" me."

**W**H<sup>Y</sup> hast thou to thy peo-  
ple join'd  
*Me*, the vilest of mankind,  
In cordial charity?  
*Why* hast thou heard the spi-  
rit's groans,  
Intreating in thy chosen ones,  
For *me*, O God, for *me*?  
*Mr. Wesley's Hymns*, vol. I.  
p. 190.

That Mr. Wesley does  
not approve the  
expression, " Why  
" me."

**M**R. F——r affirms, *Vind.*  
p. 16. (and Mr. Wesley  
gives his *Imprimatur*) " that he  
never heard Mr. Wesley make  
use of that expression, *Why me?*  
lest he should be *wise above*  
*what is written*; and because  
Mr. Wesley doubts whether  
he can say, *Why me? Why*  
*me?* without a secret touch of  
the self-applause that tickles  
the Pharisee's heart, &c and  
therefore he leaves the fashio-  
nable exclamation to others (P)."

I THINK

WE

---

(P) I cannot help thinking, that Mr. Wesley would have given a much more genuine proof of real humility, and of his dislike to having his heart a little tickled, by striking out of Mr. F——r's manuscript some of those sulsome expressions relative to himself, than he does by refusing the phrase, *Why me?* At least, there is certainly some danger of *refined pride*, and the *secret touches of self-applause*, whilst he is recommending from the pulpit a book which holds him forth as the greatest minister in the world; and, in return for the compliment, is representing Mr. F——r as the greatest writer in the world. This reminds me of a certain epigram in ~~Marshall~~ in which \_\_\_\_\_ but I find myself inclined to fall into sarcasm; therefore I add no more.—However, as I am informed, that Mr. F——r is writing against my Five Letters, I hope he will suit his answer to the *Second Edition* of those Letters, otherwise I shall not look upon it as any answer at all.

*tial*



That Mr. Wesley is a thorough CALVINIST in the point of Justification.

**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.

*Journal from Oct. 1762, to May 17, 1765, p. 115.*

I have, during this whole time, (since the year 1738) occasionally used those expressions Imputed Righteousness, the Righteousness of Christ, and others of the same kind; but it is equally true, that I never used them at all in any other meaning than that sound scriptural one, wherein they are used by many eminent men, Mr. CALVIN in particular.

*Mr. Wesley's Answer to all that is material in Mr. Hervey's Letters prefixed to his Treatise on Justification.*

I conclude this contrast with the following quotation, with which Mr. Wesley ends his Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion.

WHEREAS we are surrounded on every side by enemies, &c. &c. "It would be therefore well for you carefully to read over the foregoing Preservative, together with *Serious Thoughts concerning Perseverance, and Predestination calmly Considered.* And when you are masters of them yourselves, it will be easy for you to recommend and explain them to our societies; that they may no more be cast to and fro by every wind of doctrine; but, BEING SETTLED IN ONE MIND AND ONE JUDGMENT, BY SOLID SCRIPTURAL AND RATIONAL ARGUMENTS, may grow up in all things into Him who is our head, even Jesus Christ."

That Mr. Wesley has leaned too much towards CALVINISM in this point.

**W**E said, in the year 1744, we have leaned too much towards CALVINISM. *Min. of 1770.*

[It appears from the whole scope of the Minutes, that this leaning too much towards CALVINISM was in the matter of Justification.]

For CALVIN to ascribe one opinion to Paul in the point of Justification, and to be himself of another, is neither better nor worse than to profess himself wiser than him, yea, than the Holy Ghost speaking by him.

*Treat. on Just. p. 193.*

---

## C O N C L U S I O N.

**T**HUS have I at length brought this extraordinary FARRAGO to a conclusion; not because I could not find any more inconsistencies to have lengthened it, but because I am really tired of transcribing them.

To follow Mr. Wesley in the exact order in which he publishes and sells his contradictions, would not be an easy matter. I shall, therefore, only observe, in general, that his Extract from Bishop Beveridge's *Thoughts on Religion* is flatly contradicted, for two hundred pages together, in his edition of John Goodwin's *Treatise on Justification*. Again, This *Treatise* is flatly contradicted by his Sermon on *Jer. xxiii. 6.* And this again is contradicted by his letter to Mr. Hervey, in his *Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion, &c.* This *Preservative* is itself contradicted, over and over, and over again, in his Abstract from Dr. Preston's *Breast-plate of Faith and Love*. And this Abstract from Dr. Preston is flatly contradicted by his edition of Baxter's *Aphorisms*; and these *Aphorisms* are flatly contradicted by what he has published out of Bishop Beveridge's *Private Thoughts on Religion*; and these *Thoughts* of Bishop Beveridge are again flatly contradicted by Mr. Wesley's own *Thoughts on Imputed Righteousness*.—Thus the wheel runs round and round again; and yet Mr. Wesley asks, in his Preface to Goodwin's book, “Whence arises this whole charge of inconsistency and self-contradiction? Merely from straining, winding to and fro, and distorting a few innocent words. For wherein have I contradicted myself, taking words in their unforced, natural construction, or even changed my judgment, in any one respect, with regard to Justification, since I printed the sermon on Salvation by Faith in the year 1738?” But surely it would have been a question much easier resolved, “Wherein have I NOT contradicted myself?”

Mr. Wesley's wavering disposition is not an affair of yesterday. He must well remember with what plainness his faithful companion, Mr. Delamotte, spoke to him on this head  
more

more than thirty years ago; and endeavoured to convince him, that he was not on the right foundation (Q). All his Journals and Tracts are replete with proofs of his having been tossed from one opinion, and from one system, to another, from the time of his ordination to the present moment; and he himself cannot but acknowledge, that both his friends and foes, whether German or English, have accused him of his unsettled principles in religion. He knows full well, if he will abide by his own declarations, that after having *erred, not knowing the Scriptures*, in the way of *Mysticism*, which he justly accounts to be a scheme of justification by man's inward righteousness (R), he "*wandered many years in the new path of salvation by faith and works*," till about the year 1738; when "*it pleased God to shew him the old way of salvation, by faith only*" (S). At this time he published his sermon on *Salvation by Faith*; which, he affirms, is the only doctrine "that can prevent the increase of the Romish delusion among us;" and is, "as our Church justly calls it, the strong rock and foundation of the Christian religion (T)." Some time after this, he tells us, he became rather too *scrupulous* about using the word *CONDITION*; and, in the year 1744, *leaned too much towards Calvinism*. The consequence of this was, that *Calvinism* and *Antinomianism* began to be synonymous terms, both in his writing and preaching; and, under the convoy of *that illustrious divine, John Arminius (U)*, the *white devil of self righteousness*, (to use Luther's expression) *came in like a flood*; insomuch that, in his last Journal, he fairly gives up the necessity of a clear belief of the doctrine of Justification by faith alone, and thinks it high time to throw it aside, as *ampullas & sesquipedalia verba*; though, in the year 1738, he thought it the only barrier against Popery and licentiousness (X); yea, the good *old way which it had pleased God to shew him after his many years wanderings*. And, as if this were not sufficient, in his Minutes of 1770, he not only goes back to the mark from whence he first set out; but, as I have proved in the last edition of my Five Letters in answer to Mr. F——r, absolutely makes man's righteousness to be the procuring cause of his acceptance with

(Q) Journ. from Aug. 1738 to Nov. 1739, p. 14.

(R) Pref. to Hymns and Sacred Poems, vol. I. printed at London.

(S) Journ. from Nov. 1739, to Sept. 1741, p. 41.

(T) Serm. on Salvation by Faith.

(U) Vide Mr. F——r's Vindication.

(X) Serm. on Salvation by Faith.

God ; and his salvation, from first to last, to depend upon the intrinsic merit of his own unassisted works. So that, I presume, Mr. Wesley is now got to his *ne plus ultra* ; especially as he so cordially acquiesces in Mr. F——r's sentiments, that Solomon is "*the chief of Mystics,*" (consequently, that Mysticism is the religion of the Bible,) after having so many years condemned it as the essence of self-righteousness, yea, as what *caused him to err, not knowing the Scriptures, neither the power of God* ; and after having solemnly affirmed, in the preface to the Hymns and Sacred Poems, that he *believed himself indispensibly obliged, in the presence of God, and angels and men, to declare, that he apprehended the mystic writers did not teach the truth as it is in Jesus, and that they laid another foundation, viz. that of acceptance for our virtuous habits or tempers, thereby placing the ground of our acceptance in ourselves, and supposing that we are to be justified for the sake of our inward righteousness.* Whereas, (says Mr. Wesley, like a good sound Protestant,) "The sole cause of our acceptance with God is the righteousness and death of Christ, who fulfilled God's law, and died in our stead."

"Other foundation, therefore (says he) can no man lay, without being an adversary to Christ and his gospel, than faith alone ; faith, though necessarily producing both, yet not including either good works or holiness (X)."

But still Solomon is the chief of Mystics ; yea, even though Mr. Wesley, in his Journal from 1762 to 1765, calls *Mysticism* POISONOUS DOCTRINE, *which had well nigh extinguished the last spark of life at Cardiff.* So that if poor Solomon be *the chief of Mystics,* and Mysticism be poisonous doctrine, by the plainest rules of logic, Mr. Wesley has now as clearly made out Solomon to be THE CHIEF OF LIFE-EXTINGUISHING POISONERS, as (p. 129) we have seen that he proved him to be the head of *the body of Anti-Christ.* Yet this is the gentleman who wonders he should be thought inconsistent, or self-contradictory !

I expect you will tell me, Sir, that I have exposed Mr. Wesley, particularly in the foregoing contrast. That Mr. Wesley is exposed I allow ; but that I have exposed him I deny.—Out of Mr. Wesley's own mouth all that I have brought against him proceeds.

And here, Sir, I must beg to call in a witness, to whom you cannot have the least objection, having before summoned

---

(X) Pref. to Hymns and Sacred Poems.





“ who know not what spirit you are of, who call yourselves  
 “ men of a Catholic spirit, only because you are of a muddy  
 “ understanding ; because your mind is all in a mist ; because  
 “ you have no settled, consistent principles, but are for jum-  
 “ bling all opinions together. Be convinced, that you have  
 “ quite missed your way ; you know not where you are. You  
 “ think you are got into the very spirit of Christ ; when, in  
 “ truth, you are nearer the spirit of Anti-Christ. Go, first,  
 “ and learn the first elements of the Gospel of Christ ; and  
 “ then shall you learn to be of a truly Catholic spirit (Y).”

It is impossible for any man to read the foregoing words of Mr. Wesley, without feeling how deeply they come home to the author himself ; who, to this moment, seems to be so absolutely unsettled in every fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, that no two disputants in the schools can be more opposite to each other than he is to himself ; and so I fear he is likely to remain, whilst he continues to draw lots for his faith, instead of coming to God, with the simplicity of a little child, to be taught the truth as it is in Jesus.

But whether Mr. Wesley ever should, or should not, come to the acknowledgment of the truth ; yet, indeed, Sir, your unhappy attachment towards him has caused you to treat all

(Y) Though this sermon be entitled “ *Catholic Spirit*,” yet one of it's heads is to inculcate an attendance upon only one congregation ; in other words, “ Hear me, and those I send out, and no body else.” But if this be true *Catholic Spirit*, we may well ask, Why Christ has given diversity of gifts to divers ministers for the edification of his body the Church ? And I know not how Mr. Wesley will resolve the question, but by saying, that all these gifts center in himself. However, it is by stratagems of this sort that he holds so many souls in his own shackles, and prevents them from coming to the knowledge of all the glorious truths of the Gospel ; whilst his allies strengthen the deception by making his followers believe, that his doctrine is that of all the good old divines, whether Puritan or Churchmen, that have preceded him : and this false state of the case is still farther confirmed by Mr. Wesley's publishing their books, and taking out and interpolating as shall make them speak his own language. And here, besides the mangled work he has made with poor Bunyan, and others, I cannot help informing my readers, that in the *Life of Mr. Philip Henry*, published in his *Christian Library*, he has artfully left out Mr. Henry's Confession of Faith at his ordination ; which confession being purely Calvinistical and Evangelical, Mr. Wesley did not chuse to have it known how widely he differed from this excellent divine.

your

your Calvinistic friends with a severity which is, on no pretence, justifiable; and though it was highly necessary that your conduct, on this occasion, should be plainly laid before you, yet I am sensible, that it was scarcely possible to do so without seeming to bear very hard upon you in return; and, if I were to tell you how much you have lost yourself in the esteem of many exemplary Christians, by your late publications, (particularly the last) you would hardly think that so many good men, most of whom I am sure were strongly prejudiced in your favour, could all be mistaken in their judgment. One of these, a respectable clergyman, lately said to me, "I should as soon have expected to have seen an evangelical pamphlet from the Pope, as to have seen any thing from Mr. F——r in so severe a spirit." But *it is a small thing to be judged of man's judgment.* I shall, therefore, only say, May God enable you to lay the matter seriously to heart; and may he *shew you what manner of spirit you are of!* But permit me to intreat you not to suffer bitter words, and calumnious expressions, to disguise themselves under the appearance of *Swiss plainness*, and *Helvetic bluntness*; nor yet to conclude you have never been angry, because some condescending expressions have dropped from your pen; but examine from what spring they flow. The only time when some controversial writers speak with any degree of love and kindness, is, after they think they have well paid off their antagonist, and laid him level to the ground. Then having pretty well vented both the *acid and the bitter*, under the self-pleasing idea of having obtained the victory, they get into tolerable humour, and are so very humble, that they fancy they can, with pleasure, *lie at the feet* of those whom just before they have been belabouring without mercy.—But *the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked*; therefore, let you and I, Sir, take heed of this snare; for, certain it is, that the pride of conquest, self-love, and self-flattery, may here find a mantle under which to hide their ugly heads; whilst the quiet and complacency we experience in our hearts, may proceed from no other cause than that which makes a bottle of sour beer, or of wine upon the fret, become placid and tranquil after it has well vented itself, and has been for some time uncorked.

Should you think it worth your while to make any reply to these Letters, permit me now to inform you, that I have no thoughts of keeping up the controversy any longer under my real name, or that of *Pietas Oxoniensis*; but I can venture to assure you, that write what you will, or whatever side you

may take, Mr. Wesley himself shall answer you out of his own voluminous works; and I will aspire to no other honour than that of an editor and transcriber.

In the mean while, let me beg to recommend to your perusal a Letter on Controversy, which appeared in the Gospel Magazine for October 1771; it is signed *Omicron*; and though written by a Calvinist, and published in a performance of which you have no high opinion, yet I promise you the perusal of it will not offend you, and I hope may be of signal service. Permit me, however, at present to give you the following extract from it.—“The scriptural maxim, that the  
 “wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God, is  
 “verified by daily observation. If our zeal be embittered by  
 “expressions of anger, invective, or scorn, we may think we  
 “are doing service to the cause of truth, when, in reality,  
 “we shall only bring it into discredit. The weapons of our  
 “warfare, and which alone are powerful to break down the  
 “strong holds of error, are not carnal, but spiritual; argu-  
 “ments fairly drawn from Scripture and experience, and en-  
 “forced by such a mild address as may persuade our readers,  
 “that, whether we can convince them or not, we wish well  
 “to their souls, and contend only for the truth’s sake. If we  
 “can satisfy them that we act upon these motives, our point  
 “is half gained; they will be more disposed to consider  
 “calmly what we offer; and if they should still dissent from  
 “our opinions, they will be constrained to approve our in-  
 “tentions.”

To this extract permit me to add the following observation. For want of coming to a proper *eclaircissement*, there may be a *seeming* difference between two writers in some points when there is no *real* one, at least no *wide* one. Upon this account I would offer a word or two more concerning the doctrine of a twofold justification, before I take my leave.

1st, I believe that every child of God, at his conversion, is freely justified by faith alone in Christ Jesus; and yet not by the act of faith, but by faith as an hand or instrument whereby Christ is received.—Thus far, I believe, WE do not differ at all: and this I think is St. Paul’s doctrine, as well as the doctrine of the Reformation, and of our own Church; but how widely it differs from Mr. Wesley’s edition of Goodwin on Justification, and Mr. Baxter’s Aphorisms, is manifest from the passages I have cited.

2dly, I believe that every child of God is evidentially or declaratively justified (*i. e.* declared to be a justified person) *by works*,



as well before men here, as before the assembled world at the last day. Here I do not think we differ much, if at all.

But if you affirm, that there is any the least degree of *merit* in those works which we are enabled to perform by grace after faith received, here we differ as far as east from west. And is it not evident, that the maintaining this doctrine of *merit* (in a believer's best performances) tends to confound your own distinction between justification by the *merit* and by the *evidence* of works? Again, You cannot suppose that when Mr. Shirley said, "Blessed be God, neither Mr. Wesley, nor any of his preachers, (Mr. Olivers excepted) hold a second justification by works," that he intended to exclude good works in an evidential sense. If, therefore, you do not mean something more than this, what need was there of telling him *he wronged Mr. Wesley, and his preachers, in asserting that they did not hold a second justification by works.* Neither Mr. Shirley, nor I, nor any Calvinist that I ever heard of, deny, that though a sinner be justified in the sight of God by Christ alone, he is *declaratively* justified by works, both here and at the day of judgment. Therefore, I say, if you utterly disclaim all human works as the **PROCURING, MERITORIOUS CAUSE** of justification, what need was there of addressing Mr. Shirley as you have done? Yea, what need was there of your making this point a matter of controversy at all? We are quite agreed, both as to the expression, and as to the signification of it; and Mr. Shirley's sentiments are perfectly compatible with those of the **DECLARATION**; but I have still a suspicion that you are for giving man's works an higher place at the bar of God than what becomes the hand-maidens, or attendants, of a justified soul. And this I gather from your note, p. 99, where you say, "This plea (that is, of free justification by Christ alone) is excellent, when a man comes to Christ, his high priest, as a sinner, for pardon and holiness, or for his first justification on earth; but **IT WILL BE ABSURD** when he stands before the throne of Christ as a rebellious subject, or before his judgment-seat as a criminal, at the last day." Now it appears to me, from this note, as if a Christian had two different pleas to make for his entrance into glory; the one when he first believes, the other when he appears before the judgment-seat of Christ: a notion, which I am persuaded is no less contrary to Scripture, than it is injurious to the office and character of our great Emmanuel. If I am under an error, I hope I am open to conviction, and shall gladly own that I have misunderstood your real meaning.

The

The force of partiality I know is very great; and you must not take it ill if I say I believe this has carried you farther than you are aware of; but indeed, Sir, though I felt myself deeply wounded in the perusal of your book, yet I find the greatest reluctance in the thought of bidding adieu to all future connection with one, who, I am verily persuaded, desires *to do all things to the Redeemer's glory*.

God only knows what has passed through my heart concerning this publication: sometimes I had well-nigh resolved to suppress it; yea, I had thoughts of doing this when it was almost all printed off; and this, for no other reason, but because I was unwilling to bear too hard upon some, whom, notwithstanding all their inconsistencies and contradictory assertions, I believe are yet sincere at the bottom, and with whom I hope to live for ever in glory. But when I considered the great duplicity of Mr. Wesley's conduct in embracing Mr. Shirley as a friend at the Conference, and then directly going out from thence to give the signal for war; when I called to mind his acknowledgments of the *unguarded* manner in which the Minutes were drawn up; and, that immediately afterwards, he adhered to them, and defended them in the full sense of the words; above all, when I received letter after letter, to acquaint me of the unjust prejudices which your last publication had been the means of creating in the minds of many against the faithful laborious ministers of the Gospel; I say, when I considered these things I was more than ever convinced, that absolute duty called upon me to send this piece abroad into the world: in doing of which, I should be extremely sorry to grieve any persons in connection with Mr. Wesley, when the searcher of hearts knoweth I mean only to put them upon seeing with their own eyes, and examining for themselves. Such of them as have candidly read my letters throughout will bear me witness, that I have spoken in terms of brotherly love and Christian respect, as well towards them, as towards the *body* of lay-preachers; being fully persuaded, that the truly-excellent of the earth are to be found among both. And if I know any thing of my own heart (or may judge of it from my *Five Letters*, lately published in answer to your first book,) wherever I have sprinkled the least *grain of salt*, it has been with no other view than that of shewing my learned competitor his own face in his own glass, and with the hopes of bringing him to a proper abhorrence of that in himself which his own piety and good sense (abstracted from that self-love which is too apt to cast a mist before the eyes of the best of men) cannot help condemning in others. For, to use the words of Mr. Hervey, in  
his