



# 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.

and sent to the different booksellers whose names stand in the title, leaving others to judge how far my friend has formed a right estimate of Mr. Daubeny, in being so exceedingly anxious that I should alter or expunge what I had said of that gentleman's merit as an author.

As I certainly am not at liberty to alter my friend's expressions, I now transcribe his own words from his letter lying before me.

“ I have received a duplicate of  
 “ the sheet N, but the sheet M is  
 “ not come to hand : what is want-  
 “ ing, is between p. 160 and 177 ;  
 “ the rest is all consecutive and re-  
 “ gular.

“ I have also received the Pre-  
 “ face, which I read with great  
 “ pleasure, except the very high  
 “ compliments you bestow on Mr.  
 “ Daubeny as a writer. The pas-  
 “ sages to which I allude, occur in  
 “ p. 1 and pp. 16, 17. The epithets  
 “ nervous,

“ nervous, expreffive, accurate,”  
 “ and the declarations of your great  
 “ inferiority to him, is a panegy-  
 “ ric fo very ftrong, that if it be  
 “ not expunged or qualified to a  
 “ great degree, you will make a  
 “ man who feems to have a *quan-*  
 “ *tum fufficit* of vanity, more vain  
 “ than ever. I hope you will par-  
 “ don me, if I fay that his ftyle is  
 “ really not intitled to the praife  
 “ you give it: he, for the moft  
 “ part, walks on ftilts, and whilft  
 “ he is pompous and diffufe, his  
 “ ftyle has very few *points*; the  
 “ general character of it is feeble-  
 “ nefs and infipidity.”

What my friend here asserts, I  
 find to be the general opinion:  
 however, I fay no more on that  
 head; only that I found a diffi-  
 culty of reconciling the favorable  
 opinion I wifhed to entertain of  
 Mr. D. as a writer, with the num-  
 berlefs contradictions and incon-  
 fiftences

sistences which every where stared me in the face throughout his Appendix; but these I rather attributed to the badness of the cause he had to defend, than to the weakness of the advocate; and when I saw him just escaped out of one hole, and then viewed him immediately *floundering away* (a *coarfish* expression, perhaps) in another, I thought, If this gentleman had but half as much truth on his side, as he has of ability, chicanery and perseverance, he might be an instrument of much good to that excellent Church to which he professes to *guide* us; but whilst he is abetting errors, and cherishing schisms, even in his own mother's bosom, drawing disciples after him, who have *itching ears*, and *leading captive silly women*, we can only lament that so much labor and assiduity should be so ill employed.



The following Errata in REFORMATION-TRUTH RESTORED, which should have been printed with it, the Reader's kindness will mark as below; and this Letter being intended as a Supplement to the former ones, I conceive there can be no impropriety in adding them in this place.

---

ERRATA.

On the back of the Title, for, *Daubeneanism*, *r.* *Daubenism*.

P. 17. l. 29. for, *will be*, *r.* *will probably be*.

P. 18. l. 4. for, *Triara*, *r.* *Tiara*.

P. 43. l. 22. for, *farago*, *r.* *farrago*.

P. 81. l. 28. for, *præsentum*, *r.* *præsentem*.

P. 83. l. 27. for, *collegi*, *r.* *colligi*.

P. 120. l. 15. after *guiding*, *r.* or *permitting*.

P. 151. l. 14. for, *precedunt*, *r.* *præcedunt*.

P. 197. l. 29. for, *pale*, *r.* *pail*.

P. 199. l. 2. for, *daed*, *r.* *dead*.

P. 201. l. 18. for, *petulent*, *r.* *petulant*.

# DAUBENISM confuted.

---

London, January 10th, 1800.

REVEREND SIR,

MY reasons for making this a separate Letter from those lately published, having been briefly mentioned on a former occasion, I shall now only observe, that, however disagreeable personal vindications may be, especially to the party injured, and though they cannot be very interesting to the public, yet, as every individual has a character to maintain in life; and, as his usefulness to the community will much depend on the light in which that character is looked upon; no man, who does not act from motives merely selfish, can surely be blamed for wishing to appear in such a point of view, as may tend to give him that respect, and influence in society, which may conduce to the good of others; especially, of those within his own sphere and neighbourhood.

B

I trust,

I trust, therefore, that I am not actuated with an over-weening desire of, what is called, *the world's good word*, (which can never go hand in hand with genuine christianity,) in my present attempt to wipe off those foul aspersions and insinuations, which have *cruelly, disdainfully, and despitefully*, been cast upon me, as also upon my brother, the Rev<sup>d</sup>. Rowland Hill, by the unfeeling, not to say *wanton* manner, in which you have endeavoured to fix a stigma on our religious principles, as well by bringing up the most false quotations that ever were invented, and making us, or at least, one of us, the author of them, and then charging the consequences of the doctrines, contained in those quotations, at our door, or at least at my door, though it seems you knew not at which of us your arrow was levelled, when you shot with your *long bow*. I find, Sir, from your own extorted confession, that all the suspicions I had formed, as to the quarter from whence you had culled your nosegay, are perfectly just, and right; the sweet garden of Mr. Lackington the bookseller, in the borders of which flourish the odoriferous plants of myrrh, aloes, and cassia, has furnished you with the *fragrant flower* you have held up to view; whilst you wished to make the world believe, it was  
a rank

a rank weed of Antinomianism, growing out of the dunghill of Mr. R. Hill.

We must now inquire, how this flower, weed, or call it what you please; in plain language, this *false quotation*, came into your possession. You do not choose to acknowledge, that you had been studying the forty-five first years of Mr. Lackington's life; (indeed, what man of decency would acknowledge this?) and I am willing to credit the tale, exactly as you represent it.

It seems then, that you received it from a friend of yours; and without the smallest examination, as to it's truth, or authenticity, you give it place in your memorandum book; from whence it finds it's way into the black pulpit book; and then into the world at large, through the medium of the GUIDE, marked with Mr. R. Hill, to distinguish it's original.

Who this friend of yours is, we are not told; but his employment we are made acquainted with. It appears that the office of this same worthy gentleman, is that of a pig, which is sent to smell for truffles, that men of taste may feed upon them: or rather that of a jackall or lion's provider, that hunts for



living food or dead carrion, to gratify the king of beasts. Your friend, is the finder; he brings it to you; you treat your parishioners with it; and when they are surfeited, (as they have long enough been, and therefore look for wholesome food where they can get it;) you hash it up at second hand, and offer it to all the world, garnished with the name of R. Hill. No inquiry however was made, where this dainty morsel was found, nor did you so much as know that it had it's first existence in Moorfields; and that it was ushered into the world by Mr. Lackington, till the appearance of my Apology, stating it's *birth, parentage, and education.*

What now were you to do? That you lamented, either the deed, or the *detection*, I cannot doubt; and had you in an amiable friendly manner expressed your concern, for the mistake you had been led into, and confessed, that it was owing to your having paid too much attention to a short citation, which another had made, without considering the general scope of the place, and argument, from which it was taken; who is there that would not equally have commended your candor, and your politeness?

Instead

Instead of this, what has been your conduct? You have sheltered both the deceit and the unkindness, you have been guilty of, under the wing of a still more false quotation of the late Mr. Fletcher, from whom, there can be no doubt, but your good friend Lackington, (or whoever might have been his jackall,) first borrowed it; but you take no notice of the replies which were made to Mr. Fletcher upon the occasion, though they were generally deemed conclusive and satisfactory, to all ingenuous minds. It is necessary however to repeat to you, that not a line or syllable of the most exceptionable part of what you have produced from Mr. Fletcher, as a quotation from me, stands in any one of my publications, nor may, by fair inference, be deduced from them; though in your usual way, marked with inverted commas, as if you had given my own words; and all this is done, without the smallest attention being paid to my own explanations of those animating gospel truths, which Mr. Fletcher's attack necessarily led me to speak of, and which I did endeavour to speak of (supposing some subtle adversaries might be on the watch,) in the most guarded manner, that I might not be misunderstood, and that no wrong conclusions might be drawn from evangelical assertions;

assertions ; but long experience has taught me to say, “ Oh ! let me fall into the hands “ of God, and not into the hands of Armians, for their *tender mercies* are cruel.”

Of Mr. Fletcher himself, I would say as little as possible ; and would wish to draw the veil of charity over that part of his conduct, whereby his attachment to Mr. John Wesley carried him to such unwarrantable lengths, as to the manner in which he treated those, whom he called his *dear Calvinistic brethren*. But I have been informed from different quarters, and I hope truly, that Mr. Fletcher frequently lamented the unkindness and asperity, which had issued from his pen ; and I trust he is now triumphing in that electing love and imputed righteousness of the Redeemer, which he spoke of in such low terms, throughout his *latter* controversial writings.

Your partiality to Mr. Fletcher both is, and is not to be wondered at. You justly extol him, as a very able, pious,\* learned,  
*acute*

\* I trust Mr. F. was a pious man in the best sense of the word ; but for my own part, I have no idea of any piety, but that which has Christ for its foundation, and God's glory for its object. Every thing  
else

*acute* divine, and he certainly merits the character of a most laborious one also: But supposing you had not found in him a decidedly against the Calvinistic doctrines of grace, what would you have said of his schismatical origin, and baptism at the *Lake of Geneva*; † and what of his frequent preaching in barns, fields, conventicles, and methodist meeting houses, as well as of his inviting similar preachers, and lay-men into his own parish? Had he been a Calvinist, *fire and faggot*, some might have thought, would been too good for him.—However, with regard to his constant residence in his own parish, his unremitted vigilance and exertions both in season and out of season, his great attention to the poor of the flock, and his easy disposition in the matter of his parochial tithes and dues, I hold him up to Mr. D. not only as worthy of his admiration, but I add, “*go and do thou likewise.*”

else which goes by the name of piety, can only tend to deceive the professor, and to keep him from God, instead of leading him to God. Self-made holiness will never abide the day of trial.

† Mr. Fletcher was born near Lausanne, which is situated on this Lake, about thirty English miles from the City of Geneva; and was one of the original Churches reformed by Calvin.

Whatever peculiar opinions Mr. Fletcher might for a time have adopted, by attempting to defend Mr. Wesley's *Minutes*, &c. I hope, as the disputes relative to those Minutes died away, Mr. F.'s desire of defending them expired also; I remember the time when he was quite otherwise minded, though I am persuaded he never was a decided Calvinist.

As to Mr. Fletcher's connexion with the Methodists as a body, I by no means blame him on that account. I believe many of the excellent of the earth are among them; and I see with pleasure that numbers of them finish their course with joy and triumph; especially among those whose grace and experience outstrip their own ideas, and make them *wiser than their teachers*. They have, however, been generally instructed to look at what is called Calvinism with horror; and from having a picture drawn for them, and hung up before their eyes, totally unlike the reality, they shrink at what they esteem an hideous monster, and so make no further inquiry, denying in word, what in heart they acquiesce in.

I am sorry now for a moment to turn my own eyes, and yours to the unhappy Lack-  
ington,

ington, once a strict and flourishing professor of religion, but now, alas! a profane scoffer at evangelical truth and vital godliness. This man, I conclude, from his *Weslean* connexions, never embraced the tenets of Calvin, therefore here again all your feeble attempts at wit, had better have been spared; and if that will satisfy you, he and his sentiments are quite on your side of the question. As to his pretended quotation, I again aver, that it no where exists; and his assertion, that a friend of his read it to him out of a book of Mr. R. Hill's, is just as false as I have represented it to be: Nevertheless, for calling this conduct of Mr. L. *consummate impudence and effrontery*, you step in to his relief, and blame me for the expressions I have used. Perhaps you are of opinion, that if I had stiled it a *trifling mistake* or a *small inadvertency*, I should have put a more proper construction upon it.

Now, Sir, disavowing as I do, *in toto*, the idea of permitting either you, Mr. Lackington, or Mr. Fletcher, to be the interpreter of my own words, and expressions, or of suffering you to draw conclusions from them, diametrically opposite to those religious principles which I have always held and maintained; I proceed to a more particular

particular explanation of my sentiments, on those points, which have appeared to you so very obnoxious; and in doing this, I shall not keep back one jot or tittle of that pure gospel truth, on which I believe the security of my own everlasting salvation depends, and without a firm faith in which, I should reckon myself of all men the most miserable.

Know, then, Sir, that next to the sacred writings, I admire and esteem above all others, that very book of that highly honoured Reformer, Martin Luther, which you have so grossly abused; I mean his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians: and although you can on no occasion speak with any degree of temper or patience of this signal instrument of God, any more than of the great Mr. Calvin, yet on that very important distinction between the sin and the sinner, as held forth in the citation I have given from Luther, (or as you yourself have stated it between two persons, one a believer, and the other an unbeliever committing the same sin) I may truly affirm, SALVATION ITSELF DEPENDS; and in this declaration I shall now endeavour to prove, that you must either acquiesce with Luther, and with me, or else confess yourself to be  
a down-

a downright Papist, or rather a determined Socinian.

It should be noted, that what first gave rise to the false quotations under consideration, was an assertion of Mr. Fletcher, relative to David, who, he said, according to my sentiments, “ did not displease God more “ when he fell into his grievous sins of “ adultery and murder, than when he com- “ posed his psalms, or danced before the “ ark.” This I am sure was the exact substance of what Mr. F. said, though I have not now his own book to refer to.—In answer to Mr. F. I begged leave to explain myself, and told him that he much mistook my meaning; I was far from asserting, or thinking, that God was not highly displeased at the wickedness of David, for the word of Inspiration declared that “ the thing which “ David had done displeased the Lord.” But though God severely chastised the King of Israel for *his iniquity*, and expressed his hatred of it, yet, *his person* was not again brought under the curse and condemnation of the law. The covenant of Jehovah stood sure, from everlasting to everlasting; and in that covenant provision was made through the atoning blood of our great high Priest, to save his people from all their sins.

But



But as to my having affirmed that David would have been saved, if he had died without repentance, not a word of the sort was dropt by me; (nor indeed have you directly accused me of it, though what you said has set such an idea afloat.) I must have intirely deserted my own principles, if I had not supposed repentance and salvation necessarily connected; and that the former, however it's actings might, through the prevalence of sin and temptation, be for a time suspended, would certainly be revived in the soul, before the latter was final and complete.

Viewing the justification of a sinner as one complete, irrevocable act of God, I expressed my cordial disapprobation of that very unscriptural position in Mr. Wesley's minutes, "that we are every hour and every moment pleasing or displeasing to God, according to our works, according to the whole of our inward tempers, and outward behaviour;" which would indeed be the case, if believers were viewed as they are in themselves, and not standing in Christ their glorious Head, and Representative, in whom they are always complete, and without the imputation of any sin, seeing, "he hath put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

In

In proof of my assertions, after having made an ample appeal to the word of God, and to the stability of the covenant of grace, I brought that passage from the great reformer, Martin Luther, which has so highly provoked your indignation, and wound you up to such a pitch, as to cause you to hold him up to the world (either to his shame, or your own) as a rank Antinomian; a setter forth of nonsense; with many other such like words, and appellations. Regardless, however, of all this, I now venture once more to give the dreadful passage from Luther, which has so much ruffled the Presbyter; after which I shall boldly enter into a defence of it, and demonstrate, that there is no middle way between the belief of it, and Socinianism.

“ This I say, lest any man should say,  
 “ that after grace is received, there is little  
 “ account to be made of sin: sin is truly sin,  
 “ whether a man commit it before he hath  
 “ received Christ, or after; and God always  
 “ hateth sin; yea, all sin is damnable, as  
 “ touching the fact itself, but in that it is  
 “ not damnable, to him that believeth, it  
 “ cometh of Christ, who, by his death hath  
 “ taken away sin; but to him that believeth  
 “ not in Christ, not only all his sins are  
 “ damnable,

“ damnable, but even his good works also  
“ are sin, according to that saying, what-  
“ soever is not of faith is sin. Rom. chap. xiv.  
verse 33.

“ Therefore, the error of the schoolmen  
“ is most pernicious, which do distinguish  
“ sins according to the fact, and not accord-  
“ ing to the person; he that believeth has  
“ as great sin as the unbeliever, but to him  
“ that believeth it is forgiven, and not im-  
“ puted; not for any difference of sins, or  
“ because the sin of the believer is less, and  
“ the sin of the unbeliever is greater, but  
“ for the difference of the persons. For the  
“ faithful assureth himself by faith, that his  
“ sin is forgiven him, forasmuch as Christ  
“ has given himself for it. Therefore, al-  
“ though he hath sin in him, and daily  
“ sinneth, yet he continueth godly; but  
“ contrariwise, the unbeliever continueth  
“ wicked. And this is the true wisdom and  
“ consolation of the godly, that although  
“ they have, and commit sins, yet they know  
“ that for Christ's sake they are not imputed  
“ unto them.”

*Luther on the Galatians.*

I am now, Sir, very willing to attend to  
the case, as stated by you, as well as by Mr.  
Fletcher

Fletcher before you, and deduced from the foregoing quotation.

We will suppose two persons, both guilty of the same sins. Mr. Fletcher pitches upon Claudius, and David, and he thinks it tyrannical in God, that his anger should *smoke* against the poor heathen, for the same crime, from which he freely absolves David.— That God, however, without the smallest impeachment of his goodness, truth, wisdom, or justice, might condemn Claudius and pardon David, is most certain: for Christ gave himself for the sins of David, but not of Claudius. He bare the one in his own body on the tree, not the other. David had faith; Claudius had not. “He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned.” Upon the principle of the popish schoolmen, that sin is imputed according to the *act*, not according to the *person*, the man who has committed ten sins may be damned; whilst he, who has committed only nine may be saved. Take away this grand scriptural distinction, and the believer and unbeliever both stand on the same footing; faith in Christ is of no avail to the removal of sin from the sinner to the surety; and, the vicarious sufferings of the Redeemer become of none effect; but we are all equally under the law, whether we believe or not; and accord-

according as the law is kept or broken, so will it be well or ill with us at the judgment day. Such doctrine establishes the old Covenant of Works, without disguise ; and sets aside the whole gospel plan of gratuitous salvation.

Moreover, Sir, I do frankly avow, that, without this distinction between sin committed, and the person committing it, whether it be a smaller or a greater breach of the law ; whether a sin in thought, or a sin in act, (for before the law, we are expressly assured, that *there is no difference* ; seeing that every sin brings in the sinner guilty,) both law and gospel are crumbled into nothing, and that Paganism, Mahometism, Judaism, and Christianity, all stand upon a level.

That a true Christian may be permitted to fall into sin, yea, into great sins, and to backslide, I suppose no one who has read his Bible will deny. The question then is, does such an one come again into his original state of a child of wrath ; is he again brought under the curse of the divine law ; or does he, by virtue of his union with Christ, and through faith in his name, stand absolved in the sight of God, and free from all condemnation ? I answer, without hesitation or difficulty, that the law, though broken, has no authority,  
or

or power, to pronounce sentence against such an one ; and for this reason ; because “ Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us,” and because every believer is as much delivered from the law, as a covenant to which he is to look for life and salvation, as the woman, who is married a second time, is loosed from the law of her first husband.\*

If it be not so with the believer, what good does his faith do him? Yea, what advantage has he from the atonement of Christ? How is he his Saviour? How can he join in the triumphant song, “ who shall lay any thing to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth.”

But this is not at all the case with the unbeliever ; not being interested in Christ ; Christ not being one with him, nor he one with Christ, not being a branch engrafted into the true vine ; his person is obnoxious to the wrath of God ; and he is liable to be arrested for all his breaches of the moral law, which gives strength to sin, and in-

\* See this case beautifully and strongly argued at large, by the Apostle in his seventh chapter to the Romans.

inflicts its wages, which is DEATH ; and though his transgressions may not be of a flagrant kind, still the law makes no difference or allowance, since “ all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God ; and he that keepeth the whole law, and yet offendeth in one point, he is guilty of all.”

I do therefore again positively affirm, on the sacred records of God himself, that, supposing A and B, the former a believer, the latter an unbeliever, both commit the same sin, and even A a greater than B ; that A does not come under the curse of the law, but that B does ; and *that*, for the reasons before recited ; and because there is such a mysterious change of persons between Christ and the believer, that the curse of the law can no more be inflicted on the members, than it can on the head, upon whom it poured forth all its force and malediction, when he hung on the cross ; for it is written “ cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” And thus did Christ himself actually, fully, and completely bear all the sins of his Church and people, when “ he suffered the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God.”

I add,

I add, that without the distinction between the sin, and the person sinning, as held forth by Luther, all the types and sacrifices under the law are unmeaning and nugatory. These, one and all, prefigured Jesus Christ, as bearing sin, and taking it upon himself, that it might not be imputed to, or charged on the transgressor. Yet both then and now, sin was charged on some and not on others; and what then made, or now makes the difference? only faith in a Redeemer to come, or already come; the effect of which faith is sincere contrition for sin, with full purpose of heart to forsake it *universally*, and to follow the holy will of God; as the blessed Luther, every where maintains. Indeed, without this idea being kept in view, all the consolation which is derived from Christ, being the surety of his people, and from his expiatory sacrifice, in which the distinguishing glory of the gospel consists, must vanish into nothing at all.

Every true christian readily allows that there are different degrees of sin, more or less heinous; but there is no sin, however small it may be in human estimation, but what subjects the person committing it to the curse of the broken law. Nor is there any sin however grievous and aggravated, that



the blood of Christ does not cleanse from, as freely as from a sinful thought. If this were not so, there is an end of all distinction between law and gospel; to instance only in the sin of drunkenness, (though it will be equally true of every other sin) the man, who is only what is called a *little tipsy*, may not come under condemnation, whilst he that is *dead drunk*, becomes immediately liable to the wrath of God.—Upon your plan, and that of the popish schoolmen, which Luther justly stiles *most pernicious*, and which judges of sin according to the *fact*, not according to the *person*, (confounding the believer with the unbeliever,) similar cases must occur every moment, in ten thousand instances.

I must therefore be bold to declare, that although your opposition to the great Champion of the Reformation, is so *redoubtable*, that you seem to be *travelling in birth* for words, to express your abhorrence of the truths he taught, that they are truths which stand at the very threshold of all religion, and are the first rudiments, the A, B, C of Christianity. I *wot*, however, Sir, that through *inadvertence*, (for so the phrase will bear to be translated) *you did it*. But certainly  
your

your language on the occasion is not dressed up in *pretty words*.

In this change of persons, between Christ and the believer, is contained the essence of those great and glorious truths, that I have been exemplifying, and that you unhappily brand with the slur of Antinomianism; which in order if possible to wipe off, and to prevent the ill effects of your endeavours to prejudice your readers against a doctrine so clearly revealed in scripture, and so essential to every christian's establishment and comfort, I shall call in the venerable Bishop Hall, in whose most excellent Treatise on the mystical union between Christ and the believer, written as he tells us, when he was more than eighty years of age, I find much to my purpose, though the extracts I make, shall be as short as possible; but with this excellent work before me, I hardly know where to begin, or where to leave off.

“ O incomprehensible mercy! *He hath*  
 “ *made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin,*  
 “ *that we might be made the righteousness of*  
 “ *God in him.* What a marvellous and happy  
 “ exchange is here! We are nothing but  
 “ sin; Christ is perfect righteousness; he is

“ made our sin, that we might be made his  
 “ righteousness ; he that knew no sin, is  
 “ made sin for us ; that we who are all sin,  
 “ might be made God’s righteousness in him.  
 “ In ourselves we are not only sinful, but sin ;  
 “ in him, we are not righteous only, but  
 “ righteousness itself ; of ourselves we are  
 “ not righteous, we are made so ; the same  
 “ God in his infinite mercy, who made him  
 “ sin for us, hath made us his righteousness.  
 “ Nootherwise are we made his righteousness,  
 “ than he is made our sin ; our sin is made his  
 “ by God’s imputation ; so is his righteous-  
 “ ness made ours. How fully doth the second  
 “ Adam answer and transcend the first ? *By*  
 “ *the offence of the first, judgment came upon*  
 “ *all men to condemnation ; by the righteousness*  
 “ *of the second, the free gift came upon all men*  
 “ *unto justification of life. And, As by one*  
 “ *man’s disobedience many were made sinners,*  
 “ *so by the obedience of one shall many be made*  
 “ *righteous.* How free then, and how per-  
 “ fect is our justification ? What quarrel  
 “ may the pure and holy God have against  
 “ righteousness, against his own righteous-  
 “ ness ? And such are we made in and by  
 “ him. What can now stand between us  
 “ and blessedness ? Not our sins, for this is  
 “ the praise of his mercy, that he *justifies the*  
 “ *ungodly.* Yea, were we not sinful, how  
 “ were

“ were we capable of his justification? Sin-  
 “ ful, as in the term from whence this act  
 “ of his mercy moveth, not as in the term  
 “ wherein it resteth; his grace finds us sinful,  
 “ it doth not leave us so. Far be it from the  
 “ righteous Judge of the world, to absolve a  
 “ wicked soul continuing such; *He that justi-*  
 “ *fietb the wicked, and he that condemneth the*  
 “ *just, even they both are an abomination to the*  
 “ *Lord,* (Prov. xvii. 15.) No, but he kills  
 “ sin in us whilst he remits it; and, at once,  
 “ cleanseth and accepts our persons. Repent-  
 “ ance and remission do not lag one after ano-  
 “ ther; both of them meet at once in the peni-  
 “ tent soul; at once doth the hand of our faith  
 “ lay hold on *Christ*, and the hand of *Christ*  
 “ lay hold on the soul to justification; so as  
 “ the sins that are done away can be no bar  
 “ to our happiness. And what but sins can  
 “ pretend to an hindrance? All our other  
 “ weakneses are no eye-fore to God; no  
 “ rub in our way to heaven; What matters  
 “ it then how unworthy we are of ourselves?  
 “ It is *Christ's* obedience that is our righ-  
 “ teousness, and that obedience cannot but  
 “ be exquisitely perfect; cannot but be both  
 “ justly accepted as his, and mercifully ac-  
 “ cepted as for us. There is a great deal of  
 “ difference betwixt being righteous, and  
 “ being made righteousness. Every regene-

“ rate soul hath an inherent justice or right-  
 “ teousness in itself; *He that is righteous let*  
 “ *him be righteous still*, saith the Angel,  
 “ (Rev. xxii. 11.) But at the best, this  
 “ righteousness of ours is like ourselves, full  
 “ of imperfection; *If thou, Lord, shouldst*  
 “ *mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?*  
 “ (Psalm cxxx. 3.) *Behold, we are before*  
 “ *thee in our trespasses, for we cannot stand*  
 “ *before thee because of this*, (Ezra ix. 15.)  
 “ *How should a man be just with God? If he*  
 “ *will contend with him, he cannot answer him*  
 “ *one of a thousand*, (Job ix. 2, 3.) So then,  
 “ *he that doth righteousness is righteous*, (1 John  
 “ iii. 7.) But by pardon and indulgence,  
 “ because the righteousness he doth is weak  
 “ and imperfect; he that is made righteous-  
 “ ness is perfectly righteous by a gracious  
 “ acceptance, by a free imputation of abso-  
 “ lute obedience. Wo were us, if we were  
 “ put over to our own accomplishments; for,  
 “ *Cursed is every one that continues not in all*  
 “ *things which are written in the book of the*  
 “ *law, to do them*, (Gal. iii. 10. Deut. xxvii.  
 “ 16.) And, *If we say that we have no sin,*  
 “ *we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in*  
 “ *us*, (1 John i. 8.) Lo, if there be truth  
 “ in us, we must confess we have sin in us;  
 “ and if we have sin, we violate the law; and  
 “ if we violate the law, we lie open to a  
 “ curse.

“ curse. But here is our comfort, that our  
 “ Surety hath paid our debt. It is true,  
 “ we lay forfeited to death. Justice had  
 “ said, *The soul that sinneth shall die*, (Ezek.  
 “ xviii. 4.) Mercy interposeth, and satisfies.  
 “ The Son of God (whose every drop of  
 “ blood was worth a world) pays this death  
 “ for us; and, now, *Who shall lay any thing*  
 “ *to the charge of God's elect? It is God that*  
 “ *justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is*  
 “ *Christ that died, yea rather that is risen*  
 “ *again, who is even at the right-hand of God,*  
 “ *who also maketh intercession for us*, (Rom.  
 “ viii. 33, 34.) Our sin, our death is laid  
 “ upon him, and undertaken by him; *He*  
 “ *was wounded for our transgressions, he was*  
 “ *bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of*  
 “ *our peace was upon him, and with his stripes*  
 “ *we are healed*, (Isa. liii. 5.) His death,  
 “ his obedience is made over to us. So then,  
 “ the sin that we have committed, and the  
 “ death that we have deserved is not ours;  
 “ but the death which he hath endured, and  
 “ the obedience that he hath performed, is  
 “ so ours as he is ours, who is thereupon  
 “ made of God our righteousness. Where  
 “ now are those enemies of grace that scoff  
 “ at imputation, making it a ridiculous pa-  
 “ radox, that a man should become just by  
 “ another man's righteousness? How dare  
 “ they

“ they stand out against the word of truth,  
 “ which tells us expressly, that *Christ* is made  
 “ our righteousness? What strangers are  
 “ they to that grace they oppugn? How  
 “ little do they consider, that *Christ* is our’s?  
 “ His righteousness therefore, by which we  
 “ are justified, is, in him, our own. He  
 “ that hath *borne the iniquity of us all*, (Isa.  
 “ liii. 6.) hath taught us to call our sins  
 “ our *debts*, (Mat. vi. 12.) Those debts  
 “ can be but once paid. If the bounty of  
 “ our Redeemer hath staked down the sums  
 “ required, and cancelled the bonds, and  
 “ this payment is (through mercy) fully  
 “ accepted as from our own hands, What  
 “ danger, what scruple can remain? What!  
 “ do we then, weak souls, tremble to think  
 “ of appearing before the dreadful tribunal  
 “ of the Almighty! We know him indeed  
 “ to be infinitely and inflexibly just; we  
 “ know his most pure eyes cannot abide to  
 “ behold sin; we know we have nothing  
 “ else but sin for him to behold in us.  
 “ Certainly, were we to appear before him  
 “ in the mere shape of our own sinful selves,  
 “ we had reason to shake and shiver at the  
 “ apprehension of that terrible appearance;  
 “ but now that our faith assures us, we shall  
 “ no otherwise be presented to that awful  
 “ Judge, than as cloathed with the robes  
 “ of

“ of *Christ's* righteousness, how confident  
 “ should we be, thus decked with the gar-  
 “ ments of our elder brother, to carry away  
 “ a blessing? Whilst therefore we are de-  
 “ jected with the consciousness of our own  
 “ vileness, we have reason to lift up our  
 “ heads in the confidence of that perfect  
 “ righteousness which *Christ* is made unto  
 “ us, and we are made in him.”

*Bp. Hall.*

I confess, Sir, that I have been so much pleased with the company of Bishop Hall, that I found it impossible to leave it; and, therefore, contrary to my intention, have transcribed nearly the whole of what he says under the head of Christ being made our righteousness. How far the good prelate will now escape without being branded as an Antinomian with Luther, I know not, since I perceive nothing in the one, that is not as strongly maintained by the other.

Permit me here to observe, that although I never quoted but once (notwithstanding you affirm otherwise,) that passage from Luther, concerning the distinction between the sin and the person, of which you (*justly enough*) suppose me so fond; yet, if I had mentioned it twenty times, I should have gloried in bringing to view, a precious truth, on which  
 the



the whole consolation of a real Christian must be founded ; which is, that although he is a sinner, and continues a sinner every moment ; (since there is not a moment in which he is not, considered in himself, a transgressor of the moral law, and every transgression of the law is sin,) yet he always continues righteous and godly in Christ ; a fulfiller of the law, through his all-perfect, imputed righteousness, and screened from it's curse by his meritorious death on the cross.—Nor can I here make any papistical distinction between smaller or greater, *venial* and *mortal* sins. No sin is little in the sight of infinite perfection ; and all sin, however heinous in itself, is as nothing before the all-atoning blood of an almighty Redeemer.—Either sin is imputed, or it is not imputed ; where it is imputed, if it be but one sin, it brings the soul in guilty ; and it is impossible for any one at the same instant to be both condemned and acquitted. If sin be not imputed, the reason must be, because the law having been fully satisfied, has no charge to bring ; and what frees a man from the charges of the law, but that precious sprinkled blood, which, when the destroying angel sees on the *lintels*, or *door posts* of the heart, he *passes over*, without power or commission to hurt the sinner ?

You

You may, perhaps, tell me, that by holding forth this doctrine, I am avowing every thing, which I disclaimed as false in the quotation from Mr. Fletcher, and Lackington : but, not so ; for, so far as these great truths shine in those quotations, instead of disavowing them, I consent and *cleave to them, with full purpose of heart* ; but in the way you have brought them before the public eye, in *detached, culled scraps*, interlarded with ill-natured comments, I do not acknowledge them, for the same reason that I would object to a clipt piece of gold. You should have given the whole of what I said on the subject in question, or no part of it ; least of all, should you have omitted what I had advanced to clear my meaning on the point of sanctification, and that inherent personal holiness, *without which, no man shall see the Lord*.

Instead of this, your aim has been to make your readers believe, that the great privilege I have been contending for, was, *a privilege to sin* ; an idea, which I am sure must be viewed with horror, by every one who knows any thing what the saving grace of the gospel means.

More

More than once you make use of this very expression, or at least of the sentiment, that the doctrine contended for, intitles the believer “ to the privilege of sinning, as much “ as he chooses, without being liable to pu-  
“ nishment.”

Now, Sir, I am persuaded, that neither the person who could so sin, nor the person raising such an objection, can know what an evil and bitter thing sin is. A true child of God, so far from esteeming sin his *privilege*, or thinking, that he has a licence to commit it, because no breach of the law can bring him again into condemnation, hates sin the more on that account; he views it in the glass of a dying Saviour’s love; and in proportion as he lives nearer to that Saviour, who has freely absolved him from all sin, he lives further from whatever is displeasing to him; and looks upon it to be his *highest privilege*, to love, serve, and obey the God of all his grace and mercies.

Oh! Sir, could you look into the bosom of any true believer, and there see his fightings and struggles against what you suppose he looks upon as his *privilege*, you would not,  
you

you could not use such language, nor harbour such wrong ideas. View him even when corruption is most prevalent, and grace at it's lowest ebb, and you will find the cry of his heart to be this: " O wretched man that  
 " I am, who shall deliver me from the body  
 " of this death? When I would do good,  
 " evil is present with me; the good that I  
 " would, I do not; but the evil that I would  
 " not, that I do." And though he says,  
 " it is no more I that do it, but sin that  
 " dwelleth in me;" does he imagine that because his regenerate part cannot sin, his unregenerate part may sin with boldness? Nothing less; for his language is that of a man made up of both principles, and, in proportion as he is enlightened and renewed by grace, he abhors and resists carnal self, the law of sin that dwells in his members.

Yet in spite of all this conflict between flesh and spirit, he knows that he stands complete in Christ, " who hath made him  
 " free from the law of death and sin," and  
 " by one offering of himself hath perfected  
 " him for ever." He can therefore take up the triumphant language of faith, and say, " O death where is thy sting, O grave where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law; but  
 thanks

thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. xv. 15, 56.

Now, Sir, is it improper, is it dangerous to publish these chearing truths to the world? ought they to be kept out of sight, lest men of corrupt minds should make a bad use of them? then, I say that Christianity itself ought never to have been promulgated. For, what is there in all that I have advanced, either from myself, Luther, Bishop Hall, or any others, but what is included in these plain texts of scripture.—“Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.—The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin.—He hath put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.—Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.—There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.—He himself bare our sins in his own body on the tree.—Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.—To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.—If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the right-

righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins."

It is certain, that every objection will lie against all, and even against each of these declarations of the pure word of God, as have been brought against the great Reformer, Luther; and in fact, we find that they were raised against Christ himself, and against his Apostles, particularly against St. Paul, who frequently answers and obviates them, as I have repeatedly shewn in my Apology for Brotherly Love, and in my Reply to your Appendix; observing at the same time, that, whosoever preaches a doctrine not liable to the objections brought against Paul, must be the preacher of *another gospel*, different from that which Paul taught.

Before you had attempted to vilify Luther in the opprobrious abusive manner you have done, sneering at "*his Antinomian fits*," and holding him forth, as maintaining with the the great Mr. Calvin, "*a system of nonsense\**,"

D and

\* It is no uncommon thing before a torrent of abuse is poured forth, to prepare the way for it, by some qualifying assertions of high esteem, for those on whom the deluge is just going to burst; and by this artifice, every idea of prejudice or rancor in the writer,

writer,

and speaking in such degrading terms of his excellent Comment on the Epistle to the Galatians, you would have done well to have considered in what a high stile of approbation and

writer, is banished from the mind of the reader, who readily sucks in for truth the misrepresentations of malice, and the calumnies of hatred.

Now Mr. Daubeny assures us in his Guide, P. 91, that although he does not take his faith from Luther or Calvin, &c. yet " he professes the highest respect for each of them."

But when this *profession of high respect* is brought forward in his Appendix, let us see how it acts towards these two great Reformers.

" Calvin and Luther were men of more zeal than judgment, the very expression (*good works*) conveyed so unchristian a sound to their ears, that in guarding against it they thought the doctrine of divine agency, could not possibly be carried too far. Hence, in their pious zeal for the honor of God, which they considered as having been trampled on by human pretensions, they established what Doctor Balguy TRULY, [mark that word] though, perhaps, *coarsly*, calls a System of Nonsense."

I need not inform Mr. Daubeny, that Henry the Eighth obtained from his Holiness the title of " DEFENDER OF THE FAITH," for writing against Luther; and Cardinal Woolsey was very active in employing others to do the same. Here, then, is a popish Monarch, a Cardinal, and a Reverend Fellow of Win-

and praise the Bishop of London gave his *imprimatur* to that inimitable work, when it

Winchester College, all concurring in the same good work.—What a formidable phalanx!!! Alas, poor Luther! No marvel you are so often introduced to dance a *Fandango* on the Spanish stage with your brother, Calvin! But surely, after these illustrious men, and instruments of God in restoring religious truth, are thus held up to public contempt by Mr. Daubeny, neither Mr. Wilberforce nor myself have reason for regret or wonder that we are both stigmatized as *inimical to good works*.

To use Mr. Daubeny's own words. " You, and your friend Mr. Wilberforce, (for I now understand you both speak the same language,) seem perfectly agreed in decrying good works." Letter VI. p. 333. That great foreign divine and reformer, Zuinglius, or as Mr. D. calls him, *Zwingle*, is also ranked among those *nonsense-mongers* and enemies to good works; and so was St. Paul himself by the Pharisees of his day.

But let me ask, are there no ends and uses for which good works may be done, without arrogantly making them copartners with Christ in the work of salvation? Such as

- To glorify God.
- To Evidence our Faith.
- To Testify our love and gratitude.
- To Profit our neighbour.

These and other great ends are answered by good works: but because no one who is taught of God will presume to give works any place in procuring the sinner's acceptance, therefore all such humble Christians must be put down by Papists and modern Pharisees as enemies to, and *Decriers of Good Works*, however fruitful they may be in the practice of them. But I plainly perceive there is no end of cavils.



was first translated into English; recommending it particularly to persons whose consciences were afflicted with doubts and fears, and with a sense of sin and guilt; for whose use and benefit, according to that eminent prelate's judgment, (and indeed of all true and experienced christians, who have ever been exercised with legal terrors and apprehensions of wrath) it is admirably suited.

Should it please God, Sir, that your conscience were thus awakened, by the convincing influences of the Holy Spirit, you would then find so much sweet and precious *balm of Gilead*, in Luther's paraphrase, that I question whether it would not be in your estimation, one of the most valuable books, that ever was penned; for my own part, as already observed, I know of none preferable to it, and bless God that ever it was written.

To the extracts I have given, and to the testimony I have borne, in favor of Luther and Bishop Hall, let me make a triumvirate, by the addition of that truly respectable prelate Bishop Hopkins, from whose last sermon on the Nature and Necessity of Regeneration, or the New Birth, I transcribe what follows :

“ He

“ He that is born of God sinneth not ; he  
 “ cannot sin, because his seed remaineth in  
 “ him : This seed remains, and keeps him  
 “ that he cannot sin, either as apostates do,  
 “ who totally forsake the ways of God, or as  
 “ profane persons do, who never embraced  
 “ them. There is a great difference between  
 “ regenerate and unregenerate persons in the  
 “ very sins they commit ; all indeed sin, but  
 “ a child of God cannot sin ; (i. e.) though  
 “ he doth sin, yet he cannot sin after such a  
 “ manner as wicked and unregenerate men  
 “ do. There is a vast difference between  
 “ them, even in that wherein they do most  
 “ of all agree. *Their spot is not the spot of*  
 “ *his children,* (Deut. xxxii. 3.) Even de-  
 “ formities themselves are characteristical,  
 “ and a true Christian may come to know by  
 “ his sins, that he is not a sinner.”

Thus far Bishop Hopkins ; than whom a  
 more devout and holy soul perhaps never ex-  
 isted. But I should not be surprized if Mr.  
 Daubeny were to rank him in Luther's An-  
 tinomian ragged regiment. However, be-  
 fore Mr. D. positively does this, I hope he  
 will read the good prelate's four sermons on  
 Regeneration, if he be not too much preju-  
 diced against him, on account of his having  
 been *schismatically* baptized ; for, (as well as  
 Abp.

Abp. Secker,) the very learned Bishop Hopkins was bred and educated a Dissenter.\*

But I perceive, Sir, that great names have no authority with you, when your favorite sect is in danger; indeed how should they, when you set up your own authority so much above any other name that is named, looking down with a supercilious contempt upon all,

\* Our Church Catechism tells us, that "the promises of God are made, [or sealed] to them that believe, in that sacrament," i. e. of baptism. But then, Mr. Daubeny will say, "this benefit must be limited to those who receive baptism aright; in an episcopal Church, and by an episcopally commissioned minister, otherwise we must leave them to the *uncovenanted mercies of God.*" If Mr. D. *does not* say this, he gives up all he has been contending for in *THE GUIDE*. If *he does* say it, and chooses to stand upon the ground he has taken, then God's promises certainly do not, and cannot belong to Bishop Hopkins, any more than to Archbishop Secker; and the schismatical mischief which may have been done in Ireland, by the former, who was Bishop of Londonderry, must have operated, and still operates, in that kingdom, in the same way, though not perhaps in the same degree, as Abp. Secker's ministrations operated, and must, whilst the world exists, operate throughout England. Besides, neither of these two distinguished characters having, according to Mr. D. received the first sacrament in a way that could be valid and efficacious, ought to have been partakers of the second sacrament, or supper of our Lord; much less could they be duly qualified to administer that holy

all, who do not choose to espouse your party? Let me inquire, in the words of Bishop Hall to Arminius, (whose opinions however are far less distant from truth than yours,) “*What is it thou affectest?*” are we to think that some magnanimous *Bonaparte* is risen up in the Church, in these our days, who is to model every thing according to his own wish; attacking men, women, and books on every side, and commencing his career with the concluding century? If so, let him prove his commission, and from whence it issues; and if that be properly authenticated, we will acknowledge him as our **GUIDE**, and bow to his instructions. But,

holy ordinance to others. See here, the plain unavoidable tendency of the rigid doctrine of **THE GUIDE**! In want of charity, it even exceeds the *Novatian* heresy; in absurdity, the grossest superstitions of popery: In every view, it is diametrically repugnant to the benign nature of the gospel of Jesus Christ, which extends the covenant of promise to ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, which *Daubenism* confines comparatively to units, indeed. And if we take in all infants, whether baptized or unbaptized, throughout the whole globe, who die before the commission of actual sin, (and there is not a single text in God’s word which excludes any one of them,) then must the assembly of glorified spirits, be truly *a great multitude, which no man can number, out of every tongue, and kindred, and nation, and people.*

till

till this be done, the Church of England will probably lose but few of her sons, to join our new ECCLESIASTICAL CONSUL. Rather, they will lament, with the faithful of old, and say, “ How is the fine gold become dim !  
“ How is the most fine gold changed ! The  
“ precious sons of Sion, how are they es-  
“ teemed as earthen pitchers.” &c.

“ Remember, O Lord, what is come upon  
“ us: Consider and behold our reproach,  
“ the crown is fallen from our head, woe  
“ unto us, that we have sinned ! Turn us,  
“ O Lord, unto thee, and we shall be turned ;  
“ renew our days as of old.”

*Lam. of JER.*

---

*To be had of the Booksellers specified in the Title,*

PRICE FIVE SHILLINGS IN BOARDS,

AN

**APOLOGY**

FOR

**BROTHERLY LOVE,**

AND FOR THE

*DOCTRINES of the Church of England,*

BEING A FULL ANSWER TO

**Mr. DAUBENY'S GUIDE to the CHURCH.**