

SOME REMARKS

ON

MR. HILL'S "FARRAGO DOUBLE-DISTILLED."

medley, hotch-potch

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

1. It is far from my design to give a particular answer to everything contained in Mr. Hill's late treatise. I intend only to offer to the impartial reader a few cursory remarks, which may partly explain and partly confirm what I have already said upon the subject.

2. "Poor Mr. Wesley," says Mr. Hill, opening his cause with native eloquence, "has published various tracts, out of which Mr. Hill collects above an hundred gross contradictions. At this Mr. W.'s temper is much ruffled;" (I believe not; I am not sensible of it;) "he primes, cocks, and fires at Calvinism; and there is smoke and fire in plenty. But if you can bear the stench, (which indeed is very nauseous,) there is no danger of being wounded. He calls this last cannon, or pop-gun, 'Remarks' on my Review. Men of sense say, it is quite unfit for duty; men of grace compassionate the caster of it; men of pleasantry laugh heartily at it; but some good old women speak highly of it." (Pages 3—5.) I give this passage at some length, as a genuine specimen of Mr. Hill's manner of writing.

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

4. "Mr. W. would have us know, that his piece is written in much love. But what love? Love to his own inconsistencies; love of scolding, love of abuse. Let the reader

find out any other sort of love through the whole performance." In order to judge whether I wrote in love or no, let any one read the words he has picked out of fifty-four pages, just as they stand connected with others in each page; it will then appear they are not contrary either to love or meekness.

5. But Mr. W. says, Mr. Hill "is unworthy the name either of the gentleman or the Christian; and is amazed that Mr. Hill should lay claim to either of those titles." (Page 6.) Not so. It is my belief that Mr. Hill is both a gentleman and a Christian; though I still think, in his treatment of Mr. Fletcher and me, he has acted beneath his character. Yet it is very likely, "a friend of yours" (not mine) "might say, I wrote in much wrath." (Page 7.) I wrote then in just as much wrath as I do now; though your friend might think otherwise.

6. Nay, but Mr. W. "gives all the Calvinist Ministers the most scurrilous, Billingsgate language, while he is trumpeting forth his own praises, in Mr. F.'s 'Second Check to Antinomianism.'" (Page 8.) A small mistake. I do not give Billingsgate language to any one: I have not so learned Christ. Every one of those Hymns, out of which Mr. Hill culls the harshest expressions, are not mine, but my brother's. Neither do I trumpet forth my own praises. Mr. Hill's imagining I do, arises from an innocent mistake. He continually takes for granted that I read over and correct all Mr. F.'s books before they go to the press. So far from it, that the "Fourth Check to Antinomianism" I have not read over to this day. But Mr. W. "thinks himself to be the greatest Minister in the world." Exceedingly far from it. I know many now in England, at whose feet I desire to be found in the day of the Lord Jesus.

7. To that question, "Why does a man fall upon me, because another gave him a good beating?" Mr. Hill answers, "If your trumpet had not given the alarm, we should not have prepared ourselves for the battle." (Page 53.) Nay, truly, not mine, but Mr. Shirley's. I was sitting quietly in my study, on the other side of St. George's channel, when his trumpet gave the alarm. Yet I say again, I am not now sorry for these disputes, though I was sorry. You say, truly, "Mr. W.'s temper has been manifested" hereby. (Page 56.) Let all candid men judge between us, whether Mr. F. and I, on the one hand, or Mr. Hill on the other, has shown more "meekness and lowliness;" and

which of us has expressed the greatest heat, and the most cordial contempt of his opponent.

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

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

9. But what makes Mr. Hill so warm against me? I still believe it is for this chiefly,—because I am an Arminian, an election-doubter. For, says he, the "good old Preacher places all election-doubters" (that is, those who are not clear in the belief of absolute predestination) "among the numerous hosts of the Diabolonians. One of these being brought before the Judge, the Judge tells him he must die." (*Review*, page 35.) That is, plainly, he must die eternally for this damnable sin. I beg Mr. Hill to explain himself on this head. Does he still subscribe to the sentence of this "good old Preacher?" Are all election-doubters to be placed among the Diabolonians? Is the sentence irreversibly passed, that they must all die eternally? I must insist on Mr. Hill's answering this question: If not, silence gives consent.

10. Mr. H. farther affirms: "The only cement of Christian union is the love of God. And the foundation of that love must be laid, in believing the truths of God;" (that is, you must believe particular redemption, or it is impossible you should love God;) for, to use "the words of Dr. Owen, in his

'Display of Arminianism,'" (see what truths Mr. H. means,) "an agreement without truth is no peace, but a covenant with death, and a conspiracy against the kingdom of Christ.'" (Page 39.) Here again I beg an explicit answer. Will Mr. H. affirm this in cool blood? If he will, there needs no more to account for his enmity both to me and the Minutes. "Nay, but the foundation is struck at by those wretched Minutes." (Page 52.) True, the foundation of Calvinism. So I observed before. I know it well. If the Minutes stand, Calvinism falls. But Mr. Hill says, "The doctrines of election and perseverance are very little, indeed scarcely at all, dwelt on in the 'Review.'" Now, I think they are very much dwelt on therein, and desire any that have eyes to judge.

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

I.

"1. There was an everlasting covenant between the Father and Son, concerning man's redemption." "There never was such a covenant."

The former proposition is taken from the "Christian Library;" on which Mr. H. says again, "Mr. W. affirms that the Christian Library is 'all true, all agreeable to the word of God.'" I answered before, "I do not. My words are: 'I have endeavoured to extract such a collection of English divinity, as I believe is all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God.' (*Christian Library, preface*, p. 4.) I did believe, and do believe, every tract therein to be true and agreeable to the oracles of God. But I do not roundly affirm this of every sentence contained in the fifty volumes. I could not possibly affirm it, for two reasons: (1.) I was obliged to prepare most of those tracts for the press, just as I could snatch time in travelling; not transcribing them, (none expected it of me,) but only marking the lines with my pen, and altering a few words here and there, as I had mentioned in the preface. (2.) As it was not in my power to attend to the press, that care necessarily devolved on others; through whose inattention an hundred passages were left in, which I had scratched out.

It is probable too, that I myself might overlook some sentences which were not suitable to my own principles. It is certain the correctors of the press did this in not a few instances. The plain inference is, if there are an hundred passages in the 'Christian Library' which contradict any or all of my doctrines, these are no proofs that I contradict myself. Be it observed once for all, therefore, citations from the 'Christian Library' prove nothing but the carelessness of the correctors." (*Remarks*, page 381.)

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

But "there is very great evasion," says Mr. H., "in Mr. W.'s saying that though he believes 'every tract to be true,' yet he will not be answerable for 'every sentence or expression in the Christian Library;' whereas the matter by no means rests upon a few sentences or expressions, but upon whole treatises, which are diametrically opposite to Mr. W.'s present tenets; particularly 'the treatises of Dr. Sibbs, Dr. Preston, Bishop Beveridge, and Dr. Owen on indwelling sin.'" (Page 16.)

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

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

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

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

The tenth volume likewise contains two sermons of Dr. Sibbs’s, and his tract upon Solomon’s Song. Are any of these “diametrically opposite to my present tenets?” No more than those of Dr. Preston’s. I as willingly as ever subscribe to these also.

Is Dr. Owen’s tract, “Of the Remainder of Indwelling Sin in Believers,” “diametrically opposite to my present tenets?” So far from it, that a few years since I published a sermon on the very same subject. I hope there is no room to charge me with “quirk, quibble, artifice, evasion,” on this head; (though I believe as much as on any other;) I use only plain, manly reasoning; and such logic I am not ashamed to avow before the whole learned world.

15. But “I will go farther still,” says Mr. H.: “Let Mr. W. only bring me twenty lines together, out of the writings of those four eminent Divines, as they stand in the ‘Christian Library;’ and I will engage to prove that he has twenty times contradicted them in some of his other publications.” (Page 19.) Agreed: I bring him the following twenty lines

with which Dr. Preston begins his treatise called "The New Covenant:"—

"These words of God to Abraham contain a precept of sincerity, or perfect walking with God: 'Walk before me, and be thou perfect.' And also the motive thereunto, God's all-sufficiency: 'I am God all-sufficient.' As if he should say, 'If there were any defect in me, if thou didst need or couldest desire anything that were not to be had in me, and thou mightest have it elsewhere, perhaps thy heart might be imperfect in walking towards me. Thou mightest then step out from me, to take in advantages elsewhere. But seeing I am all-sufficient; since I have enough in me to fulfil all thy desires; since I am every way an adequate object, so that all thy soul can wish for thou mayest have in me; why then shouldst thou not consecrate thyself to me? Why then shouldst thou be uneven in thy ways, serving me sometimes, and sometimes the creature? For there is nothing in the creature, but thou mayest find in me.' 'I am all-sufficient; therefore, walk before me, and be thou perfect!'" (*Christian Library*, Vol. X., page 47.)

Here are exactly twenty lines, neither more nor less, "as they stand in the 'Christian Library.'" Now, fulfil your engagement; prove that I "have twenty times contradicted them in some other of my publications." If you cannot, acknowledge you have done me wrong. In the heat of your resentment, you have undertaken what you are not able to perform; you have spoken rashly and unadvisedly; you have gone much too far, far beyond the bounds of wisdom as well as of love.

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

Meantime, it has been acknowledged again and again,

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

17. The case is nearly the same with regard to those other tracts which I published many years ago,—Mr. Baxter's Aphorisms on Justification, and John Goodwin's tract on the same subject. I have lately read them both over with all the attention I am capable of; and I still believe they contain the true Scripture doctrine concerning justification by faith: But it does not follow, that I am accountable for every sentence contained in either of those treatises.

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

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

the calling of the Gentiles ; to be a witness to both parties of that covenant made between God and man." (Page 209.) Yea, of the "covenant made between God and man!" Of a covenant between the Father and the Son here is not a word.

"The only possible conclusion to be drawn from this defence of Mr. Wesley's is, that he became a commentator on the Bible before he could read the Bible." That is pity ! If he could not read it when he was threescore years old, I doubt he never will. See the candour, the good-nature, of Mr. Hill ! Is this Attic salt, or wormwood ?

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

II.

Of Election and Perseverance.

19. In entering upon this head, I observed, "Mr. Sellon has clearly showed, that the Seventeenth Article does not assert absolute predestination. Therefore, in denying this, I neither contradict that article nor myself." (*Remarks*, p. 382.)

It lies therefore upon Mr. Hill to answer Mr. Sellon before he witticizes upon me. Let him do this, and he talks to the purpose ; otherwise, all the pretty, lively things, he says about Dr. Baroe, Bishop Wilkins, Dr. Clark, and George Bell, are utterly thrown away.

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

lastly to execute its grand commission on the globe itself, causing the stars to fall from heaven." (*Farrago*, p. 37.)

What an heap of dirt is here raked together! I must not let it pass quite unnoticed. (1.) He "justly censures the enthusiasm and credulity of Mr. Wesley in paying so much attention to Bell's ridiculous reveries." Nay, so very little, that I checked them strongly, as soon as ever they came to my knowledge; particularly his whim about the end of the world, which I earnestly opposed, both in private and public. (2.) "Bragging of the many miraculous cures he had wrought." *I bragged of*—that is, simply related, the case of Mary Special, and no other; in the close of which I said, "Here are three plain facts,—She was ill; she is well; she became so in a moment. Which of these can with any modesty be denied?" I still ask the same question. (3.) That I ever called him "a sensible man," is altogether false. A man of faith and love I then knew him to be; but I never thought him a man of sense. (4.) That I "entreated him to continue in the society," is likewise totally false. (5.) Nor did I ever tell him, on that or any other occasion, of "the great good" he did. I know he was an instrument in God's hands of convincing and converting many sinners. But though I speak this now to all the world, I never spoke it to himself. (6.) Neither did he ever refuse, what never was asked, "to remain in connexion with me." (7.) Least of all did he refuse it because of my "double-dealings or unfaithful proceedings." He never mentioned to me any such thing, nor had he any pretence so to do. (8.) Nay, but you "was at some times full of Bell's praises." Very moderately full. "At other times," that is, after he ran mad, "you warned the people against him." I warned them not to regard his prophecies, particularly with regard to the 28th of February. (*Journal*, Vol. III., p. 130.)

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

“Dr. Halley fixes the return of the comet, which appeared in 1682, in the year 1758.” Observe, Dr. Halley does this, not I. On which he adds: “But may the great, good God avert such a shock or contact of such great bodies, moving with such forces, (which, however, is by no means impossible,) lest this most beautiful order of things be entirely destroyed, and reduced into its ancient chaos.” (*Serious Thoughts*, Vol. XI., pp. 8, 9.)

“But what, if God should not avert this contact? what would the consequence be?” That consequence I afterwards describe: “Burning up all the produce of the earth, and then the globe itself.” But do I affirm, or suppose, that it actually will do this? I suppose, nay, affirm, at the bottom of the same page, the direct contrary: “What security is there against all this, on the infidel hypothesis? But on the Christian there is abundant security; for the prophecies are not yet fulfilled.”

21. So much for the comet-enthusiasm. We return now to the point of unconditional election: “One would imagine,” says Mr. Hill, “by Mr. W.’s quoting the Thirty-first Article, in contradiction to the Seventeenth, that he thought the Reformers as inconsistent as himself.” (*Farrago*, p. 54.) I did not quote the Thirty-first in contradiction to the Seventeenth, but in explication of it. The latter, the Thirty-first, can bear but one meaning; therefore it fixes the sense of the former. “Nay, this Article speaks nothing of the extent of Christ’s death, but of its all-sufficiency.” (Pages 54, 55.) *Nothing of the extent!* Why, it speaks of nothing else; its all-sufficiency is out of the question. The words are: “The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual.” It is here affirmed, the death of Christ is a perfect satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world. It would be sufficient for a thousand worlds. But of this the Article says nothing.

But “even Bishop Burnet allows our Reformers to have been zealous Calvinists.” He does not allow them all to be such; he knew and you know the contrary. You cannot but know, that Bishop Ridley, Hooper, and Latimer, to name no more, were firm Universalists.

22. But the contradictions! Where are the contradictions? “Why, sometimes you deny election; yet another time you say,—

'From all eternity with love
Unchangeable thou hast me view'd.' *

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

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

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

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

I will now explain myself on this head. Though there are some expressions in my brother's Hymns which I do not use, as being very liable to be misconstrued; yet I am fully satisfied, that, in the whole tenor of them, they thoroughly agree with mine, and with the Bible. (2.) That there is no jot of Calvinism therein; that not one hymn, not one verse of an hymn, maintains either unconditional election, or infallible perseverance. Therefore, I can readily answer Mr. H.'s question, "How can Mr. W. answer it to his own conscience, to write prefaces and recommendations to Hymns which he does not believe?" There is the mistake. I do believe them; although still I will not be answerable for every expression which may occur therein. But as to those expressions which you quote in proof of final perseverance, they prove thus much, and no more, that the persons who use them have at that time "the full assurance of hope." Hitherto, then, Mr. Hill has brought no proof that I contradict myself.

III.

Of Imputed Righteousness.

24. "Blessed be God, we are not among those who are so dark in their conceptions and expressions. 'We no more deny,' says Mr. W., 'the phrase of *imputed righteousness*, than the thing.'" (Page 23.) It is true: For I continually

affirm, to them that believe, faith is imputed for righteousness. And I do not contradict this, in still denying that phrase, "the imputed righteousness of Christ," to be in the Bible; or in beseeching both Mr. Hervey and you, "not to dispute for that particular phrase."

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

It was neither this term, "the imputed righteousness of Christ," nor the thing which Antinomians mean thereby, the rejection of which I supposed to argue any darkness of conception. But those I think dark in their conceptions, who reject either the Scripture phrase, "faith imputed for righteousness," or the thing it means.

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

<p>"This doctrine" (of the "imputed righteousness of Christ") "I have constantly believed and taught for near eight-and-twenty years."</p>	<p>"The use of the term" (the "imputed righteousness of Christ") "is not scriptural; it is not necessary; it has done immense hurt."</p>
--	--

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

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

My words are: "We no more deny the phrase" (of "imputed righteousness") "than the thing." (*Remarks*, p. 383.)

"This doctrine I have believed and taught for near eight-and-twenty years." (*Ibid.*)

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

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

And here, says Mr. H., is a "plain concession from Mr.

W. himself, that he has been preaching a doctrine for twenty-eight years together, which has done immense hurt."

No, the doctrine which I believe has done immense hurt, is that of the imputed righteousness of Christ in the Antinomian sense. The doctrine which I have constantly held and preached is, that faith is imputed for righteousness.

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

To contradict this, Mr. H. cites these words: "'This is fully consistent with our being justified, through the imputation of Christ's righteousness.' Mr. W.'s notes on Romans iv. 9." Mr. H. adds: "These two, taken together, produce the following conclusion, that it is perfectly consistent to say, that we are justified by that which cannot be found in the Bible." (*Farrago*, p. 24.)

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

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

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

(1.) "That Mr. W. gives out such doctrines as he dares not require any others to believe." (Page 25.)

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

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

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

"Will Mr. W. be ingenuous enough to tell me, whether he did not write this when he was last in a certain country, which abounds with *crassa ingenia*?"* I will. I did not write this in the fogs of Ireland, but in the clear air of Yorkshire.

27. The two next propositions Mr. Hill quotes, are, "They to whom the righteousness of Christ is imputed," (I mean, who truly believe,) "are made righteous by the Spirit of Christ; are renewed in the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness."

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

And where is the contradiction between these propositions? "It is just this," says Mr. Hill, "that the doctrine of imputed righteousness makes those who believe it both holy and unholy." (Page 26.)

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

The First means just this: They whom God justifies, for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered, (whether they ever heard of that phrase, "imputing the righteousness of Christ," or not,) are sanctified by his Spirit; are renewed in the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness.

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

Now, where is the contradiction?

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

Mr. W. "winds up this point of imputed righteousness with a resolution which astonishes me, that 'he will never

* Persons of dull understandings.—EDIT.

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

IV.

Of a two-fold Justification.

My words cited as contradicting this, run thus:—

28. "In the afternoon I was informed how many wise and learned men, who cannot in terms deny it, (because our Articles and Homilies are not yet repealed,) explain justification by faith: They say, Justification is two-fold, the First in this life, the Second at the last day, &c. In opposition to this, I maintain, that the justification spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our Articles, is not two-fold; it is one, and no more." (*Remarks*, page 388.) True. And where do I contradict this? Where do I say, the justification spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our Articles, is any more than one? The question between them and me concerned this justification, and this only, which I affirmed to be but one. They averred, "But there is a second justification at the last day; therefore justification is not one only." Without entering into that question, I replied, "The justification whereof St. Paul and our Articles speak, is one only." And so I say still; and yet I do not deny that there is another justification (of which our Lord speaks) at the last day.

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

29. But "how is it possible to encounter such a man as this, without watching him through every line? And therefore I wish my readers would closely compare the 'Remarks' with the 'Review' itself;" (I desire no more. Whoever does this, will easily discern on which side the truth lies;) "as it is impracticable to point out half the little arts of this kind which Mr. W. has stooped to." That is, in civil terms, "Sir, you are a knave." Sir, I crave your mercy. I stoop to no art, but that of plain, sound reasoning. By this art, and by this alone, I am able to untwist truth from falsehood, how skilfully soever they are woven together. I dare use no other; for (whether you know it or no) I fear God. And by his grace, in simplicity and godly sincerity I have my conversation in the world.

"But how agrees this with what Mr. W. tells us, that he has never contradicted himself with regard to justification, since the year 1738?" (*Farrago*, p. 39.) Perfectly well. "How long has he held that justification is fourfold?" I have said nothing about it yet. "And how will he reconcile this with its being twofold, and with his preceding affirmation, that it is one and no more?" When time is, this mystery too may be cleared up.

V.

Of a Justified State.

30. Mr. W. says, "The state of a justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious." (Page 34.)

"Yet he asks elsewhere, 'Does not talking of a justified or sanctified state, tend to mislead men?' He answers: 'It frequently does mislead men;' namely, when it is spoken of in an unguarded manner. "'But where is the contradiction?' Whatever may be the contradiction, this is clearly the conclusion,—that Mr. W., by his own confession, is a misleader of men."

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

VI.

Are Works a Condition of Justification?

31. "Mr. W. says, 'No good works can be previous to justification.' And yet in the same page he asserts, 'Whoever desires to find favour with God should cease from evil, and learn to do well.'"

I answered: "Does not the Bible say so? Who can deny it? 'Nay, but Mr. W. asks, If this be not in order to find favour, what does he do them for?' And I ask it again. Let Mr. Hill, or any one else, give me an answer. So if there is any contradiction here, it is not I contradict myself, but Isaiah and our Lord that contradict St. Paul." (*Remarks*, pages 389, 390.)

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

VII.

Is Justification by Faith articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesie?

32. In the beginning of the year 1738, I believed it was so. Soon after I found reason to doubt. Since that time I have not varied. "Nay, but in the year 1763 you say, 'This is the name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord our Righteousness*. A truth this, of which may be affirmed, (what Luther affirms of a truth nearly connected with it, justification by faith,) it is *articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesie*.* It is certainly the pillar and ground of that faith of which alone cometh salvation.'" (*Farrago*, page 15.)

I answered: "It is certain, here is a seeming contradiction; but it is not a real one; for these two opposite propositions do not speak of the same thing. The latter speaks of justification by faith; the former, of trusting in the righteousness or merits

* A doctrine without which there can be no Christian Church.

of Christ. (Justification by faith is only mentioned incidentally in a parenthesis.) Now, although Mr. Law denied justification by faith, he might trust in the merits of Christ. It is this, and this only, that I affirm (whatever Luther does) to be *articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ.*" (*Remarks*, page 391.)

But Mr. Hill thinks, "justification by faith, and by trusting in the merits of Christ, are all one." (*Farrago*, page 16.) Be they or not, I still think, "some may doubt of justification by faith, and yet not perish everlastingly." Does Mr. Hill judge that such an one cannot be saved? that all Mystics (as well as Mr. Law) go to hell?

VIII.

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

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

IX.

*Of Merit.**

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

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

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

"You never use the word!" says Mr. H.: "What have we then been disputing about?" (*Farrago*, p. 36.) Why, about a straw; namely, whether there be a sense in which others may use that word without blame.

* Page 35.

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

What Mr. H. adds, is a mere play upon words: "Does Mr. W., by this looser merit, mean a merit that does not merit?" Yes; by terming a work meritorious in this improper sense, I do not mean, that it merits or deserves a reward in the proper sense of the word. Instances of the word taken in this improper sense occur all over the Bible.

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

When I say, "I do not grant that works are meritorious, even when accompanied by faith," I take that word in a proper sense. But others take it in an improper, as nearly equivalent with rewardable. Here, therefore, I no more contradict Mr. Fletcher than I do myself. Least of all do I plead, as Mr. H. roundly affirms, "for justification by the merit of my own good works." (Page 52.)

X.

Of Marriage.

34. "Mr. W. says, his thoughts on a single life are just the same they have been these thirty years." (I mean, with regard to the advantages which attend that state in general.) "Why then did he marry?" (Page 39.) I answered short, "For reasons best known to himself." As much as to say, I judge it extremely impertinent for any but a superior to ask me the question. So the harmless raillery which Mr. H. pleases himself with upon this occasion may stand just as it is.

XI.

Concerning Dress.

35. "Mr. W. advises his followers to 'wear nothing of a glaring colour, nothing made in the height of the fashion,' in order to 'increase their reward, and brighten their crown in heaven.'

"Nevertheless, in his 'Letter to a Quaker,' he says, 'To make it a point of conscience to differ from others, as to the shape and colour of their apparel, is mere superstition.'

"Yet he says, 'So I advise; but I do not make it a point of conscience.' It follows, that we are to increase our reward, and brighten our crown in heaven, by doing that which is mere superstition, and without acting from a point of conscience." (Page 40.)

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

In my "Advice to the People called Methodists," I say, "I would not advise you to imitate the people called Quakers, in those particularities of dress which can answer no end but to distinguish you from all other people; but I advise you to imitate them in plainness. (1.) Let your apparel be cheap, not expensive. (2.) Let it be grave, not gay or showy; not in the point of the fashion.

"Would you have a farther rule? Then take one you may always carry in your bosom: Do everything with a single eye; and this will direct you in every circumstance. Let a single intention to please God prescribe both what clothing you shall buy, and the manner wherein it shall be made, and how you shall put on and wear it. In other words, let all you do in this respect, be so done, that you may offer it to God, a sacrifice acceptable through Jesus Christ; so that, consequently, it may increase your reward, and brighten your crown in heaven."

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

36. "But it is inconsistent with what you said elsewhere: 'To make it a point of conscience to differ from others, as the Quakers do, in the shape or colour of their apparel, is mere superstition.'"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

XII.

Of Tea.

37. "Mr. W. published a tract against drinking tea, and told the tea-drinkers he would set them an example in that piece of self-denial." (*Farrago*, p. 41.)

"I did set them an example for twelve years. Then, at the close of a consumption, by Dr. Fothergill's direction, I used it again." (*Remarks*, p. 393.)

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

* O rare Wesleyan Logic! He who is clear in making distinctions is an able teacher.—EDIT.

XIII.

Of Baptism.

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

"Why then did you at Savannah baptize all children by immersion, unless the parents certified they were weak?" (*Farrago*, p. 42.)

I answered: "Not because I had any scruple, but in obedience to the Rubric."

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

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

Ut non

*Compositus melius cum Bitho Bacchius!**

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

39. "But what surpasses everything else is, that Mr. W. cannot even speak of his contradictions, without contradicting himself afresh. For he absolutely denies, not only that he ever was unsettled in his principles, but that he was ever accused of being so, either by friends or foes." (Pages 39, 40.) *Either by friends or foes!* I will rest the whole cause upon this. If this be true, I am out of my wits. If it be false, what is Mr. Hill? An honest, upright, sensible man; but a little too warm, and therefore not seeing so clearly in this as in other things.

My words are: "My friends have oftener accused me of being too stiff in my opinions, than too flexible. My enemies have accused me of both, and of everything besides." (*Remarks*, p. 402.) Is this "denying that ever I was accused of inconsistency either by friends or foes."

* This quotation from Horace is thus translated by Boscawen:—

"Nct half so justly match'd engage
Bithus and Bacchius on the stage."—ED:τ.

† Two thunderbolts of war.—EDIT.

I do still deny, that Mr. Delamotte spoke to me "of my wavering, unsettled disposition." (*Farrago*, p. 43.) But "he spoke to you," says Mr. Hill, "of something else." It is very likely he might.

40. Mr. W. is equally self-inconsistent "with regard to the Mystics. These, he tells us, he had once in great veneration," (I had, two or three and forty years ago,) "as the best explainers of the gospel of Christ. Yet afterwards he declares, he looks upon them as one great Antichrist." (Page 14.) I did look upon them as such thirty years ago. But in my "Remarks" I say, "I retract this. It is far too strong. But observe, I never contradicted it till now."

But how does this agree with Mr. W.'s saying, "I never was in the way of Mysticism at all?"

Perfectly well: I admired the Mystic writers. But I never was in their way; leaving off the outward means.

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

41. Now comes the capital instance of self-inconsistency: "In 1770, Mr. W. esteems the Minutes the standard of orthodoxy. In 1771, he signs a paper, owning them to be unguarded. In 1772, he tells us, he does not know but it would have been better, not to have signed that paper at all!" (Page 13.) Suppose all this true, what will it prove? Only that I made a concession which was made an ill use of.

But "Mr. F.'s defence makes poor Mr. W. appear more and more inconsistent. Mr. W. declares the Minutes to be unguarded:" (That is, "not enough guarded" against cavillers:) "Mr. F. defends them, and strives to reconcile them with the Declaration. But then comes Mr. W., and tells us, he does not know, but it had been better not to have signed it at all." And what then? Why, "hereby he intimates, that he has fixed a different sense upon the Minutes from that which they originally bore." No such thing; he intimates this and no more, that by that well-intended concession, he had given occasion, to those who sought occasion, of offence against him.

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

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

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

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

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

43. Awhile since, Mr. Ma—d related to me the whole story of Samuel Wi—n. I know not that I ever heard of it before, but only some imperfect fragments of it. The other story, of "a Preacher of perfection who said, the Holy Ghost visibly descended on all true converts," may be true for aught I know; but I question much, whether that madman was a Preacher. It may likewise be true, that several wild expressions were uttered at West-street chapel. Yet I think, all these put together will not prove, that I contradict myself.

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

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

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

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

In your account of perfection, blot out "no wandering

thoughts." None in the body are exempt from these. This we have declared over and over; particularly in the sermon wrote upon that subject.

If in the sermon on Ephesians ii. 8, (not xi. 5, as your blunderer prints it,) the words which I had struck out in the preceding edition, are inserted again, what will this prove? Only that the printer, in my absence, printed, not from the last, but from an uncorrected, copy. However, you are hereby excused from unfairness, as to that quotation. But what excuse have you in the other instance, with regard to Enoch and Elijah? On which I asked, "Why is Mr. Hill so careful to name the first edition? Because in the second the mistake is corrected. Did he know this? And could he avail himself of a mistake which he knew was removed before he wrote?" (*Remarks*, p. 395.)

It is now plain he could! Nay, instead of owning his unfairness, he endeavours to turn the blame upon me! "You are as inconsistent in your censures as in your doctrines: You blame me for quoting the last edition of your Sermon; whereas you call me to account for quoting the first edition of your Notes, concerning Enoch and Elijah; each of whom you have proved, by a peculiar rule of Foundery-logic, to be both in heaven and out of heaven." So, without any remorse, nay, being so totally unconcerned as even to break jests on the occasion, you again "avail yourself of a mistake which you knew was removed before you wrote."

45. But Mr. Wesley "hath both struck out some words, and put in others, into the sermon." This is a common complaint with Mr. Hill, on which therefore it is needful to explain.

I generally abridge what I answer; which cannot be done without striking out all unessential words. And I generally put into quotations from my own writings, such words as I judge will prevent mistakes.

Now to the contradictions:—

"If we say we have no sin' now remaining," (I mean, after we are justified,) "'we deceive ourselves.'"

I believe this; and yet I believe,

"Sin shall not always in our flesh remain."

Again:

"Many infirmities do remain."

This I believe; and I believe also,

"He that is born of God,' (and 'keepeth himself,'

1 John v. 18,) 'sinneth not' by infirmities, whether in act, word, or thought."

I believe likewise, that in those perfected in love,

"No wrinkle of infirmity,
No spot of sin remains."

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

I have spoken so largely already concerning sins of surprise and infirmity, that it is quite needless to add any more. I need only refer to the "Remarks," at the 399th and following pages.

46. But to go on:

"I wrestle not now."

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

"We wrestle not with flesh and blood."

"This he allows to be his own." (Page 31.)

Indeed I do not; although, it is true, "the perpetual war which I speak of in the note on Eph. vi. 13, is a war with principalities and powers, but not with flesh and blood." "But either way, Mr. John is stuck fast in the mire. For in his 'Remarks,' he contradicts his brother; in his Annotations, he contradicts himself; and in his Hymn, he contradicts both his brother and himself."

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

Again: "I never said,

'While one evil thought can rise,
I am not born again.'

My brother said so once; but he took the words in too high a sense." I add, and in a sense not warranted by the Bible. And yet I believe, that "real Christians, I mean those perfected in love, are freed from evil or sinful thoughts."

"But is not a babe in Christ born again? Is he not a real

Christian?" He is doubtless born again; and in some sense he is a real Christian; but not in the sense above defined.

47. We come now to the additional contradictions which Mr. Hill undertakes to find in my writings. They are already dwindled into one; and I hope to show quickly, this one is none at all. It stands thus:—

"Most express are the words of St. John: 'We know, that whosoever is born of God sinneth not.'"

"Indeed, it is said, This means only, he doth not commit sin wilfully or habitually."

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

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

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

48. "Before I quit this subject," (of perfection,) "I cannot help expressing my astonishment, that Mr. Wesley should deny that his tenets on that point exactly harmonize with those of the Popish Church; since all the decrees and books that have been published by the Roman Clergy prove this matter beyond a doubt."

I believe you have been told so. But you should not assert it, unless from personal knowledge. "Alexander Ross says so." What is Alexander Ross? See with your own eyes. "Mr. Hervey too gives an account of Lindenius and Andradius." Second-hand evidence still. Have you seen them yourself? Otherwise, you ought not to allow their testimony. As to that "most excellent and evangelical work," as you term it, the Eleven Letters ascribed to Mr. Hervey, Mr. Sellon has abundantly shown, that they are most excellently virulent, scurrilous, and abusive; and full as far from the evangelical spirit, as the Koran of Mahomet.

"But Bishop Cowper"—I object to him, beside his being a hot, bitter Calvinist, that he is a dull, heavy, shallow writer. And let him be what he may, all you cite from him is but second-hand authority. "Nay, I refer to the Bishop's own

words." But still, you have only the words at second-hand. In order to know the tenets of the Church of Rome, you must read the Romish authors themselves. Nay, it does not suffice to read their own private authors. They will disown anything we charge them with, unless we can prove it by recurring to their public and authentic records. Such are the "*Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini.*" Such the "*Catechismus ad Parochos.*" Till you have read these at least, you should never undertake to determine what is, or what is not, Popery.

49. "But as I am now on the subject of Popery, I must make a few animadversions on what Mr. Wesley affirms, 'I always thought the tenets of the Church of Rome were nearer by half to Mr. Hill's tenets, than to Mr. Wesley's.'" (Page 33.) Nay, give the honour of this to its true author: Mr. Hill goes to consult a Popish Friar at Paris, a Benedictine Monk, one Father Walsh, concerning the Minutes of the Conference. Father Walsh (Mr. Hill says; and I see no reason to scruple his authority here) assures him that the Minutes contain false doctrine; and that the tenets of the Church of Rome are nearer by half to his (Mr. Hill's) tenets than they are to Mr. Wesley's. (So Mr. Hill himself informs the world, in the Paris Conversation, of famous memory, which I really think he would never have published, unless, as the vulgar say, the devil had owed him a shame.) I add, "Truly, I always thought so." But I am the more confirmed therein, by the authority of so competent a judge; especially when his judgment is publicly delivered by so unexceptionable a witness.

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

Let us make the trial with regard to your ten propositions:—

(1.) "You deny election." "So does the Pope of

Rome." I know not that. Probably he holds it.

(2.) "You deny perseverance."

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

(3.) "You deny imputed righteousness."

Perhaps the Pope of Rome does ; but I assert it continually.

(4.) "You hold free-will."

"So does the Pope of Rome." No ; not as I do ; (unless he is a Predestinarian : Otherwise,) he ascribes it to nature, I to grace.

(5.) "You hold that works are a condition of justification."

If you mean good works, I do not.

(6.) "You hold a twofold justification ; one now, another at the last day."

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

(7.) "You hold the doctrine of merit."

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

(8.) "You hold sinless perfection."

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

(9.) "You hold, that sins are only infirmities."

I hold no such thing ; and you know it well.

(10.) "You distinguish between venial and mortal sins."

Not so ; I abhor the distinction.

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

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

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

"(1.) The big, rough man is Mr. Hill : (2.) The bar of iron" (red-hot !) "is *Logica Westleiensis* : (3.) The blow denotes the shock which Mr. John will receive by the said pamphlet : (4.) His being awakened out of a sound sleep, signifies there is yet hope, that he will, some time or other, come to the right use of his spiritual faculties." (Page 61.)

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

I am obliged to him, (1.) For sending against me only a big, rough man ; it might have been a liou or a bear : (2.) For directing the bar of iron only to my arm ; it might have been my poor skull : (3.) For letting the big man give me only one blow ; had he repeated it, I had been slain outright : And, (4.) For hoping I shall, some time or other, come to the right use of my spiritual faculties.

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

Certes I have, for many days,
Sent my poetic herd to graze.

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

King William is come home, come home !
King William home is come !
Therefore let us together sing
The hymn that 's call'd Te D'um !

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

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

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

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

Absolutely contrary to this is the crying out at every turn, " Quirk ! Sophistry ! Evasion !" In controversy these

exclamations go for nothing. This is neither better nor worse than calling names.

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

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

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

BRISTOL,
March 14, 1773.

AN ANSWER

TO

MR. ROWLAND HILL'S TRACT, ENTITLED,
"IMPOSTURE DETECTED."

Jealousy, cruel as the grave!—Canticles viii. 6.

Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, durst not bring a railing accusation against him.—Jude 9.

In a tract just published by Mr. Rowland Hill, there are several assertions which are not true; and the whole pamphlet is wrote in an unchristian and ungentlemanlike manner. I shall first set down the assertions in order, and then proceed to the manner.