

2d—All those from whom God, for wise ends, permits an abstraction of spiritual comfort.

3d—All who walk in darkness and have no light, and who, the prophet says, “shall trust in the Lord and stay himself upon his God.”

Upon this principle, he taught that if any of those persons died in that state, they must go to hell, however they might hate sin and cultivate holiness. But this monstrous and horrible doctrine he afterwards totally renounced; and he admitted it to be so unchristian that he himself said, “When I and my brother taught this doctrine, I wonder that the people did not stone us.” What would have become of your *venerable* John Wesley, had he been stoned for insisting upon false doctrine, as he himself says that he ought to have been? And yet he for years taught those errors, and was, upon his own confession, a deceiver in religion! “venerable,” forsooth!

Thirteenthly—One instance more. In the Conference of 1774, he himself says, “We have received it as a maxim that a man is to do nothing in order to justification.” He adds, “than this, nothing can be more false.” Mark! that here he admits that he and his preachers under him had received, and had been teaching a doctrine as the truth of God “than which, nothing could be more false.”

Fourteenthly—You, Wesleyan Methodists, who claim to be as orthodox as the church of England Protestants, can you deny this; that your John Wesley, being himself only in priest's orders, ordained several priests to be priests also? and went so far as to commit the “*facinus inauditum*”—that is, he a *priest*, consecrated Dr. Coke to be—a *bishop*!!! This, indeed, so horribly scandalizes his own brother Charles, that it created a lasting schism among the Methodists; and the son of that Charles afterwards became a Catholic!

I could extend this catalogue of Wesleyan enormities and contradictory wanderings in matters of religion, if a space permitted. I could also point out in detail the cruel tyranny exercised over the preachers by your self-appointed Conference. But my business with you must, for the present, for want of space, not for want of materials, be limited to some of its effects.