

ship, necessarily implied by the Rules themselves. Overlooking this important distinction (which will be more fully adverted to presently), the common interpretation assumes that there is but one condition, and that this one is simply a *penitent desire* to obtain salvation. Dr. C., too, overlooks the distinction, and thinks there is but one condition expressed or implied, but supposes this one condition to be *saving faith*.

Dr. C.'s interpretation of the introduction and Rules, when thus confounded together, is far less plausible than the one he sets aside. To give it an air of plausibility, he finds it necessary to make a definition of saving faith very different from that which Methodists have rightly accepted. He lowers the condition of acceptance with God, in order to represent all who are admitted into Society as being in a state of acceptance with the Great Head of the Church. On this point it is sufficient to say that he thinks that saving faith was possessed by those mentioned in the historical introduction, who were "deeply convinced of sin, were groaning for redemption, saw the wrath of God continually hanging over their heads," and had "a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins," (v. p. 54). He thinks that such had saving faith, and were in the favor of God.

But in taking this view of saving faith he is un-Wesleyan as well as unscriptural. Wesley never taught that all mourning penitents were in the favor of God. When James Morgan, one of his preachers, asserted that such were in the Divine favor, Mr. Wesley wrote to him to say that he considered the assertion unscriptural and unsafe, as well as "contrary to what we have always taught." "We have always taught that a penitent mourned, or was pained on this very account, because he felt he was not in the favor of God, but had the wrath of God abiding on him." And he says, "we would never utter in a congregation, at the peril of our souls, the statement that such are in the favor of God, though they do not know it." (Tyerman's Life of Wesley, vol. iii., p. 24).

This makes it evident that he did not regard mourning penitents as having saving faith, and that it was not from any thought of this kind that such were admitted into Society.

The condition of admission was obviously the desire of present salvation. But why has it been assumed that this is also the condition of full and permanent membership? On special examination we shall find that the intention was that the "admission" spoken of in the introduction, and the Rules afterwards added, should be understood as referring severally to *different* conditions.

It is plain that the Rules had not to be observed in order to admission, that it was only in order to permanent membership that they had to be observed. Here then is one point of distinction. But the right observance of these Rules requires ability to observe them, and therefore presupposes that the *present* salvation, previously desired, has in the meantime been obtained by saving faith, leaving only *final* salvation to be still desired.

Did Mr. Wesley indicate by his allusions to these Rules that he so regarded them, and that he so distinguished them from the introduction? I