Wesleyan Theological Journal

Volume 17, 2 — Fall — 1982

Editor
Alex R. G. Deasley

CHARISMATA IN THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITIES OF THE SECOND CENTURY

by
Ted A. Campbell

I. Introductory and Methodological Considerations

It will be our intent in this paper to consider the use of charismata[1] in the Christian communities of the second century A.D., and to assess the significance of the use (and eventual disuse) of charismata for our understanding of the religious intentionality of Christianity in this period. "Charismata" denoted for early Christian writers a variety of ecstatic phenomena associated with worship, especially prophecy and glossolalia.[2] The term could also be used to denote non-ecstatic "gifts of grace" as love (I Cor. 13) and service performed in love (I Pet. 4:10),[3] but we wish to take the term in the former sense for the purposes of this paper.[4] The term was also used in this (i.e., ecstatic) sense by the writers of the second century with whose works we shall be particularly concerned. The time span we are proposing to cover corresponds roughly to the second century A.D., although some of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers (e.g. 1 Clement) may date from late in the first century, and it will be helpful to refer to third and even fourth century writers and historians in our efforts to evaluate events and processes which occurred or began in the second century.

This subject is of particular interest because of the significant implications of the term itself and because of the period in which we are considering it. The word itself is one of the few terms used in a technical sense by early Christian writers to describe a particular set of religious experiences. Thus a consideration of it, and of phenomena related to it, across the spectrum of Christian groups in the second century offers a unique opportunity to study this aspect of the religious intentionality of Christians in this period, i.e., the particular manners in which these Christians expressed ultimate meaning and values.[5] Further, the time period with which we shall be concerned is of interest insofar as many persons have seen this as the period in which an earlier, more "charismatic" form of leadership in the Church was replaced by a more monarchical form of ecclesiastical government.[6] In this paper, we shall be concerned with a related process, although our focus will be on a shift in religious intentionality, rather than in sociological or ecclesiastical structures.

The largest part of this paper will be concerned with a positive inquiry into the precedents for the use of charismata in Hellenistic culture in general and in the New Testament in particular (Section II), the use of charismata in the church at large in the second century (Section III), and the seclusion and decline in the use of charismata illustrated in the rise of Montanism and reflected in various works (Section IV). The concluding part of this paper (Section V) will attempt to interpret these data by reference to categories derived from the comparative/phenomenological study of religion.

II. Context and Precedents

The use of charismata by the Christians of the second century may be seen in the context of Hellenistic religion, in general, and in continuity with preceding Christian uses, in particular. Forms of religious experience similar to those understood by early Christians to be charismata, especially prophecy, were quite well known in the world of late antiquity. This is indicated in the following report of a later classical source, Origen's interlocutor Celus:

> Many people and (indeed such) (*sic*) without names act as soothsayers with the greatest readiness, for some incidental cause, outside and inside temples; others go around begging in cities and camps. It is common practice and customary for each to say, "I am God or a child of God or a divine Spirit...." Having uttered these sayings abroad, they even add unintelligible, half-crazy, and utterly obscene words, the meaning of which no intelligent person can discover.[7]

Here we have reference not only to the multitude of prophets known in late antiquity, but also an indication of their ecstatic behavior. Further, the reference to unintelligible speech suggests a form of religious experience akin to glossolalia. Additional evidence for the frequency of prophetic figures can be drawn from Suetonius, who reported that Augustus ordered more than two thousand anonymous or pseudonymous prophetic books to be burned.[8] The ability to speak in a putatively divine language was attributed to Alexander of Abonutichus, who was said to utter "unintelligible vocables which sounded like Hebrew or Phoenician."[9] E. R. Dodds attributes the rise of oracles and "private" prophets (i.e., those not attached to a temple) in late antiquity to the general insecurity of the Roman world and to religious anxiety brought about by the pluralism of religious beliefs in the culture.[10] Due to the division between material and spiritual realms which was characteristic of the world view of late antiquity, religious experiences were often understood to be divine messages conveyed through mediators variously referred to as demons, angels, aions, or spirits (*pneumata*). Further, it seems to have been characteristic of such experiences that they were interpreted as "invasions" of the human personality:

> Not all prophets, whether Hebrew or Greek, were wild and frenzied in their ecstasies. But inasmuch as they were oracles, i.e., mouthpieces of the gods, their characteristic rhetoric, especially the use of the first person singular to refer to the

god, clearly implies an ecstatic state, i.e., a state in which a human spirit is "displaced" because of an "infilling by a higher power."[12]

We shall find much the same types of religious experiences and interpretations of those experiences in the early Christian communities.

As we have noted above, the term charismata in the New Testament can denote ecstatic religious experiences and also non-ecstatic "gifts" believed to derive from divine grace. In three lists, at I Cor. 12:8-10, I Cor. 12:28-29, and Rom. 12:6-8 both sorts of "gifts" appear with no distinctions drawn between them. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that the sense of ecstatic experience is primary,[13] and, at any rate, the discussion in I Cor. 12 and 14 centers around glossolalia and prophecy.[14] Paul's argument in I Cor. 14 presupposes that glossolalia was regarded as most important in the Corinthian congregation, perhaps because of the strength of emotion associated therewith.[15] Consistent with the view of inspiration by divine "possession" prevalent in the Hellenistic culture of late antiquity, Paul understood glossolalia to be intelligible to God, though not to humans (I Cor. 14:2).[16] The fact that glossolalia was unintelligible to speaker or hearer was the principle differentia which distinguished it from prophecy,[17] and so Paul held that glossolalia and interpretation thereof together were as desirable as prophecy (I Cor. 14:5b).

Of the charismata, prophecy is the most frequently mentioned in the New Testament and elsewhere. Prophets appear to have comprised an "estate" in the church, generally reckoned to be below apostles and above teachers (I Cor. 12:28; Eph. 2:20; 3:5; 4:11; Rev. 18:20; Acts 13:1), whose office was exercised primarily in worship (I Cor. 11:14; 14:23f.; 29f.; cf. Didache 10:7; 11:9).[18] The importance of prophets in Palestinian Christianity is also brought to light by form-critical analysis of the text of the Gospels, which suggests that some of the sayings attributed to Jesus were uttered by Christian prophets.[19] The Acts of the Apostles suggests that visionary experiences were frequently associated with prophecy (Acts 10:9-16- 16:9- 18:9; 22:17-21; 27:23-24),[20] and two passages suggest that Christian prophets spoke in the person of the Spirit (Acts 13:2 and 21:11).[21] In I Cor. 12-14 we may perceive a tension between the use of charismata and the church order,[22] not only in relation to glossolalia, but also to prophecy, since the particular gift of "discernment" (I Cor.12:10; 14:29-33) seems to have reference to the discovery of false prophets.[23] Numerous references throughout the New Testament to false prophets[24] point not only to the prominence of prophecy in the religious experience of the earliest Christian communities, but also to the tension which prophecy brought to ecclesiastical discipline. Nevertheless, at this point the only objective criterion which Paul gives for the evaluation of the users of charismata is their faithfulness to the confession of Jesus' lordship (I Cor. 12:3; cf. I John 4:1f.).

The term *charisma* itself, and its equivalent in I Cor. 12, *pneumatikon*, render valuable information on the manner in which the Christians of the New Testament period understood the various experiences denoted by them. Hans Conzelmann explains that the term *charismata* ". . . is suited from the very start to be an equivalent of *pneumatika* since of course *charis*

also has in Hellenistic Greek the sense of a supernatural power or force, thus is akin to pneuma"[25] Thus the very terminology employed by the early Christian authors suggests that the charismata were understood to be divine invasions of the human personality, consistent with what we have seen to be a common understanding in Hellenistic culture. The evidence which we have reviewed above which shows that Christian prophecy was connected with visionary experiences, that Christian prophets spoke in the person of God (or the Spirit), and that glossolalia was believed to be intelligible to God tends also to this conclusion.

III. The Use of Charismata in the Wider Church in the Second Century

It will be our concern in this and the next sections to evaluate the evidence from ancient sources which indicate to us something about the Christian use of charismata in the second century and the ways in which these phenomena were understood by them. In this particular section we shall be concerned with evidences for the use of charismata in the Christian groups which in retrospect are reckoned to have been orthodox, whereas in the next section we shall consider evidence for the seclusion of charismata in heterodox groups and for the eventual decline in the use of charismata. Although the sequence thus portrayed is roughly chronological, insofar as a decline in the use of charismata seems to have followed upon a period of relatively more frequent use, the material we are presenting is divided analytically, and so there may be considerable chronological overlap in the material presented in these two sections.[26]

There seems to be general agreement that the use of charismata by Christians in the church at large persisted into the second century and beyond, in spite of the development of more institutional forms of ecclesiastical government with which the users of charismata have often seemed at odds:

> It is, therefore, not surprising that in addition to the office- holders the old free men of the Spirit continue to play their part; and the Church is proud that this should be so.[27]

Although some have expressed doubts as to whether glossolalia continued to be practiced,[28] we shall see evidence that it too continued to be used in the wider church. Although the Apostolic Fathers volunteer little information on the use of charismata, two important facts emerge from their writings: (1) First, it is clear that the office of charismatic prophet was of some importance in the church in the early second century, since Hermas and the Didache devote some space to discussions of this office.[29] (2) Second, it is clear that the controversy over "false prophets" continued into this period, since Didache 13 is especially concerned with the discernment of true and false prophets.[30] In contrast to Paul, who had asserted that the prophets were to be evaluated by their faithfulness to the confession of Christ (I Cor. 12:3) and possibly by the special charisma of "discernment" (I Cor. 12:10; 14:29f.), the Didache suggests that the prophets should be evaluated by their moral behavior, viz., whether they attempt to exact a fee.[31] Although some would take Ignatius' prophecy in the person of the Holy Spirit and in defence of the episcopate (Phil. 7:2) to indicate that there

was no conflict between the charismatic and episcopal interests[32] or that in some areas the bishops had taken over the office of prophet,[33] I see no reason why this passage should not be taken as an attempted legitimization of the episcopal office by appeal to the prophets' own source of authority (the Spirit). At any rate, the evidence from Hermas and the Didache leaves no doubt that there was a continuing and widespread concern amongst leaders of the wider church over disreputable and heretical prophets.

The Apologists offer a bit more detail concerning the use of charismata. In his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew Justin Martyr makes much of the claim that whereas prophecy and other charismata were no longer practiced in Judaism, they continued to be practiced by Christian women and men,[34] in fulfillment of the scriptures.[35] Although in the Dialogue Justin mentions only prophecy in particular, he refers to charismata (in the plural) on three occasions,[36] and in his Apology he referred to miraculous healings and exorcisms worked by Christians.[37] Further, both Athenagoras and the Cohortatio ad Graecos (attributed by some to Justin) describe the invasion of the human personality by the divine Spirit with an analogy to be used later by Montanus, that of the strings of a musical instrument made to sound by a plectrum.[38] This would suggest that Christians of this period understood the human personality to be passive or inactive during the divine invasion, and this understanding is clearly consistent with the prophets' speaking in the person of God (or the Spirit) which we have observed above.

During the period of the Montanist movement, the anti-Montanist author quoted by Eusebius asserted that it was the wider church, not the Montanists, who had preserved the prophetic charisma.[39]

In several passages Irenaeus indicated that the charismata continued to be used late in the second century, and indicated more particularly what he understood these to be. He asserted, as Justin had done, that men and women exercised the prophetic of fice.[40] Expressing a similar concern as the Didache, he asserted that the church used the charismata, "neither practicing deception... nor taking any reward...."[41] The wording of this passage suggests a continuation of the concern over "false prophets" which we have noted at every point up to this. In one passage he referred to the use of glossolalia in addition to prophecy:

> In like manner we do also hear many brethren in the church who possess prophetic gifts and who through the Spirit speak all kinds of languages (*glossais*), and bring to light for the general benefit the hidden things of men and declare the mysteries of God....[42]

In another passage he indicated that Christians in his day had performed exorcisims, healings, and even resurrections from the dead.[43] Irenaeus may have even reflected Montanist language when he took *tois teleiois* in I Cor. 2:6 to denote those "who have received the Spirit of God";[44] but Irenaeus clearly spoke from the standpoint of the wider church, since part of the same work was directed against the Montanists.[45]

There are references to charismata among the Christians after the second century, but none so dramatic as previous cases. Cyprian reports on two occasions messages from God, by way of prayer[46] or a dream or vision.[47] Eusebius refers to charismata receiving in general, but lists only "a word

of wisdom," "a word of knowledge," and "faith" (these being clearly derived from I Cor. 12:8-9).[48] Athanasius refers to charismata in general,[49] to miracles,[50] and to "the gift of discernment."[51] Cyril of Jerusalem refers to charismata in general[52] and asserted that prophecy and exorcism were both exercised in the church in his day.[53] These references, however, might rely more on scriptural accounts of charismata utilized in intra-Christian polemics than on the actual practice of the church. Cyril's statement might indicate no more than that the institutionalized offices of "Prophet" and "Exorcist" were recognized in his day. As we shall see, there is evidence that by this time the charismata were not widely practiced in the church. At this point we may observe that charismata of various sorts continued to be practiced by Christians throughout the second and into the third centuries, with some consistency in the manners in which these experiences were interpreted.

IV. The Seclusion and Decline of Charismata

The tension between "false" and (from someone's standpoint) "true" prophets which we have observed to be a continuing phenomenon reveals how charismata were practiced not only by Christians in the communions which in hindsight were regarded as orthodox, but also in more or less independent, heterodox groups. "Orthodox" polemical works of the second and later centuries are rife with references to such works. One document reported by Hippolytus and Epiphanius, but which dates from early in the second century, the "Book of Elchasai," will serve as an example. The extant fragments of this work show that it is purportedly the record of a vision in which an angel revealed hidden truths to the prophet Elchasai. References to "the Christ" and "the Holy Spirit" indicate that it is in some sense a Christian work; and yet its prescription of a second baptism, invocation of "the seven elements" in prayers for healing, and use of astrological speculation indicate its highly unorthodox theology.[54] Various reports, some of which we have seen above, indicate that such prophets and prophetic groups must have been extremely common in late antiquity. Hippolytus, early in the third century, gives two examples of contemporary prophetic groups, one of which had been convinced by its leader to wander out into the desert to await the Lord's advent.[55]

We come, then, to consider Montanism, the most important prophetic movement of the second century. The dialectic between Montanism and the wider Church is crucial to our understanding of the charismata in the second century, and for this reason it will be necessary to examine the origins and distinctive features of the movement, the use of charismata in the movement, and the manner in which the wider church responded to the movement. The date of the rise of Montanism has been much disputed: Pelikan circumspectly suggests ". . . sometime between about 135 and 175."[56] Nevertheless, Eusebius suggested that the inception of the movement was in 172 A.D., and most modern scholars are inclined to prefer his date.[57] The sources available for the study of Montanism are almost all prejudiced against the movement, and some indicate considerable confusion over it.[58] As regards the origin of Montanism, some have tried to show that it had its basis in the pagan Phrygian cult, but this theory has been discarded since there are adequate precedents within Christianity for the

movement.[59] More likely is the view that the Montanist movement arose as a Christian response to the historical background of Roman defeats, natural disasters, and a renewed persecution of the Christians, all of which occurred in the late 60's of the second century.[60]

As to the issue of what was distinctive about Montanism, several answers may be considered. First, the dogmatic position of Montanism was admitted to have been orthodox by ancient polemical as well as sympathetic writers,[61] and thus its primary distinguishing mark must not have been in this area. Some even suggest that the Montanist emphasis on the Holy Spirit, via Tertullian, may have helped the church in its formulation of its trinitarian dogma; so Timothy Barnes notes the paradox in that "Tertullian helped to rescue the Catholic Church from theological heresy precisely because he was a Montanist."[62] Second, the suggestion that the distinguishing characteristic of Montanism was the "suppression of personality" during divine revelations[63] must be rejected, since we have seen this (the suppression of the human personality) to be quite consistent with prior Christian and Hellenistic interpretations of such revelations. Third, the claim that Montanus actually held himself to be the Paraclete must be regarded as a distortion of the prophetic use of the first person singular to speak the words of God.[64] Nevertheless, Montanism purported to be based upon a unique divine mission, as is evidenced by: 1) the use of the title "the New Prophecy" to describe the movement;[65] and 2) the consistent designation of the Spirit as "the Paraclete," suggesting that with the Montanists the prophecies of John 14-16 had been fulfilled, whilst the apostles were held by the Montanists not to have received the Paraclete.[66] This last point, i.e., the Montanist claim of the fulfillment of the Johannine Paraclete prophecies, has been noted by many interpreters as the central distinguishing mark of Montanism.[67] Some have suggested that the Montanists went so far as to suppress the New Testament writings in favor of their own scriptures,[68] but I have as yet not seen evidence for this.

The sectarian character of Montanism is well evidenced by many of the polemical works which supply our knowledge of the movement, but it is possible that its own unusual organization (i.e., as a movement outside of the wider church) may have come later than the first stirrings of the movement. Tertullian's break with the church did not come until 212 A.D. (from which time there was a separate sect of "Tertullianists" which persisted for two centuries).[69] The Montanist Church evidently had greater strength in some particular areas: one ancient church historian asserted that the only Christians in Thyatira in 250 were Montanists,[70] and Eusebius reported that there were still gome Montanigtg in the fourth century A.D.[71] The Montanists evidently developed a unique style of ecclesiastical organization, which involved "patriarchs " at Pepuza, " stewards, " and local priests referred to as "bishops."[72] The Montanists evidently committed some of their prophecies to writing, although none of their books have survived.[73] The emphasis on the Paraclete prophecies and references to the advent of Christ suggest that the movement had an apocalyptic tone.[74] In the Montanism represented by Tertullian there were some different emphases than we find expressed in the Montanism of Montanus, Prisca (or Priscilla) and Maximilla. It is thus difficult to specify the extent to which the emphases of one phase may apply to the other. Harnack held that the phase

represented by Tertullian was a later and more compromised form of the movement, which had begun to court political favor with the See of Rome." But this cannot be simply the case, for the distinctiveness of Tertullian's phase of the movement lies in the ethical rigor which he understood to be normative in his Montanist period.[76] According to Tertullian, the purpose of the Montanist movement was to restore the church to its purity as a communion of *saints*.[77] The strength of Tertullian's convictions on this matter is indicated by his frequent distinctions between the Montanists as spiritales as opposed to the normal Christians as *psychici*.[78] Such a viewpoint can hardly be described as "compromised," although I think Harnack is right in detecting a shift in interest from pneumatology to ethics as the movement progressed from the earlier Montanism to that represented by Tertullian.

Particularly relevant to our discussion as regards Montanism is the use of charismata in the movement. Epiphanius held that the principal distinction of the Montanists was that ". . . they claim that we, too, must receive the charismata."[79] Tertullian renders this term by transcription into Latin, "For seeing that we acknowledge spiritual *charismata*, or gifts, we too have merited the attainment of the prophetic gift. . ."[80] In the context in which this particular passage occurs, Tertullian is introducing evidence of a vision seen by a Montanist prophetess (concerning the shape of the soul). Clearly the prophetic gift was exercised widely by the advocates of the "New Prophecy," not only by Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla.[81] The content of Montanist prophecy is known through fragmentary sayings which have been preserved, and through reconstruction of various motifs: 1) Montanus himself would appear to have announced the advent of the Paraclete, in fulfillment of the Johannine prophecies;[82] 2) The prophetesses associated with Montanus would appear to have announced the imminent advent of Christ;[83] and 3) The Montanist prophecies reported by Tertullian would appear to have been concerned with moral laxity (e.g., shrinking from martyrdom).[84] Again, we may detect the difference between the original Montanist groups and that represented by Tertullian. Although it cannot be regarded as certain evidence, the use of the term *xenophonein* to describe Montanus' conduct while prophesying may indicate the use of glossolalia.[85] At any rate, some characteristics of the Montanist understanding of the experience of prophecy are evident from the following: 1) the term *ekstasis* (or *parekstasis*), which denotes a form of "displacement,"[86] especially used of mystical religious experiences,[87] was applied to the Montanist movement by anti-Montanist[88] polemicists as well as by Montanists themselves;[89] 2) the Montanist prophets characteristically spoke in the first person singular for God,[90] and this indicates a "sense of passivity as an instrument or mouthpiece of the divine;"[91] and 3) in one prophetic statement of Montanus which has been preserved prophetic inspiration is described with the same metaphor used by Athenagoras and the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*: "Behold, man is like a lyre and I (the Spirit) rush thereon like a plectrum?"[92] This interpretation is consistent with that which we have seen given in Hellenistic culture at large, in the New Testament, and in the continuing church in the second century. Indeed, Hans von Campenhausen referred to Montanism as "a reactionary phenomenon" insofar as it reflected apocalyptic, prophetic-enthusiastic, and ethical emphases characteristic of earlier Christianity.[93]

In spite of this, however, Montanism can be seen as illustrating not so much a continuance, or the revival, of Christian charismata, as it represents the seclusion of the charismata in a sect destined for eventual extinction. This may be seen most clearly in the wider church's reaction to Montanism. Eusebius suggests that there may have been some early Asian councils at which Montanism was condemned:

> For when the faithful throughout Asia had met frequently and at many places in Asia for this purpose, and on examination of the new-fangled teachings had pronounced them profane, and rejected the heresy, these persons were thus expelled from the Church and shut off from its communion.[94]

This condemnation must not have carried much weight, since Tertullian indicates that at one point the Pope had briefly acknowledged the validity of the movement:

> For after the Bishop of Rome had acknowledged the prophetic gifts of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, and in consequence of the acknowledgment, had bestowed his peace on the Churches of Asia and Phrygia, (Praxeas), by importunately urging false accusations against the prophets themselves and their Churches, and insisting on the authority of the bishop's predecessors in the see, compelled him to recall the pacific letter which he had issued, as well as to desist from his purpose of acknowledging the *said* gifts.[95]

Thus the movement acquired the condemnation of Rome, probably under Pope Victor, 189-199 A.D. There is evidence, though not at all conclusive, that the movement had already been condemned in the West by a group of bishops meeting in Lyons (Lugdunum) in 177. The reference in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* says only that the bishops "submitted a pious and most orthodox judgment of their own on this matter. . ."[96] Although some authorities have taken this to imply that the bishops *approved* of Montanism,[97] it seems to me that in the light of Eusebius' consistent condemnations of the movement this reference must be taken as indicating that the bishops condemned the movement.[98]

The reasons why the wider church reacted negatively to Montanism were undoubtedly mixed, but we may specify some that have support in the ancient writings. First, although the movement was doctrinally orthodox in its beginning, it is probable that some of its members later took up heretical notions. Hippolytus asserts that some of the Montanists subscribed to ". . . the heresy of the Noetians, and affirm that the Father himself is the Son, and that this one came under generation, suffering, and death."[99] Second, some in the church objected to the style of Montanist prophecy as excessively irrational or ecstatic.[100] This should indicate to us some sort of shift occurring in the outlook of the wider church, since, as we have seen, the Montanist manner of prophesying appears to be consistent with the manners in which previous Christians had prophesied. In this connection may be mentioned the assertion made by some good authorities that the church was actually embarrassed by its own lack of the charismata, but I know of no ancient sources which specifically support this claim.[101] Third,

and perhaps most important, the Montanist prophecy presented a challenge to the form of ecclesiastical authority which was developing in the wider church. In response to Gnosticism, Marcionitism, and various heresies, the church was developing a view of dogmatic authority based on the apostolic canon of scripture, the traditional *regula fidei* and the monarchical episcopate. However much Montanism's prophetic authority may have had precedents in earlier ages of the church, it was perceived as a challenge to the church's present authority.[102] In the words of von Campenhausen, the Montanists'

> . . . importance for world history lies not in their straitened later career, but in the revolutionary enthusiasm of the original movement, that is to say, in the continuing repercussions which expulsion and condemnation had on the mainstream of Christianity. From this time dates the "ecclesiastical" and later also "official" mistrust of all the cruder forms of religious enthusiasm and ecstasy.[103]

Evidence for a decline in the use of charismata in the wider church after the time of Montanism is available from several sources. Although some modern interpreters would date this decline to early in the second century [104] or to the middle of the second century,[105] the evidence from the Apostolic Fathers, Apologists, Irenaeus, and others for the continuity in the use of charismata argues against such early datings. Clear evidence of such a decline comes in the third century from Origen, who in contention with Celsus stated clearly that signs of the Spirit's presence were less common in his day:

> Moreover, the Holy Spirit gave signs of His presence at the beginning of Christ's ministry, and after His ascension He gave still more: but since that time these signs have diminished, although there are still traces of His presence in a few who have had their soul purified by the Gospel, and their actions regulated by His influence.[106]

Origen denies the veracity of Celsus' reports of Christian prophecy:

> And Celsus is not to be believed when he says that he has heard such men prophesy; for no prophets bearing any resemblance to the ancient prophets have appeared in the time of Celsus.[107]

Although Celsus' reports of Christian prophets may have been accurate, Origen's attitude indicates that by this time the exercise of the prophetic charisma was becoming rare in the church.[108] Although Eusebius' Anti- Montanist source argued that the gift of prophecy was still in use in his day, Eusebius' own attitude was different, as he indicates in his introductory comments on Montanism. The Montanists, he wrote

> . . . were winning a wide reputation for prophecy (for indeed numerous other miracles of the gift of God, still at that time performed in various churches, caused a widespread belief that they too were prophets).[109]

This apology for the presence of charismata in the Montanist movement as

well as in the wider church in an earlier day must indicate that such phenomena were uncommon in the fourth century when Eusebius wrote. Later still, John Chrysostom recorded the memory that glossolalia once accompanied baptism, but he noted that it no longer did so.[110] Thus from the evidence of the Church's reaction to Montanism, and from the evidence of Christian writers from the third and fourth centuries, one concludes that after the end of the second century charismata were increasingly rare phenomena in the church. Reasons for this decline have been given by various interpreters: James L. Ash argues on the basis of Tertullian's objections to the bishops that the rise of the monarchical episcopate and the related emphasis on the authority of the tradition as opposed to immediate revelation led to this decline.[111] Von Campenhausen suggests that ". . . the increasing hellenisation of the church with its emphasis on the spirituality and rationality of the faith…"[112] may have led to a decline in emphasis on ecstatic experiences, and Pelikan argues that (among other things) the delay of the apocalypse might have eventually eroded the credibility of prophecy.[113] It does not seem to me that these reasons are self - contradictory; in fact, all would seem to arise out of the church's actual situation in the latter part of the second century, i.e., that of a growing religious community in the Roman Empire, separated from its original apocalyptic vision by over a hundred years, and striving, on the one hand, to demonstrate the reasonableness of its faith to persons throughout the Empire, and, on the other hand, to establish unity within its own ranks by the tightening of ecclesiastical discipline.

V. Charismata as Indicative of Religious Intentionality

At this point it will be helpful to summarize the conclusions we have reached in our positive inquiry into the Christian use of charismata in the second century A.D. Ecstatic religious experiences, especially prophecy and (to a lesser extent) glossolalia, were seen to have been commonly practiced in the Hellenistic society of late antiquity and in the Christian communities represented by the New Testament writings, where the term charismata was applied to such experiences. Similar experiences were seen to have characterized the life of Christians in general through the second century, as is evidenced by the Apostolic Fathers, the Apologists, and Irenaeus. Throughout the New Testament and the second century writings there was seen to be a continuing dialectic with "false prophets" which indicates a covert conflict over ecclesiastical authority. This conflict was seen to have come to an overt crisis in the Montanist controversy. The Church's reaction to Montanism and the writings of third and fourth century Christians indicate that the use of charismata became increasingly rare after the end of the second century. We have seen how the charismata were consistently interpreted by the ancients as invasions of the human personality by a divine Spirit.

The use of modern language to describe distant historical phenomena itself implies some degree of comparison and interpretation. We now propose to sharpen our consideration of the use of charismata by the Christian groups of the second century by comparing this and interpreting it in the light of categories derived from the historical/phenomenological study of religion. Frederick J. Streng posits four "traditional ways of being

religious" which may be discerned in various combinations and degrees in positive traditional religions, and which represent various ways in which religious persons and groups express ultimate values and meanings.[114] Two of these four categories will be useful for our consideration: 1) "Personal Apprehension of a Holy Presence," characterized by the positing of a separation between the sacred and the secular which is overcome by a personal and extraordinary experience of the sacred (given its classic phenomenological description in Rudolf Otto's The Idea of the Holy);[115] and 2) "Sacred Action: Myth and Symbol," characterized by the positing of a separation between the sacred and the secular which is overcome by the use of symbols and rituals and by the recognition of sacred persons, times, and places.[116] These two "modes of ultimate transformation" have in common the positing of a separation between the secular and sacred realms, which was characteristic of the world-view of late antiquity,[117] and I would suggest that both may be seen as responses to such a world-view. Further, I see evidence which suggests that both of these types of religious intentionality characterized the earliest Christianity. The use of charismata and especially the widespread use of prophecy in the communities represented by the New Testament are indicative of a religious intentionality in which the sacred is experienced through extraordinary experiences. It is probable that such experiences were characteristic of Jesus himself.[118] One important nuance, however, of the religious experience (in the extraordinary or ecstatic sense) of early Christianity is its positing of a mediator (the Spirit) thereby lessening somewhat the directness of the apprehension of the divine. This is, of course, consistent with the general positing of mediators common in the religiosity of late antiquity.[119] On the other hand, the use of symbolism, especially in the Johannine literature, but throughout the New Testament, the use of sacramental rites (the eucharist and baptism), and the tradition of a sacred myth (the kerygma) are indicative of a religious intentionality in which the sacred is experienced through myth and symbol. I would repeat at this point that none of Streng's categories are exclusive and thus it is quite possible that both of these modes were present together in early Christianity.

The positive historical evidence presented in this paper, however, suggests that the encounter with the sacred through extraordinary experiences became considerably less important in the Christianity of the wider or normative traditions than it had been previously, and thus that the encounter with the sacred through myth and symbol came to be regarded as normative in Christianity from this time. The widespread use of charismata in the earlier period indicates that Christians considered themselves to be encountering the divine, indeed, considered themselves to have been invaded or possessed by the divine. The negative reaction of the church to this same type of experience in Montanism, and the later absence of this type of experience in the church, indicates an important shift in the religious intentionality of early Christianity which, as I see it, had enormous consequences for subsequent Christian history.

I would like to qualify my conclusion by the following observations: 1) I am not suggesting that there was a transition from the religiosity of extraordinary experience to that of myth and symbol. As I see it, these two were bound together in the religious experience of the early Christians. My

suggestion is that after the end of the second century certain elements suggestive of the religious intentionality of extraordinary or ecstatic experience disappear. 2) I have used the term suggests in stating my conclusion to indicate that this paper has considered only a controlled section of the evidence available for the study of the religious intentionality of second century Christianity. Nevertheless, the conclusion bears some importance insofar as the controlled section of the evidence which we have considered (viz., that concerned with the Christian use of charismata in this period) is in itself a significant indicator of religious experience and the Christians' understanding thereof. Finally, 3) I think that it is possible to see this shift in religious intentionality as related to a contemporaneous shift in ecclesiastical structure, from more charismatic (derived from the authority of the prophet's extraordinary experience of the sacred) to more authoritarian (based on the authority of the myths and symbols which were held to convey the sacred); a more sociological transition which has been explored by Adolf Harnack and Hans von Campenhausen.

NOTES

1 Although this term (which we shall use in its singular and plural forms) would normally be italicized because it is a transliteration (via the Latin) of a Greek term, we shall use it so frequently in this paper that constant italicizing would be cumbersome. We are, nevertheless, using the transliterated form instead of its more usual English translations ("charisms," "spiritual gifts") to underscore the fact that it is the ancient. use of the term with which we shall be concerned.

2 *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, s.v. "charisma," by Hans Conzelmann.

3 Ibid.

4 It can be argued that the term is used of non-ecstatic gifts only in an extended sense, since the context of I Cor. 12 and 14 implies that the Corinthian recipients of this epistle understood the term in its ecstatic sense. The use of the term charisma to describe love (and faith and hope?) in I Cor. 13 would thus represent Paul's attempt to broaden the understanding of the Corinthians by an extension of the reference of the term. The use of the term in I Peter is considerably later. Cf. Hans Conzelmann, I Corinthians, Hermeneia Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 204 and n. 7.

5 We are proposing to use the term "religious intentionality" as defined by Frederick J. Streng in *Understanding Religious Life* (Encino, California: Dickenson Publishing Co., second edition, 1976), pp. 5-9 and passim. A more explicit delineation of our understanding of this concept will be given in section V of this paper.

6 Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, 5 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1907), 2:1-168.

7 0rigen, *Contra Celsum* 7:9, given in Edgar Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha* (ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher; English translation ed. R. McL. Wilson; 2 vols., Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 2:685 and n. 1. Although some have maintained that this is a reference to Christian (Montanist) prophets, the commentator on this passage in Hennecke rejects this view on the authority of Labriole.

8 Suetonius Div August 31; cited in E. R. Dodds, Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety (New York: W. W. Norton Co., 1965), p. 56.

9 Lucian Alex 13; cited in Dodds, p. 55, n. 1.

10 Dodds, p. 57.

11 Ibid., p. 38.

12 James L. Ash, Jr., "The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church," *Theological Studies* 37 (June 1976): 230. For a specific example of the first person singular in reference to a god, cf. the citation from *Contra Celsum* above.

13 Vid. n. 4 above.

14 "In 1 C. 12-14 and R. 12 Paul describes as charismata the ecstatic phenomena at worship which are regarded as operations of the Spirit, notably speaking in tongues and prophecy" (*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, s.v. "charisma, " by Hans Conzelmann).

15 Conzelmann. *I Corinthians*, p. 233.

16 Cf. Dodds, p. 55, n. 1.

l7 Maurice Barnett, *The Living Flame* (London: Epworth Press, 1953), p. 127.

18 Philip Vielhauer, Introduction to "Apocalypses and Related Subjects" in Hennecke, 2:605.

19 Ibid., p. 606.

20 Cf. Barnett, p. 127.

21 Cf. Ash, p. 130 and n. 24; Dodds, p. 58.

22 Hans Conzelmann*, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1976), p. 259.

23 Ash, p. 232; Hans von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1969), pp. 182-184.

24 Matt. 7:15; 24:11; 24:24; Mark 13:22; Luke 6:26; Acts 13:6; II Pet. 2:1; I John 4:1; Rev. 16:13; 19:20; and 20:10. Von Campenhausen takes references in the Acts to Barjesus-Elymas (13:6-12), the Ephesian Jews who attempted to exorcise in Jesus' name (19:13-17), and Simon Magus (8:9-24) to be references to false prophets; von Campenhausen, p. 184.

25 Conzelmann, *I Corinthians*, pp. 207-208. This would refute the notion of Arthur Carl Piepkorn that pneumatika and charismata were for Paul two separate subjects: Arthur Carl Piepkorn, "Charisma in the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 42 (June 1971),

pp. 369-375 passim. Piepkorn's thesis rests on the conviction that there is an abrupt change of subjects at I Cor. 12:4, and that charismata never denoted ecstatic gifts until transliterated into Latin by Tertullian; all of which I find to be refuted by evidence presented in this paper which suggests a common Christian understanding of the meaning of charismata.

26 In a previous draft of this paper an attempt was made to delineate a more specific chronological sequence, showing frequent use of the charismata until the middle of the second century, a decline in the use of charismata around the middle of the second century, a revival of their use in Montanism, and another decline following thereafter. Upon reflection, it seems that such a scheme is not feasible, since: 1) there is no compelling evidence for a decline in the use of the charismata in the middle of the second century except for the polemical assertions of the Montanists; 2) there is in fact evidence for at least a limited use of the charismata during and after the Montanist period; and 3) the sequence thus depicted does not account for the sectarian (i.e., not generalized) character of the Montanist "revival" of the charismata.

27 Von Campenhausen, p. 178; cf. John DeSoyres, *Montanism and the Primitive Church A study in the Ecclesiastical History of the Second Century* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., and London: George Bell and Sons, 1878; reprinted Lexington, Kentucky: The American Theological Library Association, 1965), p. 65.

28 Von Campenhausen, p. 189; G. B. Caird, *The Apostolic Age* London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1955), p.61, where it is asserted that glossolalia "died out within a generation" (of I Corinthians).

29 Hermas *Mand* 11; *Didache* 13; cf. Jules Lebreton and Jacques Zeiler, *The History of the Primitive Church*, 2 vols. (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1946), 2:654.

30 Von Campenhausen, pp. 184-186.

31 *Didache* 13; cf. Ash, pp. 232-233.

32 Walter C. Klein, "The Church and Its Prophets," *Anglican Theological Review* 44 (January 1962): 9.

33 Ash, pp. 233-235.

34Justin *Dial* 82, 87, 88.

35 Justin *Dial* 39.

36 Justin *Dial* 39, 87, 88.

37 Justin *Apol* 2:6.

38 Athenagoras *Legat* 7; *Cohortatio ad Graecos* 8; cf. Dodds, p. 64 and n. 2; DeSoyres, pp. 66-68.

39 Eusebius HE 5:17:4- cited in Eusebius A. Stephanou, "The Charismata in the Early Church Fathers," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 21 (Summer 1976): 132. Stephanou dates the Anti-Montanist writer in Eusebiug to the period 160-195 A.D.

40 Irenaeus *Haer* 3:11; 5:6; Ap Pred 99.

41 Irenaeus *Haer* 2:32:4; cited in Stephanou, p. 134.

42 Irenaeus *Haer* 5:6:1; cited in Stephanou, p. 134.

43 Iranaeus *Haer* 2:32:4; cited in Stephanou, p. 134.

44 Irenaeus *Haer* 5:6:1; cited in Stephanou, p. 134. The observation that this may reflect Montanist language is my own, not Stephanou's.

45 Cf. the passage cited above, *Haer* 3:11.

46 Cyprian *Ep* 11:3-6.

47 Cyprian *Ep* 66:10.

48 Eusebius, *Commentary on the Psalms* 76:16-17.

49 Athanasius *Ep* 3:5.

50 deg;Athanasius *Ep* 49:9.

51 Athanasius *Ep* 1:4.

52 Cyril of Jerusalem *Myst Cat* 13:23.

53 Cyril of Jerusalem *Myst Cat* 16:12.

54 Given in Hennecke, 2:745-750.

55 Hippolytus *In Danial* 3:18-19; cited in Lebreton and Zeiler, 2:655.

56 Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, 5 vols. (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1971 et seqq.), 1:97.

57 Thus Timothy Barnes, "The Chronology of Montanism," *Journal of Theological Studies* 21 (October 1970): 403-408, who asserts: 1) that Eusebius' and Epiphanius' dates are contradictory; 2) that Epiphanius' evidence is suspect because it is self-contradictory and errs in many other particular dates in this period; and 3) an obscure passage from Tertullian's lost work *De Ecstasi* (in Jerome De Vir Ill 24, 40, and 53) holds Montanism to have arisen forty years previously, and this would concur with Eusebius' date. With von Campenhausen, p. 181, n. 15; Stephanou, p. 132; and Dodds, p. 63, n. 3; contra DeSoyres, pp. 25-26.

58 Pelikan, 1:97. The primary sources for the study of Montanism are: Eusebius HE 5:16-19; Epiphanius Pan Haer 48-49; Hippolytus Ref 8:12; Firmilian Ep ad Cyprianum (inter opp. Cypiian Ep 75); and valious references in other works, especially in Tertullian's ascetic treatises. Irenaeus indicates considerable confusion over the movement in his assertion that the Montanists "set aside the gift of prophecy from the church" (Irenaeus Haer 3:11:9; cited in Stephanou, p. 132).

59 This negative conclusion on the Phrygian origin of Montanism was the conclusion of Wilhelm Schepelern's decisive study Der Montanismus and die phrygischen Kulte (1929); cited in Pelikan, 1:98; with von Campenhausen, p. 181, n. 16; and Dodds, p. 63, n. 2; contra Barnett, p. 124.

60 Timothy Barnes, Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study (Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1971), pp. 130-131.

61 Epiphanius Pan Haer 48:1; Firmilian Ep ad Cyprianum rinter opp. Cyprian Ep 75); Hippolytus Ref 8: 12; Philaster Liber de Haeresibus 49; Tertullian Ieiun l; Monog 2; cf. von Campenhausen, p. 188; DeSoyres, pp. 68-77: Pelikan. 1:105-106.

62 Barnes, Tertullian, p. 142; cf. Pelikan, 1:105.

63 Barnett, p. 124.

64 Von Campenhausen, p. 182, n. 18; on the authority of Schepelern's study.

65 Eusebius HE 5:16:4; 5:19:2; Clement of Alexandria Strom 4:13:93; Tertullian Monog 14; Ieiun l; Res 63; Marc 3:24; 4:44, Adu Prax 30, Firmilian Ep ad Cyprianum (inter opp. Cyprian Ep 75); cited in Harnack, 2:99, n. 2.

66Hippolytus Ref 8:12; cited in Harnack, 2:99, n. 2.

67Harnack, 2:99; von Campenhausen, p. 187; DeSoyres, pp. 53ff.; Barnett, p. 122.

68J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines (New York: Harper and Row, second edition, 1960), pp. 58-59. Kelly's language suggests that at some point the Montanists (may have?) referred to the New Testament writings aspristina instrumenta, but he does not specify this locus, and I have been unable to find it.

69Barnett, p. 117.

70Sozomen HE 2:30; cited in R. A. Knox, Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press,1950), p. 34, n. 3.

7'Eusebius HE 5:17; cited in Knox, p. 34, n. 4.

72Jerome Ep 41; cited (by a different number) in Knox, p. 32, n. 1.

73Hippolytus Ref 8:12; cited in Hennecke, 2:685, n. 2; cf. Eusebius HE 6:20:3.

74 Apocalyptic references are in Epiphanius Pan Haer 48:2:4, and 49:1:2-3. These pasgageg, and the Paraclete sayings we have noted before, would seem to refute the view of Schneemelcher, that Montanism represented ". . . a restoration of early Christian prophecy in which the Apocalyptic (sic) world of ideas falls into the background" (Hennecke 2:688).

75 Harnack, 2:96-104.

76 Barnes, Tertullian, pp. 132-141-

77 Tertullian, De Pud l; cited in Harnack, 2:105, n. 2.

78 Tertullian, De Pud 21; Ieiun 11; cited in Klein, pp. 16-17, n. 55. This is Pauline language (I Cor. 2:14-15), but the distinction was used widely in the second century, e.g., in certain Gnostic documents, and in the works of Origen.

79 Epiphaniug Pan Haer 48:1; my translation.

80 Tertullian De Anima 9; translation of Holmes in ANF, 3:188.

81 This passage in Tertullian refutes the assertion of the Anti-Montanist in Eusebius HE 5:17:4, who held that there had been no prophets in the Montanist movement since the death of Maximilla.

82Montanist sayings nos. 1-3, given in Hennecke, 2:686.

83 Montanist sayings nos. 11-12, given in Hennecke, 2:687.

84 Montanist sayings nos. 6-10, given in Hennecke, 2:686-687; cf. Tertullian Virg Vel 17, where a prophetess receives explicit instructions on the necessary length of a woman's veil; cf. Pelikan, 1:100-101.

85 Eusebius HE 5:16:7; cf. Klein, p. 15, n. 52; Barnett, p. 119.

86 Liddell and Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, s.v. "ekstasis."

87 Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, s.v. "ekstasis. "

88 Cf. the Anti-Montanist in Eusebius HE 5:16:7; Epiphanius Pan Haer 48:4:1.

89 Cf. the title of Tertullian's lost work, De Ecstasi

90 Montanist sayings nos. 1-6, 13, in Hennecke, 2:686-687.

91 Pelikan, 1:102; cf. Hennecke, 2:688.

92 Epiphanius Pan Haer 48:4:1; cited in Hennecke, 2:686.

93 Von Campenhausen, p. 181.

94 Eusebius HE 5:16:10; translation of Hugh Jackson Lawlor and John Ernest Oulton, Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine, 2 vols. (London: SPCK, 1954), 1:160.

95 Tertullian Adv Prax l; translation of Holmes in ANF, 3:597; cf. Klein, p. 12; Barnes, Tertullian, p. 82.

96 Translation of Lawlor and Oulton, 1:149.

97 Harnack, 2:97; DeSoyres, pp. 38-40, 51.

98 Lawlor and Oulton (commentary), 2:159; cf. Barnett, p. 116.

99 Hippolytus Ref 8:12; translation of MacMahon in ANF, 5:124.

100 Eusebius HE 5:16; Epiphanius Pan Haer 48:2; Hippolytus Ref 8:12; cited in Ash, pp. 237-238; cf. von Campenhausen, pp. 189-190; Barnett, p. 123.

101 Pelikan, 1:99-100; von Campenhausen, p. 189; Barnett, p. 117. As we have seen before, the charismata were practiced in some quarters of the church during and after the time of Montanism.

102Pelikan, 1:106-107; Barnett, pp. 123-124; Ash, p. 228 and passim, where it is argued that "the bishops, not the canon, expelled prophecy."

103Von Campenhausen, p. 191.

104 So Philipp Vielhauer, introduction to "Apocalypses and Related Subjects" in Hennecke, 2:607: "By the end of the first century prophecy has lost its original significance; only in Asia Minor does it still appear to play a

part, if the statements in the Revelation correspond to the situation and are not assumptions of the seer." ". . . about the middle of the 2nd century (prophecy) was forced into heresy by an orthodoxy which was in the process of consolidating itself."

105 So von Campenhausen, p. 190, n. 90, on the basis of the expression prophetas numero completo in the Muratorian fragment. But in the contest here (the exclusion of Hermas from the canon), "prophets" almost certainly denotes the Old Testament writings, corresponding to "apostles," which would denote the New Testament writings. The distinction of the two testaments as "prophets and apostles" has precedents in other second century literature (Justin Apol 1:67:3).

106 Origen, Contra Celsum 7:8; translation of Crombie in ANF, 4:614.

1070rigen, Contra Celsum 7:11; translation of Crombie in ANF, 4:615.

108Cf. Barnett, pp. 114-115.

109Eusebius HE 5:3:4; translation of Lawlor and Oulton, 1:149.

110 In a locus cited in Paraclete, 1971, p. 17, to which I do not have access; cited in turn by Stephanou, p. 140.

111 "'Ash, p. 228 and passim; cf. Pelikan, 1:98-99.

112 Von Campenhausen, p. 191.

113 Pelikan, 1:98-99.

114 JStreng, pp. 66-125.

115 Ibid., p. 80.

116 Ibid., p. 96.

117 The development of this world-view is traced in Dodds, pp. 1-36.

118 Geza Vermes, Jesus the Jew (London: Fontana, 1976), esp. chapter 3, "Jesus and Charismatic Judaism," pp. 58-82.

119 Dodds, pp. 37-38.

A WESLEYAN THEOLOGY OF EVANGELISM

by
Leon O. Hynson

Introduction

Our task in this essay is to consider a theology of evangelism that will be

1. Biblically based; 2. Historically Wesleyan; 3. Of Contemporary Significance.

Initially, it seems necessary to work with some definition of the task and the key words "theology" and "evangelism." One could, of course, develop a three-hundred page opus with a full Prolegomena to all of the classifications of theology. The Wesleyan heritage has by and large not engaged in that kind of exacting effort, although we could cite John Fletcher, Richard Watson, John Miley, Randolph Foster, or Luther Lee, as notable exceptions.

Our effort here will require a simple approach to theology. For the philosophers of religion, theology is "God talk"; for the systematic theologian it is the rational analysis of the ways of God, through consideration of His self-revelation in Christ, in Scripture, and in the natural order. The cynic has described the work of the theologian by a biting analogy: it is, said Diderot, the story of a man wandering lost in a dark forest at midnight with a flickering candle to provide a little light. Along comes a theologian and blows out the light. In a more positive vein, the definition employed in this essay will be functional: "Theology is telling the faith of the fathers in the language of the children."

Now, "evangelism"-a word which has the highest and most honorable significance, but which like many words has fallen prey to the abuses of certain persons who sometimes stress a theology of human wretchedness that would upstage Karl Barth or a do-it-yourself religion that might have driven Pelagius into the arms of Augustine. The consequences of such abuse is the state of affairs that exists today concerning evangelism. A company of "cultured despisers" of evangelism has emerged over the years, thinking of evangelism in the narrow terms set by the unlearned and ignorant.

It is easy for us to rationalize our neglect of this essential Christian work, by appealing to such unattractive examples. Mr. Wesley (not Dr. Wesley), a man of the people, saw these types in his age. On one occasion he wrote:

"Let but a pert, self-sufficient animal that has neither sense nor grace, bawl out something about Christ, or his blood, or justification by faith, and his hearers cry out, 'What a fine gospel sermon.' "

But what Wesley judged to be an aberration of the gospel and an embarrassment to a reasonable person, did not become the guideline for his Christian activity. He engaged in an incessant effort to "reform the nation and especially the Church and to spread Scriptural (note, Scriptural) holiness across the land." He became the evangelist-reformer without peer in the eighteenth century (with all due credit to Jonathan Edwards, and George Whitefield). He rode up and down the land for more than fifty years, telling the faith of the fathers in the language of the children; expressing it in an admirable union of the "reasonable man" with a cool mind and style (the typical 18th century Englishman) and the man whose heart was strangely warmed, who shared God's good news wherever he went. It is all too easy for us to accent "cool mind" and ignore warmth of spirit. In our world many (most?) persons live and act on the largely affective level. To preach or teach on the rationally coherent and logical level alone i8 to miss the mark with many. This is the Wesleyan concern: to appeal to heart and mind, emotion and intellect on the level where real communication occurs. Wesley wrote this introduction to the Standard Sermons:

> I design plain truth for plain people: therefore of set purpose, I abstain from all nice and philosophical speculations, . . . from even the show of learning, unless in sometimes citing the original Scripture.... I have accordingly set down in the following sermons, what I find in the Bible concerning the way to heaven. [1]

This is evangelism in the Wesleyan manner and spirit.

This focus upon evangelism is found continually in Wesley's writing and preaching. His preoccupation was with evangelical tasks, but he did not construe that narrowly, as a few spiritual laws by which someone is converted to Christ. Wesley sought to develop the full Christian character and the mature, witnessing, sharing believer.

This is spelled out especially well in four appeals that Wesley wrote in 1744-1745. "An Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion" was written first, followed by three "Farther Appeals." The content of these essays so admirably summarizes Wesley's thought that they may be taken as the summa of Wesley's theology of evangelism. Indeed, I see the title "An Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion" as a definition of the Wesleyan approach to evangelism.

In these essays, Wesley is actually engaged in a polemic with certain "men of reason and religion." He appeals to them to recognize some of the essentials of evangelical faith, i.e., the heart of evangelism.

His concern is about:

1. The doctrines of Christian faith;
2. The manner of teaching them;

3. The effects which should follow the teaching of these.

In developing these concerns, we should recognize the ways they are pursued.

1. Doctrine. Three themes:

a. The doctrine of the faith that saves and that opens up new evangelical and ethical possibilities and expectations.
b. The life of Christian love (sanctification, perfect love) which enlarges the Christian's personal and social awareness and capacity for service.
c. The work of the Holy Spirit as a present (contemporary motivating) reality and presence (as opposed to those who relegate the Spirit's work to the ancient era of church history).

2. Manner

a. The reasoned approach to evangelism
b. The gracious appeal to the will; to an uncoerced free decision recognizing the essential freedom of persons. The right to say Yes or No. Right of private judgment.
c. Going where the people are-Field Preaching.

3. Effects-Moral change-Social transformation. Physical relief for sick and poor.

Gerald R. Cragg writes of Wesley's theology:

> The particular emphasis of his theology derived from his preoccupation with evangelism. He included all the traditional elements of the Christian system of belief, but he so arranged them as to bring into the sharpest relief the doctrine of salvation.[2]

I. The Doctrines of Christian Faith
A. The Doctrine of Faith

Wesley's theology was an attempt to "describe the true, the scriptural experimental religion...."[3] It was a theology of evangelism attuned to human failure and disorder and to God's grace and love. It was existentially sensitive, for Wesley had walked the way himself. Before he became an evangelist, he had to wrestle with his own failure, his angst, his lack of contact with Christian reality and certitude. He could not tell the way of faith until he saw with "spiritual sight," to use his metaphor, until he received the gift of faith. He could not tell the good news until he moved beyond the pre-understanding of his Oxford years to the liberating fulfillment of Aldersgate. "Experimental religion!": Religion that corresponded with life! With psychological, rational, and spiritual needs! A religion of love that calls a person into a service of love to the neighbor! Religion that works faithfully, hopefully, lovingly!

Without being too certain about the years from 1725-38 (on which good men differ), it is claimed that Wesley became an evangelist after Aldersgate. Before Aldersgate, he did not know or understand the preaching of faith. Peter Bohler had counseled Wesley in the early days of 1738. "Preach faith until you have it: then, because you have faith you will preach it." Albert Outler comments: "Wesley had preached faith until others had it-and that was what broke the drought in his own spirit."[4]

May I suggest that Wesley, like Luther and St. Paul before him becomes a mirror and an exemplar of the struggling ascents to faith;

struggles that St. Paul depicts in Romans 10 and Luther in his anguished search to find a gracious God. Each man in his own way portrays the anguish of the human quest for the treasure that finally is seen and known as gift. St. Paul wrote, certainly out of his own experience:

> But what the Scripture says about being put right with God through faith is this: 'You are not to ask yourself, who will go up into heaven?' (that is, to bring Christ down). 'Nor are you to ask, who will go down into the world below?' (that is, to bring Christ up from death). What it says is this: 'God's message is near you, on your lips and in your heart'-that is, the message of faith that we preach (Rom. 10:6-8).

Paul continues to claim that all who call on Christ will be saved, that to call they must believe, that faith comes out of the context of hearing the good news, that the good news must be proclaimed. The good news is Christ in whom faith discovers a spirit-transforming personal presence. And this faith is the gift of God made alive in the catalyst of preaching the Word. Those who seek the glory of the divine-human encounter by their own struggles or contributions to the relationship are only candidates for futility and despair. Doubt is sometimes a necessary preparation for spiritual illumination, for the moment of grace. However, it must finally become self- doubt and self-surrender to the giftedness of faith. Doubt is an understandable stage along the way. It is often a step in a person's progress from self- trust to confidence in God. To doubt the Almighty is not surprising; it is the shadow side of our own self-sufficiency. Soon enough, self-trust leads to the despair of human emptiness. The nakedness of Adam and Eve portrays the existential and spiritual finitude of all. We stand before God and one another naked, without recourse. Preeminently contingent or dependent, we require an adequate structure of trust. That structure is not found in our subjective resources. It is only in God whose image and likeness we bear and which bears us. We are marked by an infinite need for an infinite God.

How does Mr. Wesley articulate this need for faith, this mark of our image? To summarize this we may observe:

1. Faith is described in experimental terms. Faith is viewed empirically. Faith is defined by Wesley by an analogy from sensation. As a student of the epistemology of John Locke, Wesley accepted the view that innate ideas do not exist; all natural knowledge comes from sense impressions or reflection on them. They cannot transcend the physical world. However, the sphere of faith is another thing. There are spiritual sensations which bring impressions or illumination from the spiritual world. What is faith? Citing Hebrews 11, he states that "faith is 'the demonstrative evidence of things unseen,' the supernatural evidence of things invisible, not perceivable by eyes of flesh, or by any of our natural sense or faculties. Faith is with regard to the spiritual world, what sense is with regard to the natural. It is the spiritual sensation of every soul that is born of God "[5]

Using the sensation analogy, Wesley describes faith as the seeing eye of the soul; the ear by which a sinner hears God's voice and lives; the palate of the soul by which he tastes the powers of the coming age; the feeling of the soul which perceives the power and presence of God.

2. Faith is set forth in evangelical terms. Faith is viewed evangelically.

Here Wesley sees faith as a gift from God. It is a work, God's work, not ours. If it is asked why everyone does not have faith, Wesley responds that it is not a matter of human choice. Faith is not a simple human possibility. It is not a question of human merit.[6] Faith is the free gift of God to anyone who freely owns his/her "mere sin and misery," who truly repents, evidencing the reality of an awareness of personal sin. Repentance and "fruits meet for repentance" precede faith.[7] Repentance is not a good work; for it does not spring from saving faith. But it is a stage which God evokes in the soul, leading to faith.

3. Faith is presented in rational (logical) terms. Following his earlier stress on sensation Wesley affirms the full use of reason in searching out the things of God. Proper reasoning, says Wesley, presupposes true judgments already formed, or else any argument is groundless. One must have a clear understanding of the things of God in order to form a true judgment of them. You must have senses which operate on this level: "a new class of senses opened in your soul." These senses are from God and are the avenues to the invisible world. Without physical sight you cannot reason properly concerning objects of sight. So with spiritual sight, without which you cannot reason concerning spiritual sight. Only by faith or internal sensation may we receive the data by which to understand the spiritual world.

Only by the sensation of faith may we understand, know reason concerning spiritual realities.

The logical approach which Wesley employs here builds on a questionable psychology. Wesley was employing the resources of his liberal learning, and expanding it to amplify the avenue of faith. He is appealing to cultured men of reason and religion pressing on them the way of faith, driving for a reasoned choice, asking for decision. His is the logic of evangelism, a call to those especially "who do not receive the Christian system as of God."[8] If we cannot buy Wesley's analogy, let us not make the mistake of failure to develop our own ways to evangelize. How do you appeal to persons? There must be language which strikes a responsive chord. Communication is the issue.

Reuel Howe is the communication specialist, par excellence. He asserts the principle of dialogue as the necessary means of linking person-to- person. A sermon may be monologue, dealing in glittering generalitites. It may be dialogical even if one person is speaking. We must be more than the "answer-dispenser" in preaching or teaching. Yet an exaggerated use of the non-directive approach, the questioned becoming questioner, can force the servant of the Lord to become like a spectator at a tennis match, head swivelling back and forth watching the flow of the match. The evangel must be in the match-giving, taking, faulting, penetrating. Howe writes: ". . . the purpose of dialogue and therefore of communication, is to help the person participating in it make a responsible decision, whether that decision be a Yes or No in relation to what is being considered.... We worry too much about the No or negative response. It is necessary sometimes to say No before we can say Yes."[9]

Mr. Wesley practiced this principle of dialogue. It is said that he would often preach newly prepared sermons to his maid, an uneducated girl, and have her stop him when she did not understand. That is communication!

The doctrine of faith in Wesleyan thought is the immediate goal of evangelism. Evangelism means the announcement of the vital word which is the mediate source of faith. "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God."

When faith comes, there is opened up in the life of the believer a whole range of ethical possibilities. It is impossible to negate the significance of the new life with its new relationships to God, man, and self. Faith alone saves, and faith alone opens the human spirit to the way of service and love. Faith alone is the quality of spirit which overcomes the human pattern of self-trust and independence, for it is the confession of need, of weakness, of human limitation. It is the admission of the "imagedness" of man, the absolute priority of God. With this recognition, persons participate in the new humanity, begin new life.

The Methodist heritage has too often strayed from Wesley's biblical foundations. Forgetting the cruciality of faith, the ethics of love and good works has been exalted. It has sought to raise the structure of sanctification without the ground of justification by faith alone. In its linear movement it has progressed from the Reformation position which Wesley held to the Enlightenment perception of moral man. In its evangelism may be perceived the neglect of Wesley's proclamation of human inability. Often it has applied inadequate medication to the symptoms of sickness, dispensing aspirin when radical surgery is required for restoration and healing. Wesley wrote: "By salvation I mean . . . a restoration of the soul to its primitive health, its original purity....[10] Ernest Campbell has written: "A Church so busily at work correcting the massive injustices of society that it cannot or will not make the effort to win men and women to an allegiance to Jesus Christ will soon become sterile and unable to produce after its kind."[11]

B. The Life of Christian Love which Enlarges the Christian's Personal and Social Awareness and Capacity for Service

A second major doctrinal and ethical position in Wesley's thought concerns Christian love. If justification by faith alone opens the way, the way itself both at the beginning and the end is faith active in love (sanctification, good works, holiness). Wesley was not a sectarian, or a cultist, emphasizing one or two pet doctrines, but he did see his task in particular terms. Analysis of his thought shows full balance on trinitarian insights, Christology, the Spirit, and a concern for a full-orbed theology. If we remember his primary calling-evangelism, not the systematizing of theology-we understand his response to the charge against the Methodists. "They make it their principal employ, wherever they go, to instill into people a few favourite tenets of their own; and this with such diligence and zeal as if the whole of Christianity depended upon them." "A few favourite tenets!" What were these tenets? "I frequently sum them up all in one: 'In Christ Jesus . . . neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love' (Gal. 5:6)." Sometimes he taught the Commandments to love God and neighbor; sometimes that God is love, again the rule called the Golden Rule.

The grace of love is consistently viewed by Wesley as the epitome of the Christian love. It wag his familiar definition of religion, although religion (as in "Appeal to men of Reason and Religion") may be defined as

formal religion. The religion he sought for many years was love: "But all this time seeking wisdom we found it not . . . and being now under full conviction of this, we declare it to all mankind; . . . that they may go . . . the straight way to the religion of love, even by faith."

The holiness movement, tracing its lineage to Wesley, has frequently failed to emphasize or define sanctification as love. Instead there has been a strong tendency toward a scholastic definition. Wesley's view is generally dynamic, and personal or relational. It is true that aspects of his thought (e.g., his metaphor "circumcision of the heart," or his sometimes Augustinian definition of original sin), led to a "hardening of the categories." However, the normative Wesleyan category is love, a definition which preeminently expresses a relationship to a person-GOD-and to persons-our neighbors. Too often the inheritors of Wesley's teaching have been preoccupied with the personal self-what takes place within?; or with experience-how vital is my experience? Experience became objectified, an end, a goal. A series of visits to the altar was the appropriate ritual, the formalized manner of achieving the desired end. In spite of these restrictive structures, the Spirit of God blew mightily and moved gracefully among these people.

The larger "church" segment of the Wesleyan heritage failed to sort out the wheat from the chaff. John Mackay, president emeritus of Princeton Seminary in his Christian Reality and Appearance contrasts "Christian Reality and the Shadows that Betray It." Four distinctive facets of Christian reality – "The Christian Quadrilateral" – are recognized and contrasted with substitutionary shadows:

<u>Christian Reality</u>
l. God's Self-Disclosure
2. The Transforming Encounter
3. The Community of Christ
4. Christian Obedience

<u>Shadows</u>
l. Theologism-The Idolatry of Ideas
2. Impression-The Idolatry of Feeling
3. Churchism-The Idolatry of Structure
4. Ethicism-The Idolatry of Prescripts

Shadow l-Transforming ideas into realities. Loyalty to ideas about Christ, about the Bible, about the revelation of God in Christ, but without real discipleship. Reification-hardening of the categories.

Shadow 2-The thrill of the encounter is replaced by emotional thrill; the sights and sounds. Some recall the original meeting of long ago, belong to the cult of emotion.

Shadow 3-The institution becomes formalized. The Church is a place, an institution. Instead of the *koinonia*, the fellowship, it is the place, the hierarchy.

Shadow 4-Obedience to the Lord Christ is equated with obedience to codes, ceremonies, etc. Loyalty to a particular church, or to a political order is substituted.[12]

These are some of the problems which have vexed Methodism. In various sectors of the Wesleyan heritage, each of these "shadows" has fallen across the way. We must find and grasp Christian reality. If the Church experiences God's self-disclosure in a transforming encounter, shares in the vitality of the community, and practices obedience to Christ, it will be a community of evangelism.

But what does the doctrine of love-perfect love-have to do with evangelism? Is there a relationship between holy living and evangelism? There is, clearly articulated in Scripture and logically expressed in theological analysis. The significance of Pentecost is the message of evangelism which is the expression of the Spirit's presence: "You shall receive the power of the Holy Spirit coming upon you and you shall be witnesses to me, in Judea, Samaria, and the uttermost parts of the earth." In the Acts of the Apostles there is a definite link between the life of the Spirit and the empowerment of believers to be evangels.

Expressing it more in Pauline terms, we may see the way faith leads to love. Every Christian believer, in whom faith is a dynamic reality is moved to love-faith active in love. The mark of faith is good works or love.

The Christian man is moved to love-faith matures in love. Faith is contagious in acts of love and in the spirit of love. The believer's trust in Christ is communicated to his neighbor in many ways, specifically in the Christian's life-style, in a compulsion to share the meaning of the life that is in them. Faith active in love is equally a source of evangelism and social concern.

The Wesleyan heritage moved along these twin tracks in Wesley's era and in much of the 19th century. The anti-slavery crusade was sparked by the revolutionary spirit of perfect love, as Timothy Smith has demonstrated. The prominent anti-slavery voices in Methodism-from Wesley to Orange Scott and Lucius Matlack, to Jesse Peck, Gilbert Haven, B. T. Roberts, and more-were themselves persuaded that faith becomes active in works of love. The Wesleyan heritage pushed these evangelical themes apart during much of the last century. One part of the church amplified faith without concern for social ethics, while the other stressed ethics with minimal attention paid to faith (justifying faith).

Do you find yourself in the position of a friend of mine? He examined his sermons preached over a 20-year period. To his dismay he found almost no sermons on the doctrine of justification by faith or conversion, while there was an overwhelming number on love, ethics, or the Christian lifestyle. He preached love much and faith little. Ethics? Yes! Faith? No! That is the sure way to a hardening of the life of the church into formalized structured. Faith is the opening of life. The new creation precedes the works of love-evangelism and social concern.

Wesley speaks in the "Appeals" concerning the error of teaching sanctification prior to jugtification.[13] That the Church of England in Wesley's age held this position has been made clear by William R. Cannon. Gerald Cragg has spoken, too, of the work of the seventeenth century Bishop George Bull which reflected the Pelagianism of the Church during the century. Wesley wrote: ". . . when I say, Faith alone is the condition of present salvation, what I would assert is this: (l) That without faith no man can be saved from his sins; can be inwardly or outwardly holy. And, (2) That at

what time soever faith is given, holiness commences in the soul. For that instant 'the love of God' (which is the source of holiness) 'is shed abroad in the heart.'" [14]

The doctrine of perfect love is the theological completion of the doctrine of faith. To leave off at faith is to fall into antinomianism, or to fail to provide norms for the Christian life. Faith without lovelethics is truncated faith and will mean the dwarfing of the church. It means that evangelism dries up and faith becomes an intellectualized credal statement. Here it becomes of greater import what you believe than how you live.

The church in evangelism must tell the good news of love in process. This too is part of the Wesleyan genius. There i8 a dynamic life to be lived, moving, ascending; there is a "going-on" to love's perfection. A static message challenges no one, but this word from Wesley places us on the road to that personal and social health which is the end of Christ's Gospel. The nineteenth century Wesleyans in America-Gilbert Haven, Jesse Peck, Orange Scott-saw this with prophetic clarity. They were convinced that universal love is the ultimate outworking of the Wesleyan message. However, the pessimism of adventism, and millenarianism, and later the dark despair of the early Barth, Overbeck, and their spiritual kin, shadowed the luminous word of perfect love taught by the Methodists, and their grand dream of the triumph of Christ's gospel was hidden in the dark night of this century's holocausts. Were they wrong? Perhaps in their timing, but not in their vision! Was the ancient prophet wrong when he saw the day when the nations would "beat their swords into plowshares"?

If perfection is not the goal, what is? This teaching is the special contribution of Methodism. Why has the church distorted or ignored this word? Why is not the church of Wesley interested in Wesley? A Methodist bishop told me five years ago that the Methodists were not tuned in to the teachings of those nineteenth century prophets of Methodism who preached and taught in the era of Civil War and who confidently announced slavery's demise. Why? Caught up in the fashion of Ritschl and Harnack, Troeltsch and Hermann, Wellhausen and Lotze, the apparently archaic and simple gospel of Wesley seemed to be benign and primitive aspects of Methodist history. We could declare with some pride that he anticipated the anthropology of Schleiermacher by his emphasis on feeling, emotion, or experience as central to theological reflection. We ceased to believe that he and his kin-Watson, Fletcher, Pope-had much to offer. The voices of Albert Outler and Frank Baker are still crying in the wilderness, but they are being heard increasingly by persons unfulfilled by the latest fads in theology.

C. The Work of the Holy Spirit as a Contemporary Reality

A third major theological strand found in the "Appeals" is the persuasion Wesley held of the contemporary, immediate reality of the Holy Spirit. In this our own era, when we are inundated by literature on the Spirit and on the gifts of the Spirit, we may profit by the sensible position which Wesley generally maintained.

He addressed the general skepticism of his century regarding the gift of the Spirit. The prevailing opinion was expressed: The "extra-ordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were granted to the first Christians only, but his ordinary graces to all Christians in all ages...."[15] To argue against this

opinion was judged enthusiasm or fanaticism. The Church of England feared enthusiasm more than sin. Order was the keynote of the Church from the very beginnings of the English Reformation. Wesley was charged with a violation of the "sacred" principle.

To counteract this teaching and to show that the Spirit's presence is authentic today, Wesley cited at length the Gospel of John 14, 16, Romans 8, I Corinthians 2 to show that the presence of the Spirit may be expected, indeed, that it is the benefit of Christians in all ages.[16]

He then proceeded with a lesson in patristics appealing to Chrysostom, Jerome, Origen, and Athanasius. Finally he called upon the authority of Bishop John Pearson (1613-1686), one of the luminaries of the Church of England, equal in influence to Richard Hooker.

Relentlessly, Wesley appealed to the Book of Common Prayer, to ten collects, including: "Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy name" (from the "Communion Office"). He searched out the teachings of the authoritative "Homilies of the Church" (written in 1549 and 1562), quoting ten times from seven sermons, thus appealing to Thomas Cranmer and other Reformation theologians to support his claim. If, by believing in the immediate inspiration and assuring presence of the Spirit, Wesley is an enthusiast, then he belongs to a select fel1owship of moderns as well as Reformation and patristic leaders.

And what is enthusiasm as defined by Wesley? He critiques his critics: It is "a false imagination of being inspired by God; . . . one that fancies himself under the influence of the Holy Ghost, when, in fact, he is not."[17]

It is important for us to note the insistence that the Holy Spirit's work is immediate, assuring, and empowering The significance of these concepts is evident when we refer to evangelism. For Wesley these had a precise relation to effective evangelism. The immediacy of the spirit means that the element of the "holy" is present, evoking wonder. As Rudolph Otto states it, the "holy" is characterized by a "numinous" quality, or a category of feeling which eludes a full comprehension in rational terms. The "numinous" involves a deeply-felt experience; to be rapt in worship, to see the Lord as Isaiah saw Him. This numinous quality manifests itself in several modes:

l. The mysterium tremendum-an experience of the holy which may be like a gentle tide or a crashing wave in the spirit of worshippers. It sometimes bears the elements of:

a. Awfulness-the hallowing of the name; the power of the presence. Otto uses the analogy of shuddering or shivering to express it. Kierkegaard speaks of the shuddering before God or as Walter Lowrie translates it "anguished dread."[18]
b. Overpoweringness-majesty-Isaiah 6: "Woe is me, for I am undone."
c. Energy-urgency-passion, excitement, fire, force.[19]

This immediacy of the Spirit is an aspect of the church in evangelism, as we see in Acts 2: "They were all filled with the Holy Spirit," and in the community of the Spirit which was a growing community. This community evoked amazement by the presence of the Holy Spirit. Hendrikus Berkhof, in a superb study on the Holy Spirit, comments:

> Whenever Luke, in his Gospel or in Acts, speaks of being filled with the Spirit, he lays full emphasis not on the inner emotions caused by this event, but on its external consequences: People began to prophesy, to exclaim, to praise God, to be Christ's witnesses, to speak in tongues, to . . . speak the Word of God with boldness....
>
> The filling by the Spirit means that the justified and sanctified are now turned, so to speak, inside out. In Acts they are turned primarily to the world; in Paul primarily to the total body of Christ; but this is merely a difference in situation and emphasis.[20]

Secondly, we recognize the element of assurance. We have recognized this dimension of the Spirit's work in Wesley's thought. The little brochure from Tidings entitled "Four Great Emphases of United Methodism," declares: "God's Spirit Brings Assurance That We Belong to Him." And it asserts: "The 'witness of the Spirit' is more than an emotion that we feel, or a voice that we hear. It is an inner confidence that God is faithful and that He does indeed keep His promise with us. This inward confidence is confirmed by outward change-i.e., a new style of life."

Many people have agonized over this aspect of Wesleyan thought. It seems so subjective and conducive to an introspection which may produce the opposite of out-reaching love. In fact, Wesley's emphasis stresses the subjective and the objective; the root and the fruit. It is not theologically safe to separate the two.

There is an aspect of the witness of the Spirit that needs to be stressed. namely, the assuring relationship to God which the witness gives, making it possible to live confidently in the world, witnessing to our fellow citizens of this world in the power of the Spirit. When the Spirit came, as Luke records it in Acts 2, the believer's manner before the world was entirely changed. Peter's sermon in Acts 2; the Christian's response to commands to desist from preaching Jesus; St. Stephen's shining face in the midst of his stoning, and the empowered preaching among the Judeans, Samaritans, and the uttermost parts of the earth; all of these show a new assurance experienced by these believers. This characterizes the vital Christian in witness.

A third element in the Holy Spirit's work is empowerment. Carl Michalson, perhaps the premier theologian in Methodism in his day, professor at Drew until his tragic death in a plane crash in 1965, has given voice to this spiritual command-presence which the Spirit gives. Recognizing a powerful other-worldliness in Wesley, he asserts the presence of some signs of Christian worldliness. Worldliness, itself, is defined as "loving the world" in competition with the love of God.

> Christian worldliness removes the distraction of idolatry and thus liberates a man to assume responsibility for the world. Without that liberation (through holy love), one could turn the world into an idol to which he felt responsible, thus losing his capacity to be responsible for it.
>
> Holiness, without disparaging the world, is committed to orienting the world to God in order not to turn the world into

> the very idol, exclusive devotion to which obstructs the sense of responsibility for it.[21]

The person who stands in trepidation before the world, lacks any kind of world-transforming potential.

The Holy Spirit not only removes the distractions of idolatry, but bestows the positive power to bear the Christian faith hopefully and lovingly before the world. Assurance and empowerment are linked to evangelism. "Ye shall receive power." John Macquarrie's superb discussion in his book Paths In Spirituality has a chapter entitled "Spirit and Spirituality" which must be read. Defining "Spirit" as "a capacity for going out of oneself and beyond oneself," he argues that this is true both of the Holy Spirit, and the human spirit liberated by God's Spirit. He argues:

> But surely Christian spirituality envisages a broader strategy than the spiritualization of the individual. In calling the church the 'community of the Spirit' we are implying that here there is ... a society with the capacity to go out from itself.... Thus, wherever the church is this community it is introducing a new dimension into the social situation, one that gives hope for an eventual transformation.[22]

The point is that the Spirit and the community of the Spirit are reaching out and drawing others into the *koinonia*. The "fellowship of the Spirit" is the empowered communion of the Spirit. Luther described the sinful life as the self-enclosed life. The spiritual life is the opening outward to human community. This is a central affirmation of the work of the Spirit in the church empowering for evangelism.

Some persons are anxious about the present potential for a unitarianism of the third person of the trinity in which the Spirit overshadows Jesus Christ. That is a fear with a genuine base. A helpful, if partial, answer comes from the late Samuel Shoemaker: "Time was when people apparently came to the Holy Spirit through Christ. Has not the time come when many of them might better be brought to Christ through the Holy Spirit?"[23]

II. Manner of Teaching These Doctrines

A. The Reasoned Approach to Evangelism

Wesley's education, temperament, and age all contributed to his genteel character. He approached his work including evangelism with this quality of dignity. Even when he "submitted to be more vile" and took up the work of field preaching he always maintained his calm, moderate style. To see Wesley as a "hot-gospeller," screaming at the top of his lungs and turning purple in the face, is to misunderstand him. Communicate he did not by bluster, but by plain speech. For him the Word became flesh, and Words in evangelism must take on flesh. (After a heavy theological presentation at Evanston to the World Council of Church Bishop Berggrav of os1o said to an aide: "The word became theology and did not dwell among us." Jurgen Moltmann introduced a lecture by stating that a German lecture has three parts: l. What the hearers understand. 2. What is understood by the speaker. 3. What no one can understand.)

Wesley was persuaded that plain, rational speech is the medium of evangelism. He was a cool-minded man, thoroughly trained in logic (which he taught at Oxford, using Henry Aldrich's well-known text)[24] and he used it repeatedly to test the claims of his opponents. He also used this logical approach in preaching (e.g., his sermon-"The Means of Grace"). His empirical definition of faith (sight, taste, hearing, feeling) was a reference to the logic of religious experience. He was well-informed about the Cambridge Platonists, especially Richard Norris, having read many of his books between 1725-1734. This seems evident in Wesley's appeal to some who had had some intimation of the reality of grace: "Do you not remember the time when God first lifted up the light of his countenance upon you? Can it ever be forgotten? the day when the candle of the Lord first shone your head."[25] The reference "candle of the Lord" in this context ("The Appeals") can hardly be accidental. Evidently Wesley recalls the rational theology of Norris, Whichcote and John Smith. The Cambridge Platonists "are celebrated for their appeals to 'Reason': Reason, which in the text that Whichcote never tires of quoting, is 'the candle of the Lord', and to follow which, John Smith declares, is to follow God." So writes an expert on seventeenth century thought, Basil Willey.[26] Wesley also appeals to the theology of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, called the "father of Deism." His purpose is to reason with and persuade the "men of reason and religion," to nudge them toward a confession of rational faith, to the end that they might enter the realm of saving faith. His style is similar to Jesus' parabolic approach in which he works to the point of decision. Like the parable of the prodigal son, where the fervent and tender appeal of the father to the elder son to come into the house for the celebration becomes to the prideful Pharisees an appeal to forgiveness and salvation.

Wesley wrote:

> If therefore you allow, that it is reasonable to love God, to love mankind, and to do good to all men, you cannot but allow that religion which we preach and live to be agreeable to the highest reason.
>
> . . . Whenever, . . . you see an unreasonable man, you see one who . . . is no more a Christian than he is an angel. So far as he departs from true, genuine reason, so far he departs from Christianity.

But what does Wesley mean by reason? He refers to "the eternal reason, or the nature of things; the nature of God and the nature of man, with the relations necessarily subsisting between them. Why, this is the very religion we preach; a religion evidently founded on ... eternal reason...."

This religion of reason is a religion of love, central and essential to the very nature of God. It is also suited to the nature of man, showing him his sin, and offering a remedy.

B. The Gracious Appeal to Free Decision

Another important feature of the "reasonable man" was the spirit of religious toleration. John Wesley strongly insisted on this reasonable approach to evangelism. Insisting upon the right of private judgment, an important Protestant motif from the Reformation, he believed that the gospel must be addressed to every person.

An extensive body of Wesley's writings wrestles with the issues of liberty of conscience and religious toleration. The "Appeals" demonstrate that this dedication to human values, life, liberty, and happiness,[27] was of major importance to him. Consider his reference to private judgment, the right to private choice, based on conscience; decision based not on political, social, or religious pressures, but rather out of the awareness that one must assume responsibility for his decisions. "You surely," Wesley asks, "will not say that any man's conscience can preclude mine. You, at least, will not plead for robbing us of what you so strongly claim for yourselves: I mean, the right of private judgment, which is indeed unalienable from reasonable creatures."[28]

From this presumed ground of agreement, Wesley proceeds to appeal to the reasonableness of love for God, for the neighbor, doing good to everyone whether friends or enemies. He speaks earnestly to their minds and their senses, employing the empirical analogy of the spiritual senses by which we see and feel God. How will these persons, who do not believe, cross the gulf from the natural to the spiritual realm? Only by the possibility of faith, that faith which has been rejected and despised. The entire progress of the "Appeals" is toward decision. Wesley's concern becomes passionate: "O no longer shut your eyes against the light! Know, you have a name that you live, but are dead."

> Bear with me a little longer: My soul is distressed for you.... Because you did not commit gross sin, because you give alms, and go to the church and sacrament, you imagine you are serving God: Yet, ... you are doing still your own will.... You are pleasing yourself in all you do.[29]

It is not important to parrot Wesley but to capture his spirit: always pressing for a decision but never permitting unfair methods of evangelism; always gracious in manner, offering Christ. Even in the close ties of family this spirit must prevail. Wesley writes:

> A man of conscience cannot condemn anyone unheard. This is not common humanity. Nor will he refrain from hearing what may be the truth, for . . . fear of his reputation. Pray observe, I do not say, every man or any man, is obliged in conscience to hear us: But I do say, every man in England who condemns us is obliged to hear us first.
>
> Suppose your censure was just, and this was actually false doctrine. Still every one must give an account of himself to God: and you cannot force the conscience of anyone. You cannot compel another to see as you see; you ought not to attempt it. Reason and persuasion are the only weapons you ought to use, even toward your own wife and children. Nay, and it is impossible to starve them into conviction, or to beat truth into their head.... Remember what our own poet has said:
>
> 'By force beasts act, and are by force restrained;
> The human mind by gentle means is gain'd
> Thou canst not take what I refuse to yield
> Nor reap the harvest, though thou spoilst the field.'[30]

Wesley pursued the question of liberty of conscience by dealing with the employer who fired an employee for following his own conscience. He cited a specific example of a person who was fired, was unable to find food, becoming sick and dying. The employer is guilty of murder. "Why, Edward Bonner [Bishop of London who persecuted the Protestants during the reign of Mary Tudor] would have starved the heretics in prison; whereas you starve them in their own houses!"

Finally Wesley insisted that the religion of love is free from bigotry. Opinions are held, but "they are peculiarly cautious not to rest the weight of Christianity there." "The weight of all religion, we apprehend, rests upon holiness of heart and life." Describing the Methodists, he stated:

> They contend for nothing trifling, as if it was important; for nothing indifferent, as if it were necessary; for nothing circumstantial, as if it were essential to Christianity; but everything in its own order.[31]

Reason and persuasion; liberty of conscience; the right to free choice; a gracious manner. Christian evangelism respects the persons appealed to as free persons, with unalienable human rights, even the right to be wrong. Christian evangelism wrestles with the evangelical demand. It cannot but proclaim Jesus Christ in all his cosmic promise.

C. Going Where the People Are-Field Preaching

Dr. George Sweazey has stated: "The New Testament says you are to win people as fishermen or as shepherds, by hook or by crook." Mr. Wesley experienced difficulty in breaking away from the formalized structure of parish ministry. He knew that the Canon Law of 1604 restricted the granting of Holy Orders without a parish or without the Master of Arts degree with five years standing (Canon Law 33; see also Canon Law 50). It was not ordinarily permissible to be a priest without some place of service.

When Wesley "submitted to be more vile," and went out into the fields, he began his greatest work. There he was able to reach thousands with the message that would never have been given them in the church. Criticized for going into another's parish, he argued that by ordination as a priest he was given the right to preach everywhere. Too, by the call of God he was sent into the whole world. Wesley said his "ordinary call" to preach was conferred by the bishop: "Take thou authority to preach the word." His "extraordinary call" was from God and was displayed in his ministry by the grace bestowed upon it.[32] Even if man should deny him the right to preach, God's call would be heeded.

What does Wesley's example suggest to us in principle? That we must be able to break through the walls that build up between us and our age where vast hurts await healing. We are in competition with many evangelisms, which are working the frontiers of our society. Many are heretical, authoritarian, cultic, dangerous to the psychological, social, and spiritual well-being of their adherents. The issue is not: Whether to evangelize? But, what kind of evangelism can we recognize? Clearly God's call in Christ Jesus is at the heart of our work. Failure to evangelize cutg us off from the roots of creative faith and vitality.[33]

Conclusion

Before Aldersgate, Wesley's father had written urging him to become curate at Epworth. Wesley declined on the ground that at Oxford (where he was a Fellow of Lincoln College), he could foster his own spiritual life.

> From all this I conclude that where I am most holy myself, then I could most promote holiness in others; and consequently I could most promote it here than in any place under heaven.

His father had written that at Epworth the sphere of ministry would be larger, with the care of 2,000 souls. John replied:

> Two thousand souls! I see not how any man living can take care of a hundred. At least I could not.... Because the weight that I already have upon me is almost more than I am able to bear, ought I to increase it tenfold? . . . Nay, but the mountains I reared would only crush my own soul, and so make me utterly useless to others.[34]

Compare that with this commitment written in 1739:

> Suffer me now to tell you my principles in this matter. I look upon all the world as my parish: . . . I judge it my bounden duty to declare unto all that are willing to hear the glad tidings of salvation. This is the work which I know God has called me to, and I am sure that his blessing attends it.[35]

NOTES

1 *Sermons*, I "Preface to the Sermons," pp. 30-31.

2 *The Works of John Wesley*, Vol. 11, "The Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion," Gerald R. Cragg, ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 15.

3 *Standard Sermons*, I, p. 32.

4 A. C. Outler, *Evangelism in the Wesleyan Spirit*, p. 21.

5 *Works*, VIII, p. 4, "An Earnest Appeal," Section 6. (My emphasis.)

6 *Ibid*, p. 6, Sec. ll.

7 *Ibid.,* p. 47; "A Farther Appeal," Part I, Sec. I, 2.

8 *Ibid*., p. 15; "An Earnest Appeal," S-c. 38.

9 Reuel Howe. "The Dialogical Foundations for Christian Education" in *An Introduction to Christian Education*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor (New York: Abingdon Pregs, 1966), p. 92.

10 *Works*, VIII, p. 47; "A Farther Appeal," Part I, 1:3.

11 *Christian Manifesto* (New York, 1970), p. 9, cited in Howard A. Snyder, *The Problem of Wineskins* (Downer's Grove: 1975), p. 43.

12 John A. Mackay, *Christian Reality and Appearance* (Richmond: 1969).

13 *Works* VIII, p. 111; "A Farther Appeal," Part I, 6:1. "I was ordained Deacon in 1725, and Priest in the year following. It was many years after this before I was convinced of the great truths . . . of the nature and condition of justification. Sometimes I confounded it with sanctification...."

14 *Ibid*., p. 68; "A Farther Appeal," Part I, 3:10.

15 *Ibid*., p. 77; "A Farther Appeal," Part I, 5:1.

16 *Ibid*., p. 91, Part I, 5:1-14.

17 *Ibid*., p. 106, 5:15-28.

18 Walter Lowrie, *Kierkegaard*, I (New York: 1962), p. 74.

19 Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy* (New York: 1958), pp. 6-24.

20 See Hendrikus Berkhof, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Atlanta: 1976), pp. 88-89.

21 Carl Michalson, *Worldly Theology: The Hermeneutical Focus of an Historical Faith* (New York: 1967), pp. 155-157. 22(New York 1972), pp. 40, 44, 50-52-

23 *With the Holy Spirit and With Fire* (Waco, Texas: 1972), p. 48.

24 Cf., Cragg, p. 56. Wesley translated Aldrich and used his work in his own compendium of logic.

25 *Works* VIII, p. 21, Sec. 54.

26 *The Seventeenth Century Background* (New York: 1953), p. 141.

27 On happiness, see *Works* VIII, p. 7, Sec. 16. 28Ibid., Sec. 17-

29 *Ibid*., pp. 19-20, Sec. 50-51.

30 *Ibid*., p. 125; "A Farther Appeal," Part I, 7:5. The quotation is from Matthew Prior's didactic poem: "Solomon on the Vanity in the World," written c. 1708.

31 *Ibid*., pp. 127-128; 202-206; 243; 207.

32 *Letters of John Wesley*, I (London: 1960), pp. 286-287, 322-323. These were letters to James Hervey and Charles Wesley.

33 This paper does not deal with part III, supra, on the Effects which follow evangelism. See my "The Church and Social Transformation: An Ethics of the Spirit," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* (Spring, 1976), pp. 49-61; "Christian Love: The Key to Wesley's Ethics, "*Methodist History"* (October, 1975), pp. 44-55; "The Social Concerns of Wesley: Theological Foundations," *Christian Scholar's Review*, IV, 1 (1974), pp. 36-42; "Evangelism and Social Ethics in Wesley's Theology," *The A. M. E. Zion Quarterly Review* (July, 1981), pp. 2-18.

34 *Letters*, I, pp. 167-174.

35 *Ibid*., p. 286.

THE NATURE OF WESLEYAN THEOLOGY

by
J. Kenneth Grider

Theology, when it is entered into by us Wesleyans, takes on a certain nature, in relation to other theologies: Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Lutheran, Anglican, Calvinist. It is of the very nature of Wesleyan theology that it has (1) an experiential interest, (2) an existential element, (3) a large-scoped biblical character, (4) a dynamic quality, (5) a catholicity, and 6) a homing instinct for the moral.

Its Experiential Interest

John Wesley (1703-91) himself was much interested in such. It is well known from his Journal that, on May 24, 1738, after he had been at Saint Paul's Cathedral and heard an anthem on the evangelical, "Pauline" 130th Psalm, he attended a meeting place on Aldersgate Street in London and felt his heart "strangely warmed." But not just that. He started the Methodist Societies to foster in others the warmed heart-and the kind of Christian life which is its fitting outflow.

At a time when England was suffering from a dearth of experiential faith, when religion in this sense was often a laughing matter, John Wesley became the most strategic catalyst in effecting a revival of religion which transformed culture in basic ways and gained wide respect for experiential Christian faith. J. R. Green, in his Short History of the English People, as he introduces the treatment of the period immediately following 1742, says that ". . . never had religion seemed at a lower ebb."[1] Yet it is even felt by many historians such as J. Wesley Bready in his This Freedom Whence,[2] that the Wesleyan revival contributed more to the social and political freedoms of Britons than the French Revolution did-and that it was the experiential religion promulgated by Wesley, essentially, that brought about so drastic a change in human rights and human life generally in England.

Wes1ey's theology, which was not presented in sustained, systematic form, but in sermons and treatises and Bible comments (and even in a journal and letters) as issues arose, had perhaps four main sources, one of them the experiential. It is true that his theology was biblical, and I will discuss that a bit later. It is also true that reason figured importantly in it. Besides, and somewhat as an overlap with his experiential interest, he respected

very much the tradition of the church. But importantly, and distinctively, and in some ways dangerously, he stressed the importance of experience as a source for one's theology. George Croft Cell says that Wesley's theology is actually a theology of personal experience.[3] Harald Lindstrom says similarly, "In its general structure, Wesley's view of Christianity has been described as a theology of experience: his affirmation of Christian experience is considered his main characteristic."[4] Wesley has also been called a "... zealous proclaimer of individual, experiential religion."[5] He even tended at times to give a precedence to experience, over Scripture – although he states at other times that Scripture has primary authority. Mullen finds what I myself do, and writes that ". . . in practice he judged the validity of biblical and religious claims by experience, not experience by dogma."[6] In this same vein John M. Moore says, "John Wesley received an experience that night [at Aldersgate] that made him the greatest moral, social, and religious force of his century. That is the testimony of the historians.... Aldersgate Street led out into the fields where men lived, and he took the road and never grew weary of it."[7]

One special aspect of Wesley's emphasis on religious experience was his teaching on the witness of the Spirit. In a sermon on this subject, and otherwise, he stresses this matter. He taught that there is a direct witness, in which the Holy Spirit inwardly assures us of our acceptance with God in justification and of our entire sanctification; and that, also, and later, indirectly, the Holy Spirit witnesses to us of such matters by reminding us that, in our lives, the fruits of justification or of entire sanctification are evident.

Wesley was wise, in his stressing the importance of experience-Christian experience. The ancient Apostles' Creed does not read, "I believe that," but "I believe in God the Father," etc., which means that the early Christians were guided to express not simply their knowledge about God and other aspects of Faith, but their experience of such. So it was with Wesley, and so it is with us Wesleyans of the Holiness movement today. We seek to foster not simply knowledge about God, e.g., but the knowledge of God including reverence for Him and obedience to Him.

This is why, in Wesleyan churches today, the one most significant prerequisite for church membership is an experiential one-the experience of conversion. A person is not a member because he was born, physically, to parents who are. He is usually given at least a little specific instruction about the official teachings of the denomination he is about to become a member of, but it would not be sufficient if he simply expressed agreement with those teachings. For this reason, most Holiness denominations have not developed catechisms as such, as the Lutherans have done, to drill into the young the "correct" understanding of the Christian faith. Actually, we have done so little of this that we would not stray significantly from our proper moorings if we were to do much more teaching of our specific doctrines than we do. It could even be argued, and sometimes is, that we should develop something similar to the Lutheran catechisms.

But we have not done so, because our stress is upon conversion. We conduct revival campaigns, and personal evangelism efforts, and Sunday-by-Sunday evangelistic services in local churches, to secure conversions-and once a person is converted, he becomes a possible candidate for

church membership. He is not expected, necessarily, to witness to the experience of entire sanctification, the second work of grace, when believers are baptized with the Holy Spirit and freed from Adamic sin. It is usually only needful that a person express belief that the second work of grace is a possible experience.

Often, a point of strength, in a given kind of theology, is at the same time a possible point of weakness. This is to say that, sometimes, right when a point of strength is being maintained and emphasized, a teaching, at that very point, is vulnerable. Wesleyanism's emphasis upon experience is like this: the emphasis is proper but, if not guarded, it can get one into trouble.

For one thing, it can incline one to respect a person's statement that he has experienced such and such-when that experience would be contrary to the teaching of Scripture. Also, such an experience might be contrary to the guidance the church has given Christians across the centuries. An example of this might be a theft. If a person were to say the Lord impressed upon his mind that he should take a good overcoat from a restaurant's coat rack, and that he felt good about having taken it-the experience of feeling he was guided, and of feeling good about what he did, would be incongruous with Scripture and the church's stored up wisdom. A popular song has it implied that sexual intercourse outside of marriage cannot be wrong because it seems so right to both parties. It is wrong, however, regardless of the feeling of, the experience of, its being right. Scripture says so, as does the church's *sophia*.

Besides such matters as these, a Christian might find the Spirit- witness to his conversion, or to his entire sanctification, at low ebb-and he might deduce, from this, that he is not sanctified wholly or that he is not justified. The experience of being inwardly assured, by the Spirit, ebbs and flows, somewhat according to outward circumstances in one's life. Often, a serious physical or psychological illness produces a feeling of depression, at which times a Christian experiences the feeling that God has departed from him and does not hear his cries for help. Intense physical pain, especially when it continues for a period of days, can also produce in a Christian this experience of feeling that God has departed from him-that he is not God's child, after all. In instances such as these, the physical pain, or the psychological depression, has a way of spilling over into the area of our consciousness of a good relationship with God-and we tend to think God has forsaken us. Actually, if we have not willfully disobeyed God, He has not cast us off-assuming we have been justified. If we have not sinned willfully, we likewise are still sanctified wholly-assuming, again, that God had earlier granted us this second work of cleansing and empowering grace.

Again, while experience of God's grace is so all-important, it is accompanied by certain dangers-such as, as I have suggested, our experiencing a feeling of being forsaken by God, when, according to Scripture, we may be confident that He has not forsaken us when we have not willfully disobeyed Him.

A much more fundamental vulnerability of the Wesleyan stress on the importance of experience, in our theology, stems from the fact that, in experience we are engaging ourselves with ourselves, instead of with the objective matters of our faith: God himself; the historic deeds done for us at

Bethlehem and at Golgotha; Scripture as the written-down revelation of God- our holy Christian tradition, in which we learn about God's stretched- out faithfulness to His people, and about the stretched-out responsive faithfulness of our Christian forebears. Actually, we Wesleyans are fond of claiming that we are evangelicals; and yet, in this stress on experience, taken by itself, we locate close to the modernists-who tend to deprecate Scripture, and even Christian tradition, and to carry the "experience" ball too far. Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), the father of theological modernism did this, in his The Addresses (1798, and in his The Christian Faith (182i). Indeed, his colleague on the faculty of the University of Berlin, Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), who very much deprecated Schleiermacher's stress on experience as the feeling of absolute dependence, saying that in that case his dog was the most religious of creatures, and who himself stressed reason instead of such a feeling of dependence, also stressed human experience-in the form of human reason. Both Schleiermacher and Hegel, as modernists of different types, overstressed experience-human experience. They both pretty much started their theologizing with human experience, instead of with the objective matters of our Faith: God, Scripture, tradition. I am meaning to say that the Wesleyan stress on experience has in it a certain vulnerability because it puts us right into what is the principal interest vein of the theological modernists in general.

A similar possible danger of such stress on the place of experience, not quite covered in the danger just discussed, is that it tends toward beginning one's theology with man, and not with God; and that might be the wrong place to begin. This, because it is our doctrine of God which should determine what contours the other doctrines (such as that of man) are to take. It is God's holiness that makes for, in contrast, unredeemed man's sinfulness. It is God's other characteristics, justice, love, faithfulness, mercy, etc., which set the standard for what man, in a relative sense, is to be like in these regards. We do not know what we are supposed to be like, except that we know what God is like. So, we can hardly begin by examining ourselves. We can only do that against the backdrop of what God has revealed to us that He is like-and what He has revealed to us that He wants us to be like. "Be ye holy, for I am holy" (I Pet. 1:16), we read; and that word "holy" is a sort of conglomerate word that includes many characteristics: all those mentioned just above, and more.

Still another kindred danger is that it might occasion our beginning by making judgments about Scripture, instead of with an openness to permitting it to make judgments about us. It fosters man's criticism of the Bible. instead of the Bible's criticism of man.

Also, if one begins with human experience, he might say that a particular doctrine is correct or not correct according to whether people testify to the experience of what the doctrine relates to. We need to exercise special reserve in declaring what we have experienced, and, say, speak of conversion, entire sanctification, answers to prayer, etc. But we might not always do that. Indeed, Christians do not always do that. They often talk, e.g.. about experiencing a phenomenon of speaking in unintelligible syllables-and are quick to say that such is the gift of tongues which Scripture clearly speaks of (I Cor. 12-14). Actually, millions of Christians in our century (and practically only in our century, since very early times) have

felt a euphoria when they have followed the directions to let the lower jaw hang loose and to begin to say perhaps just a few syllables that do not consist of known words. I think that in the main they are well-meaning. I also believe the sense of euphoria they speak of issues from their realizing, by this unrational behavior, that they surely are willing to follow in ways they believe to be God's ways even to the extent of doing (saying) what is unconventional. Their euphoria, then, their sense of having done what God wanted them to do, their feeling that they have exercised some strange gift that God bestows upon them, is subjective only, is a datum only of their experience, and surely cannot be in keeping with Scripture-where to so speak is a curse, at Babel (Gen. 11:1-5), and where the Holy Spirit is clearly portrayed as one who makes things clear (dreams, visions, calls, teachings), and not as one who would gift us with what is the opposite: the unintelligible.

Its Existential Interest

Akin to the experiential interest of theology, especially when it has Wesleyan moorings, is its existential interest. Although similar to the experiential because this interest, too, centers in our experience as humans-it is still somewhat distinctly a separate interest. With this interest, theology is not idealistic, in which ideas (or even ideals) or concepts would be the gravitating interest. Nor is it a form of positivism, in which the thing world is real-which we can definitely, in a scientific way, posit. In distinction from idealism and positivism, Wesleyan theology is interested in the human, existing situation. It is interested in Johns and Marys, in their lived-out human situations. It is interested, when John dies, in what Mary's existing is like when she perhaps must rear two or three who are John's, without John's income, in this concrete world with its trauma- producing life circumstances. It is interested not so much in a clean, careful, accurate definition of what death is, but in the existence situation which death puts people into. It is interested not in fat globs of humanity, but in individual persons-and, as regards those individual ones, not so much in their thought life as in their lived life. It is interested, therefore, in truth as a way of life lived according to God's will; in love, not as an eternal concept, but as agapeic, disinterested, caring acts done by one human being on behalf of another. It is interested not in goodness as an eternal concept that is unchanging and that is prototypal of good acts and even productive of them; but in goodness as consisting of acts which produce a kind of life that fulfills one's proper potentials and that assists others to do the same.

A theology that is properly existential in its interests, also, will not affirm only what is good, in our world, and deny what is evil, as in some way not actually real; it will admit the reality of what frustrates or tends to frustrate the needful fulfillments of human life. It therefore admits the reality of what occasions anxieties, dreads, guilt, etc. Not being rational in its interests and not believing that reasons can always be produced to give sense to the sources of anxieties, it is content to live with what is rationally muddy. It is content not to figure out reasons for everything that happens, and not to say that it is all for the good of itself; and not to say that God directly (and perhaps not even indirectly) orders everything that happens. It s content at times not to resolve what produces anxieties, but to let God

change for us anxiety-producing situations-and, perchance, to help us to live victoriously in the midst of such situations.

Much more will be said of theology's proper existential interest later, when the proper perspective for doing theology is discussed. But, at least, it needs to be said, here, that theology, Wesleyan theology, is characterized by this type of interest.

Its Wide-Scoped Biblical Interest

To be biblical, also, is important to the very nature of the theological enterprise. This is so, of course, for evangelical theologies of varying kinds: Calvinistic, Lutheran, Wesleyan, etc. Even Neo-Orthodox theology as represented by Karl Barth (1886-1968) is in basic, declared ways interested that theology be biblical. It is because of that basic interest that Barth, who had earlier denied Christ's virgin birth and bodily resurrection, came to teach both those "kindred" doctrines as of profound significance for our Christian faith.

The Wesleyan interest, however, in theology's being biblical, has about it a few peculiarities-or, at least, a few specifics. For one thing, it is widescopedly biblical: it intends to be biblical, not merely according to this or that specific biblical passage, but when specific passages are compared with each other and interpreted in the light of all other related passages-including the ones which, on the surface, might seem to be contradictory.

Wesleyan theology is interested in the Bible's plain and literal sense. But it does not stop there. It is interested that that plain and literal sense be interpreted in the light of Scripture as a whole: in the light of Scripture's bottom-line teachings; and in the light of its meaning for us, but only after allowances are made for the differences between Bible times and our own. If Scripture tells us, for example, that our religion is invalid (as in James) if we do not help the poor right on the spot, we realize that the times were different then than now, and that we might or might not now help just any and every needy person we see. Our Christian practice of mercy toward the needy now has governmental implementation, and we help the needy, in many countries, by paying our taxes, and permitting the needy to appeal for help to appropriate governmental agencies. We also contribute annually to the United Fund and other charities, helping the needy in those concerted ways. Through taxes and giving to charities, we help the needy. And we think this is an improvement upon the way it was done in century one of our era: through giving to a beggar on a street corner. We do some transposing, therefore, of the meaning of the biblical injunctions to give to needy individuals we meet. We might or might not shell out to the rare (in America) street-corner beggar, and still, no doubt, by taxes and giving to charities, share our funds with those in economic need.

The same is so with the matter of slavery: we do some transposing of what the Bible's teaching on that matter means to us. The New Testament talks about slavery. But, then, it was not that a given race was enslaved because its skin color was such and such. Slavery was more political than racial; and it was often temporary, and not for life. So, when the New Testament speaks of slavery, we need to realize that to be a slave then was not the same as to be one in Britain until 1806 or in America until 1865.

Also, although there were some forms of slavery in New Testament times which, although often not as inhumane as later in Britain and America, were more or less condoned as by Paul in Philemon, there are other Bible passages which imply that it ought to be abolished (injunctions to love agapeicly, to prefer others to oneself, to do to others what one would like done to himself, etc.). John Wesley himself considered all the Scriptural data, and opposed slavery vigorous1y, his very last letter being written to Wilberforce to encourage the latter in his opposition to slavery in Britain.

Likewise, in America, the Holiness Movement was in the vanguard of the opposition to slavery. In 1842 the Wesleyan Methodist Church was founded, partly to emphasize the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification; but probably mostly to work for the abolition of slavery. An 1836 official decision which permitted Methodists to hold slaves was what mostly occasioned the split in American Methodism that gave rise to that denomination.

At about the time of Methodism's decision of 1836, the Congregational- Presbyterian wing of America's Holiness Movement began a special surge for abolitionism. After Lane Theological Seminary officially decided not to support abolitionism in clear-cut ways, the next fall, in 1835, Presbyterian Asa Mahan became president of Oberlin College in Ohio, and Congregationalist Charles G. Finney its first systematic theologian-importantly, to be an "abolitionist" school. (They did not teach Holiness until a few years later.) Oberlin admitted black students, harbored runaway slaves, and supported state legislation to make harboring them legal. All this, because the American Holiness Movement, in both its wings, interpreted Scripture widescopedly, as opposing the s1avery then practiced in America.

At the same time, the Calvinistic evangelicals used various specific biblical texts, such as the brief epistle to Philemon, to support the practice of slavery. Right when Oberlin was so abolitionist, Princeton exegetes were hard at work in guiding non-Wesleyan evangelicals in a crusade supportive of slavery-based on their narrow-lensed interpretation of Scripture.

Numerous Scripture passages can indeed be fled to, if one is searching for its permission to hold slaves. It does, in places, exhort Christian slaves to be good slaves and Christian masters to be good masters. But this is because the basic philosophy of Christianity's first Apostles was not to be revolutionaries, but to work within the social structures of the time-and, at the same time, to teach basic principles that would one day be seen, as by Wesley and the American Holiness Movement, as fundamentally opposed to slavery.

The same is so, in the matter of Scripture's teaching about the place of women Specific passages can be found, and are, by fundamentalist evangelicals which suggest that they are not nearly the equals of males (e.g. I Cor. 11:3 ff). They are to keep silent in church services I Cor. 14:34-36), they are to obey their husbands (Eph. 5:22), etc. Again, this is because the Apostles were willing to work with society as it was then structured, until it could be changed in basic ways. And in order to obtain, one day, a change, they taught principles regarding women that would finally incline the Wesleyan Holiness people to be the first to ordain women- Antonette Brown, an Oberlin graduate, being ordained in 1853 by Wesleyan Methodist Church co-founder, Luther Lee. Lee, in what might be

the first instance ever of ordaining a woman, used Galatians 3:28 as his text, where Paul says in the KJV, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ." Within the sermon, Lee argued that women are supposed to preach, in part, because, whereas Paul exhorts them to be silent in First Corinthians 14:34-36, in the same epistle (at I Cor. 11:5-6) he exhorts them to keep their heads covered when they prophesy.

Wesleyan theology is biblical, but not narrowly so; not rigidly so. It views Scripture through this wide-angle lens I have been talking about, as it applies the meaning of Scripture to a given time and to a given culture.

Its Dynamic Quality

Another important aspect of the very nature of theology, as I see the matter, is its dynamic quality. It never quite gets the fiddle tuned. To change the analogy, it is never able to shut up shop.

Theology is indeed rooted in Yesterday. Not in just any and every yesterday, but in certain ones. Its "yesterday" rootage includes, of course, a New Testament and an Older Testament. And while I do not intend, here, to make a special point of the biblical character of a proper theology, I am taking it for granted that we understand each other at that point, and that our theological enterprise is to assume the authority of Scripture. But most theological orientations purport to be rooted in Scripture. My own particular yesterday rootage is Arminian-Wesleyanism-or just Wesleyanism, since Wesley was so avowedly Arminian-and it is outlined in the fifteen "Articles of Faith" of my denomination, the Church of the Nazarene. But not just in Wesley is our rootage. He himself /and Arminius before him, and Wiley in our century) understood that in the main, and especially in their distinctive doctrine of human freedom, they were teaching what had been expounded by the Greek and Latin fathers in general prior to the fifth- century Augustine. It was respect for the church's good past that caused Arminius to write a 250-page treatise on Romans chapter seven by giving careful research into interpretations of that chapter all through the course of Christian history. Respect for the Church's tradition inclined Wesley to remain Anglican all his life; and to speak disparagingly of the mystics of his day, who were loners, trying to contact God and serve Him without the help of the church's traditions and sacraments. It is respect for the church's past that influenced Wiley to write a systematic theology which is importantly a study of historical theology.

With all such said, however, about my own feeling of a rootage in yesterday, in particular yesterdays, it needs to be underscored that the theological enterprise, especially when it has Wesleyan credentials, is dynamic.

This is in part because we take seriously the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as Indweller and Guide, who pours Himself into living experience. He inclined men to write the Holy Scriptures, which contain sufficient revelation for our salvation. But the selfsame Spirit continues to reveal the Father's will to specific persons in specific situations. This makes for dynamic in our theological enterprise.

Also figuring in theology's dynamic is the fact that it must often find its way by faith, there being no clear Scriptural directive on myriad

supplementary doctrines-examples being why Christ was born of a virgin, the extent of biblical inerrancy, the mode of baptism, end-time events.

The theological enterprise is dynamic, further, because of changes in the milieu in which the church functions. Obviously, a theology for a time of prosperity is to have at certain points a different complexion than one designed for depression times. Its say will not be the same if a Ronald Reagan is president as it would be if a Jimmy Carter were, or a Ted Kennedy. It will talk more about what is moral, now, than it would have before we devoured the writings of J. A. T. Robinson and Joseph Fletcher; more about hope than in the eras prior to Jurgen Moltmann; more about the nature of the church than in eras prior to the Ecumenical Movement- perhaps even more about being born again than in eras before being born again became a household term in America; more about abortion than before the 1973 Supreme Court decision that largely legalized it in America.

New opposition movements arise, doing battle with the Faith, and theology cannot say simply the same old things it was saying in an earlier time, for in that case it had just about as well say nothing at all. It answers questions which people are asking. It speaks to issues of the day. If the gates of hell construct new and divergent bulwarks against the church's terrible onslaught against sin, theology moves to where the battle is on and there declares God's counsel.

Moreover, theology is dynamic because new discoveries are being made in fact (science) and artifact (archaeology), and require to be interpreted. Theology must respond to what the scientists are doing in outer space and to what psychiatrists are doing in "inner space." If the decipherment some years ago of a certain script found in Crete does indeed indicate a common culture in the pre-Mosaic Palestinian and Grecian areas, theology must account for the wide divergence by the time you get to the era of the Hebrew seers in Palestine and the somewhat later Plato in Greece. With the Gnostic finds in Upper Egypt, and with their recent full translation, theology discourses on what it all means in Christology and in our understanding of Christian theology during the early centuries. The same is so with the Dead Sea Scrolls: they get all wound up with theology. Since, e.g., Isaiah wag unified quite a while before the time of Christ, does this suggest that perhaps it always was-and if it was, did a man named Isaiah predict with precision in the case of Cyrus?[8]

Certain steps science is taking just now, and is about to take, will also occasion dynamic in theology. On transplants, we need to be dead sure that people are fully deceased, before we cut out their hearts and eyes and kidneys, to install them in other persons. Safeguards are needed to protect the donor against a too hasty extraction from him since such is desirable for transplant tissue. And if we become able to transplant the brain, we will need to figure out who this really is that is surviving, and the ethical involvements of that decision. In cloning, we will need to theologize about whether or not it is ethical to make a clone human being and simply keep him around, perhaps frozen stiff, so that we can be kept alive by using parts from him as ours wear out.

In the area of race relations, the fairness of affirmative action programs, or of not permitting them, needs to be considered theologically and biblically.

In these days of the popularity of the electronic church, theology needs to consider such matters as whether a person may say to millions in television land, "I love you," or "We love you." We can proclaim, via TV, that God loves the millions, but, perhaps, not that we do, since the millions are oblivious to us as individuals.

Connected with the Church Growth Movement in the fields of evangelism and missiology, we have a new development which occasions dynamic in theology. There is the question of whether it is theologically and biblically sound to maintain, say, local churches as homogeneous units, even though homogeneous ones might grow more rapidly than the others which are mixed racially or otherwise.

Also, small is beautiful too, not just bigness. A minister in America's mountainous West wrote to the editor of Christian Century to say this. He drives up a treacherous mountain road for many ledgy miles to minister to twelve people, and passes, along the way, a memorial to a predecessor who had lost his life driving up there to minister to that small group. He made his point.

Besides this, there are various ways in which local churches need to grow, besides just in numbers. They need to grow in the intellectual understanding of their faith; in commitment to Christ; in the actual, lived - out costliness of their discipleship. And, perhaps, when such a preoccupation obtains, as in the Church Growth Movement, with the one kind of growth, numerical, theology needs to complain that the growth is not full - orbed, but, instead, is mere obesity.

Besides, when whole books can be written on church growth without any reference to the place of preaching in growth, as they are, theology needs to point out that we have, here, an unacceptable omission from a New Testament perspective.

The words with which creeds are written, too, change in their meaning with the passing of the years, and that in itself makes for dynamic in theology. Even as the U. S. Supreme Court must continuously interpret America's Constitution, so theologians must interpret to each new generation the official doctrines of their denominations.

Besides all this, the theologian himself does some deepening, or ought to, and this too makes for dynamic in his theologizing. He knows perhaps more surely than any other grouping of Christ's disciples that he is never what he ought to be; but he knows just as well as the others do that he is not what he was prior to his crisic encounters with grace and prior to his growth in grace at any stage on life's way. He himself develops in his reflections upon aspects of the Christian faith, and so, theology has about it a dynamic quality.

Speaking of his twenty years of work on his three-volume Christian Theology, H. Orton Wiley said, "I was constantly discovering new truth."[9]

And so was Wesley, as is well known.[10] And so was Arminius, the quiet Dutchman who taught in a Reformed University and who, while not teaching what was altogether novel in Holland, taught what was later suppressed by civil law as being divergent from Reformed theology.

If one carried around his theology in a briefcase; or worse, if he tucked it away within yellow folders in a filing cabinet-well, it would be there, neat and static, and worth almost nothing. If theology is for God and for the church at large and for

the denomination and for the preacher and for the layman-it has to be as dvnamic as it has to be.

Its Catholicity

The theological enterprise is also properly characterized by a catholicity, which could also be described as a spirit of tolerance (not simply tolerance). Much data, in Arminian-Wesleyan theological history, shows that this is historically warranted.

James Arminius (1558-60-1609) was ". . . a peace-loving man who taught tolerance and forbearance in the midst of religious dissension."[11] He wanted not that all would agree with him on his "unregenerate" interpretation of Romans chapter seven, for example, but simply that his interpretation be allowed to flourish, along with the other. The same was so on the more crucial matter of his teaching of conditional predestination. So tolerant and peace-loving was he, in fact, that he even shrank from defending his views when they were misrepresented. He wrote his "Apology Against Thirty-one Defamatory Articles"[12] only after fourteen articles had been joined with seventeen, which had appeared two years earlier, in which thirty-one articles he and a Peter Borrius were misrepresented and suspected of novelty and heresy.

John Wesley, too, was of tolerant spirit. He wrote, "For God's sake, if it be possible to avoid it, let us not provoke one another to wrath."[13]

While it must be remembered that Methodism in Britain was only a society, and not a denomination as such, when he wrote in 1788 his tract on "The Character of a Methodist," the tract's liberality at least reveals the catholicity of Wesley's spirit. He is willing to distinguish Methodist teaching from that of "Jews, Turks, and Infidels,"[14] and from "the Romish Church . . . and . . . the Socinians and Arians."[15] Yet he does not here include the Calvinists as persons from whom the Methodists are distinguished- although he does do that in other writings. He implies that the matter of conditional versus unconditional predestination is in the area of what he calls "opinion," and not in the area of Christian doctrine. After asking, in this tract, "Who is a Methodist?," he gives more than four pages of answer-altogether about the experience of God's grace, not mentioning one doctrine as such. Then he adds, "These are the principles and practices of our sect; these are the marks of a true Methodist."[16] On the last page of the tract he writes, "Is thy heart right, as my heart is with thine? I ask no further question. If it be, give me thy hand."[17]

Holiness denominational theologians and exegetes and administrators would not urge tolerance to the extent that Wesley did. Being members of actual denominations, we function within specific official doctrinal parameters-even if, as in the case of the Church of God (Holiness), there is only an unwritten agreement of belief; and even if, as in that group and the Church of God (Anderson), there are no written down membership rolls. Yet, within the Wesleyan-Holiness Movement, there are considerable theological differences.

Whereas both Calvin and Arminius taught God's foreknowledge of free acts, some Holiness scholars have taught what I would consider to be a Socinian-Brightmanian-influenced view: that God chooses not to foreknow our free acts. But we are all Holiness people.

Some Holiness scholars teach what I would consider a Calvin-inclined view in suggesting that a saint's death by lightning is an act of God, while I myself would want to restrict in certain ways what I would mean if I were to admit even that God permits such as this. I would not want to use "permit," here, in the sense that a parent would "permit" a child's death by giving the child permission to cross a busy thoroughfare.

The solar day theory of creation is held by some Holiness scholars, while others of us agree with Wiley and others that each of the days of creation was a geological age of indefinite duration. Some Holiness scholars teach a Pelagian-Knudsonian view of freedom, that it is "the power of contrary choice," whereas Arminius and Wesley both taught, I think correctly, that fallen natural man, unaided by grace, is not free to do good things – but, as the Nazarene Articles of Faith state, "is inclined to do evil, and that continually."

We differ on what may be called sin, some of us agreeing with Wesley that willful disobedience is sin "properly so-called," but that Scripture sometimes designates, as sin, acts that are not done in willful disobedience. Some teach that an unpremeditated willful disobedience to God's known will, if confessed immediately, does not cause a break in our sonship to God,[18] while others of us think that it does. We think that whether or not a sin is premeditated is not the crucial matter, but whether it is willfully done against God's known will.

Some have taught, with John Fletcher, that one can lose the experience of entire sanctification (e.g., for not testifying to it, as in Fletcher's case), without losing justification. But others of us understand that one can only lose entire sanctification by an act of willful sin, in which case one would also lose his justification. The Nazarene Articles of Faith, actually, imply my own kind of understanding, as I read them.

I am quite sure that by "old man" Paul meant the old unregenerate life characterized by both acts of sin and original sin), whereas most of my theological colleagues have said that it is a synonym of original sin.

Many Holiness people agree with John Miley and A. M. Hills that original sin is transmitted by our parents (Genetic Mode), whereas I am quite sure that Arminius and Wesley and H. Orton Wiley are Pauline in saying that we enter into the world with original sin because Adam the First (as W. B. Godbey called him) was a representative of the race and represented us badly by sinning-and causing a fall in the race.

If one believes the Representative Mode Theory, he surely ought to see that the Virgin Birth of Christ has a different *raison d'etre* than to get Christ born free from original sin. Christ is the Second Adam, another representative of the race, and He hag no original gin because the first representative, Adam, did not represent Him, but only all the rest of us. So you do not have to say that the male carries the sin taint, instead of the female, and that, having no earthly father, Christ escaped original sin. Christ's being somehow sired by the Holy Spirit, and mothered by Mary, figures, I am sure, in His deity, in His being, as Karl Barth says, 'founded in God," but not in His sinlessness. This, as I myself see the matter.

Even the late and great H. Orton Wiley wag expressly Apollinarian, in his Christian Theoloy; and he taught that the Jehovah of the Old Testament was Christ. On both of those issues I had disagreeing but amiable discus-

sion and correspondence with him. But on a thousand points, Wiley is helpful. Importantly, he helped me to see that the Penal Theory of the Atonement fits Calvinism, and not Arminianism; but still, the majority of Holiness people (judging from my students) think that Christ paid the penalty for us instead of that He suffered on our behalf.

Its Homing Instinct for the Moral

Christian theology, as I myself enter into it (as a person persuaded of the basic scriptural validity of Wesleyanism) also has a homing instinct for the moral. That is, it is a theology of human freedom. It is not Pelagian, since it admits original sin and teaches a human freedom in the context of that racial detriment. Nor is it semi-Pelagian-for that compromise Massilian position (locating in between Augustine [354-430] and Pelagius [354-after 418]) denied the need of prevenient grace for our turning to God. Instead, Wesleyan theology is Arminian: it inherits the views of James Arminius on human freedom.

It happens that Arminius was accused of being Pelagian, in his time. Yet he was not. He believed profoundly in original sin. And he was not even semi-Pelagian, for he also believed profoundly in prevenient grace-in the necessity of God's drawing to Himself the unregenerate who, by reason of original sin, would otherwise be inclined only to evil.

John Wesley was an "Arminian" and taught similarly. We have no record that he ever read any of Arminius' own writings. Although he even took a trip to Holland in part to study Arminius, his journal reporting does not state that he did so. And while he edited and published many writings by others, in his Christian Library, nothing of Arminius was included. We only have a record that he read Simon Episcopius, the principal Arminian writer just after Arminius' death; but not that he read Arminius' own writings.

Even so, Wesley named the magazine he started rather late in his life (1778) the Arminian Magazine. This, because he meant to advertise the fact that, in distinction from Calvinism, he promulgated the kind of theology advanced by "the quiet Dutchman."

In this theology, predestination is taught, since Scripture teaches some form of it. But the presdestination taught by Arminius, and re-taught later by Wesley, is of the conditional sort. In this form of the teaching, God predetermines each individual's destiny. Yet, this predetermining is based on God's knowledge of our free acts, and it is of a conditional sort: it is conditioned on whether or not we, who are all aided by prevenient grace, freely respond to God's offer of forgiveness-and repent and believe, and keep on believing and obeying.

Arminius was careful to teach that there is no merit in our free response to God's offer of forgiving grace. This, because we cannot make this free response to grace except that God enables us.

Arminius also properly taught another key doctrine which has to do with human freedom: that after a person has been saved, he can reject God and be eternally lost. Arminius used an ingenious device to teach this, so as not to seem to oppose Calvinism's eternal security doctrine head on and recklessly He admitted that believers cannot lose saving grace; but then he would add, quickly, that Christians can freely cease to believe, and that

then they will lose saving grace. So, in a sense, believers cannot backslide; but Christians can cease to believe, and then, as unbelievers (but only as unbelievers), they lose their salvation.

This belief in human freedom that is actual, and determinative, includes a way of defining what an act of sin is-in the case of sins of the serious sort. Arminius himself, who died at age 49, had not as yet seen the implications his view of human freedom had for one's doctrine of what an act of sin is. So, he defined an act of sin in the broad, legal, Calvinistic way: as simply any act which does not measure up to what God's perfect will for us is. But Wesley later saw how the Arminian understanding of freedom should figure in one's definition of what an act of sin is. Wesley said that an act of sin, a proper act of sin, is any willful violation of the known law of God.

We Arminian-Wesleyans have also taught, at various points, in our theology, doctrines that are peculiarly suited to our homing instinct for the moral. One of them is that the Scripture writers were freely left to themselves to explain, according to their backgrounds and their interests, the thoughts which the Spirit inspired them with. This, in distinction from any doctrine even resembling a dictation to them of the words of Scripture.

Another is that, at least according to some Arminian-Wesleyan theologians, such as S. S. White, Christ could have sinned-but did not because He would not do so. Many of us, too, like S. S. White, believe that Christ freely chose the Father's will in going all the way to the Cross for us-whereas He perhaps had the power not to do so. A Cross freely chosen means more to many of us than one which was necessitated all the way along. Many of us feel, actually, that, before that, the Father freely chose to send His Son to the world when the Father might have chosen not to offer us any redemption (as in the case of the fallen angels).

Still another important element of this Wesleyan instinct for the moral is the interest in our actually and freely implementing God's will in the world. In Wesley's time, Calvinism was advancing antinomian notions: that, for those under saving grace, the keeping of God's laws does not matter that much-that the Christian is Christ's and that it is enough that Christ has kept God's laws, and that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us. Wesley's main theologian, John Fletcher, wrote his Checks to Antinomianism, major theological work, against that Calvinistic view. Wesley and Fletcher, believing in human freedom, taught that, as God helps us, we really can-indeed, we really must-keep God's known laws. We have therefore had this keen interest in a freely-chosen and grace-aided Christian life of discipline.

These are at least several of the elements in this homing instinct for the moral which characterizes Wesleyan theology. It is an aspect of the very nature of the Wesleyan theological enterprise, along with such matters, discussed above, as (1) its experiential interest, (2) its existential element, (3) its large-scoped biblical character, (4) its dynamic quality, and (5) its catholicity.

NOTES

1 J. R. Green, *Short History of the English People* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1893), p. 735.

2 J. Wesley Bready, *This Freedom Whence* (New York: American Tract Society, 1942), p. 340-341.

3 George Croft Cell, *A Rediscovery of Wesley* (New York: H. Holt and Company, 1935), p. 731. See also Robert W. Burtner (ed.) and Robert E. Chiles, *A Compend of Wesley 's Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 17.

4 Harald Lindstrom, *Wesley and Sanctification* (Stockholm: Nga bokforlags aktiebolaget, 1946), p. 2.

5 Wilbur H. Mullen, "John Wesley and Liberal Religion," *Religion in Life*, Autumn, 1966, p. 561.

6 *Ibid*.

7 John M. Moore, *Methodism in Belief and Action* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946), p. 32.

8 See Ross E. Price, "The Book of the Prophet Isaiah," *Beacon Bible Commentary*, edited by Albert Harper, et. al. (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1966), V. pp. 190-191.

9 H. Orton Wiley, "Preface," Christian Theology, I, (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1941), p. 3.

10 See John Wesley, *op cit*., V, p. 5, where he writes, "Are you persuaded you see things more clearly than I . . .? Then . . . point me out a better way than I have known."

11 Carl Bangs, "James Arminius: Christian Scholar. III Basic Principles of Arminius," *Herald of Holiness*, edited by W. T. Purkiser (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House), Oct. 5, 1960, p. 7.

12 See James Arminius, *The Writings of James Arminius*, trans. by James Nichols (Grand Rapids: Baker), II, pp. 276-380.

13 John Wesley, "Preface" to sermons. *The Works of John Wesley* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1872 edition), V. 6.

14 John Wesley, "The Character of a Methodist," *op. cit*., VIII, p. 340.

15 *Ibid*.

16 *Ibid*., p. 346.

17 *Ibid*., p. 349.

18 See W. T. Purkiser, *Conflicting Concepts of Holiness* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press. 1953).

JOHN WESLEY AND WILLIAM LAW: A REAPPRAISAL

by
John R. Tyson

The purpose of this study is to examine the theological interchange between John Wesley and William Law. From this examination we hope to gain new insight into Wesley's theological pilgrimage and the development of his thought. This study will help isolate some of the specific issues that became very crucial to John Wesley during his dialogue with William Law.

I. The Early Period: 1725-1738

A. Capsule View of William Law's Thought

The factual record of Law's life is obscure at best. His biography, for the most part, can only be reconstructed from the random comments in the journals and letters of friends and acquaintances.

Law's mature thought, as it is seen in the practical treatises Christian Perfection, and A Serious Call to A Devout and Holy Life, is not characterized by a strong objective framework. To find a modern parallel for this sort of theology one might look to the movement that styles itself as "faith at work." Little time is spent establishing the theological understructure of the system; rather the over-arching emphasis is upon a disciplined, active Christian lifestyle.

His theology is also characterized by the elevation of inwardness above external canons of authority. The dynamic force of his theology is the inner- light, though this does not imply that he completely eschews other epistemological foundations.

1. The Life of Devotion

William Law's principal expression for the Christian life is that it is a life of devotion. This devotion "is nothing else but right apprehension and right affections towards God."[1] It is, in short, a way of life which brings "a sense of religion into the ordinary actions of our common life."[2]

The life of devotion is synonymous with Christian Perfection, in Law's view. This perfection is intimately connected with the duties of normal life:[3]

> a Perfection that does not consist in any singular state or in any particular set of duties, but in the holy and religious conduct of

> ourselves in every state or life. It calls no one to a cloister, but to a right and full performance of those duties which are necessary for all Christians, and common to all states of life.

Law states that he calls this life style "perfection" for two reasons:[4]

> first, because I hope it contains a full resumption of that height of holiness and purity to which Christianity calls all its members; secondly, that the title may invite the reader to pursue it with the more diligence....

This perfection stems from the enlightenment of our inner spirit, it moves to the formation of right tempers within us. It was for Law, as for Wesley too, the only source of true happiness. [5]

2. Imitation, Renunciation and Resignation

The central core of Law's thought seems to be built around these three words. His christology is principally one of imitation, the following of Christ as our supreme example in living the life pleasing to God. Indeed, this is inherent in the logic of the incarnation: "he came to make like himself."[6] It must be said that Law is somewhat opaque in locating an objective basis for our Christ-likeness. But it is clear, however, that the outworking of our imitation of Christ is to result in the keeping of the "whole law of love."[7]

This imitation of our Saviour includes within it a renunciation of the world. This amounts to "a forsaking all its enjoyments in order to be His true disciples…"[8]

The third theme in this center core of Law's theology is resignation, the giving over of one's will to the guidance of the Divine Will. William Law divides this resignation into two categories:[9]

> first, it signifies a thankful approbation of God's general providence over the world; secondly, . . . it signifies a thankful acceptance of his particular providence over us.

This resignation carries with it the impulse which "so powerfully governs the heart, that so strongly excites us to wise and reasonable actions"; that is, a true sense of God's presence.[10]

3. The Theology of the Cross

William Law was capable of making extremely traditional statements about the place of the Cross in Christian life and thought. For example:[11]

> It is plain from Scripture that that death which our blessed Lord died on the Cross was absolutely necessary for our salvation; that He, as our Saviour, was to taste death for every man; that as the Captain of our salvation, He was able to be made perfect through sufferings; that there was no entrance for fallen man into paradise till Christ had overcome Death and Hell, or that first and second death which stood between us and it.

Law summarized his christology under the three points of St. Paul (Rom. 6:6): (1) We suffer with Him, (2) our "old man" is crucified with Him, and (3) We believe we shall rise with Him.[12]

But the real structure of Law's theology of the cross is not found in his use of traditional

language, rather it is found in his reworking of traditional language. "To have a true idea of Christianity we must not consider our Blessed Lord as suffering in our stead, but as our representative...."[13] Here the emphasis shifts to the subjective aspects of the atonement, to our perception of Christ as our example. To perceive Christ as our representative means we share in "absolute conformity to that Spirit which Christ showed in the mysterious sacrifice of himself on the cross."[14] Christ seen as our representative obliges and obligates us "to conform to all that he did and suffered for us."[15] Christians, therefore, must be full of humility and willingness to suffer for their sin; there is a "reasonableness" about our suffering for our sins, it is a form of our participation in Christ's sufferings.[16]

In these early writings Law does not deny the wrath of God, the divine "judicial displeasure" over our sins, but neither does Law connect the cross and divine wrath.[17] The cross is seen as the example of the life lived for others, it is the great teacher of humility.[18] This exemplary aspect is the over-riding factor in Law's theology of the cross, and it has direct implications for his soteriology.

The example of the cross demands that we follow Christ's example; and in so doing we are involved in "working out our own salvation." Thus Law writes:[19]

> The sum of the matter is this: from the above mentioned (Mat. 25:31) and many other passages of Scripture, it seems plain, that our salvation depends upon the sincerity and perfection of our endeavours to obtain it.

The emphasis is quite different from that of Wesley, who insists that works are consequent to our salvation but do not contribute to it.[20]

The structures of Law's thought are not as forensic or objective as the style of theology one finds in Luther or Calvin. His wedding of mysticism and practical piety whispers of roots in another tradition. His understanding of justification has strong affinities with the Roman Catholic formularies. The Council of Trent, for example, responding to Luther's predominantly forensic understanding of justification as "pardon," formulated the doctrine as meaning "making just." The latter implies a blurring of the same distinction between justification and sanctification which Wesley later champions, and an acknowledgment of the fact that our works participate in our own justification.

Perfection was an important concern of Law's early writings; and it is seen principally as a part of religious discipline. Wesley seems to have captured Law's vision of Christian Perfection, though he gave the doctrine a decidedly different sort of explication. For Wesley the matter hinged on justification by faith, and followed after justification; whereas Law, who understood justification as that long process by which one is actually made "just" (or righteous), blurred the distinction between justification and sanctification. The result of this, for Law, was that justification increasingly became a matter of human works and contemplation.

B. Law's Influence on Wesley 1725-1735

1725 is a proper year for beginning our inquiry about Wesley's theological formation. It was during this year that Wesley's father pressed him to enter into Anglican Orders. The process ultimately led to a period of

self-examination and the crossing of the threshold some scholars call Wesley's "intellectual conversion." It was a period when Wesley made a conscious resolve to lead a more godly life, and strove mightily to uphold this resolution.

During this period John Wesley began to cultivate a deeper devotional life and eventually came into contact with William Law's two most practical treatises, Christian Perfection and A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life. These possess a rich conception of ethical Christianity combined with a disciplined devotional life. They interfaced well with Wesley's awakened spirituality.

Recounting the discovery of William Law's books, seen from the distance of many years, Wesley writes:[21]

> A year or two after 1726, Mr. Law's Christian Perfection and Serious Call were put into my hands. These convinced me, more than ever, of the absolute impossibility of being half a Christian; and I determined, through His grace (the absolute necessity of which I was deeply sensible), to be all devoted to God, to give Him all my soul, my body and my substance

Wesley's "Letter to a Friend" (May 14, 1765), describes the same event in this way:[22]

> In 1727 I read Mr. Law's Christian Perfection and Serious Call, and more explicitly resolved to be all devoted to God, in body, soul, and spirit. In 1730 I began to be *homo unius libri*, to study (comparatively) no book but the Bible.

Once again recounting this same period in a Journal entry Wesley writes:[23]

> But meeting now with Mr. Law's Christian Perfection and Serious Call, although I was much offended at many points of both, yet they convinced me more than ever the exceeding height and breadth and depth of the law of God.

Thus, we see Law's influence in Wesley's religious awakening; but this is a qualified awakening. The Wesley we meet in 1727 is Wesley the "legal man," bent on "busyness" (his own word) striving after God in a legal sort of way, yet not experiencing the grace of God in Christ appropriated by personal faith. The John Wesley of this period is riddled by the same sort of doubts that plagued the young Martin Luther, and both men sought the inward assurance of divine acceptance.

So deeply affected by Law's works were the Wesley brothers that they frequently visited their "oracle" at Putney. John's first visit comes in 1 732, though the exact accounting of the number of visits is open to question. So much did Wesley depend on Law's advice that John wrote him urgently inquiring as to how to deal with the spiritual state of one of his students (June 26, 1734). This correspondence eventually resulted in Wesley visiting Law again.[24]

Wesley's "Letter to Richard Morgan" (Oct. 18, 1732), which explains the tragic circumstances related to the death of Morgan's son William, shows how seriously the Oxford Holy Club took the disciplines suggested

by William Law.[25] In that letter Wesley outlines the practices of the Holy Club, and they roughly parallel the disciplines recommended by William Law's books.

William Law and his writings had a profound impact upon John Wesley during this period. The young Oxford student, being somewhat serious by nature, set himself to Law's program of discipline in earnest. Wesley crossed a threshold in his life, committing himself to full-time religious service. Devotional literature was instrumental in this reorientation of Wesley's life, and William Law's works were certainly in the forefront of these. Law's ethical mysticism forms a very significant part of Wesley's early religious experience. It is a program centered in Christian Perfection, a conception embracing (1) the perfect love of God and Man, (2) self-denial, (3) humility, and (4) renunciation of the world and worldly pursuits.

C. Wesley Goes to Georgia

John Wesley's decision to go to Georgia as a missionary to the Indians and a pastor to the settlers was one that included several motivations. He explained his reasons, at least partially, in the Journal entry of October 14, 1735:[26]

> Our end in leaving our native country was not to avoid want, God having given us plenty of temporal blessings, nor to gain riches and honour, . . . but singly this-to save our souls, to live wholly to the glory of God.

Wesley had not made the progress he desired under the tutelage of Law and Law's books, and his quest for the assurance of salvation took him to more extreme measures, to the shores of that primitive world-America.

Law's books were Wesley's constant companions on the voyage to the new world and were the mainstay of his devotional life, as well as his teaching ministry upon arrival in Georgia. The reading of pertinent sections of Law's tracts was the prescription for Mrs. Hawkins' "varying moods," as well as for the problems Wesley had with Miss Sophy-though even the "most affecting parts" were without effect upon her.[27] The reading of passages of Christian Perfection and A Serious Call was very much a part of the devotional life of Wesley's "little company," as well as of his own private devotions.[28] So important were these little books to Wesley's ministry that he began translating Christian Perfection into German for the German-speaking settlers on June 14, 1736.[29]

Despite the fact that Law's writings were continually at Wesley's side in the missionary undertaking, Wesley's spiritual state was no better. Indeed, things had become worse. Wesley came to America seeking salvation, his own and others', and returned a failure on both accounts. The result of this was that Wesley's faith in the mystical-ethical route of salvation was soundly shaken, as his letter to his brother Samuel (Nov. 23, 1736) clearly indicates: "I think the rock on which I had nearest made shipwreck of faith was the writings of the mystics...."[30]

A second contributing factor in the erosion of Law's influence on Wesley was Wesley's contact with the Moravians during this same period. The Moravians reflected the sort of concerns for personal piety and devotion shared by Wesley and Law but they also combined these with the

Reformation doctrines of justification by faith, and the Theology of the Cross. Peter Bohler, the Moravians personified for Wesley, pricked him with sharp questions at just the points where Wesley was the most sensitive-personal faith and the assurance of it.[31]

It needs to be noted briefly that while John Wesley's religious experience was being tried to its limits in Georgia, William Law's own thought was undergoing a significant transition. Law had become attracted to the thought of Jacob Behmen, and Behmen's theology was beginning to make its mark on Law's writings after 1736. This amounted to an inventive coupling of Law's ethical mysticism with Behmen's more philosophical system.

Charles Wesley's Journal entries for August 31, and September 9, 1737, show Law to be slipping into a more mystical and philosophical frame of thought, one less concerned with the ethical route than his previous writings. Law's advice to Charles was: "Renounce yourself and be not impatient."[32] It was at this same juncture that Law pronounced his famous judgment that nothing Charles could write to John would "do him (John) any good."[33]

II. The Letters of 1738

A. John Wesley's First Letter

John Wesley returned from Georgia, landing at Deal on February 1, 1738.[34] Within the week he met with the dominant influence of this brief period of his life, Peter Bohler.[35] The Journal testifies to the large amount of time these two spent in conversation. It is clear that they dialogued on at least six separate occasions after the initial meeting and prior to Bohler's leaving for Carolina on May 4, 1738.[36] Bohler's theological agenda with John Wesley and brother Charles always revolved around the center pole of justification by faith and the personal appropriation of the merits of Christ. Bohler seeks to "purge away" John Wesley's "philosophy," urging Wesley to full reliance on Christ.[37] So powerful was Peter Bohler's message that finally Charles Wesley's "eyes were opened" during their conversation of May 3, 1738, the day prior to Bohler's embarkation.[38] Bohler's letter to John, dated 8 May, 1738, pressed the same agenda; appropriation of Christ and His merits by faith:[39]

Beware of the sin of unbelief; and if you have not conquered it yet see that you conquer it this very day, through the blood of Jesus Christ. Delay not, I beseech you, to believe in your Jesus Christ; but so put Him in mind of His promises to poor sinners that he may not be able to refrain from doing for you what He hath done for so many others.... Surely He is ready to help; and nothing can offend Him but our unbelief.

It is difficult to escape the fact that Wesley's first letter to William Law, May 14, 1738, was written out of a spiritual depression that carried with it a sort of desperation. Since arriving in England Wesley had been serving his ministerial function but with "a continual sorrow and heaviness of heart."[40] Although Wesley has accepted Bohler's teaching of justification by faith, and Wesley presses Law hard on that very point, Wesley still had not entered into the assurance he sought.

This is not to brush aside Wesley's claim that he wrote on the injunction of what he took to be "the call of God;" but it is to say that the letter is tinged by as much or more of Wesley's spiritual frustration as it is basic concern for Law's own situation or doctrine.[41]

Wesley's despair and frustration had been increased by the fact that after preaching for two years "after the model of your (Law's) two practical treatises" he found neither himself nor his parishioners greatly improved.[42] The ideals Law propounded were "great, wonderful and holy" but they were too high for men to fulfill; Wesley specifically identifies Law's formulation with a sort of works righteousness, "by which no living flesh shall be justified."[43] Thus, Wesley characterized his own preaching at Savannah as "beating the air."[44] He described his own spiritual state as "one under the law," "in bondage to sin," "fighting continually but not conquering."[45]

While in this situation, which Wesley described as being "under his heavy yoke," God directed "a holy man" to speak to Wesley about justification by faith: "believe and thou shalt be saved."[46] Wesley assumed that if Law too was born of God he would grasp the significance of this teaching and "approve of its design;" if not, then Wesley expresses sorrow for Law's own state.[47]

Enter the indictment: "How will you answer it to our common Lord that you never gave me this advice?"[48] The only answer Wesley can muster is that Law did not own this saving faith for himself. He added that Peter Bohler, "the holy man" had seen this in Law immediately.[49] It was only in retrospect, far removed from the heat and despair of the moment, that Wesley was able to write to the Countess of Huntingdon (Aug. 14, 1771), that certainly William Law was "a child of God."[50]

The rather harsh tones of Wesley's letter of May 14, 1738 flowed out of the well-spring of his own spiritual despair. Coupled with the apparent betrayal or failure of such a trusted and revered spiritual guide as William Law had been to Wesley, it is easy to see the letter as the product of a sad man. It is proper, as Overton points out, to recall that Wesley is generally "the most outspoken of men," but the language of this letter reaches beyond the typical and reveals more than Wesley's "plainness of language."[51] J. Brazier Green is well within the mark when he writes:[52]

> It reads like the outburst of a disappointed man who is trying to lay the blame upon his mentor, until its burning sincerity persuades the reader that behind this revelation of spiritual agony there is a deep and simple anxiety, not only for the deliverance of his own distressed soul, but for that of his imperfect instructor.

B. Wesley's Second Letter

Wesley's letter of May 20, 1738 brushes aside Law's claim to have offered instruction in justifying faith through the books he placed in Wesley's hands. Wesley still presses home the same two arguments: Law does not teach about justification by faith and he is, therefore, responsible for Wesley's spiritual state.[53]

The language of the second letter was more restrained; apparently Wesley's indignation had subsided, but the agenda had not changed-Wesley closes, "I ask pardon, sir, if I had said anything disrespectful–I

am, reverend sir, your most obedient servant."[54] Wesley apparently suspected that his earlier letter was a bit strongly worded.

C. William Law's Replies to Wesley

Law's replies to Wesley were hardly pastoral ones, though it must be said that Wesley's first letter sets the tone of the ensuing correspondence. Both of Law's letters were attempts at self-justification in the face of Wesley's charges. There is an obvious lack of sensitivity to the mood and motivations of Wesley's writing. In both of his letters William Law treats the "issues" without really touching upon the person involved. He really did not seem to see the depth of Wesley's need and the importance he placed upon this doctrine of salvation by faith.

Law's replies showed him to have been wounded by Wesley's attacks, and he responded defensively, striking out at Peter Bohler rather directly, and in some instances, at Wesley himself.

D. The Issues

As often happens in theological controversy, the theological issues become interwoven with matters of personality and correlative considerations. It is regrettable that Wesley made so much of Law's complicity in the "heavy yoke" that bore down upon him; certainly this aspect stemmed as much from Wesley's spiritual state as it did from the difference in their approaches to the understanding of justification.

Nor should the theological dynamics involved be ignored. It must be said that Law and Wesley now represent two different styles of theology. And while it could be argued from the broader context of Law's entire corpus that he did treat the cross more extensively than in the two practical treatises, his thought is certainly not characterized by an insistence on the objective "onceness" of the cross, and the passivity of faith as the human appropriation of the merits of Christ. Law's thought was structured around the understanding of justification as a process, an active undertaking by the believer. The Theology of the Cross and the Way of the Cross are not mutually exclusive, but they do reflect different theological frameworks. This was, principally, the chasm between Wesley and Law, and the reason why Wesley, flushed with this new knowledge of salvation, could find none of the sort of language he sought in Law's theology.

E. Aldersgate

It is interesting to notice that Wesley's two letters to William Law in May 1738 preceded Wesley's Aldersgate experience. The relation between Aldersgate and the letters offers two important side notes to the discussion. First, as is apparent from the first letter, Wesley wrote to Law lacking the inner assurance and spiritual rest he sought. Second, it is also apparent from these letters that Wesley was in possession of rudiments of justification by faith (and even turns the doctrine upon Law), prior to his internalization of the doctrines in such a way that they become a part of his own religious experience. This would seem to force us to consider Aldersgate in the entire context of the events of the spring of 1738. This does not diminish the validity of Aldersgate as a turning point in Wesley's life and thought, but it does suggest that it is not the isolated event it is sometimes portrayed to be.

III. 1738 to 1756

Wesley's references to William Law in this period are few. The Journal entries for June 11, and November 7, and 8, 1739 indicate that John Wesley continued to read Law's Christian Perfection as a part of his devotional life.[55] Charles Wesley's Journal records a visit with William Law on August 10, 1739. Charles made the following observation on Law's doctrine:[56]

He agreed to our notion of faith, but would have it, that all men held it; was fully against the laymen's expounding, as the very worst thing, both for themselves and others. I told him, he was my schoolmaster to bring me to Christ; but the reason why I did not come sooner to Him, was, my seeking to be sanctified before I was justified.

In this context we see Law standing against two basic Methodist tools, meeting in bands and lay preaching. More important was Law's interest in a universalist approach, and Charles Wesley's statement on the relationship between justification and sanctification he knew under Law's tutelage. John Wesley's Preface to a Collection of Hymns and Sacred Poems (1739), shows him to be increasing his polemic against mysticism. In fact, as Green points out, virtually the whole preface is devoted to this single topic.[57] The teaching which Wesley sets out in that Preface is summarized under these points:[58]

1. We believe ourselves indispensably obliged in the presence of God and angels, and men, to declare wherein we apprehend those writers (the mystic divines) not to teach the truth as it is in Jesus. (ix)

2. And first, we apprehend them to lay another foundation. They are careful indeed to pull down our own works, and to prove that by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified. But why is this? Only, to establish our own righteousness in the place of our own works.... Still the ground of our acceptance is placed in our selves.... These suppose we are to be justified for the sake of our inward righteousness.... (ix-x)

3. They advise 'to the desert, to the desert, and God will build you up.' Numberless are the commandments that occur in all their writings not of retirement intermixed with conversation, but of an entire seclusion from men . . . in order to purify the soul. (xx)

4. So widely distant is the manner of building up souls in Christ taught by St. Paul from that of the mystics! . . . For contemplation is with them the fulfilling of the law, even a contemplation that 'consists in a cessation of all works.' (xxi)

5. Directly opposite to this is the gospel of Christ. Solitary religion is not to be found there. 'Holy solitaries' is a phrase no more consistent with the gospel than holy adulterers. The gospel of Christ knows no religion, but social; no holiness, but social holiness. Faith working by love is the length and breadth and depth and height of Christian Perfection. (xxii)

Green is correct to suggest that this same preface, no doubt, greatly irritated William Law.[59]

John Wesley's Journal records him reading William Law's book on the New Birth (October 23, 1739). He found it "philosophical, speculative, precarious; Behmenish, void and vain."[60] Charles Wesley's comments, written three days earlier, follow the same line of thought: "how promising a beginning! how lame a conclusion!"[61] The contents of the book were such that Charles concludes that Law's "knowledge of the new birth is mostly in theory."[62]

Following 1739 the Journal and Letters of John Wesley are relatively silent about William Law. No longer is Law mentioned as a portion of Wesley's devotional reading, nor does Wesley recommend Law's work to others through his pastoral correspondence. When Law's name does come up during this period it is often linked to that of Jacob Behmen, and in such a way that is not flattering to Law.[63]

Reviewing Law's Spirit of Prayer in his Journal (July27, 1749),Wesley found it "another Gospel" (a Wesleyan synonym for "heresy").[64] John Wesley's criticism of Law's book revolved, once again, around the issue of reconciliation:[65]

> if God was never angry (as this tract asserts), He could never be reconciled, and consequently, the whole Christian doctrine of reconciliation by Christ falls to the ground at once. An excellent method of converting Deists, by giving up the very essence of Christianity!

This middle period of relative silence shows that the issues laid out in the 1738 correspondence, particularly those issues relating to salvation by faith in Christ, were continued. It also shows that the division between Wesley and William Law was deepened by Law's growing affinity with the thought of Jacob Behmen and Wesley's growing rebellion against mysticism and philosophical religion. The only factor missing from the 1738 agenda was matter of the personal accusations and recriminations as to guilt and responsibility. John Wesley's statements of this middle period were pretty much restricted to the issues at hand. He was less concerned with attacking Law than he was interested in discrediting Law's theology.

IV. Wesley's Letter of 1756

John Wesley's Journal gives no indication as to the specific occasion of the writing of this letter. The focus was the same as the last Journal entry mentioning Law (July 27, 1749), those fundamental issues upon which scriptural Christianity stands or falls. Overton suggests that Wesley is writing out of concern about the effects Law's latest books would have upon the Methodists, and certainly this idea carries some credence.[=]

Wesley's "vigorous language" and "relentless logic" are not, as Green points out, inconsistent with the purity of his motives.[67] The letter is a relentless expose of Law's philosophy and its theological implications, but nowhere does Wesley attack Law's character or motives. Indeed, as the opening and closing sentences of the letter suggest, part of the agenda is to call Law back to a scriptural faith.

Wesley's theological critique of Law's position revolves around seven basic points:[68]

> (1) Law's philosophy denies the omnipotence of God; (2) Law denies God's justice and abridges this no less than His power; (3) Law's philosophy totally denies the Scripture doctrine of justification, which includes justification by faith-and not by longing or works-, divine wrath, and atonement; (4) Law misunderstands the new birth; (5) Law teaches the unscriptural doctrine of Christ naturally present in every man; (6) Law teaches stillness as a means of grace; and (7) Law denies a real, localized hell.

While it is no doubt true that Wesley did not always grasp the spirit of Law's formulations, it is also apparent that he sought to present Law's case as fairly and extensively as was possible.[69] Green is certainly correct in seeing the significance of this Open Letter of 1756 as "clarifying the essentials of the faith for himself and his followers. As such the letter is perhaps the most effective statement of his most cherished theological beliefs that John Wesley ever produced."[70] By the same token it must also be said that Wesley felt that these same cherished essentials stood as a barrier between him and William Law.

Not all of Wesley's theological allies approved of this Open Letter to William Law. Charles Wesley's conversation with Law's close friend Dr. Byrom gives a hint of this:[71]

> I drank tea with Dr. Byrom, and was hard pressed to it to defend my brother's book against Mr. Law. We got at last to a better subject, and parted, not without a blessing.

George Whitefield's comments were more severe. He calls Wesley's publication "unchristian and ungentlemanly."[72] It certainly could be said that Wesley mounted an all out attack on Law's theology, but there is really nothing "ungentlemanly" about it. Never does Wesley move from the courtesy of his preface, nor is there any clear indication of the earlier resentment or bitterness toward William Law.

William Law's reaction to Wesley's Open Letter is difficult to assess. Law published no reply and only passing remarks in his personal correspondence give any indication of his feelings about the letter by Wesley; and even these indications are inconsistent.

Law's letter of February 16, 1756 to "a person of quality" (assumed to be the Countess of Huntingdon) states:[73]

> Mr. Wesley's letter did not at all disappoint me. I had no expectation of seeing a better, either with regard to the substance, or the style, and manner of it.

An even-tempered tolerance was the prevailing mood there. But Law's Letter XIX evidences a different tone:[74]

> To answer Mr. Wesley's letter seems to be quite needless, because there is nothing substantial or properly argumentative in it. I was once a kind of oracle to Mr. Wesley. I judged him to be much under the power of his own spirit. To this was owing the false censure which he published against the mystics as enemies to good works. His letter is such a juvenile composition

> of emptyness and pertness as is below the character of any man who had been serious in religion for half a month. It was not ability but necessity that put his pen into his hand. He had preached much against my books, and forbid his people the use of them; and for a cover of all this he promised from time to time to write against them; therefore an answer was to be made at all adventures. He and the Pope conceive the same reasons for condemning the mystery revealed by Jacob Behmen.

How different this is from the earlier passage to the Countess of Huntingdon! This letter certainly reveals traces of bitterness in its indictment of both Wesley's motives and character. Law's April 10, 1757 letter to George Ward is tinged with the same sort of bitterness. In that letter the indictment includes Wesley and his aged companion Dr. Samuel Johnson.[75] It is clear that Law resented Wesley's attack. It remains an open question why he never published a response to Wesley's arguments.

The publication of Law's Collection of Letters in 1760 renewed the dialogue between Wesley and Law because that collection included the letters with rather harsh language about John Wesley. The publication of these letters motivated Wesley to make further reply to Law, this time in the form of a letter to the editor of The London Chronicle.

V. Letter to the London Chronicle (Sept. 27,1760)

Wesley's letter was occasioned by the publication of William Law's Collection of Letters earlier in the same year. Law's motivation in publishing the letters is unclear. Telford suggests Law's friends Ward and Langcake were the real forces behind the move and certainly they edited and collected the correspondence for publication.[76] But it is also difficult to escape the fact that Law, who undoubtedly retouched some of the letters in the Collection, allowed the statements about John Wesley and his associates to stand as they do. Whether this is to be interpreted as a continuation of the bitterness between them, or as an oversight on Law's part in his declining years is open to question.

In Wesley's letter to the London Chronicle he took the time to cite the full text of the letters of Law which make reference to him. Wesley asks the reader to judge for himself if Law's remarks require reply. Wesley's opinion is that they do require reply and he sets himself to the task.

Wesley prefaced his remarks with an explanation of the relationship between Law and himself. "It is true," writes Wesley, "that Mr. Law, whom I love and reverence now, was once 'a kind of oracle' to me."[77] Law found Wesley functioning under "his own spirit," and therefore not under the unction of the Spirit of God. Wesley replies that he has merely exchanged the Mystic writers for the Scriptural ones. The obvious implication here is that Wesley and Law are on rather different theological routes.

Apparently sensitive to Law's charge that he used ridicule as well as argument in "exposing the philosophy of Behmen" Wesley offers examples of similar treatment from Law. But the most significant portion of the letter is yet to come. In this letter to the editor of the London Chronicle Wesley stated the basis of his opposition to Law's philosophy:[78]

> My reason is this, and no other: I think he contradicts Scripture, reason and himself; and that he has seduced many unwary

> souls from the Bible way of salvation. A very strong conviction of this, and a desire to guard against that dangerous seduction, laid me under a necessity of writing that letter.

Wesley went on to add that he has rarely mentioned Law's books, either positively or negatively, and that who ever informed Law otherwise "wanted either sense or honesty."[79]

A secondary charge was leveled in the concluding paragraph of Wesley's letter. It was against William Law's distrust of learning. This, Wesley concluded, was the basis of Law's remark about Dr. Johnson and his dictionary.[80] Education was an issue that had long lurked in the background of the dialogue between Wesley and Law, particularly in the context of Wesley's rejection of Law's quietism and withdrawal from the world.

This letter to the London Chronicle was the last correspondence or dialogue between Wesley and William Law. Law died soon afterward.

VI. After William Law's Death

Wesley's treatment of Law and his thought remained much the same following Law's death in 1761. He recognized fundamental theological differences between Law's position and his own, yet he expressed both debt and appreciation for Law's tutelage.

Wesley's Journal account of "a letter to a friend" dated May 14, 1765, linked the reading of Law's practical treatises with Wesley's early resolution to live a life wholly devoted to God.[81] Wesley's letter to John Newton, of the same year, made a similar connection.[82]

Wesley still maintained, in his letter to the Countess of Huntingdon of August 14, 1771, that Law "flatly denies" the "great truth Justification by Faith."[83] But Wesley recommended Law and Baxter's writings to Richard Lockes as "useful writers."[84] Wesley's sermon "On a Single Eye," preached at Bristol on September 25, 1786, recommended Law's Serious Call:[85]

> a treatise which will hardly be excelled, if it be equalled, in the English tongue either for the beauty of expression, or for justness and depth of thought.

During this same period John Wesley complimented Mr. Skelton by comparing him favorably with William Law:[86]

> I spent an hour with Mr. Skelton; I think full as extraordinary a man as Mr. Law; of full as a rapid genius; so that I had little to do but to hear-his words flowing as a river.

Wesley was able, on the one hand, to recommend Law's tracts to Elizabeth Richie as being useful for meditation;[87] yet on the other hand, he criticized Law's later works to Mary Bishop, particularly emphasizing Law's lack of a doctrine of the atonement. The doctrine of the atonement was the point that Wesley saw as "the distinguishing point between Deism and Christianity."[88]

Wesley's use of William Law's work in this later period showed two interesting distinctions. First, Wesley seemed to distinguish Law's early, practical treatises from his later more philosophical ones. The early practical treatises were recommended as guides to piety and disciplined life, but

not principally as teachers of the doctrine of salvation they presented. Second, the later writings of Law, which Wesley found particularly deficient in their theology of the cross, were not recommended to seekers or inquirers after the path of salvation. Thus, Wesley seemed to distinguish between the earlier and later works of William Law, as well as between the specific needs of various readers.

VII. Conclusion

It is difficult to examine the dialogue between John Wesley and William Law without feeling that they were like two men involved in a chance meeting on the street. They walked steadily towards each other and paused for a brief moment, and then continued past each other, hurrying off in different directions.

The early Wesley, the "legal man," was strongly drawn to Law's presentation of a highly ethical, devotional, disciplined way of life. The men showed the same sort of interest in a disciplined, reasonable religious life. We saw Wesley finding Law as "a sort of oracle" in these early years. Law, an older and established thinker, offered the younger man many of the ideals he sought.

As this strongly mystical and ethical conception of Christianity failed to satisfy Wesley's longing for inner assurance Wesley took upon himself more extreme measures: finally venturing to America to save the Indians and himself as well. The failure of his work in Georgia, coupled with the evaporation of much of the naivete Wesley might have had about human nature, laid him lower after the Georgia mission than he was when he first undertook the venture. Wesley's meeting with the Moravians and their piety of Reformed extraction offered Wesley another theological option, one that led directly away from the route prescribed by William Law.

When Wesley committed himself whole-heartedly to the proposition of justification by faith in the atonement of Christ the theological break with William Law was complete. The events of 1738 cloud the primary doctrinal issues with feelings of betrayal and resentment, but the conclusion that the doctrinal break is the primary consideration seems inescapable.

The doctrinal split can be viewed most clearly from the difference between Wesley and Law in the basic definition of "justification." Wesley viewed the category, following the lead of the Protestant Reformers, primarily in terms of "pardon." It is received by a faith that is "trust" in God and Christ, by Whose merits we are reconciled.

Law's definition of justification was more closely akin to that of Catholic Mysticism, and historical Catholicism in general. For Law "justification" means "being made just." This formulation blurs the distinction between justification and sanctification. Justification is seen as a process, and not principally as an event based on the "onceness" of the cross. "Faith" in this theological context becomes more of a "longing" for unity with God than it is a "trust" in the God revealed in the event of the cross. The focal point of the activity involved in Law's view was not upon the atoning grace of God in Christ, but upon the life-long quest of the inquirer.

This basic difference in theological format underlies the entire dialogue between Wesley and Law. There are many ways of describing this

difference: passive and active faith, objective and subjective views of the atonement, Theology of the Cross and the Theology of Glory, and so forth. The point is that Wesley and William Law wind up on opposite sides of the fundamental theological question of what it means to be justified, and how one is to be justified.

Charles Wesley, whose terse Journal entries are sometimes more enlightening than his brother's, pin-pointed this matter of justification as the problem area:[89]

> I told him (Law), he was my school master to bring me to Christ; but the reason why I did not come sooner to Him, was, my seeking to be sanctified before I was justified.

While it would be foolish to lay the entire blame for this confusion of justification and sanctification at the feet of William Law, the fact that precisely this sort of confusion is at work in Law's thought seems inescapable.

A secondary difference in the theological pattern of William Law and John Wesley revolves around Law's ideal of separation from the things of this world. This eventually evolved, in Law, to a sort of anti-intellectualism and quietistic withdrawal from society-both of which were intolerable to John Wesley.

The most obvious contribution of William Law to Wesleyan theology is in the doctrine of Christian Perfection. While in their mature thought Wesley and Law formulated this doctrine quite differently, it is undeniable that under Law's influence Wesley was "seized of an idea that never after that let him go."[90]

We see in both men an interest in Christian Perfection that fills all of life with a devotional quality. And in his practice of "works of piety" Wesley closely follows William Law's example; both insist on the importance of self-discipline, private prayer, fasting, stewardship of time and wealth, propriety in amusements (though in this Law was more rigid than Wesley), and modesty and plainness in attire.[91]

It has been argued by competent commentators that Wesley never really understood William Law's position.[92] It can be said that Wesley, particularly in his early writings against Law, wrote as much out of emotion as out of logic and insight; but the same cannot be said for Wesley's later polemics. Wesley's lack of sympathy for Law's soteriology should not be taken for ignorance. Indeed, Wesley consistently showed himself well read in Law's many books. Even in 1738, when Wesley's letters seem to reflect as much of his own spiritual state as of the theological differences he had with Law, Wesley was still able to discern a theological format that was substantially different from the one he had only recently adopted himself. The failure to see two fundamentally different styles of theology at work in Wesley and Law is a dangerous one.

It should also be noted that these doctrinal differences did not cause Wesley to renounce William Law or the effect that Law had upon his own theological pilgrimage. The letter to the editor of the London Chronicle indicated that while Law "was once a sort of oracle" to Wesley, even at that writing he was loved and revered by Wesley.[93]

Again, it is Charles Wesley who offers the terse summary; this time on the impact William Law had on the brothers Wesley. Charles aptly describes Law as "our John the Baptist."[94]

APPENDIX A:

William Law	*Contact*	John Wesley
b. 1686: Kingscliffe, Northamptonshire		b. 1703: Epworth, Lincolnshire
		1725: Prepared for Ordination. So-called intellectual conversion. Begins reading Thomas a' Kempis, J. Taylor.
1717: Letters to Bishop Burger		
1721: Remarks on "The Fable of Bees"		
1723 (?) Begins as a Tutor at Putney		
1726: A Practical Treatise Upon Christian Perfection		
	1727: Wesley's "furious reading" of William Law's Christian Perfection, and later Serious Call. Law is "a kind of oracle" to him.	
		1728: After serving as his father's curate, Wesley returns to Oxford and is ordained Priest.
1729: A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life		
	1732: A letter critcizing the Methodists appears in Fog's Journal, the incident revolves around the death of William Morgan. A researched reply subsequently appears in the same Journal vindicating the Methodists. It is generally thought that the reply was made by William Law.	
	1732: Exact date uncertain: Wesley visits William Law at Putney.	
		1732: Upon returning to Oxford Wesley sets out to live according to Law's ideal of Perfection.
		1735: Wesley brothers set sail for missionary work in Georgia

1738: Wesley meets Peter Bohler: also Feb. 17, March 4, 23, April 22, 23, 26.

1738: Wesley's letter of May 14. The essential doctrine of saving faith is a glaring omission from Law's teaching.

1738: May 19, Law replies to Wesley's letter. Law reminds Wesley of the books he recommended, and that the cross is inseparable from faith in Christ and following Him. The letter shows hints of irony throughout.

1738: May 20, Wesley's second letter. He levels charges of neglect against Law, concluding that if he (Wesley) had misunderstood a' Kempis it was Law's responsibility to set him straight.

1738: May 30 (?) Law's second reply. Law restates his earlier argument, adding a rebuke against Bohler. He also suggests that Wesley is merely venting personal dislike for him. Law concludes that Wesley can learn nothing from him, and brusquely disowns responsibility for Wesley's defects.

1737-1740: A transitional stage in Law's writings; he discovers Behmen's work in 1736 and the latter's influence is beginning to be seen.

1749 and after: Behmen's thought is deeply interwoven into Law's work.

1749: Spirit of Prayer

1750: Way of Divine Knowledge

1752: Spirit of Diuine Love

1756: Jan. 6, Wesley's Open Letter renews the public quarrel. The main thrust is a critique and criticism of Law's Spirit of Prayer and Spirit of Love, the reading of which, no doubt, occasioned Wesley's letter.

1756: Law makes no public reply to Wesley's Letter; though Law's private correspondence to Countess of Huntingdon, Langcake, and Ward show him to be provoked by Wesley's rebuke.

1760: William Law's Collection of Letters is published. Several letters contain attacks upon John Wesley.

	1760: Sept. 7, Wesley answers Law's criticisms in a letter to the editor of The London Chronicle	
1761: Law dies		

APPENDIX B:

William Law's Thought	Dates	John Wesley's Thought
Christian Perfection	1725	"Religious Awakening"
Serious Call	1727	Furious Reading
	1732	Visits Law
Behmen	1735	Georgia
	1738	Return to England, Does not visit Law, Peter Bohler
	"Aldersgate"	
		Series of Letters
	1750	
Spirit of Prayer		
	1752	
Spirit of Love		
	1756	Letter of Jan. 6
Collection of Letters	1760	Letter to London Chronicle

The vertical lines represent the lines of development and affinity of the thought of John Wesley and William Law.

1738 is the pivotal year. It marks the personal and theological break between Wesley and William Law. Wesley's 'evangelical conversion' assures him of the importance of justification by faith and its related doctrines. The breach with Law is also accompanied by a feeling of betrayal, in that Law (according to Wesley) did not mention that foundational principle to him. This was a period of personal bitterness as well as theological difference.

During this same period (1736 and onwards) Law's open thought began to become more and more affected by the work of Jacob Behmen. Thus Law's theology began moving in one direction at just about the same time Wesley's theology began moving in another direction.

In the later years the personal differences were apparently overcome, at least on Wes1ey's part, though the profound theological differences remained.

NOTES

1 William Law, *A Serious Call to A Devout and Holy Life* (Romsey: S. Kackson Printer, 1819), p. 219.

2 *Ibid*., p. 88.

3 William Law, *Christian Perfection*, in *The Pocket William Law*, A. W. Hopkinson, editor (London: Latimer House, 1950), p. 19.

4 *Ibid*.

5 *Ibid*., p. 26.

6 Law, *Serious Call*, p. 134.

7 *Ibid*. p. 329.

8 *Ibid*., p. 7.

9 *Ibid*., p. 370.

10 *Ibid*., p. 381.

11 William Law, *An Appeal to All Who Doubt*, in *The Pocket William Law*, A. W. Hopkinson, editor (London: Latimer House, 1950), pp. 103-104.

12 Law, *Serious Call*, p. 266.

13 *Ibid*.

14 *Ibid*., pp. 264-65.

15 *Ibid*., p. 267.

l6 Law, *Christian Perfection*, p. 48.

17 Law, *Serious Call*, pp. 398-99.

18 *Ibid*., p. 253.

19 *Ibid*., p. 27.

20 Cf. John Wesley's Standard Sermons: "The Scripture Way of Salvation," and "On Working Out Your Own Salvation."

21 John Wesley, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* (Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press, 1966), p. 10.

22 John Wesley, *The Journal of John Wesley*, Vol. V, edited by N. Curnock (London: Robert Culley Press, 1916), p. 117.

23 *Ibid*., Vol. I p. 467.

24 John Wesley, *The Letters of John Wesley*, Vol. I, edited by John Telford (London: The Epworth Press, 1931), pp. 161-163.

25 Wesley, *Journal*, I, p. 87f.

26 Wes1ey, *Journal*, I, p. 109, cf. Letters, I, pp. 190-191.

27 *Ibid*., pp. 124, 283.

28 Wesley, *Journal*, Vol. I, pp. 231, 233, 268, 269, etc.

29 *Ibid*., p. 232. Curnock suggests that this "translating" was merely an oral exercise, not actually involving a written copy; there seems to be no way of knowing for certain.

30 *Letters*, I, p. 207.

31 *Journal*, I, pp. 436, 440, 442, 447, 454, 471.

32 Charles Wesley, *The Journal of Charles Wesley*, Vol. I, edited by Thomas Jackson (London: John Mason Press, 1849), p. 74.

33 *Ibid*.

34 John Wesley, *Journal*, I, p. 432.

35 *Ibid*., p. 436.

36 *Ibid*., pp. 436-460. (Feb. 17, March 4, 23, April 22, 23, 26.)

37 *Ibid*., p. 440.

38 *Ibid*., p. 459. It is very curious that Charles Wesley's Journal makes no mention of this event!

39 *Ibid*., pp. 461-462.

40 *Ibid*., p. 464. Also cf. p. 460.

41 *Ibid*., p. 467. Cf. Letters, I, pp. 238-240.

42 *Ibid*., Also *Letters*, I, p. 239.

43 *Ibid*., p. 470.

44 *Ibid*.

45 *Ibid*.

46 *Letters*, I, p. 239.

47*Ibid*., p. 240- 49

48 *Ibid*.

49 *Ibid*.

50 Letters, V, p. 274.

51 J. H. Overton, *John Wesley* (London: Methuen and Co., 1905), p. 63.

52 J. Brazier Green, *John Wesley and William Law* (London: The Epworth Press, 1945), p. 66.

53 *Letters*, I, p. 241.

54 *Ibid*.

55 Wesley, Journal, II, pp. 216, 314.

56 Charles Wesley, *Journal*, I, p. 159.

57 Green, *Wesley and Law*, p. 180.

58 G. Osborn, *The Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley*, Vol. I (London: Wesleyan-Methodist Conference Office, 1868), pp. ix-xx.

59 Green, *Wesley and Law*, p. 180.

60 John Wesley, *Journal*, II, p. 297.

61 Charles Wesley, *Journal*, I, p. 191.

62 *Ibid*.

63 Wesley, *Letters*, III, pp. 208, 215, 332, 370; IV, p. 106.

64 John Wesley, *Journal*, III, p. 442.

65 *Ibid*.

66 Wesley, *Letters*, III, p. 332.

67 Green, *Wesley and Law*, p. 130.

68 Wes1ey, *Letters*, III, p. 332f.

69 Green, *Wesley and Law*, p. 160.

70 *Ibid*.

71 Charles Wesley, *Journal*, II, p. 129.

72 Green, *Wesley and Law*, p. 130.

73 Wesley, *Letters*, IV, p. 105.

74 *Ibid*.

75 *Ibid*. Cf. Green, *Wesley and Law*, p. 165.

76 Wesley, *Letters*, IV, p. 105.

77 *Ibid*., p. 106.

78 *Ibid*.

79 *Ibid*.

80 *Ibid*., p. 107

81 John Wesley, *Journal*, V, p. 117.

82 Wesley, *Letters*, I V, p. 299.

83 *Ibid*., V. p. 274.

84 Wes1ey, *Letters*, V, p. 199.

85 John Wesley, *The Works of John Wesley*, Vol. VII, edited by Thomas Jackson (Salem, Ohio: Schmul Publishers, 1978 reprint), p. 297.

86 Wesley, *Journal*, IV, p- 405.

87 Wesley, *Letters*, VI, p. 125.

88 *Ibid*., pp. 297-298.

89 Charles Wesley, *Journal*, I, p. 159.

90 George C. Cell, *The Rediscovery of Wesley* (New York: Holt and Co., 1935), p. 354.

91 Eric Baker, *A Herald of the Evangelical Revival* (London: The Epworth Press, 1948), pp. 93-99.

92 For example: Keith Walker, *William Law* (London: SPCK, 1973), p. 133f. Cf. A. W. Hopkinson, *About William Law*.

93 Wesley, *Letters*, IV, p. 106.

94 Green, *Wesley and Law*, p. 211.

THE WESLEYS' HYMNS ON FULL REDEMPTION[1] AND PENTECOST: A BRIEF COMPARISON

by Ken Bible

In the last few years there has been considerable discussion among Wesley scholars about the relationship between entire sanctification and Pentecost in the thought of the Wesleys. Dr. Timothy L. Smith has extended this discussion to Wesleyan hymnody in his paper "The Holy Spirit in the Hymns of the Wesleys."[2] By discussing and quoting from selected hymns, primarily from their earlier collections, he seeks to establish a strong connection between the two themes. Since the body of Wesley hymns is so vast, however, and since Dr. Smith's approach does not cover a number of relevant aspects of the question, perhaps further attention to the issue would be constructive.

This paper does not pretend to exhaust the subject. Neither does it seek to state definitely and in systematic form what the Wesleys did or did not teach. Certainly any such attempt would need to examine their hymns in light of their other writings, and that is beyond the scope of this study. It is our purpose to shed light on the relationship between entire sanctification and Pentecost by examining the occurrence and recurrence of major themes in a selected body of hymns on each subject. These selected hymns were chosen to be reasonably representative of the Wesleys' hymnic treatment of those themes, and justifications for the choices will be discussed later. In any case, limiting the field of study is necessitated by the scale of the Wesleys' hymnody; estimates vary from 6500 up to 8000 hymns. Studying the entire group would certainly violate the practical limitations of this paper. In addition, such a large and varied body of literature is inevitably susceptible to "proof-texting." Nearly any doctrine could be seemingly substantiated by the determined researcher.

It is for this reason that a more statistical method is employed here. Figuring and comparing percentages may not be the ultimate way of understanding hymns, but hopefully it will contribute to a more objective overview in this case.

For the hymns on entire sanctification we will be examining the section entitled "For Believers Seeking for Full Redemption" from the hymnal A

Collection of Hymns for the Use of People Called Methodists, published by John Wesley in 1780.[3] There are several reasons why this portion of hymns has been chosen for study.

1. John Wesley apparently considered the 1780 collection representative of his hymns in general. The Wesleys published at least 57 hymn collections in their lifetimes. This multiplicity of hymnals caused a growing demand for one hymnal that would be large enough to provide a single body of hymns for the societies' use, yet modest enough in proportions to be affordable. John chose 525 hymns from their earlier collections to form the 1780 collection, and he endorsed it strongly.[4]

The collection was widely circulated and has been extremely influential. It was supplemented at various times to fill in certain gaps that developed, but otherwise it essentially remained the official hymnal of Methodism in Britain into the twentieth century.

3. It represents common ground between John and Charles. This paper will not attempt to delve into the theological differences that John and Charles had from time to time but will concern itself with the concerted teaching which their hymns did in fact present. In regard to the 1780 collection, Charles wrote the majority of the hymns, and John served as editor and compiler.[5]

It is important to understand the unique organization of this collection, for the organization itself lends insight into the Wesleys' teaching. In John's words, "The hymns are not carelessly jumbled together, but carefully ranged under proper heads, according to the experience of real Christians. So that this book is, in effect, a little body of experimental and practical divinity."[6] The organization of this volume is a fascinating and fruitful study in its own right, and space here does not permit a full discussion of it. Suffice it to say that it is divided into five main sections and is in essence arranged as "a spiritual biography" of a true Christian.[7] It begins exhorting or calling sinners, progresses through the various stages on the road to redemption, and ends with hymns on and for the society. Our section, "For Believers Seeking for Full Redemption," is contained in section IV, following the sections "For Believers Rejoicing, For Believers Fighting . . . praying . . . watching . . . working . . . suffering," and preceding "For Believers Saved" and "For Believers Interceding for the World."

A full 78 hymns are contained in the section on "seeking full redemption," which both speaks to the importance John placed on the doctrine and argues for its being relatively complete and well-rounded in its contents. Note that it is for believers seeking full redemption. Holiness is a recurring theme throughout their hymns on virtually all subjects. In these particular hymns the Wesleys are modeling for those believers seeking and longing for full redemption, and thus expressions of the actual achievement of holiness are rare here.

For Pentecost hymns, we will be considering the volume Hymns of Petition and Thanksgiving for the Promise of the Father, or Hymns for Whitsunday. This volume of 32 hymns, published in 1746, is one of a series of hymn pamphlets the Wesleys published on the major Christian festivals. It has been chosen as being representative of their Pentecost hymns for several reasons:

1. It also was widely circulated for many years and was quite influential in the Methodist movement.

2. It was strongly endorsed by John Wesley.

3. It represents common ground between John and Charles, since it was published in both of their names.

First, an overview of the collection:

Hymns 1, 2, and 3 are invocations to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, respectively, petitioning for the coming of the Spirit. Hymn 4 is an exhortation to "sinners" to receive "The Promise." Hymns 5-16 are mostly prayers to Jesus concerning the giving of the Spirit wherein the writer repeatedly marvels at the fact that God now indwells His people forever. Hymns 17-22 are a series of hymns all in the same rhyme scheme and meter, seemingly designed as various sections of one continuous hymn. The hymns discuss the work of the Spirit and are expressly based in sequence on John 16:8-11. Hymns 23-27 are not a discernible series: hymn 23 is based on John 16:13-15, then hymn 24 on verses 20-22 of the same chapter; hymn 25 is on the fruits of the Spirit; hymn 26 is a prayer for the Spirit to reclaim and pardon a penitent sinner; hymn 27 is a prayer for the Spirit to reveal God. Hymns 28-31 again form a series of hymns in the same meter and rhyme scheme. It is a progressive study of the work of the Spirit first in creation, then in prevenient grace bringing about justification, then to the finishing of that work in sanctification, and finally to the fruit of the Spirit and His abiding presence all through the walk of life. The pamphlet closes with hymn 32 being of a celebrative character, rejoicing in the fact that Jesus is now above and the Spirit is come, guiding and setting up the "kingdom of love in the heart." Again, He is God's presence forever with believers.

There are some similarities between the full redemption and Pentecost hymns. "Waiting" is a frequent theme and attitude in both, but in the full redemption hymns it is usually waiting for the appearance of Christ within the individual heart; in the Pentecost hymns it is usually waiting for the sending of the Holy Spirit to mankind. Faith based on God's Word is common to both, and this lends a confident tone to the hymns even in sections where the most desperate longing is expressed. In the Pentecost hymns faith is usually based on Jesus' promise to send the Comforter, while in the full redemption hymns the foundation is most often God's expressed will that we be holy. Also, "God indwelling" is a recurring idea in each, although it is more common and more specifically stated in the Pentecost hymns. Similarly, the word "love" appears frequently in both groups but is more frequent in the holiness hymns. It is perhaps surprising that empowering for Christian work and witness is not a major theme in either group.

There are significant differences in the two bodies of hymns, and these will be discussed under the following general headings:

1. Holy Spirit content
2. Sinlessness
3. Scripture backgrounds
4. Tone
5. Overlap of the 2 collections

Holy Spirit Content

Dr. Smith centers on the role of the Holy Spirit in the holiness hymns

and discusses it at length.[8] This seems a bit strained, however, in light of the fact that one of the most striking aspects of the Wesleys' holiness hymns is their lack of emphasis on the Spirit. They are so overwhelmingly Christocentric that the Spirit is generally pushed into the background. Of the 78 hymns, 47 do not mention the Spirit at all; 20 refer to the Spirit only once; 11 refer to the Spirit more than once. This is certainly not the case in the Pentecost hymns. Of the 32 hymns, only 3 hymns do not mention the Spirit; 1 refers to the Spirit once; 28 refer repeatedly to the Spirit. Thus in 86% of the full redemption hymns the Spirit is mentioned once or not at all, as opposed to 12% in the Pentecost hymns. 44% of the Pentecost hymns begin as prayers to the Spirit, whereas this occurs in only 5% of the full redemption hymns.

Beyond these raw percentages, the Spirit is far more predominant in the Pentecost hymns. As was discussed above under the description of the Hymns for Whitsunday collection, the sending of the Spirit and the Spirit's ministry are the main themes of the volume. Two extended series of hymns examine these subjects in great detail. Among the holiness hymns, only 3 of the 78 hymns can truly be said to center on the Spirit.[9]

The nomenclature used in reference to the Spirit also differs significantly. In the full redemption hymns, simply "Spirit" or "Holy Spirit" are most commonly used. "Holy Ghost" occasionally appears, and "Spirit of burning" is used once;[10] one hymn uses the term "Comforter" in 2 of its interior verses.[11] The nomenclature is far richer and more varied in the Pentecost hymns. "Comforter" appears in half the hymns, and other titles abound, such as: "The Gift," "Eternal Spirit," "The Promise," "Paraclete," "Guest," "Guide," "Teacher," "The Blessing," "Spirit of Truth," "Witness," "Presence Divine," and "Universal Soul."

The most common Scriptures used in the holiness hymns in reference to the Spirit are I Timothy 1:7 and Romans 8. There are several references from Revelation 22, several from Old Testament books such as Psalms and Ezekiel, and few from gospel passages such as John 3 and John 20. There are no clearly discernible references to Acts 2, and aside from one hymn mentioning the term "Comforter," there are no apparent references to the Paraclete sayings in John. The Pentecost hymns draw their Spirit references primarily from John's paraclete sayings. More about the Scripture backgrounds will be discussed later.

Sinlessness

The most prevalent theme in the full redemption hymns is the desire for sinlessness-the earnest seeking for freedom from all sin in heart and life. 80% of the hymns discuss it directly, and it is a central concern of many of those. Most of the 16 hymns which do not specifically mention it are those hymns which dwell on the more positive aspects of holiness. Even then the concern for freedom from sin seems right under the surface.

In contrast to the 80% mentioned above, only 34% of the Pentecost hymns mention sinlessness directly, and even that does not tell the whole story. The initial stages of redemption — justification and regeneration — play a far more major role here than in the holiness hymns. Where sinlessness is mentioned, it is not merely the prevailing, driving force that it is in the holiness hymns. Where it appears, it is in a progressive sequence

in which the various stages of the redemptive process are being covered in a sweep.

Scripture Backgrounds

The Wesley's use of Scripture is indeed one of the most unique and enriching aspects of their style. Numerous writers have commented on the fact that every verse of their hymns is packed with scriptural allusions. The most remarkable facet of this is that the writer is so steeped in Scripture that he naturally expresses himself in scriptural terms. The references are not forced together in an artificial or pedantic fashion, but they flow out of his thought seemingly without conscious effort.

Sometimes a specific background Scripture reference is given at the head of the hymn, but that does not necessarily predetermine the actual contents or theme of the hymn. The stated reference may simply be used as a jumping off point, suggesting a theme by a word or phrase. At other times the treatment of the Scripture is relatively expositional in character.

Wesley has given a specific Scripture background reference or references for 51 of the 78 full redemption hymns. There is a broad spectrum of Scriptures used, drawn from 11 Old Testament books and 16 New Testament books. A variety of scriptural treatment is displayed. One hymn is based on Zechariah 4:7 and likens inbred sin to the "great mountain."[12] Several speak of spiritual healing in terms of Jesus' earthly healing ministry. Other hymns are based on such passages as I Kings 18:38-39 — Elijah on Mount Carmel; [13] Hebrews 13:8 — "Jesus Christ the same, yesterday, today, and forever";[14] Deuteronomy 33:26; [15] Hebrews 4:9,[16] and many more. Considering the myriad sources and treatments employed, it seems remarkable that only one reference is cited from the book of Acts, and that from a non-Pentecostal passage.[17] There are no references to the Paraclete sayings in John.

Of course, numerous scriptural allusions appear that are not directly cited by the Wesleys in the hymn headings. It is utterly impossible to come up with a definitive list of these, for certainly any one scholar's list would be distinctively colored by his own background and scriptural familiarity. Reading through the full redemption hymns, one seems to be the most struck by the many references from the epistles, and it would appear that those references would predominate both in number and influence. It would be very risky to positively assert that no allusions are made to the Pentecostal passages in Acts, but none were clearly visible to this writer. Neither were any clear references noted to the Paraclete sayings in John, aside from the use of the term "Comforter" in the one hymn already mentioned. As we have explained, these specifics as to scriptural allusions not expressly cited by the Wesleys are subjective and open to question. It does seem clear, however, that if references to Acts and the Paraclete sayings can be found, they are at least remarkably rare.

There is a distinct difference in the Scripture backgrounds of the Pentecost hymns. 15 of the 32 hymns have specified Scripture backgrounds. All are from John's gospel: 1 from chapter 7, 6 from chapter 15, and 7 from chapter 16.[18] This is a far narrower range than in the holiness hymns. In fact, none of these Scriptures are cited by the Wesleys among the full redemption hymns under study. Also, the treatment of Scripture

backgrounds is more consistently expositional in character in the Pentecost hymns. Again, unspecified scriptural allusions are difficult to pin down, but many come from the gospels, with a number from the epistles.

Tone

The overall tone of the two groups of hymns is different in several respects. First, the historical orientation that is so characteristic of the Pentecost hymns is essentially absent from the full redemption hymns. The latter contain no discernible references to Pentecost as an historical event. Perhaps more obvious is the fact that the full redemption hymns are extremely personal in tone, with the vast majority of the hymns being written in the first person singular. Only 2 of the Pentecost hymns are in the first person singular, and most of them are in the first person plural. This contrast may be partially explained by the differences in purpose often attributed to the two volumes. The 1780 collection was designed primarily for the societies, while Hymns for Whitsunday, being written for a Christian festival, was perhaps intended primarily for church use. It is doubtful, however, that this entirely explains the strongly corporate tone of the Pentecost hymns in contrast to the full redemption hymns.

Overlap of the Two Collections

The 78 hymns on full redemption were selected by John from 8 previous hymn collections, with Hymns and Sacred Poems of 1742 and Short Hymns on Select Passages of the Holy Scriptures of 1762 claiming the largest shares-30 and 20 hymns, respectively. Only one of the 78 full redemption hymns is selected from the Hymns for Whitsunday under present study. That is hymn 1 in the Whitsunday collection, "Father of everlasting grace, " in 8 verses. When it appears in the " seeking full redemption" section of the 1780 collection, however, verses 2-5 have been dropped, presumably by John as editor. The entire hymn is reproduced here, with the omitted block of verses being indicated by brackets. By deleting these verses, all direct reference to Pentecost is omitted, along with much of the specifically Pentecostal content:

Father of everlasting grace,
Thy goodness and Thy truth we praise,
Thy goodness and Thy truth we prove.
Thou hast in honor of Thy Son
The Gift unspeakable sent down,
The Spirit of life and power and love.

[Thou has The Prophecy fulfilled,
The grand original compact sealed,
For which Thy word and oath were joined.
The Promise to our fallen head,
To every child of Adam made,
Is now poured out on all mankind.

[The purchased Comforter is given,
For Jesus is returned to heaven,
To claim, and then the Grace impart.

Our day of Pentecost is come,
And God vouchsafes to fix His home
In every poor, expecting heart.

[Father, on Thee whoever call,
Confess Thy promise is for all,
While every one that asks receives,
Receives the Gift, and Giver too,
And witnesses that Thou art true,
And in Thy Spirit walks and lives.

[Not to a single age confined,
For every soul of man designed,
O God, we now that Spirit claim:
To us the Holy Ghost impart;
Breathe Him into our panting heart;
Thou hearest us ask in Jesus' name.]

Send us the Spirit of Thy Son,
To make the depths of Godhead known
To make us share the life Divine;
Send Him the sprinkled blood to apply,
Send Him, our souls to sanctify,
And show and seal us ever Thine.

So shall we pray, and never cease;
So shall we thankfully confess
Thy wisdom, truth, and power, and love;
With joy unspeakable adore,
And bless and praise Thee evermore,
And serve Thee like Thy hosts above;

Till added to that heavenly choir,
We raise our songs of Triumph higher,
And praise Thee in a bolder strain;
Out-soar the first-born seraph's flight,
And sing with all our friends in light
Thine everlasting love to man.

It is true that the use of hymns from the pamphlets on the major Christian festivals in the 1780 collection is limited by the fact that the 1780 collection does not provide hymns specifically for those festivals. This is probably due to the fact that the 1780 collection was for the societies, and that since members were also expected to regularly attend the Church of England on Sundays, festival hymns were not really necessary. Thus in the 1780 collection John did not attempt to provide hymns specifically for Whitsunday. However, if Pentecost and holiness were as closely linked in the hymns as Dr. Smith proposes, it seems quite surprising that John did not draw more on the Pentecost hymns in his providing such a large body of hymns on full redemption. The fact that Wesley did in fact use several of the Pentecost hymns in other sections of the 1780 collection proves that the Pentecost hymns were not shunned where they seemed appropriate or applicable.[19]

Summary

Numerous striking contrasts have been pointed out between the Wesleys' teaching on full redemption and Pentecost in their hymns. As was stated above, it is not the purpose of this paper to attempt to delineate what the Wesleys did and did not teach. It is obvious, however, that a careful examination of their hymns casts grave doubts on any direct connection between Pentecost and full redemption in their thought. There is little or no Pentecostal content in the full redemption hymns, especially in the Scripture backgrounds used and in Holy Spirit material. At the same time, the desire for sinlessness or inward cleansing, the dominant theme in the holiness hymns, is not a prevailing idea in the Pentecost hymns. It merely takes its place next to the other works of the Spirit without assuming center stage. In addition, John chose only one of the widely circulated Pentecost hymns for inclusion in his comprehensive 1780 volume, while drawing heavily on a number of other collections. That one hymn appeared in drastically altered form.

For us in the twentieth century it is sometimes quite difficult to read the Wesley hymns without being strongly influenced by our own historical perspective. The subjective, personal nature of the hymns lends itself to such reading to some extent. It is vitally important, however, that we make a conscious effort to listen to what the hymns have to say without subconsciously making them say what we would like to hear. It is only then that we can profit fully from their deep scriptural expressions of a soul hungering and thirsting after all that God offers and provides.

NOTES

1 For the purposes of this paper, the terms full redemption, holiness, and sanctification will be used synonymously.

2 Timothy L. Smith, "The Holy Spirit in the Hymns of the Wesleys," *The Wesleyan Theological Journal*, 16 (Fall, 1981), 32-37.

3 The edition used for this study was not a first edition, and in fact the edition and year of printing were not indicated. The "Seeking Full Redemption" section is nearly identical to the 1830 London edition, with only minor variations, including the printing of an additional verse in a few hymns. A few hymns are found in this edition that were not a part of the first edition, but these were clearly marked by the editor and thus were not made a part of this study. Using this later edition was necessitated by practical limitations: the rarity of first editions of the 1780 collection. and the fact that the collection is not included in Osborn's *Poetical Works*. Careful comparison between the original version of each hymn in the *Poetical Works* and the version used in our edition show that if any differences exist between the first edition and our edition, it is highly unlikely that they would affect our study.

4 Note these portions from John Wesley's preface to the 1780 collection:

"It is large enough to contain all the important truths of our most holy Religion, whether speculative or practical; yea, to illustrate them all, and to prove them by Scripture and Reason . . . I do not think it inconsistent with modesty to declare, that I am persuaded no such hymnbook as this has yet been published in the English language. In what other publication of the kind have you so distinct and full an account of Scriptural Christianity? Such a declaration of the heights and depths of Religion, speculative and practical? So strong cautions against the most plausible errors, particularly those that are now most prevalent? And so clear directions for making your calling and election sure; for perfecting holiness in the fear of God?"

5 In the preface of the 1780 collection John writes that "but a small part of these Hymns is of my own composing," and in a footnote is added, "The greater part was composed by the Rev. Charles Wesley."

6 *A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People Called Methodists*, preface.

7 Bernard L. Manning, *The Hymns of Wesley and Watts* (London: The Epworth Press, 1942), p. 11.

8 Op. cit.

9 All hymns referred to in this paper will be identified by first line and by the hymn number under which it appears in the 1830 edition of *A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People Called Methodists*. The three hymns are:

"Come, Holy Ghost, all quick'ning fire," #351. "Come, Holy Ghost, all quick'ning fire," #374. "I want a spirit of power within," #376. An additional possibility is "O come and dwell in me," #367.

10 "My God, I humbly call thee mine," #361.

11 "I want the spirit of power within," #376.

12 "0 Great mountain, who art thou!" #382, vs. 1.

13 "Thou God that answerest by fire," #412.

14 "O God, to whom in flesh revealed," #395; "O Thou whom once they flocked to hear," #396; "Jesu, thy far-extended fame," #397.

15 "None is like Jeshurun's God," #407.

16 "Lord, I believe a rest remains," #403.

17 "Jesus hath died, that I might live," #415, based on Acts 16:31.

18 Hymn 6-7:37-39; hymn 7-14:16; hymn 8-14:16; hymn 9-14:16-17; hymn 10-14:18-21; hymn 11-14:21-23; hymn 12-14:25-27; hymn 13-16:1-4; hymn 14-15:26-27; hymn 15-16:6-7; hymn 16-16:7; hymn 17-16:8; hymn 19-16:10; hymn 23-16:13-15; hymn 24-16-20-22.

19 "Come, Holy Celestial Dove," hymn 26 in *Hymns for Whitsunday*, appears in the 1780 collection in the section "For Mourners Convinced of Sin," and "Spirit of Faith, Come Down," hymn 27, appears under "Praying for a Blessing."

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF JOHN WESLEY'S SERMONS AND DOCTRINAL ESSAYS

by
Timothy L. Smith

A major problem in understanding and interpreting the several hundred published sermons, theological essays, tracts, and prefaces John Wesley wrote across 66 years is that no chronological list of them has ever been published. The simplest matters of context being thus difficult to establish, scholars have tended to omit citing particular works and to refer only to a volume number and page in his collected writings. The result has been to perpetuate a bad habit: quoting anything John Wesley said on a given subject to stand as a summary of his lifelong thought about it. Yet each sermon and each essay was a separate text, composed for a particular occasion.

Consider the sermons. Although in 1763 Wesley designated as "standard" his first four volumes of sermons, they included all he had published since Aldersgate except the one on "Free Grace." And that designation was simply a legal one, prompted by the necessity of drawing up a model deed that would protect Wesleyan chapels from diversion to non-Wesleyan preaching. He revised for publication in the volumes of 1746,1748,1750, and 1760 sermons he had in all but a few cases composed and preached many times earlier. The revisions took place in a few weeks of the months preceding the appearance of each volume. In his own comprehensive edition of his Works, published in 1771, Wesley mingled nine other sermons with those from the first four volumes. Occasional sermons continued to appear, and in 1779 he began publishing six sermons a year in The Arminian Magazine, a practice he continued until his death in 1791. Some of these sermons are among his finest. Many of them expound texts he had preached on repeatedly in preceding decades and may, therefore, have been polished versions of older manuscripts. Whether early or late, however, each one reflected both the immediate concerns of its author at the time he first wrote it, as well as his sense of its worth and soundness at the time he revised it for printing.

Wesley's Journal and letters have, by contrast, always been quoted by date, though the letters were never placed in chronological order in any

published work until John Telford drew together a complete edition in eight volumes in 1931. Wesley edited and published his Journal in sections. These appeared usually within a year or two of the last date to which each referred. The Journal thus constitutes an intentionally public record, as only a few of the letters do. Scholars also can and should cite the hymns by the date of their first publications, as well as by reference to John Wesley's selections for the standard hymnbook in 1782, for G. Osborn's great collection of the Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley, printed in 13 volumes in 1869, placed the hymn books in the chronological order of their composition. We greatly need an edition of the "Large Minutes" that will assign such dates as are known to each question and response and explain what is known of the manner in which successive versions were edited and published.

The list below is intended to make it convenient for students to set whatever passage from Wesley they are considering, whether from a letter, journal, hymn, sermon, preface, or a theological or devotional essay, in the context of his other important published writings composed in roughly the same period of time. In the left-hand column appear the dates that I have concluded may reasonably be assigned to the composition of each sermon, preface, or tract. In the years before 1738, I have often determined these dates from manuscripts in Wesley's handwriting, as recently discovered by Richard Heitzenrater at the Methodist Archives and Research Center at the University of Manchester, England. Beginning with the so-called "Aldersgate Sermon," preached before the University at St. Mary's Church, Oxford, on June 7, 1738, whenever I have indicated a specific day, month, and year, the source is usually from either Wesley's Journal for that date or the date he attached to the work in its original published version, usually indicated in the volume and page number in his Works cited in the note in the accompanying parenthesis. Reading down the numbers of the sermons indicating their sequence in his Works, as they appear in the second column from the left, indicates how sharp is the contrast between the topical and logical order Wesley imposed on the first 53 sermons and a straightforward chronological order.

In the cases of a number of sermons, I have opted for a much earlier date than Edward H. Sugden assigned, in his edition of the Standard Sermons published in 1955-56. In this I have relied upon rather specific allusions to the text and content of the sermon that appeared in the Journal, or .upon other contemporary evidence. For example, the poem attached to the sixth discourse on the Sermon on the Mount (published in 1748), which parallels a central argument of that discourse, appeared in the second volume of Hymns and Sacred Poems, published in 1740. I have relied partly on this evidence to conclude that the substance of the first six sermons on this series, not published until 1748, date from the series Wesley preached several times in the late summer and fall of 1739. When the Journal or other evidence did not seem to establish a precise date for the composition of a sermon, I have simply cited the date or period indicated in the Journal when Wesley prepared the manuscript for the press.

From September, 1754 forward, I have relied upon multiple references in the Sermon Register published in Nehemiah Curnock's edition of The Journal of John Wesley, volume eight, as well as the Journal itself, to

justify earlier dates than are usually assigned to certain crucial sermon-on texts that Wesley employed repeatedly as the great revival of Christian Perfection between 1758 and 1762 got under way. These include several notable ones that Wesley published only after the troubles with George Bell and Thomas Maxfield reached their climax in 1763, and that scholars have sometimes (I think mistakenly) attributed to Wesley's effort to fence out their fanaticisms. Among them were "Scripture Way of Salvation," "The Lord Our Righteousness," and "The Repentance of Believers."

Students who are dubious of my judgments of the evidence for the earlier dating of a sermon (summarized or cited in the parentheses following the title and text) may of course rely on the publication date, uniformly cited in the same place. Indeed, they will occasionally find evidence for a more aggressive judgment. For in all periods, whenever I found the text, or the description of a sermon seemingly on that text, noted in either the Journal or the Sermon Register at a date much earlier than the one I assigned to Wesley's composition of the substance of the published version, I have indicated that and other alternative possibilities in the parenthetical note.

When Wesley began publishing additional sermons in the Arminian Magazine in January 1781, he made my task seem easier by signing many of them with a date. But he never told his readers whether that date represented the first substantial composition and delivery of the sermon, or simply the time he prepared it for publication. I suspect the latter was frequently the case. When, therefore, I have run across significant or frequent use of the text of such a dated sermon at an earlier time I have either indicated the early use of the text in the parenthetical note or, when the Journal or other cited sources justified it, simply assigned the earlier date in the left-hand margin. In cases where Wesley assigned no date, I felt more free to rely on other evidence. Examples are the important undated sermons, "On Patience" and "On Perfection," published in March of 1784 and 1785, respectively. I have found reason to believe that both were composed at the dates cited in his Journal for 1761. I have also cited in the parenthetical notes important earlier references to the texts of the very latest group of sermons that Wesley published and dated from 1788 onward.

For the essays, prefaces, and polemical letters Wesley published to explain and defend the scriptural and doctrinal basis of his teaching, I have generally used the dates appended to them in the Works, and cited the volume and page number in the attached parenthetical notes, unless the Journal clearly indicates the date of their composition. The latter, of course, takes priority. But in some cases, as indicated in the notes, I have had to rely-or for what I thought were sufficient reasons chosen to rely-upon Richard Green's bibliography.

Those who use this list should know that I have prepared it while concerned primarily with three aspects of John Wesley's theology: his view of the nature of the authority and inspiration of Scripture; his doctrine of the Holy or (as he himself translated the Hebrew adjective) the "Sanctifying" Spirit; and his doctrine of Christian perfection. I assume that my focus upon these issues caused me to miss or search less intensely for probable earlier dates of sermons on other subjects. A glance at the dates I have assigned to sermons Wesley preached during the years from 1756 to 1765 will make clear not only how preoccupation with these three issues shaped

my work, but also how crucial the doctrine of entire sanctification was to him during that significant decade.

Unless Albert Outler's edition of Wesley's sermons, part of the new Oxford edition of his Works, appears before the publication of this list, many students will be surprised at the absence of several favorites. The great one "On the Holy Spirit," described in the many earlier editions of his Works as preached at Oxford in 1736, when Wesley was in Georgia, was not his. The manuscript, discovered among Wesley's papers after his death and published by Thomas Jackson in 1830, is in the handwriting of John Gambold; and Wesley himself seems to have written the note on the back attributing it to Gambold. The sermon on "Grieving the Holy Spirit of God" he borrowed almost entirely from William Tilly. He often quoted the text, however, and in seeming reference to the substance of the sermon.

This loss of pieces of inauthentic evidence concerning Wesley's doctrinal development before Aldersgate is balanced, however, by the recent discovery of new and authentic ones. The manuscript copies of most of the sermons published by permission of Charles Wesley's widow over the great poet's name in 1816 are in fact in John Wesley's handwriting, as are the dates between 1724 and 1736 when he preached them. Those titled "Winning Souls," "A Single Intention," and "Love of God and Neighbour" join the early Wesley canon, alongside "Circumcision of the Heart" and several recently discovered manuscript ones to be published in Dr. Outler's first volume. Together, they give us a much richer view of the theology of sanctification he had carved out of Scripture before he perceived its pervasive promise that the two sublime moments of assurance, bringing regeneration and purity of heart, are crucial to the process by which God perfects His children in love, and that both come "by grace, . . . through faith, and that not of ourselves but by the gift of God."

It would seem to me helpful if Wesley scholars should adopt henceforth the practice of citing in footnote references to his Works the title of the particular essay, preface, tract or sermon being quoted, and in each case put the likely or certain date of its composition in parentheses following the title, before indicating the volume and page number where it appears in the Works. This would focus the attention of all readers on particular writings, and keep before us always the necessity of considering each one in the context of related events described or alluded to in his other works composed around the same time.

Abbreviations

AM-The Arminian Magazine

CWS-Charles Wesley, Sermons . . . (London, 1816).

DWJ-John Wesley, "Diary," in parallel dated notes to JJW, listed below.

GB-Richard Green, The Works of John and Charles Wesley. A Bibliography (rev. ed.; London, 1906). The number following the abbreviation is the one in Green's series, not the page number.

JCW-Charles Wesley, Journal (ed. Thomas Jackson; 2 vols.; London, 1849; reprinted, Kansas City, Missouri, 1980).

JJW-John Wes1ey, Journal (ed. Nehemiah Curnock; 8 vols.; London, 1909-16).

LJW-John Wesley, Letters (ed. John Telford; 8 vols.; London, 1931).

MARC-Methodist Archives and Research Center, The John Rylands Library of the University of Manchester, England.

OJW-Albert C. Outler, John Wesley (The Library of Protestant

Thought, NY, 1964).

SR-Sermon Register of John Wesley's texts, by date, from 14 January

1747 to 25 December 1761, in JJW, VIII, 171-252.

WJW-John Wesley, Works (14 vols.; New York, 1872; reprinted,

Grand Rapids, Mich., 1958-59, and Kansas City, Mo., 1978).

WJWJ-John Wesley, Works (ed. Thomas Jackson; 3rd ed.; London, 1829-31).

*Dated from mss. at MARC
**Dated from SR

Date	Sermon No.	Sermons	Tracts, Essays, Prefaces, Pub. Letters
*11/21/1725		"Seek Ye First the Kingdom," Matt. 6:33 (P. London, facs. of ms., 1903)	
*9/29/1726		"On Guardian Angels," Ps. 91:11 (P 1816, CWS)	
*1/11/1727	135.	"0n Mourning for the Dead," 2 Sam. 12:23 (P. 1830, WJWJ)	
*10/6/1727	136.	"On Corrupting the Word of God," 2 Cor. 11:17 (P. 1830, WJWJ)	
*7/4/1730		"On the Sabbath," Ex. 20:8 (P. 1816, CWS)	
*10/13/1730		"The Promise of Understanding," Jo. 13:7 (P. 1816, CWS)	
2/19/1732	101.	"The Duty of Constant Communion," Luke 22:19 (P. May, 1787, AM)	
*9/31/1732	140.	"0n Public Diversions," Amos 3:6 (P. 1830, WJWJ)	
*7/12/1731		"Winning Souls," Prov. 11:30 (P. 1816, CWS)	

1/l/1733	17.	"Circumcision of the Heart," Ro. 2:29 (P. 1748, GB 107)	
*9/15/1733		"Love of God and Neighbour," Mk. 12:13 (P 1816, CWS)	
1733			A Collection of Forms of Prayer for Every Day in the Week (P. 1733, GB 1) WJW, XI, 203-37.
1733	138.	[from William Tillyl, "On Grieving the Holy Spirit," Eph. 4:30 (P 1830, WJWJ)	
*5/?/1734		"The One Thing Needful," Luke 10:42 (P 1816, CWS; cf. JJW, 811411739; and cf. SR 111611761 with JJW 11/2, 13, 29/1761)	
9/21/1735	127.	"The Trouble and Rest of Good Men," Job 3:17 (P 1735, GB 5)	
1735			" Preface " to Thomas a ' Kempis, The Christian 's Pattern, or. . . the Imitation of Christ (P 1735, GB 3), WJW, XIV, 199-210.
*2/4/1736		"A Single Intention," Matt. 6:22-23 (P 1816, CWS)	
2/20/1737	139.	"0n Love," I Cor. 13:3 (P 1830, WJWJ)	
6/7/1738	l.	"Salvation By Faith," Eph. 2:8 (P 1738, GB 8)	
11/12-18/1738			The Doctrine of Salvation, Faith, and Good Works Extracted from the Homilies of the Church of England (P 1739, GB 9), text in OJW, 123-34.
2/9/1739			"Preface" to Barnes, Two Treastises . . . On Justification By Faith Only (P 1739, GB 14), WJW, XIV, 21 1-14.

4/25/1739	9.	"The Spirit of Bondage and Adoption," Ro. 8:15 (P 1746 GB 88 cf. LJW, 4/30 and 11/14/1739, and JJW, 10/7, 23, 24/1739)
4/29/1739	128	"Free Grace," Ro. 8:32 (P 1739, GB 11)
	.	
7/21/1739	21.	"Sermon on the Mount- I," Matt. 5:1-4 (P 1748, GB 107; cf. JJW, 4/1, 8l26, 10/15, and 10/19/1739)
7/21/1739	22.	"Sermon on the Mount- II," Matt. 5:5-7 (same refs. as preceding)
7/21/1739	23.	"Sermon on the Mount- III," Matt. 5:8-12 (same refs. as preceding)
9/23/1739	l9.	"The Great Privilege of Those That are Born of God," I John 3:9 (P 1748, GB 107)
10/6/1739	5.	"Justification by Faith," Ro. 4:5 (P 1746, GB 88; cf. JJW, 10/18 and 12/13/1739)
11/7/1739	40.	"Christian Perfection," Phil. 3:12 (P 1741, GB 29; cf. DJW, 11/7/1739, and JJW, 11/15, 25/1739 and 1/4/1741)
11/15/1739	16.	"The Means of Grace," Mal. 3:7 (P 1746, GB 88)

1739	"Preface" to the first volume of Hymns and Sacred Poems (P 1739, GB 15), WJW, XIV, 319-22.
1740	"Preface" to the second volume of Hymns and Sacred Poems (P 1740, GB 19), WJW, XIV, 322-37.
8/8/1740	Letter "To the Church of God at Herrnhuth," WJW, I, 326-32.

10/22-26/1740	24.	"Sermon on the Mount- IV," Matt. 5:13-16 (P 1748, GB 107; cf. JWJ. 4/1, 7/21, 8/26, and 10/19/1739)
10/22-26/1740	25.	"Sermon on the Mount- V," Matt. 5:17-20 (same refs. as preceding, and also JJW, 5/15/1739)
10/22-26/1740	26.	"Sermon on the Mount- VI," Matt. 6:1-15 (same refs. as preceding)
4/3/1741	18.	"Marks of the New Birth," John 3:8 (P 1748, GB 107)
6/24/1741	134.	"True Christianity Defended," Isa. 1:21 (P 1830, WJWJ)
6/27/1741	35.	"The Law Established Through Faith, Discourse I," Ro. 3:31 (P 1750, GB 139)
7/25/1741	2.	"The Almost Christian," Acts 26:28 (P 1741, GB 28)
9/3/1741		Conversation with Count Zinzendorf (P 1744, in Latin, JJW, 91311741; tr. in Henry Moore, Life of the Rev. John . . ., The Rev. Charles Wesley. . ., 2 vols., London, 1824, I, 481-8).
10/18/1741	6.	"The Righteousness of Faith," Ro. 10:5-8 (P 1746, GB 88)
4/4/1742	3.	C. Wesley, "Awake Thou That Sleepest," Eph. 5:14 (P 1742, GB 33; cf. JJW 5/22/1739)
Spring 1742		" Preface " to the third volume of Hymns and Sacred Poems (P 1742, GB 40) WJW, XIV, 328-30. 61211742 25."Sermon on the Mount- X," Matt. 7:1-12 (P 1750, GB 139)
6/6/1742	7.	"The Way to the Kingdom," Mark 1:15 (P 1746, GB 88)

6/2/1742 25 "Sermon on the Mount X,"
. Matt. 7:1-12 (P 1750, GB 139)

Fall 1742 Principles of a Methodist (P 1742, GB 35; cf. sec. 12:1-3, quoting pref. to 3rd vol. Hymns and Sacred Po em s J, WJ W , V I I I , 359-74.

1742 The Character of a Methodist (P 1742, GB 34), WJW, VIII, 339-46.

1/30/1743 32. "Sermon on the Mount- XII," Matt. 7:15-20 (P 1750. GB 139)

2/22/1743 Nature, Design, and General Rules of the United Societies. . . (P 1743, GB 43; cf. JJW, 5/1/1743), WJW, VIII, 269-71.

5/29/1743 45. "The New Birth," John 3:7 (P 1760, GB 200; cf. SR 311611755 and 8 other occasions before 4/26/1756, and 17 times between 5/16/1758 and 4/27/1759).

August 1743 Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion (P 1743, GB 47; cf. JJW 911211743), WJW, VIII, 1-45.

2/17/1744 50. "The Use of Money," Luke 16:9 (P 1760, GB 200; cf. SR 911511755, 10/31/1758, 1/31/1759).

8/24/1744 4. "Scriptural Christianity," Acts 4:31 (P 1744, GB 55; cf. JJW, 4/2 and 41171 1739).

12/22/1744 A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, Part I (P 1745, GB 63; dated WJW, VIII, 134), WJW, VIII, 46-135. 1744-1747

1744-1747	Minutes of Some Late Conversations Between the Rev. Mr. Wesley and Others (P 1749. GB 135; dated by year and day in WJW, VIII, 275-98).
6/25/1745	"The First-Fruits of the Spirit," Rom. 8:1 (P 1746, GB 88)
1745	A Dialogue Between an Antinomian and His Friend (P 1745, GB 70), WJW,X, 266-75.
2/2/1745	An Answer to the Rev. Mr. IThomas] Church 's Remarks on the Rev. Mr. John Wesley's Last Journal (P 1745, GB 65; dated in WJW,VIII, 413), WJW, VIII, 375-413.
8/24/1745	A Second Dialogue Between an Antinomian and His Friend (P 1745, GB 71; dated in WJW, X, 284) WJW,X, 276-84.
10/l0/l745	Advice to the People Called Methodists (P 1745 GB 73; dated in WJW VIII, 359), WJW, VIII 351-59.
11/25/1745	A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, Part II (P 1745, GB 64), WJW, VIII, 136-200
1745	A Collection of Prayers for Families (P 1745, GB 74), WJW,XI, 237-58.
12/18/1745	A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion Part III (P 1746,GB 65, dated in WJW,VIII, 247) WJW,VIII, 201-47.
6/17/1746	The Principles of a Methodist Farther Explained Occasioned by the Reverend Mr. Church's Second Letter to Mr. Wesley (P 1746, GB 87), WJW,VIII, 414-80.

May-Aug/1746	0.	"The Witness of the Spirit -I," Rom. 8:16 (P 1746, GB 88)
May-Aug/1746	6.	"The Means of Grace," Mal. 3:7 (P 1746, GB 88)
May-Aug/1746	2.	"The Witness of our own Spirit," 2 Cor. 1:12 (P 1746, GB 88)
6/11/1747		Letter to . . . The Lord Bishop of London, Occasioned by His Lordship's Late Charge to the Clergy (P 1747, GB 103; dated in WJW, VIII, 495), WJW, VIII, 481-95.
11/1-16/1747	7.	"Sermon on the Mount- VII," Matt. 6:16-18 (P 1748, GB 107).
11/1-16/1747	8.	"Sermon on the Mount- VIII," Matt. 6:19-23 (P 1748, GB 107; cf. JJW, 912811740)
11/1-16/1747	9.	"Sermon on the Mount- IX," Matt. 6:24-34 (P 1748, GB 107).
2/10/1748		A Letter to a Person Lately Joined with the People Called Quahers (P 1748, GB 108; dated in WJW, X, 177), WJW,X, 177-88.
5/4/1748		A Letter to a Clergyman (P 1748, GB 110; dated in WJW,VIII, 496), WJW, VIII, 496-99.
1/2-1 9/1749		A Letter to the Reuerend Doctor Conyers Middleton, Occasioned by His Late "Free Inquiry" (P 1749 GB 121; cf. WJW,X, 79) WJW,X, 1-79.
Winter/1749		A Plain Account of the People Called Methodists: In a Letter Written to the Rev. mr. Perronet, Vicar of Shoreham (p1749, GB 126; dated by year only in WJW, VIII, 248), WJW, VIII, 248-68.

7/18/1749		A Letter to a Roman Catholic (P 1749, GB 134; dated in WJW, X, 86), WJW, X, 80-86.
9/8/1749	39. "Catholic Spirit," 2 Kings, 10:15 (P 1750, GB 139; cf. separate printing, 1755, GB 170).	
11/1-7/1749	31. "Sermon on the Mount- XI," Matt. 7:13-14 (P 1750, GB 139).	
11/1-7/1749	33. "Sermon on the Mount- XIII," Matt. 7:21-27 (P 1750, GB 139).	
11/1-7/1749	36. "The Law Established Through Faith, Discourse, II," Rom. 3:31 (P 1750, GB 139).	
11/1-7/1749	34. "The Original Nature, Property, and Use of the Law," Rom. 7:12 (P 1750, GB 139).	
11/1-7/1749	37. "The Nature of Enthusiasm," Acts 26:24 (P 1750, GB 139; cf. JJW, 51201 1739).	
11/1-7/1749	38. "A Caution Against Bigotry," Mark 9:38-39 (P 1750, GB 139).	
11/1-7/1749	42. "Satan's Devices," II Cor. 2:11 (P 1750, GB 139).	
3/9/1750	129. [Charles Wesley], "The Cause and Cure of Earthquakes," Psalm 46:8 (P 1750, GB 141; JCW, 3/19/1750)	
**3/1/1751	46. "The Wilderness State," John 16:22 (P 1760, GB 200, cf. SR 5125, 5/30/1751, 5 subsequent occasions that year, and 21 occasions on 1752)	
1751		Serious Thoughts on the Perseverance of the Saints (P 1751, GB 153; cf. JJW, 24 August 1743), WJW, X, 284-98.

11/19/1751		A Second Letter to the [Lord Bishop Lavington, of Exeter] Author of "The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared " (P 1751, GB 152) WJW, IX, 1 5-60.
12/20/1751		Letter on Preaching Christ (P 1779 in AM, GB 338; dated in WJW, XI, 486), WJW, XI, 486-92.
**2/5/1752	49. "The Cure of Evil-Speaking," Matt. 18:15-17 P 1760, GB 200: cf. SR, 6 other occasions in 1752)	
1752		Predestination Calmly Considered (P 1752, GB 155), WJW, X, 204-59.
**5/5/1754	47. "Heaviness through Manifold Temptations," 1 Peter 1:6 (P 1760, GB 200; cf. SR 5/15/1754, and 7 more occasions by 3/15/56)	
**5/15/1754	44. "Original Sin," Gen. 6:5 (P 1759, GB 196, cf. SR, frequently after 5/15/1754)	
1754-1755		Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament (P 1755, GB 172; 2nd ed., 1760; cf. JJW, 1/4 and 2/27/1754, 10/27/1755, 12/12/1759, and, on the preparation of his last edition, 12/4-6/1787; cf. also LJW, III, 126, 130, 179).
**2/17/1755	48. "Self-Denial," Luke 9:23 (P 1760, GB 200; cf. SR 3/24/1755, and JJW 8/16/1744 and 2/17/1745).	
1/5-9/1756		An Address to the Clergy (P 1756, GB 175; cf. LJW, III, to his wife, 21611756), WJW, X, 480-500.
2/5/1756		"On Christian Perfection. To the Rev. Mr. Dodd" (P. 1779, AM, GB 338; dated in WJW, XI, 448), WJW, XI. 448-49.

3/12/1756			"An Answer to the Rev. Mr. Dodd" (P 1779, AM, GB 338; dated in LJW, III, 167), WJW, XI 450-54.
6/18 to 11/30/1756			
3/10/1758	15.	"The Great Assize," Ro. 14:10 (P 1758, GB 185)	
5/14/1758	51.	"The Good Steward," Luke 16:2 (P 1768, GB 251; cf. SR 6/21/1758 and 4/8/1759)	
**5/22/1758	43.	"Scripture Way of Salvation," Eph. 2:8 (P 1765, GB 230; cf. SR 7/13/1758, and many times thereafter and JJW 3/30/1764)	
**5/26/1758	14.	"The Repentance of Believers," Mk. 1:15 (P 1768, GB 248; SR records this text 18 more times by 7/8/1759)	
10/1/1758	92.	"0n Zeal," Gal. 4:18 (P Sept. 1781, AM; cf. SR 1/14/1759)	
*10/22/1758	20.	"The Lord Our Righteousness," Jer. 23:6 (P 1766 GB 235; cf. SR 10/26/1755 and 4/10/1756, and JJW 11/24/1765)	
11/4/1758			"A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Potter," (dated in WJW, IX, 96), WJW, IX, 89-96.
12/9/1758	62.	"The End of Christ's Coming," I John 3:8 (P July 1781, AM; cf. SR 121251 1758)	

10/16/1759		Thoughts on Christian Perfection (P 1760, with 4th vol. of Sermons, GB 200; cf, JJW 91911759); OJW, 283-97, is the only readily available text.
11/30/1760	41. "Wandering Thoughts," II Cor. 10:5 (P 1760, GB 200 and 276; cf. SR 11/30/ 1760, 1/1/1761).	
1760		"Advice to the People Called Methodists With Regard to Dress" (P 1760, with 4th vol. of Sermons, GB 200), WJW, XI, 466-77.
3/29/1761	76. "0n Perfection," Heb. 6:1 (P March 1785, AM; cf. JJW 3/29, 6/28, 11/2, and 11/29/1761; cf. SR 91281 1758, 1/25 and 912711759, 6/26 and 10/19/1760, and 3/12, 4/4, 7/9, and 9/21/1761).	
7/13/1761	83. "On Patience," James 1:4 (P March 1784, AM; cf. JJW 12/16/1740)	
**10/27/1761	110. "0n the discoveries of Faith," Heb. 11:1 (P July 1789, AM, and dated there; cf. SR 1/14, 15, 23/ 1759, and JJW, 11/2, 13, 29/1761)	
**11/29/1761	118. "On a Single Eye," Matt. 6:22-23 (P Nov. 1790, AM, and dated there 9/25/1789; cf. SR 11/11/1761, and JJW 11/2, 11, 16/1761)	
12/21/1761		Farther Thoughts on Christian Perfection (P 1761, GB 219; cf. JJW 1112911761). Cf. WJW, XI, 414-27.
3/8/1762		A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Horne (P 1762, GB), WJW, IX, 110-17.

4/5/1762		Thoughts on the Imputed Righteousness of Christ (P 1762, GB 211; dated in WJW, X, 312-15.
1762		A Blow at the Rook or Christ Stabbed in the House of His Friends (Luke xxii:46J (P 1762, GB 212), WJW, X, 364-69.
1762		Cautions and Directions Given to the Greatest Professors in the Methodist Societies (P 1762, GB 213 cf. OJW, 299 the only readily available text).
11/29/1762	A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop lWarburtonl of Gloucester; Occasioned by his Track "On the Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit" (P 1763, GB 216), WJW, IX 117-73.	
1/30/1763	52. "The Reformation of Manners," P. 94:16 (P 1763 GB 217).	
3/28/1763	13. "0n Sin in Believers," II Cor. 5:17 (P 1763, GB 218- cf. JJW llll and 5/3/1741 and SR 1/1/1756, 1/1/1758, and 2/2/1760.	
1762-1765		Explanatory Notes Upon the Old Testament (P 1765, GB 234; dated 412511756 in Preface, reprinted in WJW, XIV, 253)
1765		A Short History of Methodism (P 1765, GB 229 WJW, VIII, 347-51.
Feb. 1766		A Plain Account of Christian Perfection as Belieued and Taught by the Rever end Mr. John Wesley, from the Year 1725 to the Year 176/[6?]7 (P 1766, GB 238; cf JJW 511411765, and LJW 212811766, WJW, XI, 366-445.

May 1766			Some Remarks on "A Defense of the Preface to the Edinburgh Edition of Aspasio Vindicated " (P 1766, GB 236; dated in WJW, X, 346), WJW, X, 346-50.
4/4/1767	11.	"THe Witness of the Spirit --II,"Rom. 8:16 (p 1767, GB 242)	
11/18/1770	53.	"On the Death of the Rev. Mr. George Whitefield," Num. 23:10 (P 1770, GB 266)	
9/9/1772			Some Remarks on Mr. Hill's "Review of All the Doctrines Taught by Mr. John Wesley" (P 1772, GB 283; dated in WJW, X, 414), WJW, X, 374-414.
3/14/1773			Some Remarks on Mr. Hill 's "Farrago Double- Distined (p 1773, GB 287; dated in WJW, X 446), WJW, X, 415-46.
6/5/1773	55.	"0n the Trinity," I John, 5:7 (P 1775, GB 306; cf. JJW 61111760, and 5171 1775)	
5/14/1774			Thoughts Upon Necessity (P 1774, GB 300; dated in WJW, X, 474), WJW, X, 457-74.
9/11/1775	84.	"The Important Question," Matt. 16:26 (P 1775 GB 308; cf. SR, 512111758 and 11/12/1761)	
11/7/1775	130.	"National Sins and Miseries," II Sam. 24:17 (P-1775, GB 309)	
4/21/1777	132.	"0n Laying the Foundation of the New Chapel, Near City-Road, London," Num. 23:23 (P 1777, GB 317)	

11/21/1777	99. "The Reward of the Righteous" Matt. 25:34 (P 1777, GB 324)	
5/20/1778	86. "A Call to Backsliders," Ps. 77:7-8 (P 1778, GB 329)	
1778 1.	13 "Some Account of the Late Work of God in North America," Ezek. 1:16 (P 1778. GB 331)	
12/5/1779 7.	10 "0n God's Vineyard," Isaiah 5:4 (P Jan. 1789, AM; cf. Journal, 4/3/1780).	
1779		Thoughts on Salvation by Faith (P 1779, GB 338, in AM), WJW, XI, 492-96.
1780	87. "The Danger of Riches" I Tim. 6:9 (P Jan. 178; AM)	
12/22/1780	77. "Spiritual Worship," I John, 5:20 (P Mar. 1781, AM, and dated there)	
1/5/1781	78. "Spiritual Idolatry," I John, 5:21 (P May 1781, AM, and dated there)	
7/6/1781	70. "The Case of Reason Impartially Considered" I Cor. 14:20 (P Nov. 1781 AM, and dated there)	
11/30/1781	60. "The General Deliverance, " ["Free Thoughts on the Brute Creation"], Ro. 8:19-22 (P Jan. 1782, AM, and dated there)	
12/?/1781		A Short History of the People Called Methodists, (Wesley's abridgment of his Journals) (P 1781, GB 355; dated in WJW, XIII, 303, 381), WJW, XIII, 303-81 . 3/13/1782 57. "On the Fall of Man," Gen. 3:19 (P May 1782, AM, and dated there; cf. SR 2/16 and 2/18/1759)
1/20/1782	93. "On Redeeming the Time," Eph. 5:16 (P Mar. 1782, AM, and dated there; cf. SR, 1/14/1759)	

3/13/1782	57	“On the Fall of Man,” Gen. 3:29 (P May 1782, AM, and dated there; cf. SR 2/16 and 2/18/1759)
1782	56.	"God's Approbation of His Works," Gen. 1:31 (P July 1782, AM)
7/9/1782	59.	"God's Love to Fallen Men," Ro. 5:15 (P Sept. 1782, AM, and dated there)
8/29/1782	71.	"0f Good Angels," Heb. 1:14 (P Jan. 1783, AM, and dated there; cf. SR, 11/25/1758)
10/10/1782	73.	"0f Hell," Mark 9:48 (P Nov. 1782, AM, and dated there)
1/7/1783	72.	"0f E,vil Angels," Eph. 6:12 (P Mar. 1783, AM, and dated there)
1783	61.	"The Mystery of Iniquity," II Thess. 2:7 (P May 1783, AM, and dated there)
4/22/1783	63.	"The General Spread of the Gospel," Isaiah 11:9 (P July 1783, AM, and dated there)
5/26/1783	94.	"0n Family Religion," Josh. 24:15 (P Sept. 1783, AM, and dated there)
7/12/1783	95.	"On the Education of Children," Prov. 22:6 (P Nov. 1783, AM, and dated there cf. SR, 4123158 and 7/11/1758, and JJW 6/24/1748)
1783	79.	"On Dissipation," I Cor. 7:35 (P Jan. 1784, AM)
3/5/1784	69.	"The Imperfection of Human Knowledge, " I Cor. 13:10 (P May 1784, AM, and dated there)

4/28/1784	68.	"The Wisdom of God's Counsels," Ro. 11:33 (P July 1784, AM, and dated there)
1784	96.	"0bedience to Parents," Col. 3:20 (P Sept. 1784, AM)
7/17/1784	81.	"In What Sense We Are to Leave the World," II Cor. 6:17-18 (P Nov. 1784, AM, and dated there)
10/15/1784	91.	"On Charity," I Cor. 13:1-3 (P Jan. 1785, AM, and dated there)
3/18/1785	97.	"0n Obedience to Pastors," Heb. 13:17 (P May 1785, AM, and dated there)
1785	90.	"An Israelite Indeed," John 1:47 (P July 1785, AM; cf. SR 6/22/1755)
1785	85.	"0n Working Out Our Own Salvation," Phil. 2:12-13 (P Sept. 1785, AM)
1785	64.	"The New Creation," Rev. 21:5 (P Nov. 1785, AM)
9/28/1785	74.	"0f the Church," Eph. 4:1-6 (P Jan. 1786, AM, and dated there; cf. SR, 6/16/1754 and 4/28/1756)
10/24/1785	133.	"On the Death of the Rev. Mr. John Fletcher," Ps. 37:37 (P 1785, GB 382; dated in Works, VI, 449; cf. Journal, 1/16/1785, date preached)
3/3/1786	67.	"0n Divine Providence," Luke 12:7 (P Mar. 1786, AM, and dated there)
3/30/1786	75.	"On Schism" I Cor. 12:25 (P May 1786, AM, and dated there)

3/31/1786		Some Thoughts on An Expression of St. Paul, in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, Chapter V, Verse 23 (P 1786, AM, GB 391; dated in WJW, XI, 448), WJW XI, 447-48.
5/1/1786	80. 0n Friendship with the World," James 4:4 (P July 1786, AM, and dated there)	
5/23/1786	98. 0n Visiting the Sick," Matt. 25:36 (P Sept. 1786, AM, and dated there)	
6/28/1786	54. On Eternity," Ps. 90:2 (P Nov. 1786, AM, and dated there)	
9/12/1786		A Short Account of the Life and Death of the Reverend John Fletcher (P 1786, GB 389; dated in WJW, XI, 276), WJW, XI, 273-365. 812711787 66. "The Signs of the Times," Matt. 16:3 (P Mar. 1788, AM, and dated there)
10/7/1786	82. On Temptation," I Cor. 10:13 (P Jan. 1787, AM, and dated there)	
12/30/1786	88. On Dress," I Peter 3:3-4 (P Mar. 1787, AM, and dated there)	
1787	89. The More Excellent Way," I Cor. 12:31 (P July 1787, AM)	
5/22/1787	100. 0n Pleasing All Men," Ro. 15:2 (P Sept. 1787, AM, and dated there)	
6/27/1787	102. Of Former Times," Eccles. 7:10 (P Nov. 1787, AM, and dated there)	
7/23/1787	103. What Is Man?" Ps. 8:34 (P May 1788, AM, and dated there)	
7/28/1787	65. The Duty of Reproving Our Neighbor," Lev. 19:17 (P Jan. 1788, AM, and dated there)	

8/27/1787	666	“The Sings of the Times,” Matt. 16:3 (P Mar. 1788, AM, and dated there above)
10/7/1787	104.	"On Attending the Church Service," I Sam. 2:17 (P July 1788, AM, and dated there)
3/25/1788	112.	"The Rich Man and Lazarus," Luke 16:31 P Nov. 1789, AM, and dated there, cf. SR, 212411756 and Dec. 1758)
4/8/1788	105.	"0n Conscience," II Cor. 1-12 (P Sept. 1788, AM, and dated there)
4/9/1788	106.	"0n Faith," Heb. 11:6 (P Nov. 1788, AM, and dated there)
4/22/1788	108.	"0n Riches," Matt. 19:24 (P Mar. 1789, AM, and dated there)
5/2/1788	109.	"What Is Man?" Ps. 8:4 (P May, 1789, AM, and dated there)
8/12/1788	lll.	"On the Omnipresence of God," Jer. 23:24 (P Sept. 1789, AM, and dated there)
12/30/1788	113.	"The Difference Between Walking By Sight and Walking By Faith," II Cor. 5:7 (P Jan. 1790, AM and dated there; cf. SR, 6/9 and 8/23/1758)
4/9/1789	114.	"The Unity of the Divine Being," Mark 12:32 (P Mar. 1790, AM, and dated there)
5/4/1789	115.	"The Ministerial Office," Heb. 5:4 (P May 1790, AM, and dated there)
7/2/1789	116.	"Causes of the Inefficacy of Christianity," Jer. 8:22 (P July 1790, AM, and dated there; cf. SR 5/23, 7129, and 8/27/1758)

8/15/1789	117.	"On Knowing Christ After the Flesh," II Cor. 5:16 (P Sept. 1790, AM, and dated there)
2/19/1790	119.	"On Worldly Folly," Luke 12:20 (P Jan. 1791, AM, and dated there)
3/26/1790	120.	"0n the Wedding Garment," Matt. 22:12 (P Mar. 1791, AM, and dated there)
1790	121.	"Human Life a Dream," Ps. 73:20 (P May 1791, AM)
4/21/1790	123.	"On the Deceitfulness of the Human Heart," Jer. 17:9 (P Jan. 1792, AM, and dated there)
6/17/1790	124.	"The Heavenly Treasure in Earthen Vessels," II Cor. 4:7 (P March 1792, AM, and dated there)
7/6/1790	125.	"On Living Without God," Eph. 2:12 (P May 1792, AM, and dated there)
9/21/1790	126.	"On the Danger of Increasing Riches," Ps. 62:10 (P July 1792, and dated there)
1/17/1791	122.	"0n Faith," Heb. 11:1 (P July 1791, AM, and dated there)

BOOK REVIEW
John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World,

ed. W. Stanford Reid. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, 415 pp.

Wesleyan Arminians will profit much from reading this important symposium on John Calvin's teachings and their influence in many Western countries.

As we read what Calvinist scholars say about the influence of their own teachings, we might be in for a few surprises. For one thing, we Wesleyans have often thought of them as antinomian. John Fletcher's Checks to Antinomianism, of course, has them in mind. This book nowhere suggests that they are antinomian, nor even that they have been thought to be. Instead, e.g., W. Robert Godfrey, in treating "Calvin and Calvinism in the Netherlands," says, "Concern for the piety of the church is inherent in Reformed Christianity" (p. 110). And he then quotes F. E. Stoeffler as saying, " 'Calvinism is intrinsically oriented toward piety' " (ibid.). The book correctly speaks of Calvin's stern discipline in Geneva, and of the Calvinist- Puritans as being similarly interested. In fact, a strong case is made for the "law and order" interest in present-day Fundamentalism, and of the Moral Majority's similar interests, as stemming authentically from the Calvinism of the Puritans of Colonial America.

Another surprise that Arminian readers might be in for is this book's interpretation of the way the Arminians were treated at the Synod of Dort. We Arminians have usually felt that our "forebears" were treated unfairly. Only three of the 42 delegates were Arminians, and they had to drop out because they could not take a certain pledge at the outset. Even the 33 invited, non-voting foreign visitors were all Calvinists (see my "Arminian- ism" in Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia, Moody, 1975). Yet Godfrey says, "The Dutch Calvinists were sensitive to the Remonstrants' claim that they would not receive a fair trial at a national synod," and adds "To insure and to demonstrate the fairness of the proceedings, therefore, the Dutch decided to invite delegations from sister Reformed churches . . ." (p. 106). We Arminians have usually felt that real fairness would have meant that the Arminians would have been part in the inside workings of the synod.

Besides a few possible surprises such as I have mentioned, many of us Arminian-Wesleyan readers will probably receive enlightenment on a

number of important matters. For one thing, the book shows that the roots of the rationalism among Fundamentalists, such as Francis Shaeffer, are in Calvin himself. Calvin had been educated as a humanist, before becoming a Christian; and afterward, he still had much respect for humanists and for human reason as an important aspect of the Sovereign Creator's work. This is in part why courses in apologetics are often offered in Calvinistic colleges and seminaries; but none that I know of, in Wesleyan schools. It is in part why J. Gresham Machen earlier this century, accepted the challenge of the liberals to be rational. The reader will find Calvin's rationalism and humanism discussed in the books first chapter, "Calvinism as a Cultural Force," by Robert D. Knudsen. Knudgen, who says, "Calvin may be called a 'humanist'" (p. 15), writes: "It is a mistake to suppose that Calvin's enduring interest in humanistic studies and in man's cultural development was a simple holdover from the time antedating his conversion to the evangelical faith" p. 15).

Another special way in which the book will enlighten many Arminian-Wesleyans is because it will show us that Calvinism is much broader than the decisions of the Synod of Dort-which were directed specifically against Arminianism. A particular view of the Lord's Supper, for example, that was somewhere between the literalism of Luther and the memorial view of Zwingli although I feel that Zwingli's view includes more than that), is significant in Calvinism. Indeed, R. T. Kendall, who writes outstandingly on "The Puritan Modification of Calving Theology," says that when Mary Tudor "Bloody Mary") acceded to England's throne in 1553, "Calvin's influence . . . was probably more eucharistic than predestinarian" p. 200).

Arminians might also be enlightened by this book's suggestion that Calvin was not only influential in soteriology, but in "ecclesiology." That is, he influenced various countries by his presbyterian form of church government, in which you do not have to waste money, they felt, on the salaries of archbishops and bishops and other administrators. This was only implicit in Calvin, but was made explicit and even dogmatized by Theodore Beza see p. 201).

Still another way in which some of us might be enlightened by the book is because it points out the difference between Calvin and Calvinism, and we have not always been sufficiently careful to do this. On this matter, Calvin himself taught that Christ's atonement was unlimited, whereas Beza is the one who said that it wag limited to the elect in its efficacy-so that one of the writers says that Calvin became Calvinism in Beza.

We might also be enlightened by reading Calvinists on Calvinism, because they put its teachings positively, and we tend to outline the teachings negatively. For example, they like to talk about God's sovereignty, and we often say, with Arminius, that they teach that this sovereign God is even the author of sin.

This volume also treats in some detail Peter Ramus on pp. 86ff. whose logic Arminius took up with); and in considerable detail the work of William Perkins pp. 202ff), whose Beza-influenced supralapsarianism Arminius responded to in one of his most important works. Carl Bangs' Arrninius Abingdon, 1974 regretfully out of print) mentions Ramus and Perkins, of course; but this new book tells us more about them.

The scholarship in the book is most commendable. The writers of the chapters were well chosen, as experts, and the *festschrift* which they produced, to honor Church Historian Paul Woolley, long of Westminster Theological Seminary, contains careful treatments in the fields of theology and church history. There might be a bit of the unscholarly and prejudicial, as when Godfrey speaks of "Calvinism's five answers to the five errors of Arminianism" p. 108), not putting "errors" in quotes. Yet on the whole, it is written with commendable objectivity. Calvinism is faulted on a number of counts. This includes Calvin's responsibility for Servetus' martyrdom; the Puritans' putting to death an American divinity student who, according to one witness only, denied the divinity of Christ; and their exploiting the American Indians on the basis that they themselves, the Colonial American Puritans, were the true Israel that was especially blessed of God. The book states that John Knox and others have had to modify Calvin's understanding that heads of state are ordained of God. It also admits that the Colonial American Calvinists did not succeed very well in their attempt to make the whole culture Christian. Along with the heroism of Knox and others, it tells of how prudent William Perkins was, in teaching only his supralapsarianism, and not his beliefs relating to presbyterian church government, at a time when in England you could be summarily burned for the latter teaching.

Nazarene Theological Seminary J. Kenneth Grider

Kansas City, Missouri