

Oxford Paper Draft

Introduction

On the face of it, the work of John Wesley is an odd place to look for resources to support Christian efforts to collaborate with those of other faiths, or no faith at all. One would be hard pressed to identify a thinker more comprehensively and exhaustively *theological* in his approach to questions; indeed, it is his theological view that determines what appear to him as questions to begin with. The matters of what we would call social or political concern with which he is so assiduously engaged come into view for Wesley only because he regards them as aspects of fidelity or infidelity. Moreover, there is nothing at all generic about his idea of faithfulness. It is expressed with passionate particularity in terms of trust in the redeeming work of Jesus Christ; framed by the all-absorbing occupation of being conformed in everything to his image; and lived out as the external manifestation of an ongoing transformation wrought by God in the soul. John Wesley's practical work is the visible expression of a quite specific confession, and inseparable from it. (It is entertaining to imagine what he might have made of someone who declared according to the current fashion that she was "spiritual but not religious.") However compelling it may be for us to wrestle with the issue of Christian cooperation in interfaith or secular work in the public realm in our own day, we must acknowledge that it is not a question that Wesley ever addressed directly and explicitly.

Nor are the strategies by which such undertakings have commonly been understood and supported in recent decades especially congenial to Wesley's thought. He does not, for instance, cleanly separate Christians' outward engagements in the world from the faith that directs and motivates them. I expect the contemporary notion that we might share public or political activities with all similarly disposed persons, while maintaining a distinctive and as it were

‘private’ set of beliefs or purposes that inform their meaning for us, would have seemed to him odd at best. To Wesley’s way of thinking, even the most practical and mundane acts of care are forms of proclamation as much as forms of service. In all such works we embody the very presence of Christ, and it is his light, healing, nourishment or succor that we have to offer and nothing else. We do not merely come in Christ’s name: we come in his company, and one might almost say that we come in his *person*, moved by his love, animated by his spirit, incarnating the mercy of God bestowed on us in himⁱ. Like most theologians of his time, Wesley does not separate theology and ethics, but more than that he insists that there can be no real division between faith and practice. As he presses upon his flock in his preaching till the very last, it is no use to hold up the orthodoxy of your confession if your conduct does not embody it; what you enact IS what you believe. To think otherwise is to have what he calls “the faith of demons”, who believe and tremble.ⁱⁱ It is on this account that I have argued elsewhere that John Wesley did not have a social ethics as we think of it, or a political theology either; he had a vigorous and comprehensive understanding of the gospel, and simply sought to make every aspect of human existence captive to it.ⁱⁱⁱ

Wesley’s theology also lacks some of the features that commonly undergird interfaith and secular pursuits of the social good among Christian thinkers. In particular, he does not have a positive view of (fallen) human nature. One can fairly say that of all the Protestant reformers he has the bleakest anthropology, persuaded that the fall into sin deprived humankind not only of spiritual life and communion with God, but even of their intellectual faculties.^{iv} In this utterly impoverished state, we neither know nor desire the good, much less have the inner resources to advance it. Unsurprisingly, therefore, Wesley does not have a vigorous natural theology, a confidence that those without access to the special revelation of Scripture or the preached Word

can find their way to the truth of God by unaided reason or by inference from creation. He is unconvinced that rational arguments for God's existence can significantly aid unbelievers in coming to know God as Redeemer.^v Similarly, he denies that the apparent purposiveness of nature can offer the evidence of God's *character* that leads to saving faith. Reason supports faith, Wesley believes, and a knowledge of creation's intricacies can offer *believers* grounds for praise, and nourish their confidence in the wisdom and power of God.^{vi} Neither, however, can stand apart from God's self-revelation as a means to the faith and hope that brings us to the one essential, the love of God. None of this would seem to bode well for Wesley's theological offspring seeking support for collaboration with those outside the Christian faith as a means of pursuing our mission in the world.

Having acknowledged all the features of Wesley's work that make it seem an unlikely resource for the present project, I now propose to draw upon it all the same. I will do so in three dimensions: in its theological substance, in its theological method, and in the practical strategies Wesley was led over time to adopt in his leadership of the Methodist movement. In fairness, I recognize that I may be mining this material in ways Wesley did not envision or directly intend. I hope nevertheless to persuade you that we as Wesleyans have reasons and resources for honoring and collaborating in our public ministry with others whose religious convictions (or lack of them) place them outside the Christian communion. Still, there are risks in such an undertaking, I think; in the end I will offer (tentatively indeed) some caveats and raise some questions about possible dangers and distortions to which we might be attentive in our efforts to pursue missional work with partners of other faiths, or of no religious faith.

Anthropology and Epistemology

To anyone familiar with the bitterly polemical exchanges between Wesley and his Calvinist critics, it is surprising to see how much John Wesley's account of our natural condition has in common with Calvin's anthropology at its darkest. Wesley's view of the devastation wrought by the fall into sin is both profound and comprehensive. Here if you like is the "total depravity" of Calvinist orthodoxy, a deprivation of good reaching beyond spiritual and moral faculties all the way down to human capacities for knowledge, judgment and rational thought – which is to say, further even than the humanist Calvin is prepared to take it. Humanity is left in a state near to that of the other animals, even the light of reason rendered captive to base desires, shorn of all the glory and dignity that shone in them as God's own image^{vii}.

But for all the darkness of this description, in Wesley's picture of the natural human condition we are beholding a sort of phantasm. According to him, no single human being ever subsists in that condition^{viii}, and indeed no one save the Almighty has ever seen such a spectacle of ruin. Wesley's gospel is overwhelmingly his testimony to God's sovereign love reaching out to overcome the catastrophe of sin. The God who in mercy clothes the first couple even as He casts them from Eden also moves preemptively to restore some of what human wickedness and foolishness have cast away, initiating from the beginning and in perfect liberty the divine work of recovery.

This "preventing" grace of God touches all of Adam's children, restoring to them sufficient reason to make human civilization possible. But Wesley asserts here more than the "common grace" of Calvin's understanding, which has practical utility but no salvific significance. The universal gift of prevenient grace also provides the basis of self-knowledge that will show each person his or her need of God, and liberty sufficient to respond to the pardon

offered through Jesus Christ^{ix}. While it is axiomatic for Wesley is that all human beings *require* God's saving intervention in Christ to escape damnation, it is equally a matter of principle for him that salvation is by God's free grace genuinely *available* to all.

Wesley's account of the universal reach and power of prevenient grace also enables him to acknowledge and make sense of moral insight and virtues of character when these are displayed within non-Christian groups, whether the pre-Christian pagans of antiquity or the unevangelized peoples of Africa and the New World. Where goodness is found apart from the knowledge of Christ, there we encounter evidence of the restorative work of God, sustaining human life in community and preparing the way for the reception of revelation. This conviction shapes his reading of the burgeoning 18th century literature of cross-cultural encounter, as well as informing his approach to the natives of the American continent he expected to evangelize.

It is only fair to say that Wesley's appraisal of the spiritual state of these non-Christian peoples shifted dramatically as his naïve expectation of ready conversions among North American natives was confounded. His frustration and disappointment initially lead him to denounce as "devilish" the existing religious beliefs and practices he encountered among the American Indians^x. But his tone softens significantly over time. Already by the 1740's, we see evidence that Wesley is unwilling to declare that those without the definitive revelation of the Word are thereby shut off from all hope of knowledge of God. In later writings, he avers that the universal revelation through creation aided by God's restoring grace may allow those without special revelation to discern not only God's existence and general attributes, but something of God's nature, and even the rudiments of good and evil^{xi}.

The Potency of Prevenient Grace

It seems that the quality of moral life or spiritual insight that he encounters (in person, or by reading acquaintance) among some of those outside Christian faith is to Wesley a persuasive witness that God is at work in their lives, revealing himself to them despite their ignorance of his Son. Thus provoked, in his latest reflections on the subject, Wesley contemplates that some may even be “taught of God, by His inward voice, all the essentials of religion”, the Holy Spirit reaching directly to the spiritual senses of those with no knowledge of Christ.^{xii} This direct inner revelation might be the source of virtue and holiness that, according to him, revelation through reason or inference from creation alone cannot produce.

One must underscore that Wesley is consistent in saying that all possibility of salvation comes only *through* the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, whether or not a particular recipient knows his name; even prevenient grace flows only from his atoning work.^{xiii} He also argues that only those who **do** know him have the assurance of salvation and the means of entire sanctification, making the work of evangelization still urgent. But the fact remains that Wesley’s developed theological understanding does provide him resources to grasp other religious traditions as, in a broad sense, Spirit-prompted reachings toward the truth of God.

This is less a validation of natural theology as such than it is a manifestation of Wesley’s vigorous doctrine of the Holy Spirit, his essential confidence in God’s will and power to bring all who will come into his fold. In Wesley, particularly in his mature thought, pneumatology frames and determines both soteriology and ecclesiology, and the freedom and power of the Spirit of God defies prediction and constraint. His long pastoral experience qualifies his confidence in any theory about the operation of divine grace, including his own. Writing to an unnamed member of the Society in 1771, he acknowledges, “The dealings of God with persons are infinitely varied,

and cannot be confined to any general rule. Both in justification and sanctification, He often acts in a manner we cannot account for.”^{xiv}

Thus, Wesley refuses to declare any group certainly beyond the reach of God’s saving mercy. While he appears ready to consign all who actively **reject** the gospel of Christ to a perdition he regards as self-chosen, he says of “heathens” and “Mahometans” (sic) that their “not believing the whole truth is not owing to want of sincerity, but merely to want of light....It cannot be doubted that this plea will avail for millions of modern heathens: “Inasmuch as to them little is given, of them little will be required.”^{xv} Despite many remarks regarding the limitations and failings of the Judaism of Jesus’ time and since, he extends this reticence regarding their standing before God also to the Jews living after Christ, who “have the oracles of God” but do not recognize the Messiah. They have been blinded to the truth of the gospel, he says, and “it is not our part to pass sentence upon them, but to leave them to their own Master.”^{xvi}

Finally, in a 1790 sermon titled “On Living without God”, Wesley takes the same stance toward all those outside the Christian revelation, and further asserts that no one may do otherwise:

I have no authority from the Word of God to judge those that are without. Nor do I conceive that any man living has a right to sentence all the heathen and Mahometan world to damnation. It is far better to leave them with Him that made them, and who is the Father of the spirits of all flesh, who is the God of the heathens as well as the Christians, and who hateth nothing that he hath made.^{xvii}

While such statements do not directly address the matter of how Christians might cooperate with those outside the Christian faith, they at least suggest that works undertaken out of a desire to serve God or neighbor according to one’s best lights need not be despised. They are not

themselves salvific, as indeed no human works can be; but they may *be signs of God's saving work already underway* in those who do not know Christ.

Wesleyan Soteriology: Works of Mercy as a Means of Grace

Apart from the possibility that efforts to address human suffering may be evidence of God's self-revelation in the life of a non-Christian, there is another dimension. Service to those in need may also be part of the process by which the Spirit of God brings those who are far off nearer. Influenced by decades of leading his society members in direct service to the poor, Wesley comes to include the works of mercy as themselves among the means of grace, the ordinary paths by which God is pleased to make himself known to and bless those who seek him^{xviii}. If such are among the means God uses to bring people to truth and holiness, it is hard to imagine how Christians could decline to share in such work with those outside the church, both for the sake of those who are served and for the sake of their fellow servants who may thus come nearer to God. Thus, whether we see an awareness of God and a desire to serve God in those with whom we propose to cooperate, or see in them only a desire to offer some practical service of the common good, the absence of Christian faith, or perhaps of any religious consciousness at all, need not be a barrier.

It may, of course, be a challenge, and that in a number of ways. Different conceptions of God, or divergent understandings of how God is related to the material and social world, may bring those of different faiths to reach quite different conclusions about how the practical good of neighbors is to be served. It may also affect who counts as a neighbor and what constitutes her good. These differences may not be immediately apparent, becoming evident only after

adherents of different traditions undertake some common task, each assuming their own understanding will be shared by all participants. Similarly, those who cooperate in some form of practical service from a secular standpoint may see less significance than religious practitioners in what means are taken to effect a good end. (I recall a colleague some years ago being shocked to find that the staff of the social service organization she was working with had a weekly meeting for the purpose of falsifying federal reporting documents in order to obtain needed aid for clients. This practice they called frankly “lying to the government”, and had no qualms about.) Christian collaborators in interfaith or secular undertakings should anticipate having to negotiate misunderstandings and conflicts.

There are solid theological grounds in Wesley for not letting such difficulties deter us, grounds which are evident in both his teaching and practice. The universal ruin wrought by sin renders all the relative differences of conduct and status insignificant. All are equally lost apart from God, all equally desperate in their need for redemption and restoration. But his firm conviction that the move toward reconciliation is always already begun from God’s side allowed his high expectations for actual transformation of life among believers to coexist with a posture of invitation and welcome toward those not yet come to faith – even those whose lives were spectacularly *untransformed*. No one was definitively beyond the pale, outside the scope of grace or out of reach of God’s power to awaken, convict, pardon and reclaim.

Therefore, Wesley insisted, all persons, no matter how depraved or corrupt, remain properly the object of care and respect, and have claims upon Christians for assistance in need. This theological core undergirded the vigorous and socially daring evangelistic and missional efforts for which the Methodist movement became famous (or notorious) among more conventional groups and their leaders. The scandal of field preaching, the prison ministry, the

pursuit of the poor into the hovels and workhouses of his day, the pre-dawn addresses to coal miners on their way underground, even the rides in the open carts carrying the condemned to the gallows: all are testimony to Wesley's overwhelming confidence in the power of the Holy Spirit to bring even the unlikeliest from darkness into light. But just as God's universal prevenient grace makes all persons fit objects of the works of corporal as well as spiritual, it makes them fit participants and sharers in such work as well. The Spirit of God is at work in all seeking of the good for others, for as Wesley never tires of saying, God's nature and name is love.

Thus far I have tried to show how in his anthropology, in his religious epistemology, and in his understanding of how God moves and draws human beings into the orbit of his grace, Wesley provides his modern descendants with tools for entering into shared mission with those who – according to our sight at least – are outside the fold of those redeemed by Christ. But beyond his explicit theological formulations, there are resources implicit in how he does his work as a theologian and a pastor, in his theological method, in his work as a leader of the Methodist movement, and his role as an 18th century public moral authority.

Implications of Wesley's Theological Method

Here it is possible to be brief, because I shall be building upon the research of others. The features of Wesley's theological approach to which I will be adverting are commonplaces in recent Wesley studies. They been observed and commented upon extensively in the last few decades by numerous scholars, including many who are in attendance at the present Institute.^{xix}

First, the lack of a thoroughly systematic structure to Wesley's thought, which was long regarded as disqualifying him as a "real" theologian, has come to be seen as essential to his

character as a practical and pastoral theologian. Instead of an abstract intellectual scaffolding from which are carefully suspended all the classical loci of Christian theology, Wesley begins with an existential problem: initially, his own, and later that of the people he undertakes to counsel and to lead. How is a sinner to draw near to God? How can a soul have confidence that God's mercy is indeed extended to cover the sins of the past, and how be set free from its captivity in the future? It is not how to *understand* Christian faith that chiefly occupies him, but rather how to enter into and inhabit the *life* of faith. Therefore what he contributes to the history of Christianity are not new ideas so much as new strategies, new ways of ordering and nurturing Christian communities, new ways of relating very old ideas about the faith and its practice to the circumstances and problems of his own time and society.

If there is any newness in Wesley's thought, it is not an originality of conception, but an originality of relationship. He offers a dynamic and persuasive account of how central ideas about the attributed righteousness of justification by faith relate to and harmonize with equally deep-rooted commitments to actual transformation of life through the imitation of Christ. He is able to take the utter helplessness of the human condition after the Fall with full seriousness, and yet not obliterate human freedom and responsibility, or make God's grace appear arbitrary or capricious. He combines evangelical zeal and openness to "all sorts and conditions of men" with the most earnest appropriation of the traditions of holiness reaching all the way back to the saints of the early church. In Wesley, such tensions are not *balanced*, but rather astonishingly *married*: found to be manifestations of the same comprehensive Gospel seen from different angles of vision. If this is not exactly theological originality, it is nevertheless a genius of its own. It is the fruit of regarding theology as a practical rather than a theoretical discipline, a means of nourishing and guiding life rather than principally a system of related doctrinal concepts.

Thus he begins not with the nature of God or the relations among the persons of the Trinity or the revelatory character of Scripture (things he appropriated from the broad Christian tradition), but with a less abstract problem: how are we to live if all this is true? It is the sort of question dear to the heart of an ethicist, and what I find compelling in Wesley even on those occasions when I might take issue with some of his answers. This practical focus drives his “experimental” approach to all manner of things, from how to read troubling or confusing biblical texts to how to respond to differences in doctrine, discipline or polity among the various groups with which he corresponded and debated or cooperated by turns. The test for Wesley was what brought people to faith; what enabled believers to be nourished by the Word; what helped them to grow in holiness; what presented a winning image of the love of Christ in the world; and what advanced the church’s mission of proclaiming and embodying God’s saving mercy to all who might hear and respond. He was in this sense supremely pragmatic, asking always what was edifying to his little Societies and what was effective in bringing the Gospel to life in the communities where they were called to serve.

This is not to say, of course, that Wesley set out to achieve originality. He was a remarkably conservative revolutionary, largely prepared to take Scripture and the legacy of Protestant doctrine, particularly as expounded within his own Anglican church, as standards for teaching. Contested points of doctrine or evident conflicts between biblical texts were to be resolved in light of “the whole tenor of Scripture”, with interpretation guided ultimately by an understanding of the character of God consonant with the gospel of grace. He is not absolutely hide-bound in this respect, however. He willing to reject what seems to be the most straightforward reading of passages when he sees them as incompatible with a God of justice and mercy (thus frequently in his debates with Calvinist interpreters). He is also willing to edit or

omit certain articles of doctrine of his Anglican church when he finds them to be misleading or at odds with his own considered views. (For instance, his version of the Articles of Religion prepared for the American church reduces them from 39 to 24, omitting several articles concerning election and predestination, those concerning approved creeds, Christ's descent into Hell, and matters concerning ecclesiastical authority required for preaching, among others.) Still, it is less often in doctrinal formulae than in modes of organization and in matters of community practice and discipline that Wesley is prepared to innovate. The most obvious example is his distinction between the ordained means of grace, those commanded in scripture which are obligatory aspects of Christian practice for all believers, and the prudential means, those which have proven to be advantageous for Society members. These latter include class meetings, bands, and periodic Conferences for the support of the faithful and the guidance of the growing movement, all of which came to be among the distinctive marks of Methodism for generations to come.

The same practical standard is evident in Wesley's famous eclecticism regarding the sources upon which he draws in his writing and preaching, and which he also makes available to his followers through the inexpensive editions he edited and published. Freely editing out whatever he regards as objectionable or misleading, he finds materials he regards as useful in everything from Greek patristic sources, to medieval saints of the Roman church, to his recent predecessors in the Anglican holiness tradition. The criterion appears to be simply what might be edifying to his preachers or their flocks. He does not appear to be troubled by the degree to which these diverse thinkers are embedded within larger theological frameworks which are incompatible with each other, and indeed with some of his own views. It is enough that they

have something truthful and helpful to convey, and something to contribute to the growth of God's people.

Perhaps it is not too great a reach to suppose that Wesley, who looked to “experimental” grounds for his strategies, who drew upon so wide and various a stream of Christian resources, and who found evidence of spiritual insight and real holiness even beyond the boundaries of Christian belief, would find grounds for sharing practical projects with those outside the Christian fold. It seems in keeping with his historical method for his modern heirs to apply a similarly experiential test to decide what kinds of cooperation and collaboration might advance God's work in the world, and bear witness to the inclusiveness of divine mercy.

The Use of Public and Political Means – and Some Caveats

Though John Wesley's vocation and activity was overwhelmingly focused on preaching, teaching and pastoral leadership within the Methodist movement, he also found it part of his duty to enter into aspects of public life and debate. He wrote tracts and broadsides for public distribution, and penned numerous letters to the editors of a wide range of newspapers and magazines. In these writings he addressed public issues ranging from prison reform to tax policy to the evil consequences of smuggling. These addresses were intended to inform the ignorant and awaken the consciences of nominally Christian England. They served as a sort of adjunct public preaching on social evils, working through persuasion, challenging those who regarded themselves as pious and upright to acknowledge and respond to pressing problems of suffering and injustice. Along with inciting public dissatisfaction and calls for reform, he recommends boycotting products whose production or distribution are injurious, urging people to use their

economic power to shape their society. As moral appeals, these were natural extensions of Wesley's office as an Anglican clergyman, although they were sufficiently challenging to provoke resistance among some of the respectable classes to whom they were directed. (Rather famously, an aristocratic correspondent wrote to Lady Huntingdon, complaining of her support for "the hateful preaching of these wretched Methodists, who seek to abolish all social distinctions.")^{xx}

But with regard to at least one issue, Wesley went beyond public appeals to conscience in attacking an evil he found utterly intolerable. Having found preaching and teaching ultimately ineffectual in bringing an end to England's highly profitable role in the slave trade, after 1770 Wesley became an active supporter of William Wilberforce and the abolitionist movement. He enters upon this legislative campaign with some reluctance, chagrined to find that he must resort to coercion to end an evil that England "had not the Christian decency to abandon voluntarily." This foray into the rough and tumble of Parliamentary politics may be something of a last resort, but it does reflect his readiness to use political means and the force of law to bring about what he regarded as an essential reform. This may be the clearest example of Wesley pursuing secular means to an end he understood as required by Christian conviction. It offers at least the suggestion that Christians might, in cooperation with others, harness the power of the state to address evil.

There are risks associated with such strategies, and in closing I want at least to acknowledge them. The maxim that politics makes strange bedfellows applies to all political undertakings, however well-motivated some of the participants may be. Some of the supporters of abolition in the 18th century had business interests in competition with slave-worked plantations, just as some current advocates of badly needed immigration reform have self-

interested reasons for wanting more access to immigrant labor. The give and take of political negotiation has never been pristine, and approaching social betterment through legislative means may involve *quid pro quo* exchanges governed by many interests other than the common good. Partly for that reason, even success in such undertakings is generally a matter of somewhat better rather than somewhat worse. Political struggles are rarely simply won, and even when they are the victory is never permanent and secure. What the legislature gives, it can also take away. Whatever might be said of the moral compromises of Christian Realism, Reinhold Niebuhr is right about one thing. In human institutions at best justice and charity are more nearly approached; they are not achieved. For all these reason, the church does well to undertake cooperation in wider political initiatives with caution and appropriately modest expectations. We will not usher in the Kingdom of God in this fashion. At best, we might make the kingdoms of this world a little less hostile to God's reign.

Some reservations apply to other efforts to pursue the good of our neighbors by cooperation with interfaith or secular groups. Here the issue is not so much a chastened realism about political processes and ends as it is the danger that the endeavor will be de-natured, cut off from its vital spiritual energy and deprived of its essential character as an imitation and embodiment of the love of Christ. It is the risk that we will forget or lose sight of the center of our work as a church, and deflected into generic do-gooding. There is always the possibility of confusing the vital but limited work of reducing human suffering which we can do (with God's help) with the fundamental human need for transformation, the healing of heart and mind and spirit which God alone can accomplish in us as well as in those we serve.

This happens within the church all the time, so that the heirs of Methodism abandon its great contribution to Christian ethics: its insistence on living out the gospel in all its dimensions,

personal devotion and the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, recognizing in all of them the means of grace.. But the danger is heightened when we undertake the practical work of amelioration in interfaith and secular contexts, particularly if we try leave our Christian convictions at the door and adopt a neutral language. Speaking a sort of moral Esperanto, focusing entirely on the material aspects of the work we have in common with our partners, we may be in danger of substituting our work for faith in God's work, and placing our hope and confidence in what we can accomplish.

This does not add up to a counsel of non-involvement, only a plea that we who undertake any shared work for the love of God and neighbor remember and cling to the source of our life: the love made known to us in Jesus Christ.

Endnotes

-
- ⁱ “Go and see the poor and sick in their poor, miserable hovels. Take up your cross, woman! Remember the faith! Jesus went before you, and will go with you. Put off the gentlewoman; you bear a higher character. You are the heir of God, and joint heir with Christ!” *The Works of John Wesley*, T Jackson, ed., 3rd edition, London: 1872. Reprinted Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1958,12:300. Hereafter *Works* (Jackson)
- ⁱⁱ Sermon 106 “On Faith” I: 9-10 *Bicentennial Edition of the Works of John Wesley*, F Baker, editor: Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1984 ff. 3:496. Hereafter cited as *Works*.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Wheeler, Sondra “John Wesley and Social Ethics”. Unpublished paper prepared for 1997 BW Conference Wesley Institute .
- ^{iv} Sermon 21, I:4 “Sin....totally overspreads his soul and corrupts every faculty thereof...” *Works*,
- ^v Sermon 70, “The Case of Reason Impartially Considered” *Works*, 2:
- ^{vi} Extensively expounded in his *Survey of the Wisdom of God in Creation*. *Works*, v. 17.
- ^{vii} Sermon 44, II: 9 *Works* 1:
- ^{viii} Sermon 85, III: 4 “There is no man in a state of mere nature, that is, wholly devoid of the grace of God.” *Works*,
- ^{ix} *Ibid* , II: 1
- ^x Letter to Editor of Gentleman’s Magazine, reproduced in *Journal*, 20th July 1736. *Works*
- ^{xi} Sermon 10, III: 7; Comments on Rom. 1:17ff. in *Explanatory Notes on the New Testament*
- ^{xii} Sermon 106, “On Faith” I: 4 *Works*, 3: 494
- ^{xiii} So explicitly in the Minutes of 2 August 1745
- ^{xiv} *Works* (Jackson) 12:290
- ^{xv} Sermon 106, I: 3-4. *Works*, 3:494.
- ^{xvi} Sermon 106, “On Faith”, I:6, op cit.
- ^{xvii} Sermon 130, par 14.
- ^{xviii} Sermon 98, “On Visiting the Sick”, I, *Works* 3:385; Sermon 92, “On Zeal” II 5, *Works* 3:313
- ^{xix} Most obviously, Randy Maddox, in *Responsible Grace: John Wesley’s Practical Theology*. Nashville, TN: Kingswood, 1994.
- ^{xxxx} Letter from Duchess of Buckingham, quoted by Gerald Lean in *John Wesley, Anglican*. (London, 1964)