“HOW DO YOU EXPECT ME TO BE A CHRISTIAN WITHOUT BEING A BUDDHIST?”

Roy I. Sano


INTRODUCTION

I will address a highlighted version of a question for the Working Group. “How does . . . a church . . . in a quite pluralistic context shape the interactions with other religions?”

The pluralistic context I have in mind is the persisting migration diversifying neighborhoods and regions throughout the world. Amid the resulting tensions in the mounting diversity, a cross fertilization among people is quietly blending religions and cultures in individuals and communities.¹ The blending will present problems for purists.² A version of the Wesleyan Quadrilateral, however, can shape the interactions constructively. I will begin with (1) experiences and proceed with (2) reason examining (3) traditions and (4) the Bible.³ Coherence among the resources will establish cogency in the procedure and integrity in a blended faith which is too readily rejected as syncretism.

I. EXPERIENCES AND REFLECTIONS ON TRADITIONS

A. Experiences.

I began to recognize elements of Japanese Zen Buddhism were very much alive in me (experiences) while I was teaching at Mills College, 1969-1975, Oakland, CA. I was reflecting (reason) on my cultural traditions in Asian American ethnic studies, and tracking its Buddhists roots in the history of religions.⁴ The number of elements in Japanese Zen Buddhism resonating in me increased to the point that I reversed a familiar question: “How can you be a Buddhist when you are a Christian?” I started to ask, “How do you expect me to be a Christian without being a Buddhist?”

Two of the Buddhist elements related to this paper appear in the historic Zen Buddhist picture book, “The Ten Stages of Spiritual Cow-Herding.”⁵ Searching for a water buffalo⁶ depicts a spiritual quest for wisdom. When it is sufficiently mastered, wisdom is superseded by the yang in emptiness, a foretaste of the Ultimate in satori (Enlightenment). Then, the pilgrim becomes a Bodhisattva who returns to this world to bless others. He bears the emptiness of the Ultimate, but paradoxically is fat and jolly, carrying a bag full of goodies to share, and is, quite possibly, inebriated.⁷ The
pilgrimage to emptiness and the Bodhisattva returning with the Ultimate explain two components in this paper.

B. Reflections on the Traditions

First, the tradition of the Zen pilgrim moving beyond wisdom to emptiness, or nothingness, will appear in the basic thrust of this paper. Walking humbly with God (Mic 6:8) means Methodists will be open to additional insights beyond the wisdom in the newly established orthodoxies on the Left and Right in Wesleyan/Methodist studies. God, the *deus absconditus*, is the inexhaustible source of more than eyes have seen or ears heard. Similarly, John Wesley may have insisted on speaking “plain truth for plain people,” but he also acknowledged the transcendence of God beyond words. “It is hard,” Wesley said, “to find words in the language of men to explain the deep things of God.” Wesley was simply following the Apostle Paul’s spirituality. “How unsearchable are (God’s) judgments and how inscrutable (God’s) ways. (Rom 11:33b) The basic thrust of these traditions therefore urges Methodists to hang loose with the established doctrines and be open to additional insights.

Second, the Buddhist tradition of the Bodhisattva returning to bless others explains why this paper will move through three steps to establish the integrity of a Christian faith that blends Buddhism and the Bible. A fuller background, however, is required. Japanese Zen Buddhism changed the identity and the activities of the Bodhisattva into the *Bushido* values of loyalty and bravery, sacrifice and honor. Those “core values,” as Robert Bellah called them, were most visible in the 17th century Samurai class. By the late-19th century, those same values turned Samurai into artists and intellectuals, the economic entrepreneurs and political leaders that radically transformed society in Japan. For ordinary individuals, the *Bushido* spirit enabled Japanese people to see the beauty of the Ultimate by fulfilling family and community obligations, and, when necessary, to act decisively in costly actions that rectified wrongs for honorable ends. Ruth Benedict summarized those Japanese values of beauty and decisive action in two symbols, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword.* Because Japanese immigrants to the US from the late 19th century embodied the *Bushido* spirit, they surmounted wave upon wave of hatred, abuse, and oppression directed against them. During WWII, their children served in the military with exceptional valor and sacrifice. Many of them volunteered while incarcerated as “enemy aliens” without due process of law. By becoming the most highly decorated unit in US military history, they demonstrated the loyalty of their people and vindicated their honor. As a younger member in that generation, I have come to see that the *Bushido* values prompted peculiar theological moves and produced distinctive positions in the Asian American liberation theology I developed from the late-1960s. Those moves and positions increasingly set me at odds with the emerging orthodoxies in Methodist studies.

The *Bushido* values will therefore explain why in Part II the uses of reason proceed through the following three steps. First, descriptive uses of reason in critical reflections will detect flaws in traditional Methodist doctrines. Second, the same uses of reason will uncover neglected biblical traditions (*Bible*) that Methodist doctrines had
overlooked. And third, the prescriptive uses of reason will incorporate those neglected biblical traditions into Methodist doctrines.

Because of the affinity between *Bushido* values shaped by Buddhism and the contents of the neglected biblical traditions, and because incorporating them into Methodist doctrines will restore their authenticity and relevance, I will claim integrity in a faith that blends Buddhism and the Bible. Furthermore, the claim will be based on the cogency in the procedure because of the coherence among the four resources of experience, reason, traditions, and the Bible.¹⁴

II. RECASTING METHODIST DOCTRINE

A. Doctrine of Salvation

1. Flaws in the Doctrine.

The theme for the 1977 Oxford Institute, “Sanctification and Liberation: Liberation in the Light of the Wesleyan Tradition,” proposed Methodists be generous and welcome the contributions from liberation theologies. The first use of reason in critical reflections detected two flaws in the proposal. The first flaw is the theme **proposed an impossible task.** What the Latin American liberation theologian, Jose Miguez Bonino, called the “straightjacket” of the traditional Order of Salvation for individuals, including sanctification,¹⁵ could not, with theological integrity, be wrapped around the far broader liberating actions of God in society and in nature.¹⁶ Even if the task could be fulfilled, a cultural imperialism was involved in trying to subsume the enormous contributions of liberation theologies under existing Euro-North American Methodist doctrines. The Institute should have explored the opposite, namely, changes required in traditional Methodist doctrines in order to appropriate contributions from liberation theologies.

Second, the impossible proposal was based on deeply imbedded, if understandable, **theological sleight of hands.** Theologians understandably had to explain the 19th century social transformations that British Methodism advanced in England, as well as the 19th and 20th century transformations that US Methodists advocated through their outreach.¹⁷ However understandable the theological agenda, theologians **anachronistically read social transformation into an individualistic doctrine of salvation.** Periodically acknowledging the anachronism in passing did not address the flaw, nor did careless appeals to the unexamined heritage of combining personal and “social holiness.” Without convincing changes in the Methodist doctrine of salvation, theological conservatives resisted the church’s witnesses and activities in society. The resulting theological tension between progressives and conservatives continued until liberation movements and theologies raised the ante globally in the last quarter of the 20th century and raised the ante.

In order to correct the flaws and resolve the impasse, Methodism still needs solid biblical witnesses to God speaking prophetically and working for salvation with judgment and mercy to overcome the evils that Methodist pursued in social transformations. The
second use of descriptive reasoning examined a wide range of the biblical traditions and eventually isolated relevant but neglected witnesses in Ezekiel 36. Third, the prescriptive use of reason infused Ezekiel's witness into Methodist doctrine of Salvation to restore its authenticity and relevance.

I turn next to an analysis of four points in Ezekiel’s witness that recasts the Methodist doctrine of salvation so it has authenticity and relevance. The affinity between those points with the Bushido values has caused me to think, long after the fact, that it was the Zen Buddhist heritage which led me to uncover stories of God’s transforming activities in society and nature, as well as in individuals.

2. Recasting the Doctrine of Salvation with Ezekiel 36:22-32

First, the “scriptural holiness” at issue in Ezekiel is the holiness of the divine name, or God’s self, just as Jesus taught us first to pray, “Hallowed be thy name.” (Mt 6:9)

22 “Thus says the Lord GOD: It is not for your sake, O house of Israel, that I am about to act, but for the sake of my holy name, which you have profaned among the nations to which you came.”

Because they are so concerned about God acting for their holiness, Methodists have humanized “scriptural holiness” for self-serving ends! Ezekiel’s “scriptural holiness” heightens the priority on establishing the holiness of God’s name. That ultimate agenda in God’s salvific work to glorify the divine name is reminiscent of the Bushido spirit which sought to vindicate the honor of the superior.

Second, God promises an evangelistic outcome when people join God in establishing the sanctity of the divine name through the History of Salvation.

23b “the nations shall know that I am the LORD, says the Lord GOD, when through you I display my holiness before their eyes.”

My appreciation for this emphasis on human responsibility in God’s activities parallels the Japanese Zen Buddhist Bushido’s call for decisive actions which rectify wrongs.

Third, Ezekiel’s capsulized version of God’s History of Salvation appears in three words, take, gather, and bring (Ez 36:24), and their cognates in this and five other places. (See Ez 20:34-35, 41-42; 34:12-13; 37:21; and 39:26-28.)

24 “I will take you from the nations, and gather you from all the countries, and bring you into your own land.”

“Take” in Ezekiel refers to a new Exodus from Babylonia, and, by extension, to our current participation in liberation movements with our people (Ez 36:23b), as did Moses, Miriam, and Aaron. “Gather” in Ezekiel refers to reuniting the tribes scattered in the exile, and also recalls the Covenant at Sinai, or uniting the people before God after
the Exodus (taking). By extension, in 20th century decolonization movements, gathering suggested reuniting people divided against each other by colonizers, and in the history of Christianity, to Ecumenism, or the re-membering of the dismembered Body of Christ. “Bring” refers in Ezekiel to rebuilding society, a livable space in the cities and in the countryside following the exile. Like building up the “promised land” after the Exodus (take) and the Covenant (gather), “bring” in recent history refers to nation building after liberation from colonizers (take) and the quest to unite their people in a new nation state (gather). The wide ranging social transformation also recalls the contribution of the Bushido spirit to modernize Japan in the late 19th century.

Since biblical scholars have for decades studied social transformation in the Histories of Salvation21, and more recently through Tradition Criticism,22 it has come time for Methodists to incorporate them into the Doctrine of Salvation because they clearly bear witness to God liberating the oppressed, unifying the divided people, and building up devastated communities and the countryside. Because God is engaged in those salvific efforts, we are not pursuing secondary or secular ministries, nor engaged in Marxists or heretical efforts.

Fourth, Ezekiel also witnesses to the Order of Salvation,23 which incidentally appears in Wesley’s sequence, when the locus classicus for the New Covenant in Jeremiah 31 and Hebrew 8, actually reverses the order.24

25 “I will sprinkle clean water upon you . . .” Justification
26 “A new heart I will give you . . .”25 Sanctification
27 “I will . . . make you follow my statute . . .” Perfection

Several important points in Ezekiel 36 need highlighting. Ezekiel’s vision did not end with broader transformation in the History of Salvation; Ezekiel added transformation of individuals with his Order of Salvation. This dual emphasis recalls the Bushido values highlighting social transformation and personal integrity. What is most relevant for the critique of the theme for the 1977 Institute is that the History of Salvation is the overarching narrative, and the Order of Salvation is the subordinate story. A weighty theological and ethical issue is at stake. Without the overarching transformations in the History of Salvation, transformations of individuals in the Order of Salvation become at best a palliative and at worst an appeasement. Ezekiel’s witness therefore corrects the proposed cultural imperialism in the theme of the 1977 Institute which tried to shoehorn liberation in the History of Salvation into sanctification in the Order of Salvation.26 By blending in Ezekiel’s neglected biblical witnesses into the Methodist doctrine of salvation we can restore its authenticity and relevance.

In addition to expanding the Methodist doctrine of salvation, critical reflections on experiences with religious, theological, and biblical traditions drastically recast the Methodist understanding of the witness of the Spirit.
B. Witness of the Spirit

1. Flaws in Reading Romans 8:16

The Wesleyan/Methodist theological renaissance in the last quarter of the 20th century has established that John Wesley warm hearted assurance, May 24, 1738, at the Aldersgate Chapel, was an important moment, but not the sole salvific moment in his spiritual journey. However beneficial experiences of an assurance in Methodist history, the first use of reason in critical reflection has detected a grossly misleading eisegesis of Romans 8:16 that turned the witness of the Spirit into warm fuzzyies. Moravians read into Romans 8:16 a hankering for an answer to their anfechtung reminiscent of Luther’s anxiety about acceptance by God. Under the prompting from Moravians and under the prevailing hunger for epistemological certainty addressed by British empiricism, Wesley read into Romans 8:16 his spiritual empiricism to “see” God’s goodness and to “hear” God’s comforting assurance. The basic theological issue in the Moravian and Wesleyan eisegeses is that they muffled and nullified in the witness of the Spirit an awesome biblical call to strive first for God’s reign and realm.

2. Recasting the Witness of the Spirit

Rather than perpetuating the Moravian and Methodist eisegeses strapped to the Order of Salvation, the second use of reason in critical reflection followed John Wesley’s principle to explain Scripture with Scripture and uncovered a startlingly new reading about the witness of the Spirit in Scripture.

The witness about being a child and an heir of God in Romans 8:16 is more accurately interpreted in connection with the witnesses Jesus received at his Baptism and Transfiguration. The early church did not hear in those witnesses a cozy comfy assurance. They heard in those witnesses the echoes of Psalms 2:7-9 and 110:1-6, where a son is seated at the right hand of God and is commissioned to overturn the reign of evil in frightful, costly struggles before inheriting God’s reign and realm. The costly struggles explain the Apostle Paul’s reference in the very next verse (Rom 8:17) to suffering and glory. In addition, the Gospel writers cited Isaiah’s Servant Songs to explain how the anointing of the Spirit at his Baptism enabled Jesus to fulfill his calling. (Is 42:11-4 in Mt 12:18-21; Is 61:1-2, 53:6 in Lk 4:18-19) Jesus fulfilled his ministry by violating sacrosanct taboos and prejudices as he practiced kindness, but also advocated justice and liberation, and brought them to pass. Clearly, the witness of the Spirit in the Bible is not a cozy comfy, “I’m okay because I believe in Jesus Christ,” tied to the Order of Salvation. In line with Bushido’s expectations of costly and decisive acts to promote what is good and vindicate honor, the witness of the Spirit in Romans 8:16 calls us to join God in the hazardous mission of overcoming evil and spreading God’s reign and realm. For our day, a relevant version of God’s mission was noted above in grand sweep of Ezekiel’s History of Salvation (Ez 36:24) and his narrower Order of Salvation (Ez 36:25-27) that vindicate the “scriptural holiness” of the divine name. (Ez 36:22-23a) As we participate in the fullness of God’s mission, people...
will be led to know the Lord (Ez 36:23:b), as demonstrated in church history. A blending of Buddhism and the Bible therefore urges Methodists to restore authenticity to the Witness of the Spirit and recover its relevance.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper offered by means of a Quadrilateral, cogent steps that shaped interactions with another religion and with integrity nurtured a blended faith for Methodist ministries in our pluralistic context. Although the Bible was consulted chronologically last, it has exercised a logical priority because the Bible, with the support of other resources, played the definitive role in upgrading Methodist doctrines. Finally, because elements of Japanese Zen Buddhism in the Bushido values drew me to neglected biblical stories that infused authenticity and relevance in Methodist doctrines, I ask more forcefully today, “How do you expect me to be a Christian without being a Buddhist?”

ENDNOTES

1 The massive global migrations and the attending blending of cultures and religions will persist because of the intractable economic disparities and continuing ethnic clashes, the unrelenting ideological rivalries and shifting armed conflicts, and finally, the unfolding climate changes. Hence the relevance of the question for the Working Group: How do we shape the interactions of Christian faith with other religions?


3 In The Book of Discipline of The United Methodist Church 2012 (Nashville, TN: The United Methodist Publishing House, 2012), the order of the resources and criteria is Scripture (Bible), Tradition, Experience, and Reason. (80-86) For testing the cogency in a case, however, this paper begins with Experience, and moves with Reason, applied to Traditions, and culminates with the Bible. Further, because no systematic summary of the order is provided, instances of using each of the resources are highlighted in bold, thus, (experience) or reason. Finally, it should be noted that traditions includes those in religions, cultural and theological heritage, and the Bible. If not explicitly stated, the context should establish which one is under
consideration. Although biblical traditions are considered, the Bible is also treated separately because of its distinctive and definitive role.


5 Because this resource is foundational for this paper, I will list prominent English versions and commentaries currently available. The title used in the text, “The Ten Stages of Spiritual Cow-Herding,” comes from D. T. Suzuki’s *Essays in Zen Buddhism, First Series* (NY: Grove Press, 1949). The plates for that series appear between pages 192-193, and his analysis on pages 363-376. In his *Manual on Zen Buddhism* (NY: Grove Press, 1960), Suzuki simply called the second version, “The Ten Oxherding Pictures I,” with Plates I-X and the analysis on pages 127-134. The elegant pictures were painted by Shubun, the famous Japanese artist in the Ashikaga era (1336-1573), but the analysis was written earlier for another series by Kaku-an Shi- en in the Chinese Sung era (960-1127). In the same volume, Suzuki provided a third version, “The Ten Oxherding Pictures II” (1585?), on pages 135-144. The painter is unknown but the commentary is by a Pu-ming, whose date is unknown. Curiously this series culminates with an empty circle in the tenth picture: The pilgrim does not return to this world! The high point of empty circles in a Zen pilgrimage appears in artists who draw circles, enso, circles upon circles. See the examples in Audrey Yoshiko Seo’s *Enso: Zen Circles of Enlightenment* (Boston: Weatherhill, 2007).

A fourth, recent version was attractively published in *The Oxherder: A Zen Parable Illustrated*, ed. Stephanie Wada (NY: Braziller, 2002). This version was originally entitled, *The Ten Oxherding Songs*, and was produced, 1278.

6 Whether it is called a cow or an ox, the animal we regularly see in the pictures is clearly a water buffalo. The water buffalo represents wisdom in Kosuke Koyama, *Water Buffalo Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1999) and in Nobuaki Hanaoka, *On the Back of a Buffalo: Eastern Stories for Western Journey, Interfaith Dialogue*, Foreword by Alfred Bloom (West Conshohocken, PA: Infinity Publishing, 2007).

7 “Fatness” and “bag full of goodies” recall a Japanese Zen Buddhist paradox associated with blackness, nothingness (or emptiness), and silence. In blackness there is “no thing” discernible, no subject nor predicate to speak of. At most, one could only speak of “suchness” and “thusness,” or better yet, simply remain silent. For “suchness” and “thusness,” see D. T. Suzuki, *Essays in Zen Buddhism, Third Series*, ed. Christmas Humphreys (NY: Samuel Weisner, 1970) 340-341; for quietness see Suzuki, 40 and 116. In his *Silence*, trans. William Johnston (NY: Taplinger, 1976), Shuasaku Endo correlated blackness with silence. The paradox is that
blackness and silence radiates for Japanese an aura of inexhaustible possibilities, hence the fullness, fatness, and heavy load of goodies in the Bodhisattva who bears the Emptiness.

The humor we associate with Zen appears in Han-shan and Shih-te looking a bit giddy. They appear in Hisamatsu’s *Zen and the Fine Arts* with paintings by Liang K’ai, 151; Ma Lin, 159; and Yin-ht’o-lo, 188-89.


9 In his *Tokugawa Religion: The Cultural Roots of Modern Japan*, Robert Bellah said the Samurai *Bushido* values and their religious foundations (194) were Japan’s core values from the 17th century Tokugawa era (90-98) into the 20th century. (184, 186, 188) The 18th century story about the 47 *ronin*, the masterless samurai, continues to epitomize the *Bushido* values for people in Japan. The *ronin* committed suicide under an Imperial Edict because they violated the decorum in the castle where they vindicated the honor of their lord. Annual pilgrimages to their cemetery continue. A drama of the 47 *ronin*, *Chushingura*, is performed to this day for cultural elite in *Noh* dramas, and for the populous in puppet shows and movies.

10 Sacrifice in Japan is most vividly dramatized in suffering defeat or death out of loyalty to a superior. See the Pulitzer Prize winning analysis by John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of WWII* (NY: Norton, 1999) and a number of historic heroes in Ivan Morris, *The Nobility of Failure: Tragic Heroes in the History of Japan* (Canada: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, 1975).


I readily acknowledge that the horrendous expressions of *Bushido* in Japanese Militarism desperately needs to be exorcized of its sins through baptisms into death to sin with Christ, and be raised with Christ to newness of life through the Holy Spirit. See the unspeakable war crimes in Yuki Tanaka, *Hidden Horrors: Japanese War Crimes in World War II* (NY: Westview


14 I am not able within the limits of this paper to offer a further justification for syncretism in a blended faith. In a sermonic/essay on the same topic, September 27, 2012, Drew theological Seminary, I offered a rationale based on the WCC document on the *missio dei*, 1955, Willengen, Germany, and the WCC BEM document, 1982, Vancouver, Canada. I said the blending of faith call us to join the *missio dei* of the triune God by plunging (baptizing) ourselves into the Name, the person and work, of the triune God, into the Name of the Creator, Christ, and Consummator.

15 Theodore Runyon, Editor, *Sanctification & Liberation: Liberation in Light of the Wesleyan Tradition* (Nashville: Abingdon,1981), 55. My paper assumes John Wesley’s Order of Salvation includes three phases: Justification, Sanctification, and Perfection. That Order is based on the *locus classicus* for the New Covenant in Jeremiah 31:33-34, as outlined in End Note 24. Although he frequently referred to Wesley’s Order of Salvation, Albert Outler did not provide a definitive summary. We find several summaries in his Bicentennial Edition of the Sermons, but none simply listed the three phases I have noted. See for example, *SI*, pp. 13, 57, 75, 165 n 61, 184 n 17, and 275 n 34.

16 In his *The New Creation: John Wesley’s Theology Today* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), Theodore Runyan offered a sustained case to expand sanctification to cover social transformation. See especially his “Conclusion: Rethinking Sanctification.” (222-233)

I regret to say, I was not convinced by Runyan’s case. In essence, I agree with Orv A. Brendlinger. In his study, *Social Justice through the Eyes of Wesley* (Ontario, Canada: The Joshua Press, 2006). Brendlinger said, “Wesley did envision a complete social reconstruction, albeit emanating from the smallest societal unit, the individual, rather than through a reformation of structures themselves.” (144) Brendlinger correctly adds, “Although Wesley did not normally relate his social ethic to the structures of society, as time went on the persons he influenced did.” (145). In other words, in an honest reading of his “plain words,” John Wesley clearly had in mind transformations of individuals and not social/structural transformations, in sanctification, and therefore it was not possible with theological integrity to wrap the “straightjacket” of sanctification in the Order of Salvation around liberation with its transformations of society and nature.
To establish such a controversial thesis would require weeks in a seminar analyzing hundreds of passages in John Wesley as well as an in depth discussion of Runyon’s key passages. In this End Note I can only outline the case.

In the first four important sermons which Albert Outler sets apart, John Wesley clearly had in mind individual experiences of the Order of Salvation. They included, “Salvation by Faith,” “The Almost Christian,” “Awake, Thou that Sleepest,” and “Scriptural Christianity.” (S1, pp. 109-180) The perspective found there was spread throughout his sermons.

I add a few additional key words and phrases noted in bold type. In the Minutes of the Conferences in 1745, 1746, and 1747, sanctification clearly refers to individuals. (See Minutes, Bicentennial edition, Vol 10, pp. 131, 154-55, 195-96). Wesley cites those decisions in his important essay, “A Plain Account of Christian Perfection. . .” (Jackson, XI, 387-88) We read in the introduction to the Hymns and Sacred Poems (1739), “The gospel of Christ knows no religion but social; no holiness but social holiness,” by which John Wesley meant loving expressions of an individual to another individual. In the same way, “social religion” had the same individualistic focus in his sermon on Matthew 5:13-16. (S1, S24, I,1, p. 533) Wesley therefore did not mean by “social holiness” and “social religion” that we are to transform structures in society to sanctify them. In addition, Wesley’s call to “reform the nation” by “spreading scriptural holiness” might have linked his understanding to social transformation, but he clearly had in mind the sanctification of individuals in bands and classes would spread into society. That “scriptural holiness” does not cover social, structural transformation will be noted below in discussing Ezekiel 36. The same individualistic interpretation appears in “The General Spread of the Gospel.” (SII, S63, pp. 485-499) Furthermore, even if we sanctified the intentions in Wesley’s “political image” of God in us, it would still refer directly to transforming the individual’s management of society, but not automatically to sanctifying the political structures in society.

John Wesley missed several opportunities to expand his views. In his sermon, “The Great Assize,” when Wesley spoke “truth to power,” about their final judgment before God, Wesley reminded political leaders that they will be judged on their personal morality, not on public policies. (S1, S15,IV.3-4, p. 372) Even weightier is John Wesley’s impressive systemic analyses of evil in structures and their operations, as well as the role of key individuals. We see this in Wesley’s “Thoughts Concerning the Present Scarcity of Provisions.” (Jackson, Vol 11, pp. 53-59) and his “Thought upon Slavery” (Jackson, Vol 11, pp. 59-79) Although changes are called for in public policy, Wesley did not expand his theological categories beyond his Order of Salvation for God to transform structures in society, nor did he provide biblical witnesses to God acting in such changes.

I have therefore assert that (1) Wesley had in mind transformation of individuals in sanctification, (2) without another theological categories for salvation, a sleight of hands snuck social transformation into sanctification and expanded the meaning of “social holiness,” and (3)
integrity in doing theology calls for new theological categories in the doctrine of salvation as well as biblical foundations to do so.

I summarized in outline the wide ranging missional outreach of Methodism in the 19th through the 20th century in my paper for the 2002 Oxford Institute, “Theological Reconstruction and Historical Agenda.” In that paper, I provided biblical witnesses to God’s activities in comparable efforts which promoted physical health and social welfare, economic development and political empowerment. The social transformations were also vividly demonstrated in the Wesleyan Holiness efforts in the mid-19th century. See, Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform in Min-Nineteenth-Century America* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1957).

Albert Outler said the sermon on “The Circumcision of the Heart” contained “Wesley’s most careful and complete statement on his doctrine of holiness.” In that Sermon, Wesley did not cite Ezekiel 36:22 on vindicating God’s holiness, and holiness is essentially humanized. *(SI, S17, An Introductory Comment, p. 398)* When Wesley uses Matthew 5:48, “be perfect as your Father in heaven,” God’s holiness is a model for human emulation. In the Lord’s Prayer, we begin by asking for the hallowing of the divine name, and end in a doxology to God’s glory *(Mt 6:13, margin)*. *(Mt 5:48 is alluded to in SI, 1:184, 205, 403, 539; and quoted in 428, 530 (2), 656)* Similarly, the culmination of many Anglican Collects appropriately has an eschatological vision of glorifying God as the ultimate goal of our prayers.

We find historical parallels of people coming to know the Lord, the Sovereign Savior because Christians facilitated the History of Salvation (taking, gathering, and creating livable space). Parallels appeared in Methodism’s rapid growth in North America in the late 18th and early 19th century and in Methodism’s participation in decolonization and nation buildings in Africa, South Korea, and the Philippines during the last half of the 20th century. We are yet to see students of church growth correlating participation in the History of Salvation with evangelistic results. To take account of the connection between work in social transformation with the growth of the church, Latin American theologians began to speak of “evangelization,” as if social transformation permeated society with good new. “Evangelism,” by contrast was primarily restricted to proclamation of the word. Probably the classic and most persuasive case for evangelization appears in Mortimer Arias’s *Announcing the Reign of God: Evangelization and the Subversive Memory of Jesus* (Lima, OH: Academic Renewal Press, 1984).

21 Robert Gnuse, *Heilschichte as a Model for Biblical Theology: The Debate Concerning the Uniqueness and Significance of Israel's Worldview* (NY: University Press of America, 1989). While Gnuse’s primary focus is on comparison of religions, the actual outline of narratives are also studied.


23 I regained an appreciation for my evangelical teenage experiences of personal salvation through the Order of Salvation, when former liberators in Africa and Asia turned into greedy leaders tyrannizing their own people, a la George Orwell’s *Animali Farm*. Changes in public policy still called for personal morality; prophets insisted on justice and righteousness. (Amos 5:24; Mic 6:8)

24 In Jeremiah 31:31-34 (See, Hebrews 8:8-12); 32:6-16, we see the Order of Salvation reversed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW COVENANT</th>
<th>Jer 31:33-34</th>
<th>Reconciliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obey God fully</td>
<td>31:33</td>
<td>Perfection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renew God’s image</td>
<td>31:34a</td>
<td>Sanctification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness of Sins</td>
<td>31:34b</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeremiah has his version of the History of Salvation. It precedes and ends his Order of Salvation with two events in his History of Salvation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW EXODUS</th>
<th>Jer 31:31-32</th>
<th>Redemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REBUILD JERUSALEM</td>
<td>Jer 31:38; 33:6-26</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Curiously, at the 1747 Conference, when he quotes a portions of what I am calling Ezekiel’s Order of Salvation (Ez 36:25-27), John Wesley omits what clearly refers to sanctification: “A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will remove from your body the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh.” (Ez 36:26, *Minutes*, Bicentennial Edition, 196)

26 The pattern appears in the Lord’s Prayer. It begins with the holiness of the divine name, then turns to the History of Salvation for God’s reign on earth as in heaven, symbolized in the prayer for “bread,” before forgiveness of sin which recalls the Order of Salvation. Perfection is suggested in the prayer to overcome temptations.

28 In his sermon, the “Witness of the Spirit of God, Discourse II,” John Wesley said the Witness of the Spirit will mean “the stormy wind and troubled waves subside, and there is a sweet calm; the heart resting as in the arms of Jesus, and the sinner being clearly satisfied that God is reconciled, that all his ‘iniquities save, forgiven, and his sins covered.’ Rom 4:7 (Ps 32:1).” *SI*, S11,II.4, p. 287. It will of course sound sacrilegious to speak of these experience as “warm fuzzies” until one considers below in the text and in End Note 34 the actual scriptural explanations of the Witness and anointing of the Spirit.


30 Wesley spoke of “spiritual senses, exercised to discern spiritual good and evil” with the “hearing ear and the seeing eye.” (Italics his) He also called them “internal senses.” See, *The Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion and Certain Related Open Letters,* The Works of John Wesley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1975), ed. Gerald R. Cragg, par. 32-33, pp., 56-57. An example of his use of the *spiritual* senses of seeing (apprehending) and hearing appears in his sermon, “The Spirit of Adoption,” *SI*, S9, II.1, p. 255; II.3-4, p. 256; III.3, p. 260. For Albert Outler’s extensive analyses of John Wesley’s epistemology in “spiritual sensorium” and “intuitionism,” see *SI*, S10, “The Witness of the Spirit, I,” p. 276, n 46. John Wesley was originally concerned about answering charges of enthusiasm and delusion, as well as possible “presumption” on the part of those who have no grounds to claim they have the Witness of the Spirit. *SI*, S10, II,2-13, pp. 277-284; S11, IV.7-8, p. 295; V.2, p. 297.

31 This principle of biblical interpretation appears in at least two passages in John Wesley.

“1. If then we have spoken the Word of God, the genuine unmixed Word of God, and that only; 2. If we have put no unnatural interpretations upon it, but [have] taken the known phrases in their common, obvious sense, and where they were less known *explained Scripture by Scripture.*” John Wesley, “On Corrupting the Word of God,” *S4*, S 137, p. 250. Emphasis added.
“Scripture is the best expounder of Scripture. The best way, therefore, to understand it, is carefully to compare Scripture with Scripture, and thereby learn the true meaning of it.” John Wesley, “Popery Calmly Considered,” Works, Jackson edition, X, 172. Emphasis added.

Witnesses to Jesus at his Baptism appear in Luke 3:22 (Mt 3:17; Mk 1:11); and at his Transfiguration in Luke 9:35 (Mt 17:5; Mk 9:7).


On suffering in Christian life (Rom 8:17), two points must be born in mind. The first is the consequences of John Wesley heightening the identity of believers being sons, and second is the larger apocalyptic drama of salvation in which Christ and Christians suffer. First, John Wesley’s discussions about a son muffled the identity of a servant, and therefore of suffering. Wesley said, “Exhort him[her] to press on by all possible means, till he[she] passes from ‘faith to faith’; from faith of a servant to the faith of a son; from the spirit of bondage unto fear, to the spirit of childlike love.” (S4, S117, “On the Discoveries of Faith,” Par 13, p. 35. Italic his. See the same distinction in S3, S106, “On Faith,” I.12, p. 497.) Wesley may have urged people to be servants elsewhere, but urging Methodists “to press on by all means possible” from being a servant to becoming a son, muffled the high calling for Christians to be a servant and even a slave. Over time, the superiority of a son to a servant easily diminishes the words of Jesus: “Whosoever wishes to become great among you must be a servant, and whosoever wishes to be first among you must be slave of all. For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.” (Mk 10:43-45. Emphases added. The Index of Scriptural References in the Sermons has no reference to Mk 10:43-45! See too, Mt 20:26-28.) The Apostle Paul followed Jesus: “For though I am free with respect to all, I have made myself a slave to all, through God.” (Gal 4:7)

The second note is the importance of seeing the larger Pauline apocalyptic drama of salvation in which Christ and Christians suffer for redemptive purposes. The drama operates with a “three stories universe” with humankind on earth, God in the heavens, and “many gods and many lords” in between. (1 Cor 8:5) A cluster of other referents seem comparable, including, “powers, . . . heights, . . . depths” (Rom 8:38-39) and “thrones or dominions or rulers or powers” (Col 1:16). A battle ensues against the likes of those intermediaries: we wrestle “against rulers, against authorities, against the cosmic powers of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in heavenly places.” (Eph 6:12) Jesus Christ, however, has in his death and
resurrection already “disarmed the rulers and authorities and made a public example of them, triumphing over them.” (Col 2:15. See too the triumphal note in 2 Tim 2:26.) However much Christ has accomplished in these battles, which recall those against the enemies of God’s reign and realm in Psalms 2 and 110, in the Pauline tradition the writer says, “I am now rejoicing in my suffering for your sake, and in my flesh, I am completing what is lacking in Christ’s afflictions for the sake of his body, that is, the church. . . . For this I toil and struggle with all the energy that he powerfully inspires within me.” (Col 1:24-29. See too, gentler tasks in 2 Tim 2:24-26, though the devil is an adversary.) No warm fuzzies here (!) because Christians suffer if they join the Pauline apocalyptic drama of salvation. I originally used a version of this drama at The Tenth National Conference of the Trinity Institute, 1978, Trinity Parish, New York city. See, Roy I. Sano, “Jesus as Savior and Lord,” The Myth/Truth of God Incarnate, Durstan R. McDonald, editor (Wilton, CT: Morehouse Barlow Co, 1979), 85-103.

35 To appreciate the new reading of Romans 8:16, we need to distinguish between the “fruit of the Spirit,” or Graces that characterize Christians, and the Gifts of the Spirit for ministry. In general it is a distinction between the character and the calling of a person, between morality and ministry. The Graces or “fruit of the Spirit” (“Law of the Spirit of life,” Rom 8:2) appear, e.g., in Galatians 5:22; Romans 12:9-12; Ephesians 4:32-5:2; Colossians 3:12-15; 2 Peter 1:5-7, and dominate the Sermon on the Mount. (Mt 5:3-7:27) The Gifts of the Spirit for ministry appear, e.g., in Romans 12:6-8; 1 Corinthians 12:4-11, 28-30; and Ephesians 4:1-12. The distinction cannot be drawn too sharply because practice of ministry overlaps with character, e.g., in 1 Cor 12, after Paul lists what I am labeling gifts for ministry (1 Cor 12:28-30), he calls love a gift. (1 Cor 12:31-13:1)