

EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 10

Volume 10 • Number 3 • July 1986

**Evangelical
Review of
Theology** p. 199

spiritual assumptions or to the holocaust-bound plight of the nations. We are living in the past which makes us feel secure and shields us from the perplexities of today's world and the agony of making moral choices.

At the same time, we must learn the lessons of history. How, for example, has the church in Egypt withstood the attack of Islam for fourteen centuries or how has the church in China multiplied 20 or 40 fold in the past 35 years without organized evangelism and with little para-church support? Evangelism is central to our theological task, but it must be neither isolated from nor merged with social action or the struggle for justice. Partnership is good, but marriage is better; it is commitment for life!

This issue of ERT focuses on salvation for man in society with several studies on the *imago dei* and the grace of God and continuing reflections on issues raised by Liberation Theologies. This process will be the central issue at the Theological Commission's triennial meetings and consultation in June 1986 in Singapore. The theme 'Jesus Christ our Redeemer and Liberator' goes to the heart issue of the relationship of justification to justice—redemption from sin to liberation from violence and oppression. Most liberation theologies are not radical enough; they fall short of the full biblical view of sin, the work of the Holy Spirit in redemption and liberation and the mission of the Church in the world.

The increasing millions of people who suffer from violence and oppression are also the majority of those who have never heard the Gospel. But, alas, they often block their ears to what they hear p. 201 because what they see, the lifestyle of the witness and the materialism of a secularised church, is inconsistent with our words.

With this issue of ERT, your editor hands on the pen to others. My work as editor since Vol. 1 No. 1 in 1977 has been both challenging and rewarding. A special word of appreciation must go to my wife who has proofed every issue and made valuable comments on articles and especially on editorials! To contributors and readers alike, we say, Thank you.

As I step down from the leadership of the Theological Commission, my wife and I take up the call of God to pastoral ministry in the Delhi Diocese of the Church of North India. India has been our home for 31 years and we are looking to God to extend our time. Within the bounds of the 23 dioceses of the CNI live 1/10 of the world's population! The challenge to the Church is immense. We are committed to the affirmation of our Lord, 'I will build My Church and the gates of Hades will not overcome it.' Pray for us, brethren, farewell. p. 202

Adam's Fall and God's Grace: John Wesley's Theological Anthropology

John Chongnahm Cho

Printed with permission

JOHN WESLEY—THE THEOLOGIAN

Dr. William Hordern, a Lutheran scholar, once said, 'I was raised on the assertion that Wesley had no theology and that he taught a religion of experience alone, but it is now evident that Wesley was a powerful theologian.'¹ He further observed that in recent years many Methodists have returned to Wesley and have rediscovered John Wesley as a great theologian.

At this point, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley* by George C. Cell, which was published in 1915, made a recognizable contribution toward the rediscovery of Wesley as a theologian. Cell points out that Wesley was misunderstood as though he were of Liberal Arminianism, being far from the theology of the Reformers, and that he made so little contribution to the history of Christian thought. But through his study, Cell asserted that Wesley was rather reaffirming the main principles of the Reformers' theology and has overcome the decline of Christianity which was under the influence of the Enlightenment.² The theme of Cell has been well accepted and developed further by the later Wesleyan scholars.³

Skevington Wood writes, '*Sola gratia* and *sola fide* were the twin watchwords of the Reformation, and they found an echo in Wesley's preaching.'⁴ That is to say, Wesley regards the problem of the original sin very seriously. For Wesley 'the starting point of the Gospel is the total inability of the sinner to make the tiniest contribution toward his own salvation.'⁵ It is the interest of this paper to see how Wesley theologized the doctrine of *original sin*. What is the result of Adam's sin upon his descendants? What is the condition of fallen man in his relation to the gospel? p. 203

For Wesley to preach the whole council of God as it is revealed in the Bible, 'There must be a clear association of God's sovereignty and man's responsibility.'⁶ This was Wesley's position. Then on what ground does Wesley maintain such a position concerning the fallen man? What is the methodology and dynamics of his theologizing?

ADAM'S SIN AND ITS EFFECTS UPON THE HUMAN RACE

Wesley believed that Adam was created in the image of God. God's image consisted of a threefold character: the natural, the political, and the moral image.⁷ Therefore, according to Wesley, the nature of man is spirit or soul, which includes endowment with the faculties of reason, will, and liberty. Man has the dominion over the lower creatures. Furthermore, man in his original condition lived in righteousness and true holiness. Man was full of love which was the sole principle of his tempers, thoughts, words, and actions.⁸ From the right

¹ William Hordern, 'Recent Trends in Systematic Theology' in *Canadian Journal of Theology*, vol. VIII (1961), No. 2, p. 87.

² George G. Cell, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley*, Nashville, Abingdon, 1946, pp. 5-9.

³ William Cannon, *The Theology of John Wesley*, Nashville, Abingdon, 1946; H. Lindstrom, *Wesley and Sanctification*, London, The Epworth Press, 1946.

⁴ Skevington Wood, *John Wesley: The Burning Heart*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1967, p. 220.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 150, of *Works*, X, p. 456, 'Thoughts Concerning Gospel Ministers'.

⁷ *Standard Sermons of John Wesley* ed. by Sugden (hereinafter it will be referred to as STS), II. 228, *The Works of John Wesley*, ed. by Jackson (it will be referred to hereafter as WORKS), IX, pp. 293, 355. Here it appears that Wesley accepted Isaac Watts' view in *The Ruin and Recovery of Mankind*.

⁸ STS, II, 228.

use of all his faculties, man maintained a continued relationship of love and obedience to God.⁹

But Wesley believed that when Adam disobeyed God, he fell from the original state in which God created him. Wesley believed that this disobedience or rebellion of Adam was the result of the misuse of liberty and that the responsibility rests with Adam, not with God.¹⁰

In consequence of his rebellion, he lost the life of God. He was separated from Him in union with whom his spiritual life consisted.¹¹ Man's faculties of reason, will and liberty were then corrupted and man's love and obedience to God were replaced by self-love and self-will.¹²

Adam was primogenitor and the federal head of mankind, according to Wesley.¹³ Therefore, when Adam sinned, the effect was upon all human kind. For 'Adam's first sin was the sin of a public person' representing all his descendants.¹⁴ p. 204

Wesley believes that all men are therefore totally corrupt and children of wrath. Prior to any act of his own, each descendant of Adam shares in the depravity and guilt of the original sin. Wesley writes:

This is undoubtedly true, therefore God does not look upon infants as innocent, but as involved in the guilt of Adam's sin; otherwise death, the punishment denounced against that sin, could not be inflicted upon them.¹⁵

This view of John Wesley was made more clear when he was confronted with the opposition of John Taylor. In 1740 John Taylor published a treatise, *The Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin Proposed to Free and Candid Examination*. Taylor was a learned Presbyterian minister. He was the pastor of a church in Norwich. He was the first president of the Presbyterian Theological College at Warrington until his death in 1761. Taylor was leaning towards Socinianism and denied the original sin.¹⁶ Wesley was very upset and said, 'If Taylor is right, I cannot see that we have much need of Christianity.' There would then be no room to talk about salvation.¹⁷ In 1757 Wesley wrote a long treatise, *The Doctrine of Original Sin According to Scripture, Reason and Experience*.¹⁸ A part of this treatise was written in a sermon form again in 1759, under the title, 'Original Sin'.¹⁹ In this treatise, Wesley refuted Taylor's position and maintained strongly both the corruption of human nature and the original guilt. Wesley writes:

⁹ WORKS, VI, 243 (sermon, 'The General Deliverance').

¹⁰ STS, II, 229, cf. WORKS, X, 468.

¹¹ STS, II, 229, STS, I, 117.

¹² STS, II, 229–230.

¹³ For Adam as the primogenitor, STS, II, 230, WORKS, V, 224, 247. For Adam as the federal head, WORKS, IX, 332, 427, 240.

¹⁴ WORKS, IX, 418.

¹⁵ WORKS, IX, 316.

¹⁶ STS, II, 207.

¹⁷ WORKS, IX, 194.

¹⁸ It is the 269 pages long treatise contained in the WORKS, IX.

¹⁹ See STS, II, 207ff.

'We were children of wrath by nature; we were born fallen creatures; we came into the world sinners, and as such, liable to wrath in consequence of the fall of our first father.'²⁰

'Children of wrath' here means that they are liable to some degree of wrath and punishment. Therefore, it involves the guilt of original sin. Wesley says, 'It is undeniable that guilt is imputed to all for the sin of Adam.'²¹ Wesley argues that the fact that all mankind in all ages have died, including infants themselves proves this, for 'none is liable to death, but for sin.'²² He further argues, if infants are not sinners how is Christ the Saviour of all men? If you deny that original sin of infants, p. 205 that death is the wages of sin, or that there is punishment without guilt, it would mean that 'God punishes innocent, guiltless creatures.'²³ Then it follows that infants are sinners; that they are lost, and without Christ, are undone forever.'²⁴

We notice that Wesley makes a pastoral distinction of the original sin; imputed guilt and inherent depravity. Wesley writes:

We have a clear evidence both of what the Divine terms, original sin imputed, and original sin inherent mean. The former is the sin of Adam, so far reckoned ours as to constitute us in some degree guilty; the latter, a want of original righteousness and a corruption of nature.'²⁵

Wesley also makes a distinction between the guilt of Adam and the original guilt of his descendants.

In one sense, indeed Adam's sin was not ours. It was not our personal fault, our actual transgression. But in another sense it was ours; it was the sin of our common representative: And, as such, St. Paul shows it is imputed to us and all his descendants.'²⁶

But to be sure, such distinction as Wesley makes should not be taken to mean that Wesley takes lightly the imputed guilt in mankind. Wesley believes that such a view which he expressed in his treatise is not only a truth agreeable to Scripture and reason, but a truth of the utmost importance.'²⁷ This is a truth, according to Wesley, known only to 'grace healed eyes',²⁸ and the truth which the heathen and blind natural men do not discern.' Wesley thinks, 'none of them [heathens] know of his corruption.'²⁹ But as soon as God opens the eyes of their understanding, they see the state they were in before.'³⁰ He says,

²⁰ WORKS, IX, 419.

²¹ WORKS, IX, 426.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ WORKS, IX, 428.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ WORKS, IX, 420.

²⁶ WORKS, IX, 418.

²⁷ WORKS, IX, 429.

²⁸ Williams, Colin, W., *John Wesley's Theology Today*, New York, Abingdon, 1960, p. 52.

²⁹ STS, II, 222.

³⁰ STS, II, 215.

'This, therefore, is the first ground distinguishing point between Heathenism and Christianity.'³¹ This is Wesley's position.

How does Wesley then differ from the Calvinism of his day? Has he come to 'the very edge of Calvinism?'³² Another question is whether he maintains the consistency in his teaching on the original sin. Some interpreters of Wesley think that Wesley did not hold the guilt of p. 206 original sin but only corruption of the nature. To answer these questions, more extended consideration must be given in the following pages.

FALLEN MAN IN THE STATE OF GRACE

Wesley usually begins his preaching of salvation with the condition of man. When he preached of 'justification by faith,' Wesley states:

Thus by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin. And so death passed upon all man, as being contained in him who was the common father and representative of us all. For as by one man's disobedience all were made sinners, so by that offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation. In this state, we were, even all mankind, when God so loved the world, and He gave His only begotten Son.³³

Again when he preached on the New Birth, Wesley states:

And in Adam all die, all humankind, all the children of men who were then in Adam's loins. The natural consequence of this is, that every descendant from him comes into the world spiritually dead, dead to God, wholly dead in sin; entirely void of the life of God; void of the image of God, of all that righteousness and holiness wherein Adam was created. Instead of this, every man born into the world now bears the image of the devil, in pride and self-will; the image of the beast, in sensual appetites and desires ... the entire corruption of our nature.³⁴

Wesley concludes this first section of his sermon with this. This, then, is the foundation of new birth.³⁵

Hillman observes that it is 'Wesley's normal procedure in evangelistic preaching to establish the sinfulness of the hearers and on this basis to offer then the grace of God.'³⁶ Therefore, in Wesley, if the spiritual man finds favour with God, it is only by the Grace of God, but he believes that 'the process of salvation begins when he becomes conscious of his sinfulness with conviction of sin.'³⁷ Therefore Wesley in his sermon, 'The Way to the Kingdom,' preached that to enter into the Kingdom, first repent, that is, know yourselves. p. 207

Know thyself to be a sinner ...

³¹ STS, II, 215.

³² WORKS, VIII, 285.

³³ STS, I, 117–118, sermon, 'Justification by Faith' (1739), cf. STS, I, 37–38, 'Salvation by Faith' (1738).

³⁴ STS, II, 230–231, 'New Birth' (1740). See also STS, I, 268, 'The Circumcision of the Heart' (1733). STS II, 223, 'Original Sins' (1759).

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Robert John Hillman, 'Grace in the Preaching of Calvin and Wesley', an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation at Fuller Theological Seminary, 1978, p. 63.

³⁷ Lindstrom, *ibid.*, p. 33.

Know that corruption of thy inmost nature, ...
Know that thou art corrupted in every power,
in every faculty of thy soul, that thou art
totally corrupted in every one of these ...
Such is the inbred corruption of the heart,
of thy very inmost nature.³⁸

We observe here that Wesley is, as Hillman points out, concerned to describe the present condition of the sinner rather than the original sin.³⁹ The question of the guilt of original sin and the idea of our original guilt imputed to man is not mentioned in his preaching.⁴⁰ This brings some questions to the mind of interpreters of Wesley. Would it mean then, that Wesley had an inconsistency in his teaching on original sin? Some of Wesley's interpreters thought that Wesley did not believe in the original guilt, but only the corruption of the nature. They thought Wesley maintained the guilt of personal sin only. They think that Wesley held partial depravity rather than total depravity by the fall. For Wesley mentioned elsewhere that part of the image of God (natural image) remained even after the fall.⁴¹

However, this writer thinks that such an interpretation is not just to Wesley. Wesley, I think, did not have inconsistency in his mind. To support this view, we must bear in mind that his treatise of the original sin, in which he strongly maintains the original guilt as well as total corruption of humankind by the fall, was written in a later year (1757) than the sermons. Moreover, we note that Wesley preached these sermons repeatedly in the 1750s. Wesley re-edited those sermons in his latter years, for example in 1771 and again in 1787–8, rearranging the order of sermons.⁴² But Wesley made no remarks anywhere on any change he made in his teaching. This seems to prove that in the mind of Wesley there was no change or inconsistency concerning the doctrine of original sin. Cox believes, 'It has not been proved that Wesley changed his mind.'⁴³ How should we then correlate these words which appear to be different? p. 208

'At this point,' Furfman says, 'it is necessary to point out that there is another view of man in Wesley's writings. Alongside his view of fallen man as totally corrupt and guilty of Adam's sin, he lays out his view of fallen man as seen in the state of grace.'⁴⁴ That is to say that Wesley presents the condition of man in a much milder way, saying some of the image of God even now is to be found in the worst of man.⁴⁵ No man, however primitive, ever

³⁸ STS, I, 156, 'The Way to the Kingdom' (1742).

³⁹ Hillman, *ibid.*, p. 69.

⁴⁰ Charles A. Rogers, 'The Concept of Prevenient Grace in the Theology of John Wesley', an unpublished dissertation (Ph.D.) at Duke University, 1967, pp. 111–112.

⁴¹ WORKS, VI, 223, sermon, 'On the Fall of Man'.

⁴² See STS II, 208f., II 226.

⁴³ Cox, Leo, *John Wesley's Concept of Perfection*, Kansas City, Beacon Hill Press, 1964, p. 29. Wesley often made some remarks when he changed his view in his life. For example, see STS, I, 269 (The Circumcision of the hearts, on faith), sermon on 'Faith' I:11 (of the faith of the servant), Letters V, 358–359 (March 1768 on the assurance of faith). Note also that Wesley published these sermons (New Birth, Original Sin) in 1760 in the 4th volume.

⁴⁴ Eldon R. Furfman, 'The Wesleyan Doctrine of Grace in the Theology of John Wesley', unpublished Ph.D. dissertation at State University of Iowa, 1963, p. 105.

⁴⁵ WORKS, VI, 223, 'On the Fall of Man'.

existed without a measure of free will; man is morally responsible for his actions.⁴⁶ Wesley presupposes that he is already in the state of grace, namely under the operation of the prevenient grace. As Cox says, 'Wesley saw fallen man as living, not now under a covenant of works, but under a covenant of grace,'⁴⁷ because of the grace of God whence our salvation is free in all and free for all.⁴⁸ Therefore, Furhman points out, as opposed as these viewpoints seem to be, Wesley correlates them with his idea of prevenient grace. Wesley would not see opposition between the two, but on the contrary, the closest connection.⁴⁹ Wesley must have presupposed when he preached, that the fallen man is already the recipient of God's grace—prevenient grace. For Wesley believes that 'by preventing grace the guilt of original sin is cancelled.' 'By the righteousness of Christ the original guilt is cancelled as soon as men are sent into the world.'⁵⁰ 'There is a measure of free-will supernaturally restored to every man.'⁵¹

It seems important therefore for us to observe, as Robert E. Cushman points out, that Wesley makes no sharp divorcement between nature and grace in his description of the fallen man because man's whole existence is enveloped by the wooing activity of God. Nevertheless the distinction between nature and grace in fallen man is not dissolved.⁵² p. 209 To state this in another way, in Wesley, as Rogers says, 'While nature and grace are thus distinct Wesley conceives them to be in an intimate and complementary relationship in a vital and functional unity.'⁵³ This approach appears to be a characteristic of Wesley's theologizing. Chiles says that in Wesley's view of Original sin, the 'irreconcilable tension' between sin and grace forms the bedrock of his theology. This is the dynamics of Wesley's theologizing. And if this is neglected, interpretation of Wesley's position inevitably becomes ambiguous or compromising, being unjust to Wesley.⁵⁴

We mentioned earlier that at the close of the nineteenth century, some Wesleyan students rejected original guilt. It appears that they came to reject original guilt because they tended to view man's responsive freedom in an anthropological rather than a soteriological setting. They departed from Wesley in their theological methodology, so as to reach another conclusion.⁵⁵

THE DYNAMICS OF WESLEY'S THEOLOGY

⁴⁶ WORKS, X, 457–459 'Thoughts Upon Necessity'.

⁴⁷ Leo Cox, *John Wesley's Concept of Perfection*, Kansas City, Beacon Hill Press, 1964, p. 31.

⁴⁸ WORKS, VII, 373, 'Free Grace'.

⁴⁹ Wesley's such argument is also well revealed in his sermon 'On Working Out Our Own Salvation', in WORKS, VI, 506–513.

⁵⁰ Letters, VI, 240, cf. WORKS, VIII, 277, IX, 303.

⁵¹ WORKS, X, 230. Also see, WORKS, X, 392, 'Some Remarks on Mr. Hill's Review of All the Doctrines Taught by John Wesley'.

⁵² Robert Cushman, 'Salvation for all: Wesley and Calvinism', in *Methodism*, ed. by W. K. Anderson, Nashville, The Methodist Publishing House, 1947, p. 110.

⁵³ Rogers, *ibid.*, p. 164.

⁵⁴ Chiles, *ibid.*, p. 120–121.

⁵⁵ Some examples of this departure among Wesleyan students such as Watson, and Knudson are shown in Chiles' book, *ibid.*, p. 124ff.

We have observed that Wesley's main thrust in his preaching is to declare the saving grace of God, the whole counsel of God, and anthropology is the existential reference. Therefore, Wesley's doctrine of the fallen man, as Lindstrom noted, is necessarily linked up With the essential purpose of the Gospel, which is from God's grace instead of from man's free-will.⁵⁶ As Starkey pointed out, 'soteriology is prior to anthropology in Wesley.'⁵⁷ Wesley develops the doctrine of the fallen man in the soteriological setting. At this point, his idea of prevenient grace takes a very important role, but it is not the interest of this paper to discuss his doctrine of prevenient grace.

We have also observed that in his view of the fallen man, Wesley maintains the total depravity of human nature and the original guilt by the fall of Adam. He is with Paul and Augustine on this. At this point there is widespread agreement among interpreters of Wesley's theology.⁵⁸ But this collective approach is combined in Wesley with p. 210 the individual approach (in which he maintains that each individual is also responsible), with his idea of prevenient grace. In this approach, Wesley makes no sharp divorcement between nature and grace in the fallen man, but he keeps the tension between assertion of sin and the promptings of grace. Wesley finds the dynamics of his theologizing in the irreconcilable tension which he maintains between the assertion of sin and the promptings of the grace of God, with his idea of preventing grace. Therefore, Wesley interprets in a uniquely significant way the man *coram deo*, because he views the fallen man as sinner because of Adam, at the same time as the recipient of grace because of Christ.

Such an approach by Wesley reveals its significance when it is applied to the relationship between God's grace and man's responsibility for salvation. At this point, I think Wesley makes a significant contribution to theology. Wesley in his sermon, 'On Working Out Our Own Salvation,' based on the text, [Phil. 2:12-13](#), maintains the idea of *sola gratia* and total depravity of the fallen man. He says, without God it is not possible for man to do anything well. But Wesley at the same time maintains that man is able to work and man must be responsible since God works in man.

Yea, it is impossible for any man, for any that is born of a woman, unless God worketh in him.

Seeing all men are by nature, not only sick, but dead in trespasses and in sins, it is not possible for them to do anything well till God raises them from the dead ... Yet this is no excuse for those who continue in sin ... For allowing that all the souls of men are dead in sin by nature, this excuses none. Seeing there is no man that is in a state of mere nature; there is no man, unless he has quenched the Spirit, that is wholly void of the grace of God ... You can do something, through Christ strengthening you.⁵⁹

Thus Wesley is able to maintain man's responsibility for his own salvation, without falling into Pelagianism. At the same time, Wesley does not fall into the difficulty which Augustinianism and Calvinism enter. The working relationship between God's grace and man, in Wesley, is also distinguished from the synergism of the Roman Catholic semi-

⁵⁶ Lindstrom, *ibid.*, p. 32.

⁵⁷ L. Starkey, 'The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of John Wesley', an Unpublished Ph D. dissertation at Columbia University, 1953, p. 200.

⁵⁸ See W. Cannon, *The Theology of John Wesley*, p. 200ff. Robert E. Cushman, 'Salvation for All' in *Methodism* ed. by W. K. Anderson, pp. 106-8. Lindstrom, *ibid.*, p. 12. L. Starkey Jr., *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, p. 124ff. George G. Cell, *ibid.*, p. 25, 272. Chiles, *ibid.*, p. 119. Fuhman, *ibid.*, p. 105. Leo Cox, *ibid.*, p. 29, 47.

⁵⁹ WORKS, VI, 512-513.

pelagianism. For in Wesley, 'First God works; therefore you can work.'⁶⁰ Cox calls Wesley's view synergism in the framework of monergism.⁶¹ L. Starkey calls it 'evangelical synergism.'⁶² Wesley is able to hold such a view because of the dynamics of his theologizing which we observed. Wesley is able to solve the difficulty of the [p. 211](#) theologians of grace, like the Reformers Augustine and Barth, even emphasizing the *sola gratia*.

Moreover, it would not be difficult for us to apprehend that it was this methodology and position which made Wesley safeguard the doctrine of the fallen man from the teaching of 'stillness' of the Moravianism of his day, on the one hand, and from the teaching of 'good works' of the Roman Catholic Church on the other.

It seems also true that when this approach is applied to the doctrine of Christian life, it makes a constructive contribution. We note that Wesley is able to safeguard the doctrine of Christian life from both a shallow view of sin and pessimism concerning nature. For in Wesley Christian life is not understood as a smooth movement, like a train moving on the tracks, not taking seriously the sin problem. Wesley was conscious of the grave result of even the unconscious sin occasioned by the infirmities in the sanctified.⁶³ Therefore, in Wesley repentance of believers is fully necessary. On the other hand, he was not pessimistic because of the gravity of sin, but he was optimistic of Christian life because of the promptings of God's grace, the blood of the atonement of Christ 'continually applied' for His children who depend on 'His intercession for us.'⁶⁴ This theological approach is well reflected in his sermon, 'The Repentance of Believers' which was written in 1767. We could easily observe that an underlying presupposition of Wesley's theology here is the emphasis on the grace—'where sin increased, grace abounded all the more,'⁶⁵ and this is made in the dialectical tension between the assertion of sin and the promptings of grace. This is the dynamics of his theologizing. Therefore, in Wesley salvation of man begins with the grace of God and is maintained by grace, and will be completed by the grace of God. Man however, is responsible only 'if the time and opportunity is given.'⁶⁶ For the rest, it is God who does the work for man, so long as man is in a faith relationship with Christ, the High Priest. Wesley preaches:

Thus it is, that in the children of God, repentance and faith exactly answer each other. By repentance we feel the sin remaining in our hearts and cleaving to our words and actions. By faith, we receive the power of God in [p. 212](#) Christ, purifying our hearts, cleansing our hands. By repentance we are still sensible that we deserve punishment for all our tempers, and words, and actions; by faith, we are conscious that our Advocate with the Father is continually turning aside all condemnation and punishment from us. Repentance says,

⁶⁰ WORKS, VI, p. 511.

⁶¹ Cox, *ibid.*, p. 43.

⁶² Starkey, *ibid.*, p. 116.

⁶³ STS, II, 389, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* by Wesley, p. 52.

⁶⁴ STS, II, 393.

⁶⁵ [Rom. 5:20](#), see WORKS IX, 303.

⁶⁶ STS, II, 456, 'Scripture Way of Salvation'. Here Wesley says, 'Fruits (of repentance) ... are only necessary conditionally, if there be time and opportunity for them; otherwise a man may be sanctified without them.'

‘without Him I can do nothing.’ Faith says, ‘I can do all things through Christ strengthening me.’⁶⁷

Thus, in Wesley, ‘the repentance (i.e. the assertion of sin) and faith (i.e. the assertion of grace) are full as necessary, in order for our continuance and growth in grace ... to our entering into the Kingdom.’⁶⁸ But to be sure, in Wesley, he keeps this tension with much more emphasis on the grace, for ‘where sin increased, grace abounded all the more’ ([Rom. 5:20](#)). Here is the optimism of grace in Wesley which supercedes the pessimism of sin, nature,⁶⁹ wherein Wesley is to be distinguished from Luther and the neo-Reformation theologians. Their doctrine of fallen man often tends to view the Christian life as a constant struggle between sin and grace, *simul justus et peccator* or as ‘impossible possibility.’

Furthermore, we would note some significant contributions that Wesley could make in the contemporary theological enterprises, when his approach and position is applied. For example, Wesley’s position of the fallen man would offer a constructive help toward the theology of mission.

First of all, Wesley’s theology would insist on the universal need of salvation by God’s grace because of his assertion of the depth and universality of man’s sin, and on the other hand, emphasize the possibility and hope of salvation for all men, because of his assertion of the free grace of God in all and for all. But, in doing so, Wesley’s theology would safeguard the doctrine of salvation by grace alone from the danger of both Universalism and divine determinism, because it is Wesley’s position that maintains the responsibility in the fallen man who is already in the state of grace. Thus, in Wesley, the hope of salvation for all men is emphasized and yet the responsibility of man, and the Church’s mission is equally stressed. In this way, Wesley’s theology would bring a welcome relief in the soundly biblical deliverance from the dilemma which resides in the house of Luther and Barthian theology.

Secondly, Wesley’s position would bring another welcome contribution in the search for a solution from the dilemma at the issue of the [p. 213](#) point of contact; continuity or discontinuity between God (the Gospel) and man (culture) in mission. It appears that there is a dilemma in the theology of mission because if one maintains the continuity between God and man, it often tends to identify nature and grace as do romanticists, pantheists, deists and modern liberal humanists; on the other hand, when one maintains the discontinuity between the two, as do the Reformers, Barthians and Kraemer, it leads to an impasse in his finding the point of contact, dialogue and the ground for apologetic approach in mission. This is a perennial issue in the cross cultural mission. But, when we are true to Wesley’s position and approach, a healthy solution to this dilemma will be found. For Wesley’s approach is not either/or in its abstract inference, but ‘both/and,’ a correlation of the two into a creative synthesis, keeping a dialectical tension between grace and nature.

So keeping the tension (discontinuity) between God and man, Wesley finds the point of contact in terms of the work of grace which is initiated by God and already operative in the fallen man. By doing so, Wesley, without identifying nature with grace, provides the point of contact in mission, and moreover his theology gives hope and encouragement in mission because it finds the ground of mission in the operation of God’s grace in the world.

⁶⁷ STS, II, 394.

⁶⁸ STS, II, 380. The words in the parenthesis are mine.

⁶⁹ Williams, *ibid.*, p. 190.

Thus, Wesley's position, when true to its own dynamics of theologizing, will provide a respectable, relevant solution to the contemporary theology of mission.

It may be reasonably assumed that Wesley's approach and position will also provide constructive contributions in other contemporary theological frontiers. This represents a challenge to, and responsibility of the students of Wesley today and in the future.

Dr. Chongnam Cho is a Senior University Chaplain, Dean of Seoul Campus College, Myongji University in South Korea and is a former member of the Theological Commission. p. 214

Imago Dei and Church Order

Leroy S. Capper

Reprinted from Presbyterian, Spring 1985 with permission

The crowning act of the creative work of God was his creation of man in his own image:

Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground.'

**So God created man in his own image,
in the image of God he created him;
male and female he created them.**

([Gen. 1:26, 27](#))

It is his being in the image of God which distinguishes man from all the rest of God's creation and gives him an elevated status, and it is the fact of his being in the image of God which serves as the basis for human ethics (cf. [Gen. 9:6](#)). In recent years a particular view of the nature of the image, first suggested by Karl Barth, has been urged by Paul K. Jewett as the basis for sexual egalitarianism in the ministry and offices of the church (finding written expression in his work *Man as Male and Female*). From this perspective 'the image of God' has primary reference not to individual men or women but to man(kind) as male and female. It is our purpose here first to examine whether such a view of the *imago dei* has a biblical foundation and then to determine whether such a view leads to the dismissal of the role distinctions traditionally recognized as biblical and practised in the Christian Church.

Our first task is to consider the nature of the image of God in man. Prior to the Reformation there was a tendency to distinguish between 'image' and 'likeness' and in this distinction to find some indication of what the image consists of. For Irenaeus and Tertullian, the distinction was between bodily and spiritual traits; for Clement of Alexandria and many following him, the distinction was between those qualities essential to man as man, and those qualities not essential to man, which could be cultivated or lost. The Reformers and most scholars since have rejected such distinctions, seeing 'image' and 'likeness' as two almost (if not entirely) synonymous words giving full expression to the single concept of 'the very image of God'. For Luther, this image consisted solely of original