

porate fellowship and life in Christ. Apart from monastic or semi-monastic patterns of spirituality, are there many signs that we have taken with real seriousness the fact that the New Testament refers over sixty times to 'saints', but only once to 'saint' (an individual who is styled *hagios*)—and that in an inclusive sense? (Phil. 4. 21).

NOTES

- 1 *Letters* ed. J. Telford (London 1931), viii p. 238
- 2 *Plain Account*, p. 30
- 3 A. C. Outler ed. *John Wesley* (Oxford 1964), p. 31
- 4 *Ibid.*, p. 9f
- 5 *A Collection of Hymns, for the use of the People called Methodists*, (London 1780), 526(4)
- 6 R. A. Knox *Enthusiasm* (Oxford 1950), p. 433
- 7 A. C. Outler, *op. cit.* p. 252
- 8 *Works* ed. T. Jackson (London 1829-31), xi p. 366ff., my italics
- 9 Harald Lindström *Wesley and Sanctification* (London 1950), p. 136
- 10 R. N. Flew *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology* (Oxford 1934), p. 284
- 11 *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (London 1739), p. viii
- 12 *The Methodist Hymn Book* (1933) 105
- 13 R. A. Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 3
- 14 F. C. Gill ed. *Selected Letters of John Wesley* No. 126
- 15 Cited in Dora Greenwell, *Two Friends* (London 1863), p. 92 of 1952 edn
- 16 Aelfred of Rievaulx *The Mirror of Charity* ed. G. Webb and A. Walker (London 1962) p. 39
- 17 R. A. Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 432

Whitefield's Break with the Wesleys

Frank Baker

Professor of English Church History,
Duke University, N. Carolina, U.S.A.

ONE of the most pregnant events in English church history was George Whitefield's parting company with the Wesleys over the publication of John Wesley's sermon *Free Grace*, for it brought theological bitterness and recriminations into what might have remained a difference of doctrinal opinion between those who were equally sincere and successful in preaching the gospel of redemption. This in turn marked the dividing of the waters between two great streams of revival in eighteenth-century England. It is true that the rupture has sometimes been regarded as inevitable. Certainly doctrinal bigotry is frequently the parent of schism. Perhaps the Arminian Wesley's sincere desire to remain in evangelical harness with the Calvinist Whitefield would have created problems which might eventually have become insuperable; perhaps it was impossible for them always to steer clear in their preaching and writing of divisive doctrine. The fact remains that their disagreements were magnified out of proportion during a series of events surrounding the publication of John Wesley's sermon, the circumstances of which have been little known and largely misunderstood, so that it seems worth while to attempt a reconstruction of the whole story in a moderate amount of detail.

Having followed the Wesleys as missionaries to Georgia, Whitefield returned to England to receive priest's orders and to beg money for his

projected orphanage in Savannah. During his tours in the west of England he found himself the focal point of a religious revival, especially after he had begun to preach in the open air. In March 1739 he asked his former tutor John Wesley to come and take over for him. At that time John Wesley was thirty-five, his brother Charles thirty-one, and Whitefield himself twenty-four.

On 2 April 1739 John Wesley began in Bristol and Bath an exhilarating round of preaching salvation in the fields and expounding spiritual growth in religious societies both old and new, with amazing success. He remarked with surprise, 'Many Presbyterians and Anabaptists come to hear'; even a Presbyterian minister joined the company.¹ This held both promise and threat. Before he left London Wesley's friends had urged him not to be tempted into doctrinal disputes, 'least of all concerning predestination, because this people was so deeply prejudiced for it'.² His own irenic temperament heartily seconded this advice, and accordingly he had been proclaiming only the positive message of salvation. On Tuesday 24 April, however, he received a long letter charging him with 'resisting and perverting the truth as it is in Jesus by preaching against God's decree of predestination'. He reported to his friends in London:

I had not done so yet; but I questioned whether I ought not now to declare the whole counsel of God; especially since that letter had been long handed about in Bristol before it was sealed and brought to me, together with another wherein also the writer exhorts his friends to avoid me as a false teacher. However, I thought it best to walk gently, and so said nothing this day.³

Early the following morning, however, his diary notes that he 'writ upon predestination', and kept this up for three or four hours.⁴ On the Thursday he believed himself led by the Holy Spirit to break the self-imposed silence, with remarkable results:

Thursday, 26th, preaching at Newgate on those words, 'He that believeth hath everlasting life', I was led, I know not how, to speak strongly and explicitly of predestination, and then to pray 'that if I spake not the truth of God, He would stay His hand and work no more among us: if this was His truth, He would not delay to confirm it by signs following'. Immediately the power of God fell upon us: one, and another, and another sunk to the earth: you might see them dropping on all sides as thunder-struck. One cried out aloud. I went and prayed over her, and she received joy in the Holy Ghost. A second falling into the same agony, we turned to her, and received for her also the promise of the Father. In the evening I made the same appeal to God, and almost before we called He answered. A young woman was seized with such pangs as I never saw before; and in a quarter of an hour she had a new song in her mouth, a thanksgiving unto our God.⁵

Thus was Wesley convinced that it was God's dramatically confirmed will that he should not maintain silence on what he considered the dangerous antinomian tendencies of the doctrine of predestination. Shortly after the Newgate gathering he made up his mind to appeal to God for yet further confirmation, by the method of preparing slips of paper show-

ing the various courses open to him in this matter and then drawing one after prayer for God's guidance. The result is well known :

This day, I being desirous to speak little, but our brother Purdy pressing me to speak and spare not, we made four lots, and desired our Lord to show what He would have me to do. The answer was, 'Preach and print'. Let Him see to the event!⁶

Already, as we have seen, Wesley had gathered together his thoughts on predestination in private study, and had allowed them to spill over in public. More was needed, however. For many hours that Saturday he prepared a 'sermon upon predestination', writing out the final manuscript after supper that night; he made a few revisions the following morning. At 7 a.m. on Sunday 29 April 1739 (once more after recourse to the lot to be doubly, trebly sure that this was indeed God's will) he delivered it to a great crowd in the Bowling Green, Bristol:

I declared the free grace of God to about four thousand people from those words, 'He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?' At that hour it was that one who had long continued in sin, from a despair of finding mercy, received a full, clear sense of His pardoning love, and power to sin no more.⁷

Having thus fulfilled the first part of the drawn lot that he should 'preach and print' on the Monday morning, he spent two or three hours writing (probably preparing the brief preface and undertaking further revisions) and on Monday afternoon paid the first of his many visits to the Bristol printers Samuel and Felix Farley, who were still in partnership.⁸ Within two weeks his first Bristol publication was on sale:⁹ *Free Grace. A Sermon preach'd at Bristol. By John Wesley, M.A. Fellow of Lincoln-College, Oxford. Bristol: Printed by S. and F. Farley, 1739.* Wesley's hesitations were mirrored in the brief preface:

To the Reader

Nothing but the strongest conviction, not only that what is here advanced is 'the truth as it is in Jesus', but also that I am indispensably obliged to declare this truth to all the world, could have induced me openly to oppose the sentiments of those whom I highly esteem for their works' sake. . . .¹⁰

At the same time he pleaded that those who disagreed with him would reply only in a spirit of meekness and love.

Read in the light of the sermon itself, this was expecting rather much of bigots for the predestinarian point of view, for Wesley's attack was devastating, and in fact with its thirty numbered sections this was far more treatise than sermon. (Indeed when thirty years later he collected his writings, he did not include this among his sermons, but in Volume 20 among his controversial writings.) He quickly disposed of his first point, that God's grace is 'free in all to whom it is given', and came to grips with the main problem: 'But is it free *for all*, as well as *in all*?' He insisted that single predestination implied double predestination—election of a few to salvation necessarily involved the reprobation of the many to

damnation, whatever sophistry or synonyms were used to conceal or minimize the fact:

Call it therefore by whatever name you please, election, preterition, predestination, or reprobation, it comes in the end to the same thing. The sense of all is plainly this: 'By virtue of an eternal, unchangeable, irresistible decree of God, one part of mankind are infallibly saved, and the rest infallibly damned, it being impossible that any of the former should be damned or that any of the latter should be saved'.¹¹

He went on to show how this makes 'all preaching vain', and 'not only tends to destroy holiness, happiness, and good works', but even 'the whole Christian revelation'.¹² Worse still, the doctrine of predestination is a blasphemy against the whole nature of God:

It destroys all His attributes at once; it overturns both His justice, mercy, and truth; yea, it represents the most holy God as worse than the devil, as both more false, more cruel, and more unjust.

Sections 26 and 27 emphasize this point, echoing the very word 'blasphemy' which he had introduced in section 25:

26. This is the blasphemy clearly contained in *the horrible decree*¹³ of predestination. . . .

27. This is the blasphemy for which (however I love the persons who assert it) I abhor the doctrine of predestination. . . .

Let the predestinarians quote Scripture as they might: 'No scripture can mean that God is not love, or that His mercy is not over all His works; that is, whatever it prove beside, no Scripture can prove predestination'.¹⁴ Appended to the treatise itself was a thirty-six-stanza poem by Charles Wesley entitled 'Universal Redemption', later reprinted in *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1740), and thence transferred to *Hymns on God's Everlasting Love*.

While this was happening in Bristol, in London Whitefield, waiting for embarkation to America, was engaged in a busy round of preaching and money-raising. Wesley did not go out of his way to inform his young colleague of this Bristol publication, especially as any day he might have left the country, and thus have been exposed to unnecessary distress. In any case both men were involved in a whirl of activity, and Whitefield's ignorance about *Free Grace* may well have been purely accidental. If the silence was indeed deliberate, it was probably the result of Wesley's mistaken kindness rather than of dissimulation, for Whitefield was chief among those whose Calvinist principles he deplored, even though he admired his religious zeal and loved him as a personal friend. Just as Wesley deliberately refrained from referring to Whitefield by name in the publication, so he might have allowed himself to slide into telling him nothing at all about it.¹⁵ Nevertheless it is strange that not until 25 June, five weeks later, did Whitefield mention the subject to Wesley:

I hear, honoured sir, you are about to print a sermon on predestination. It shocks me to think of it; what will be the consequences but controversy? If

people ask my opinion, what shall I do? I have a critical part to act; God enable me to behave aright! Silence on both sides will be best. It is noised abroad already that there is a division between you and me.¹⁶

Wesley must have replied telling his friend that in fact the sermon was already published, describing how he came to accept God's instructions to 'preach and print'. Whitefield responded: 'Dear, honoured sir, if you have any regard for the peace of the church, keep in your sermon on predestination. But you have cast a lot. . . . The Lord direct us all'.¹⁷ Privately he asked the question, which he was to repeat in print the following year, whether Wesley had not in fact tempted God by seeking to resolve his problem by the method of drawing lots after prayer, remembering an earlier occasion when such a decision would have prevented his sailing to America—and forgetting how just such a lot brought Wesley to his rescue in Bristol.¹⁸ In spite of their differences in theological opinion, however, like Wesley he wished to retain their ties of affection, and signed himself, 'Your obedient son and servant in Christ'.¹⁹

'Disputes about predestination' had by this time begun to threaten the societies in London as well as in Bristol, and both John and Charles Wesley preached against the doctrine of election, which could so easily lead to antinomianism. After all, what was the point in seeking holiness if you were saved anyway? Charles also followed his brother's lead by challenging God for a public demonstration of his approval, praying 'that if God would have all men to be saved He would show some token for good upon us'—whereupon three people were converted.²⁰ Nevertheless John Wesley so far yielded to Whitefield as to promise that he would not publish another edition of the sermon while the younger man remained in England, and he may even have agreed to hold up further sales of the Bristol edition.²¹

Wesley did far better than keep his promise. Not until the following summer did he publish a second edition. In June 1740 he returned to London after a month in Bristol to find the Fetter Lane society falling to pieces from quietism on the one hand and predestinarianism on the other, and he saw these as equally the parents of his favourite enemy, antinomianism. He expounded the Epistle of James to them: he urged his own sympathizers not to enter into 'doubtful disputations' with predestinarians like Acourt who were spoiling for theological combat; he even led a small secession from Fetter Lane to his own Foundery; and at last he reprinted his sermon on *Free Grace*.²² To his former preface he appended this note:

Advertisement

Whereas a pamphlet entitled *Free Grace Indeed!* has been published against this sermon, this is to inform the publisher that I cannot answer his tract till he appears to be more *in earnest*. For I dare not speak of the deep things of God in the spirit of a prize-fighter or a stage-player.²³

A far more damaging attack was soon to appear, however, from the pen of his old pupil, colleague, and friend. While Whitefield was out of the country he and Wesley kept up a monthly correspondence, though only

Whitefield's letters have survived to help us estimate the gradual fraying of the ties that bound them across the ocean of distance and the gulf of doctrine. On 26 March 1740 Whitfield wrote from Savannah:

The doctrine of *election*, and the *final perseverance* of those that are truly in Christ, I am ten thousand times more convinced of, if possible, than when I saw you last. You think otherwise. Why then should we dispute, when there is no probability of convincing? . . .²⁴

So distressed was he that he seriously pondered remaining permanently in America, so much more sympathetic to Calvinism, rather than returning to risk blowing upon the embers of controversy. In May he ventured the opinion that Wesley was 'entirely inconsistent' with himself, though he believed nevertheless that eventually his former tutor would be brought to heaven by the same power that he denied, 'sovereign, distinguishing, irresistible grace'.²⁵ A month later he wrote: 'For Christ's sake, if possible, dear sir, never speak against election in your sermons'.²⁶ Before this reached Wesley, he had reprinted his *Free Grace*. On 9 August he replied to Whitefield's letter of 24 May:

The case is quite plain. There are bigots both for predestination and against it. God is sending a message to those on either side. But neither will receive it, unless from one of his own opinion. Therefore for a time you are suffered to be of one opinion and I of another.²⁷

On 25 August Whitefield wrote forebodingly: 'I cannot bear the thoughts of opposing you; but how can I avoid it, if you go about (as your brother Charles once said) to drive John Calvin out of Bristol?'²⁸ Some tartness crept into his letter of 25 September:

I find your sermon has had its expected success: it hath set the nation a disputing; you will have enough to do now to answer pamphlets; two I have already seen. O that you would be more cautious in casting lots! O that you would not be too rash and precipitant! If you go on thus, honoured sir, how can I concur with you? It is impossible: I must speak what I know.²⁹

A heavy destiny seemed to have laid its hand on him as he penned his letter of 24 November:

Last night brother G[ladman] brought me your two kind letters. O that there may be harmony and very intimate union between us! Yet it cannot be, since you hold *universal redemption*. But no more of this. Perhaps, in Spring, we may see each other face to face. . . . My dear brother, for Christ's sake avoid all disputation. Do not oblige me to preach against you; I had rather die.³⁰

The following monthly letter was very much longer, and constituted a frank though still friendly tearing apart of Wesley's hated sermon. He criticized John Wesley's supposed divine guidance in preaching and printing, and claimed: 'Your discourse . . . is as little to the purpose as your text, and . . . does but more and more confirm me in the belief of the doctrine of God's *eternal election*'. He accused Wesley of false definitions, of 'absurd reasoning', of 'sophistry'.³¹ He answered what he considered the main arguments of the sermon, and maintained that

Wesley dishonoured God by denying election, and made 'salvation depend not on God's *Free Grace* but on man's *free will*'.³²

Although this strongly critical letter was certainly written with the possibility of eventual publication in mind,³³ some of Whitefield's over-enthusiastic London supporters secured a copy and jumped the gun, printing at least extracts, possibly in a broadsheet. On Sunday 1 February 1741 Wesley recorded in his *Journal*:

A private letter wrote to me by Mr Whitefield having been printed without either his leave or mine, great numbers of copies were given to our people, both at the door and in the Foundry itself. Having procured one of them I related (after preaching) the naked fact to the congregation, and told them, 'I will do just what I believe Mr Whitefield would were he here himself'. Upon which I tore it in pieces before them all. Everyone who had received it did the same. So that in two minutes there was not a whole copy left. Ah! poor Ahithophel!³⁴

Wesley did not know it, of course, but on that very day Whitefield was writing to him from shipboard announcing that in fact a copy of this letter which he had left in Charleston was now in the press, that he had sent another to Boston, and that he was bringing still a third with him for intended publication in London.³⁵

On 11 March 1741 the *Minerva* deposited Whitefield at Falmouth, and four days later he reached London. Quickly he discovered that his stock had fallen badly:

Many, very many of my spiritual children . . . are so prejudiced by the dear Messrs Wesleys' dressing up the doctrine of election in such horrible colours that they will neither hear, see, nor give me the least assistance.³⁶

John Wesley seems still to have hoped for a full reconciliation, but Charles was more guarded, writing to his brother (who was in Bristol) on 16 March:

His fair words are not to be trusted to, for his actions show most unfriendly. An answer to your sermon he just put into my hands. The title was enough. I endorsed it 'Put up again thy sword into its place', and deferred reading till it is in print.

Some say you cannot help disputing and preaching and printing against him. Let us by the grace of God disappoint them.

However, the friendly gesture of offering Whitefield the Foundry pulpit on the following day, was sadly abused. Charles reported to John:

Tu. Morn. G.W. came into the desk while I was showing the believer's privilege, i.e. power over sin. After speaking some time I desired him to preach. He did—predestination, perseverance and the necessity of sinning. Afterwards I mildly expostulated with him, asking if he would commend me for preaching the opposite doctrines in his Orphan House, protesting against the publishing his answer to you, and labouring for peace to the utmost of my power. [I] asked whether he held reprobation, which he avowed, as also his intention of preaching it upon the housetop. Behold the hope of him is in vain. . . . Warn all among you not to make mention of his name within their lips except in prayer.³⁷

It seems that Whitefield's Calvinism had hardened during his second sojourn in America, especially under the influence of men like Jonathan Edwards. It also seems that those who had prematurely published his answer to Wesley were quickly at work urging him to make a complete break with the heretical Arminians.³⁸ On 25 March he wrote to James Habersham in Georgia:

I am now constrained, on account of our differing in principles, publicly to separate from my dear, dear old friends Messrs John and Charles Wesley, whom I still love as my own soul.³⁹

To John Cennick in Bristol he wrote the same day: 'It is a trying time now in the church. The Lord give us a due mixture of the lamb and lion'.⁴⁰

John Wesley was still trying to stand firm on the doctrinal issue without allowing personal recriminations to intervene. In the preface to *Hymns and Sacred Poems*, published in July 1740, he had struck a glancing blow at predestination, and the volume presented two poems on 'Universal Redemption', including the one appended to *Free Grace*. Towards the end of the year he published *Serious Considerations concerning the Doctrines of Election and Reprobation*, extracted from Isaac Watt's *Ruin and Recovery of Mankind*.⁴¹ More recently he had printed an extract from Robert Barclay's *Apology* under the title of *Serious Considerations on Absolute Predestination*, while brother Charles had prepared further *Hymns on God's Everlasting Love*.⁴² Charles recommended that the Barclay extract should be held back until the day after Whitefield's *Letter* was published, presumably to demonstrate that they were defending themselves rather than attacking Whitefield, even though nothing personal appeared in any of these publications.⁴³

Although at first Whitefield had promised to follow Wesley's example in avoiding personal attacks, he went back on his word. Soon after his return from Bristol John Wesley sought Whitefield out. He reported sadly their interview of 28 March:

He told me he and I preached two different gospels, and therefore he not only would not join with, or give me the right hand of fellowship, but was resolved publicly to preach against me and my brother wheresoever he preached at all. Mr Hall (who went with me) put him in mind of the promise he had made but a few days before that, [that] whatever his private opinion was, he would never publicly preach against us. He said, that promise was only an effect of human weakness, and he was now of another mind.⁴⁴

A few days later the thirty-one-page answer appeared—*A Letter to the Reverend Mr John Wesley: In Answer to his Sermon, entituled, 'Free-Grace'*. Wesley's *Journal* record of another interview a week later shows a resultant hardening of his own feelings:

I believed both love and justice required that I should speak my sentiments freely to Mr Wh[itefield] concerning the letter he had published, said to be in answer to my sermon on *Free Grace*. The sum of what I observed to him was this: (1) That it was quite imprudent to publish it at all, as being only the putting of weapons into their hands who loved neither the one nor the other. (2) That if he was constrained to bear his testimony (as he termed it)

against the error I was in, he might have done it by publishing a treatise on this head, without ever calling my name in question. (3) That what he had published was a mere burlesque upon an answer, leaving four of my eight arguments untouched, and handling the other four in so gentle a manner as if he was afraid they would burn his fingers: however, that (4) he had said enough of what was wholly foreign to the question to make an open (and probably irreparable) breach between him and me. . . .⁴⁵

Whitefield had now thrown down the gauntlet in public, and emphasized the fact by his choice of a motto for his title page, in which he figured as Paul and Wesley as Peter: 'But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed' (Gal. 2.11). Wesley told his brother Charles that he could not yet come to Bristol to relieve him, but must stay in London: 'I must go round and glean after Mr Whitefield'. He pointed out that in a measure he had now taken the warfare into the other camp: 'We presented a thousand of Barclay to Mr Whitefield's congregation on Sunday. On Sunday next I propose to distribute a thousand more at the Foundery'.⁴⁶ This was on 21 April. He was not finished with his attack on Whitefield's doctrinal position, though he still carefully avoided personal recriminations. (There is probably solid basis for the anecdote that when asked to answer the *Letter* he replied, 'You may read Whitefield against Wesley, but you shall never read Wesley against Whitefield'.)⁴⁷ On 2 May he prepared another tract on predestination, adapted from Thomas Grantham's *Dialogue between the Presbyterian and the Baptist*. This was published in a very large edition of 6,000 four days later under the title of *A Dialogue between a Predestinarian and his Friend*.⁴⁸ Three months later he issued a second edition, 'corrected and enlarged', once again of 6,000 copies.⁴⁹ This was followed up later in August with an extract from Henry Haggard's *Order of Causes* under the title of *The Scripture Doctrine concerning Predestination, Election, and Reprobation*—this time of 4,000 copies.⁵⁰

One of the most interesting volleys in this paper warfare was Mrs Susanna Wesley's first venture into print, in *Some Remarks on a Letter from the Reverend Mr Whitefield to the Rev. Mr Wesley, in a Letter from a Gentlewoman to her Friend*. The old lady pointed out that the Wesleys only said that all *might* be saved, not that all *would* be saved, and shrewdly observed that much of Whitefield's animus was in fact against their teaching on Christian Perfection:

I am verily persuaded that many of the Predestinarians are more angry with the Wesleys for preaching up gospel holiness than for their pleading so strongly for universal redemption; and if they would let the former alone, they would forgive them the latter.⁵¹

However, the damage had been done. The issues had hardened and the forces of evangelicalism had gathered into two camps around opposing leaders. Even though these leaders were reconciled after a few months and remained lifelong friends; even though many preachers, like Howell Harris and the Reverend William Grimshaw, successfully managed to keep one foot in each camp; there was little hope that a major and permanent reconciliation would be brought about during the lifetime of the chief

protagonists, and shortly after Whitefield's death in 1770 the Calvinist-Arminian controversy flared into new life. Any thoughtful attempt to assess the responsibility must take into account the immense hazards inherent in the co-operation of deeply sincere evangelists with strongly-held but opposing doctrinal convictions, must agree that there were faults on both sides. On the whole, however, the summary which Wesley gave in his *Short History of Methodism* (1765) is both accurate and fair:

In March 1741 Mr Whitefield, being returned to England, entirely separated from Mr Wesley and his friends because he did not hold the decrees. Here was the first breach, which warm men persuaded Mr Whitefield to make merely for a difference of opinion. Those, indeed, who believed universal redemption had no desire at all to separate; but those who held particular redemption would not hear of any accommodation, being determined to have no fellowship with men that 'were in so dangerous errors'. So there were now two sorts of Methodists, so called: those for particular, and those for general, redemption.⁵²

NOTES

- 1 John Wesley *Letters*, Standard edn, ed. John Telford (London, Epworth Press 1931) i, p. 294-5, corrected from the original in the Moravian Archives, London
- 2 *Ibid.*, i, p. 302
- 3 *Ibid.*, i, p. 302
- 4 John Wesley, *Journal*, (Standard edn, ed. Nehemiah Curnock (London, Epworth Press 1938) ii, p. 183
- 5 *Letters* i, p. 303; cf. *Journal* ii, pp. 184-5
- 6 *Letters* i, p. 303; the diary for noon that day reads 'appealed to G[od] concerning predestination'. This might possibly refer to his challenging prayer in Newgate, but more probably pinpoints the drawing of a lot (*Journal* ii, p. 184; cf. *Letters* i, pp. 307-8)
- 7 *Journal* ii, p. 185; cf. *Letters* i, p. 304. The text is Romans 8.32
- 8 *Journal* ii, p. 186
- 9 *Letters* i, p. 312
- 10 *Free Grace* (Bristol 1739), pp. iii-iv; cf. *Wesley Works*, 14 vols, ed. T. Jackson (London, Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, n.d.) vii, p. 373
- 11 *Works* vii, pp. 375-6
- 12 *Ibid.*, p. 379
- 13 See Calvin, *Institutes*, iii, 33, 7: 'How is it that the fall of Adam involves so many nations, with their infant children, in eternal death without remedy, unless that it so seemed meet to God? . . . The decree, I admit, is dreadful (*Decretum quidem horribile fateor*); and yet it is impossible to deny that God foreknew what the end of man was to be before He made him, and foreknew because He had so ordained by His decree'
- 14 *Works* vii, pp. 382-3
- 15 See *ibid.*, xi, p. 181
- 16 Luke Tyerman, *Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley* (London, Hodder and Stoughton 1870), i, pp. 277-8
- 17 *Ibid.*, i, pp. 277-8, quoting *Methodist Magazine* 1849, p. 165
- 18 *George Whitefield's Journals* (London, Banner of Truth Trust 1960), pp. 572-3 (Whitefield's Letter to Wesley); cf. *Wesley, Journal*, ii, pp. 156-8
- 19 Tyerman, *Wesley*, i, 313
- 20 Charles Wesley, *Journal*, ed. T. Jackson (London, Wesleyan Methodist Book Room n.d.), i, p. 155
- 21 Whitefield Letter to the Reverend Mr John Wesley (London, Strahan 1741), p. 7 (cf. *Journals*, p. 572): 'At my desire you suppressed the publishing the sermon whilst I was in England; but soon sent it into the world after my departure'. This somewhat ambiguous sentence has naturally misled earlier scholars who did not know that the sermon had already been published when this was written
- 22 *Journal* ii, p. 349-54; *Letters* i, pp. 343-4; entry for 12 July 1740 on folio 11 of William Strahan's Ledger, B.M. Add. MSS. 48800
- 23 See Richard Green *Anti-Methodist Publications* (London, Kelly 1902), item 100X. There is a copy in the Methodist Archives, London
- 24 *Whitefield Works* (London, E. and C. Dilly 1771), i, p. 156
- 25 *Ibid.*, p. 182

- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 189
- ²⁷ Wesley, *Letters* i, p. 351; actually this letter is preserved only by Whitefield himself, in his *Letter to Wesley*, pp. iii-iv
- ²⁸ Whitefield, *Works* i, p. 205
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 212
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 225; cf. Wesley, *Journal* ii, pp. 413, 498
- ³¹ *Letter*, pp. 5-27; cf. *Journals*, pp. 562-88, especially pp. 574-5, 576, 587
- ³² *Letter*, pp. 25-6; cf. *Journals*, p. 587
- ³³ Whitefield, *Works* i, p. 248
- ³⁴ *Journal* ii, p. 422. Apparently the Aithophel referred not to Whitefield as Wesley's treacherous friend, but to whomever among Whitefield's followers had betrayed him by publishing the letter. No copy appears to have survived bearing evidence of being earlier than the regular one published by Strahan two months later. Charles Wesley does not seem to have heard of the incident, nor to have seen a copy, witness his distress when Whitefield showed him the manuscript six weeks later. A broadsheet would be a normal (and less costly) method of printing extracts for popular dissemination—and would be far easier to tear to bits in public—but this is only my guess
- ³⁵ Luke Tyerman, *Life of the Rev. George Whitefield*, 2nd edn London, Hodder and Stoughton 1890), i, p. 465
- ³⁶ *Works* i, p. 256-7
- ³⁷ MS letter in Methodist Archives, London, endorsed by John Wesley 'C. March 16. 1740' [i.e., 1740/41], but begun on the 16th and continued on the 17th
- ³⁸ Wesley, *Works* viii, p. 349; cf. *Journal* ii, pp. 439-40
- ³⁹ *Works* i, p. 257
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 257-8
- ⁴¹ Richard Green, *The Works of John and Charles Wesley: a bibliography*, 2nd ed (London, Methodist Publishing House 1906) No. 16, though he does not note Wesley's source
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, Nos. 22, 31
- ⁴³ MS letter referred to in note 37
- ⁴⁴ *Journal* ii, pp. 439-40
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 441. No. 27 of *The Christian's Amusement* announced the intended publication of the *Letter* 'in a few days'. This was the last weekly issue before its place was taken by the *Weekly History*, and although it bears no date it would seem to belong to 4 April. Wesley, however, saw Whitefield that day and spoke about the *Letter* as already published
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, ii, pp. 447-8
- ⁴⁷ Tyerman, *Wesley*, 1.351
- ⁴⁸ Green, *op. cit.*, No. 24. There is no question that Wesley's *Dialogue* comes from Grantham's work
- ⁴⁹ Strahan's Ledgers, B.M. Add. MS. 48800
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*; see Green, *op. cit.*, No. 27; Haggard's work was in fact sometimes appended to Grantham's, noted above, and is so in the British Museum copy
- ⁵¹ See *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, xxv (September 1965), pp. 68, 71
- ⁵² *Works* viii, p. 349; cf. xi, pp. 481-2 (*A Letter to the Rev. Mr Thomas Maxfield*, 1778)

Perspectives in the History of Ancient Israel

J. R. Bartlett

Lecturer in Divinity, Trinity College, Dublin

As ONE of the many who teach 'the history, religion, and literature of ancient Israel' from Israel's beginnings (whenever they are) to the end of ancient Israel (A.D. 70?), I am becoming increasingly concerned about the perspective of the picture of ancient Israel that we present to our students. I am not simply concerned in this essay with the perennial difficulty of covering all the desired ground in the lecture hours available, nor with a lecturer's natural tendency to focus upon the debate of the day—let us say,