

**JOHN CALVIN AND JOHN WESLEY:
*AN ENGLISH PERSPECTIVE***

A paper given at the International Calvin Congress in Geneva on 26 May 2009

by

Dr Alan C. Clifford

Introduction

Had Augustine of Hippo (354-430) been honoured with a quincentenary celebration somewhere in the Holy Roman Empire in 854, a ‘positive’ paper on the ‘British heretic’ Pelagius (ca. 350-420) would not have been welcomed by the hyper-Augustinian monk of Orbais, Gottschalk (d. ca. 869).¹ Just in case any suspicious conference delegates here in Geneva imagine a similar paper on the ‘British Arminian heretic’ John Wesley (1703-91) to be inappropriate during our Calvin celebration, let me assure them that my choice of subject is not an English attempt to undermine Calvin’s legacy in any way. However, while I am neither Pelagian nor Arminian, I claim to be (the Servetus aspect apart) ‘an authentic English Calvinist’. In which case, delegates might reasonably have expected a paper on ‘Calvin and John Owen’ or, more appropriate in 18th century terms, one on ‘Calvin and (Wesley’s antagonist) George Whitefield’ (if not on John Gill).

Wesley ‘in’ Geneva

That said, my subject was not only prompted by the anniversary of John Wesley’s ‘evangelical conversion’ in 1738. Indeed, the 24 May - the very day our Calvin Congress commenced - continues to be a day of celebration in England and beyond. And why? Besides the gratitude for Wesley’s ministry felt by English-speaking Christians unashamed still to be ‘Evangelical’ and ‘Protestant’, historians like Lecky and Halévy have justified the gratitude of those more interested in socio-political reforms than matters strictly religious. Indeed, Wesley’s life and labours made an epochal contribution to civilisation.² But for him and his Methodist brethren, England might well have faced a bloody revolution like that in France. For all their not-insignificant differences, even George Whitefield - the Calvinist who requested that John Wesley take his funeral service in 1770 - would be happy in great measure to

¹ See G. P. Fisher, *History of Christian Doctrine* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896), 206.

² See J. Wesley Bready, *England: Before and After Wesley* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1939), 449, 451).

endorse a contribution on Wesley here in Geneva. These reasons apart, my choice is deliberately theological, believing as I have argued elsewhere that ‘in several respects, John Wesley’s theology is closer to John Calvin’s than John Owen’s is’.³ By substituting ‘Whitefield’ for ‘Owen’, the same point is made in strictly eighteenth-century terms.

Predestinarian perplexities

We need not be detained by Wesley’s well-known yet predictable protest against Calvin’s doctrine of predestination.⁴ Without trivialising the very real and profound differences involved, the problems highlighted by Wesley are not in fact unique to Calvinism. Indeed, doesn’t Arminianism share them too? True, the Calvinist doctrine of divine foreordination raises perplexing philosophical questions about the nature of evangelistic endeavour, but the Arminian doctrine of divine foreknowledge or prescience - the basis of conditional election - poses a similar one: ‘if God knows beforehand who will accept and reject Christ, is it not merely academic to say that salvation is possible to all?’ In other words, telling an unbeliever about Christ seems pointless if God already knows that their response will be negative. To say that we do not possess God’s knowledge, and that such knowledge is not given for evangelistic enterprise is as much a Calvinist as an Arminian answer. The chief difference between us lies in the interaction between the divine and human wills. Calvinists say the final factor in conversion is the divine will whereas Arminians insist that it is the human will. Although ‘foreknowledge’ has no necessitarian connotations as such, yet if God’s foreknowledge or prescience is certain - which it must be, irrespective of what makes it so - then it is as sure as if it were determined. So, do the contending parties not have to agree, in the final analysis, that in the mysterious divine-human interaction in salvation, God remains God, the just yet sovereign creator, and man remains man, the dependent yet accountable creature?

Wesley on Calvin

³ See my *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology 1640-1790 -- An Evaluation* (Oxford: OUP, 1990, 2002), 134.

⁴ See ‘A Dialogue between a Predestinarian and His Friend’ in *The Works of John Wesley*, ed. T. Jackson (London: J. Mason, 1841), x. 250-56.

For all his life-long opposition to Calvinism, Wesley had *something* good to say about Calvin, despite several criticisms on various issues including his repeated lamentations over the latter's 'persecution' of Servetus. In 1766, Wesley was careful to say 'I believe Calvin was a great instrument of God; and that he was a wise and pious man',⁵ repeating four years later (while defending the memory and reputation of Arminius) that 'John Calvin was a pious, learned, sensible man'.⁶ As for Calvinism itself, Wesley was not as antipathetic as his usual stance would seem to suggest. Dr J. I. Packer is right to remark that 'Wesley's teaching included so much Reformation truth about the nature of faith, the witness of the Spirit, and effectual calling. Wesley's Arminianism, we might say, contained a good deal of its own antidote'.⁷

Authentic Calvinism

Realising that Dr Packer rescues much of Wesley's reputation from a strictly 'Owenite' or 'Whitefieldian' perspective, much more may be reclaimed from an 'authentic Calvinist' one (meaning thereby - to be open about my own perspective - an Amyraldian one). To clarify my stance, I present a summary of Calvin's balanced biblicism, which explains why Moïse Amyraut (1596-1664)⁸ effectively rejected the *unbalanced* soteriologies of both Arminius and Beza. Rooted in a dualistic [double-intention] conception of the divine will (see *Deuteronomy 29: 29*), Calvin taught that Christ's atoning death was universal in scope, and that He was offered as the Redeemer of the whole world according to God's 'revealed' conditional will, albeit only received by elected believers according to God's 'hidden' absolute will. Notwithstanding the rationally-challenging paradox involved, Calvin maintained the doctrines of universal atonement and divine election side by side. Faced by clear biblical evidence for both, he refused to tamper with the scriptural texts. Logic was not allowed to dictate one emphasis at the expense of the other. Typical of his numerous statements on the extent of the atonement, Calvin commented thus on Romans 5: 18: 'Paul makes grace common to all, not because it in fact extends to all, but because it is

⁵ 'Some Remarks on "A Defence of the Preface to the Edinburgh Edition of *Aspasio Vindicated*"', *Works* (1841), x. 337.

⁶ 'The Question, "What is an Arminian?" Answered, by a Lover of Free Grace' in *Works*, x. 346.

⁷ See my *Atonement and Justification*, 119.

⁸ See my *Amyraut Affirmed* (Norwich: Charenton Reformed Publishing, 2004).

offered to all. Although Christ suffered for the sins of the world, and is offered by the goodness of God without distinction to all men, yet not all receive him'.⁹

On the edge of Calvinism

Notwithstanding Wesley's standard Arminian response to Calvinism, none can doubt the Calvinistic elements in his thought. Not forgetting his life-long exposure to Puritan works in general, the special influence of Baxter's writings and the not entirely negative response to Whitefield in the 1740s probably left some favourable impressions. However impatient he was with *High* Calvinism, he still retained the essential evangelical emphasis of Reformation Calvinism. At the 1745 Methodist Conference, it was admitted that 'the truth of the Gospel' lies 'very near' to Calvinism: 'Wherein may we come to the very edge of Calvinism? (1) In ascribing all good to the free grace of God. (2) In denying all natural free will, and all power antecedent to grace, and (3) In excluding all merit from man; even for what he has or does by the grace of God'.¹⁰ Even after the publication of Wesley's main counter-blast against Calvinism, *Predestination Calmly Considered* (1752),¹¹ he continued to live 'on the edge of Calvinism' in his view of divine grace.

⁹ Calvin, *Comment on Romans 5: 18*. Significantly, Roger Nicole admits that Calvin's comment on Romans 5: 18 'comes perhaps closest to providing support for Amyraut's thesis' (*Moyse Amyraut (1596-1664) and the Controversy on Universal Grace* (Harvard University thesis, 1966), 83, n. 38). Richard Muller also states that 'Calvin's teaching was...capable of being cited with significant effect by Moïse Amyraut against his Reformed opponents' (*The Unaccommodated Calvin* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), 62). For further extracts (90 in total), see my *Calvinus: Authentic Calvinism, A Clarification*, 2nd ed. (Norwich: Charenton Reformed Publishing, 2007). A particularly compelling example is the following: 'Yet I approve of the common reading, that He alone bore the punishment of many, because the guilt of the whole world was laid upon Him. It is evident from other passages ... that 'many' sometimes denotes 'all' ... That, then, is how our Lord Jesus bore the sins and iniquities of many. But in fact, this word 'many' is often as good as equivalent to 'all'. And indeed, our Lord Jesus was offered to all the world. For it is not speaking of three or four when it says: 'God so loved the world, that He spared not His only Son'. But yet we must notice what the Evangelist adds in this passage: 'That whosoever believes in Him shall not perish but obtain eternal life.' Our Lord Jesus suffered for all and there is neither great nor small who is not inexcusable today, for we can obtain salvation in Him. Unbelievers who turn away from Him and who deprive themselves of Him by their malice are today doubly culpable. For how will they excuse their ingratitude in not receiving the blessing in which they could share by faith? And let us realize that if we come flocking to our Lord Jesus Christ, we shall not hinder one another and prevent Him being sufficient for each of us... Let us not fear to come to Him in great numbers, and each one of us bring his neighbours, seeing that He is sufficient to save us all' (*Sermons on Isaiah 53*).

¹⁰ 'Minutes of Some Late Conversations Between the Rev. Mr. Wesleys and Others', *Works*, viii.274.

¹¹ See Wesley, *Works*, x. 197.

Of course, the *raison d'être* of Wesley's mission was the doctrine of universal redemption. His famous sermon on *Free Grace* (1740)¹² reveals the preacher's dislike for Calvinism. As he saw it, the doctrines of election, reprobation, and especially limited atonement were a total negation of evangelistic enterprise. Aware of his views, Whitefield had discouraged Wesley from publishing the sermon in the interests of unity, but not long after Whitefield's departure for America, Wesley published it. In his reply, Whitefield argued that Wesley's theology was inconsistent with Article XVII of the Church of England, 'Of Predestination and Election'. He then proceeded to insist, as Dr John Owen had done a century before, that the atonement was limited to the elect: 'Our Lord knew for whom he died'.¹³

If Whitefield's arguments had a profound but temporary influence over Wesley, the latter's thinking was influenced from another source. In the wake of the 'Free Grace' controversy, Wesley published a small pamphlet which revealed his awareness of John Calvin's teaching on the extent of the atonement. His *Serious Considerations Concerning the Doctrines of Election and Reprobation* (1740)¹⁴ consisted of extracts from Chapter 13 of Isaac Watts' *The Ruin and Recovery of Mankind* (1740).¹⁵ A disciple of Richard Baxter rather than John Owen, Watts (the well-known spokesman for Protestant Dissent) produced six quotations from Calvin on universal atonement. In his pamphlet, Wesley cited only four of these, also omitting Watts' summary: 'Thus it appears that Calvin himself thought that Christ and his salvation are offered to all, and that in some sense he died for all'. As the Wesleyan scholar Dr Herbert Boyd McGonigle points out, 'Watts offered a sixth consideration in defence of universal grace which Wesley's abridgement omitted altogether'.¹⁶ What is interesting is that Wesley never seems to have used the Calvin evidence in his frequent debates with

¹² See Wesley, *Works*, vii. 356.

¹³ *George Whitefield's Journals*, ed. I. H. Murray (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1960), 587.

¹⁴ See listing in Wesley, *Works*, xiv. 202. For all its brevity, this penny pamphlet was reissued in 1752, 1769, 1773, 1778, 1782 and 1790. For some reason, Wesley withheld the author's name in every issue.

¹⁵ For examples of Calvin's universal atonement statements, see *The Works of The Revd and Learned Isaac Watts, DD*, ed. D. Jennings and P. Doddridge (London: 1753), vi. 287-8.

¹⁶ H. B. McGonigle, *Sufficient Saving Grace: John Wesley's Evangelical Arminianism* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2001), 122.

Calvinists, despite the reformer's belief in the universal love of God.¹⁷ He evidently missed seeing any significant potential in the 'Calvin vs. the Calvinists' debate. Why is a mystery. Perhaps he thought Calvin's 'concessions' too insignificant in the context of the reformer's predestinarian thought. Perhaps he felt that enlisting Calvin's support against the Calvinists might have reduced the impact of his sharply-polarised polemic against Calvinism. Perhaps too, Wesley feared his enemies might use Calvin's authority to induce him to make even further shifts in their direction.

Later, in 1743, John Wesley wrote a brief and equally-fascinating memorandum entitled *Calvinistic Controversy*.¹⁸ Anxious to avoid 'needless dispute' with Whitefield, Wesley declared his sentiments in a distinctly Calvinistic manner. But, in affirming unconditional election, irresistible grace and final perseverance, he significantly omits limited atonement. Although Wesley had been cautious about leaning 'too much towards Calvinism' in the 1744 Methodist Conference, he - as we have seen - was willing in his doctrine of grace to 'come to the very edge of Calvinism' at the 1745 Conference. It was probably the question of the extent of the atonement which turned the scales in favour of Arminianism, a fact confirmed by the subtitle of *The Arminian Magazine: consisting of Extracts and Original Treatises on Universal Redemption*, issued by Wesley from 1778-91. Wesley's 'moderately Calvinistic' phase was therefore temporary.

Anglican Calvinist: Whitefield or Wesley?

If Whitefield's appeal to the Thirty-Nine Articles was a source of embarrassment to Wesley (whose denial that this was the case is not entirely convincing¹⁹), Calvinist Whitefield was also involved in an anomaly which Wesley was not slow to exploit in a later exchange (in 1772) with Rowland Hill.²⁰ Indeed, as surely as Article XVII acknowledges personal predestination and election, Article XXXI states that the atonement was 'for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual'. A year

¹⁷ See my *Calvinus*, 30, 36.

¹⁸ Wesley, *Works*, xiii. 478-9.

¹⁹ See Wesley, *Works*, x. 313, 407.

²⁰ See 'Some Remarks on Mr Hill's "Review of all the Doctrines Taught by Mr John Wesley"', *Works*, x. 368.

later, Wesley rightly appealed not only to the Articles, Homilies and Catechism of Church of England,²¹ but also to the universalist statements of such Anglican reformers as Ridley, Hooper and Latimer to vindicate his position.²² In this respect, Whitefield was simply out of order. However, nowhere does Wesley augment his appeals by citing the views of John Calvin, as he might well have done. The simple fact remains that, in view of the consistency of the reformer's ubiquitous universal atonement statements with the Anglican formularies, Calvin would have endorsed Wesley against Whitefield.

It is important to remember that John Wesley claimed an English precedent for his thinking in the works of the Arminian Puritan John (not to be confused with Calvinist Thomas) Goodwin (1594?-1665). Again, this is important in relation to Calvin, since Goodwin's ample treatises on universal redemption²³ and justification by faith²⁴ include substantial quotations from Calvin, not to mention several other reformers.

²¹ He first did this in *The Doctrine of Salvation, Faith, and Good Works, Extracted from the Homilies of the Church of England* (London: 1738). Article XXXI explicitly affirms that 'The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual;...' Consistent with this, the *BCP* prayer of consecration from the service of Holy Communion states that Christ made 'a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world'. The *Catechism* teaches the catechumen to believe that God the Son 'hath redeemed me, and all mankind' while it hastens to add, in Calvinist rather than Arminian fashion, that God the Holy Ghost 'sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God'. The *Homily for Good Friday* is equally clear: 'So pleasant was this sacrifice and oblation of His Son's death, which he so obediently and innocently suffered, that he would take it for the only and full amends for all the sins of the world' (*Sermons or Homilies* (London: Prayer-Book and Homily Society, 1833), 287). See my *Atonement and Justification*, 79.

²² See 'Some Remarks on Mr Hill's "Farrago Double-Distilled"', *Works*, x. 409. Archbishop **Thomas Cranmer** stated that Christ 'by His own oblation ... satisfied His Father for all men's sins and reconciled mankind unto His grace and favour'. Bishop **John Hooper** affirmed that Christ died 'for the love of us poor and miserable sinners, whose place he occupied upon the cross, as a pledge, or one that represented the person of all the sinners that ever were, be now, or shall be unto the world's end'. Bishop **Nicholas Ridley** declared that the sacrifice of Christ 'was, is, and shall be forever the propitiation for the sins of the whole world'. Bishop **Hugh Latimer** preached that 'Christ shed as much blood for Judas, as he did for Peter: Peter believed it, and therefore he was saved; Judas would not believe, and therefore he was condemned'. Even particularist **John Bradford** admitted that 'Christ's death is sufficient for all, but effectual for the elect only'. The Elizabethan Anglicans were no different in their understanding. Bishop **John Jewel** wrote that, on the cross, Christ declared "It is finished" to signify 'that the price and ransom was now full paid for the sin of all mankind'. Elsewhere, he made clear that 'The death of Christ is available for the redemption of all the world'. **Richard Hooker** stated an identical view when he said that Christ's 'precious and propitiatory sacrifice' was 'offered for the sins of all the world' and that he 'hath thereby once reconciled us to God, purchased his general free pardon, and turned away divine indignation from mankind' (for bibliographical details, see my *Atonement and Justification*, 79).

²³ *Redemption Redeemed* (London: 1651).

²⁴ *Imputatio Fidei, or a Treatise of Justification* (London: 1642).

Unlike Wesley, Goodwin clearly saw potential in Calvin to bolster the Arminian view of the atonement. Clearly valuing Goodwin's treatise *vis-à-vis* the high Calvinist John Owen,²⁵ Wesley did not seemingly make much use of Goodwin's appeal to Calvin.

However, the picture is decidedly different where the doctrine of justification is concerned. In this respect, aided by Goodwin, Wesley was justly at odds with Whitefield's views on the imputation of Christ's righteousness, not least on account of the dangers of antinomianism. According to biblical exegesis and in line with the Anglican formularies, Wesley argued that 'The plain scriptural notion of justification is pardon, the forgiveness of sins'²⁶ and that 'Christ by his death alone (so our Church teaches) fully satisfied for the sins of the whole world'.²⁷ However, in his sermon, *The Lord our Righteousness*, Whitefield - teaching that justification is more than pardon - argued that 'the word righteousness ... implies the active as well as passive obedience of the Lord Jesus Christ. We generally, when talking of the merits of Christ, only mention the latter, his death; whereas the former, his life and active obedience, is equally necessary'.²⁸ On the other hand, Goodwin argued that 'he that is completely justified by having his sins forgiven, is justified without the imputation of this active obedience or righteousness of Christ'.²⁹ Strikingly, Goodwin justifies his argument by launching into several pages of Calvin citations, a fact highlighted by Wesley!³⁰ In short, Whitefield's

²⁵ In a letter to Walter Sellon in 1768, Wesley wrote: 'I am glad you have undertaken the "Redemption Redeemed." But you must in no wise forget Dr Owen's Answer to it: otherwise you will leave a loop-hole for all the Calvinists to creep out. The Doctor's evasions you must needs cut in pieces, ...' (*The Letters of the Revd John Wesley, AM*, ed. J. Telford (London: 1931), v. 96).

²⁶ See Wesley, 'Justification by Faith', *Works*, v. 52, and my *Atonement and Justification*, 169ff.

²⁷ 'Preface to a Treatise on Justification', *Works*, x. 313.

²⁸ *Select Sermons of George Whitefield* (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1959), 74.

²⁹ *Imputatio Fidei*, 118.

³⁰ Wesley, *Works*, x. 304. John Calvin's statements are thoroughly explicit on this matter. 'Justification by faith is reconciliation with God and...this consists solely in the remission of sins' (*Inst.* III. xi. 21); 'God justifies by pardoning' (*ibid*); '...this justification may be termed in one word the remission of sins' (*ibid*); 'Thus the Apostle connects forgiveness of sins with justification in such a way as to show that they are altogether the same...' (*ibid*). It is obvious that Calvin's position has been something of an embarrassment to later Reformed theologians who, like Owen, wish to argue that justification is more than pardon. Although Calvin did speak of 'the imputation of the righteousness of Christ' (*Inst.* III. xi. 2) he plainly regarded 'justification', 'imputation' and 'remission of sins' as synonymous terms (see *Inst.* III. xi. 4; *Comm.* Gal. 3:6; Luke 1: 77). Furthermore, it is precisely because justification is no more than forgiveness that Calvin never suggested the imputation of Christ's active obedience: 'Our righteousness has been procured by the obedience of Christ which he displayed in His death' (*Comm.* Rom. 4: 25);

view reflects not Calvin's but Beza's over-developed orthodoxy, the type later expounded by John Owen.³¹ In his writings on the subject, Wesley not only published an edition of Goodwin's *Imputatio Fidei*; he explicitly appeals to Calvin himself. In his preface to Goodwin's treatise on justification, Wesley insists that he employs the expression 'imputed righteousness' just as Calvin did.³² In his own sermon, *The Lord our Righteousness* (1765), Wesley quotes from Calvin's *Institutes*.³³ In the same year, Wesley insisted that 'I think on justification just as I have done any time these seven-and-twenty years (i.e. since 1738); and just as Mr Calvin does. In this respect, I do not differ from him a hair's breadth'.³⁴ As late as 1770, the year the second Calvinistic controversy commenced, Wesley argued in his tract *What is an Arminian?* that Calvin never asserted justification by faith more strongly than Arminius and the Methodists had done.³⁵ The inescapable conclusion is obvious, that regarding the doctrines of the atonement and justification, Arminian Wesley is the Calvinist!

Dr Doddridge and the *via media*

In the eighteenth-century English context, one may say - in view of the above portrayal of Calvin's 'authentic Calvinism' - that neither Wesley *nor* Whitefield can validly lay claim to the *full* title 'Calvinist'. The only real contender of note is their fellow labourer, the godly pastor and Dissenting tutor Dr Philip Doddridge of Northampton (1702-51).³⁶ Known and respected by the two Methodists, who had both sought his advice,

'...Christ has attained righteousness for sinners by His death,...' (*Comm. Rom. 5: 9*). It was Theodore Beza who insisted that justification was more than pardon. Mere forgiveness was deemed insufficient; the believer needed a more 'positive' righteousness before God. Hence Christ's passive obedience in death *and* his active obedience to the law form the basis of that righteousness imputed to the believer (see T. Beza, *Tractationes theologiae* (Geneva: 1570-82), iii. 248, 256). While Calvin clearly grounds Christ's saving work in the whole of his obedience, he suggests that his 'active' [the term is post-Calvin] obedience was intended to demonstrate his qualification to be the guiltless sin-bearer. His own obedience was thus immediately relevant to himself, and only to the believer's justification indirectly (*Inst. II. xvi. 5*). For further discussion, see my *Atonement and Justification*, 169ff.

³¹ See my *Atonement and Justification*, 169ff.

³² Wesley, *Works*, x. 326.

³³ Wesley, *Works*, v. 226.

³⁴ *The Journal of the Revd John Wesley, AM*, ed. N. Curnock (London: 1909-16), v. 116.

³⁵ See Wesley, *Works*, x. 345.

³⁶ See my *The Good Doctor: Philip Doddridge of Northampton - A Tercentenary Tribute* (Norwich: Charenton Reformed Publishing, 2002).

Doddridge's early death deprived the polarised preachers of his ongoing personal influence. Indeed, his wise and insightful biblical scholarship would have facilitated greater personal, theological and organisational harmony. Amounting to a *via media* between Bezaism and Arminianism, the Northampton pastor's position had potential to attract both Whitefield and Wesley to a biblical middle ground.

Whitefield's particularism and Wesley's universalism are alike one-sided accounts of the Gospel. At their biblical best, *both* men may be regarded as semi-Calvinists, albeit from opposing perspectives. They both stress different sides of the same coin, paradoxical truths Calvin held in tension. Alternatively, agreeing with Richard Baxter (and one may include Isaac Watts), Doddridge was concerned to expound the textual data in an integrated manner, without suppressing either the general or the particular aspects of the Gospel. Like Calvin and Baxter, Doddridge - *data-driven* rather than *dogma-driven* - accepted the fact of paradox, urging the need to restrict theological activity to the confines of the evidence. Thus he adopted a dualistic hermeneutic in his theology of grace. The atonement is to be seen in a two-sided manner: it is general in provision, though particular in application, both aspects being part of the divine intention. While Doddridge (and Baxter before him) was accused of compromise, his concern was not merely dictated by the demands of an ecumenical vision. His was a convinced theological evaluation of the issues. He was not therefore 'diluting' truth, but restoring what had become a 'super-concentrate' to its proper biblical 'strength'. In this latter respect, both Baxter and Doddridge had a clear precedent in John Calvin. Indeed, Doddridge's Baxterianism (give or take one or two details) was the eighteenth century expression of authentic Calvinism. Of course, judged by the criteria of *High* Calvinism, it was bound to look like a compromise with Arminianism. Like Amyraut (who still remains Calvin's most accurate exponent overall)³⁷ and Baxter, Doddridge considered that, at their biblical best, both High Calvinists and Arminians expressed features that were united in Calvin's theological and pastoral thought. He saw that as the Arminian was not all wrong, so the High Calvinist was not all right, and *vice versa*.

Conclusion

³⁷ See my *Amyraut Affirmed* (Norwich: Charenton Reformed Publishing, 2004) and 'Justification: the Calvin-Saumur Perspective', *The Evangelical Quarterly*, 79. 4 (2007), 331-48.

Returning to Wesley, it remains to be repeated that, the *metaphysics* of grace apart, John Wesley was at least a partial disciple of John Calvin, an assessment he might have accepted with some degree of equanimity, especially where the doctrine of justification is concerned. Without exceeding the scope of this paper, it is not inappropriate to indicate that in their justifiably-negative views of Rome³⁸ and Islam,³⁹ Calvin and Wesley also saw eye to eye. Even on matters of church order, despite the Genevan reformer's lack of episcopal ordination, quasi-presbyterian Wesley defended the 'great work' of Calvin's Genevan ministry.⁴⁰ Had they 'met' here (through the diplomatic efforts of Philip Doddridge and Jean-Alphonse Turretin⁴¹), they doubtless would have

³⁸ See O. A. Beckerlegge, *John Wesley's Writings on Roman Catholicism* (London: Protestant Truth Society, n.d.).

³⁹ (1) Wesley on Islam: 'Ever since the religion of Islam appeared in the world, the espousers of it...have been as wolves and tigers to all other nations, rending and tearing all that fell into their merciless paws, and grinding them with their iron teeth; that numberless cities are raised from the foundation, and only their name remaining; that many countries, which were once as the garden of God, are now a desolate wilderness; and that so many once numerous and powerful nations are vanished from the earth! Such was, and is at this day, the rage, the fury, the revenge, of these destroyers of human kind' ('The Doctrine of Original Sin', *Works*, ix. 205); 'How far and wide has this miserable delusion spread over the face of the earth! Insomuch that [Muslims] are considerably more in number (as six to five) than Christians. And by all accounts, ... these are also, in general, as utter strangers to all true religion as their four-footed brethren; as void of mercy as lions and tigers; as much given up to brutal lusts as bulls or goats: so that they are in truth a disgrace to human nature' ('The General Spread of the Gospel', *Works*, vi. 261).

(2) Calvin on Islam and Rome: 'Muhammad and the Pope have this religious principle in common, that Scripture does not contain the perfection of doctrine, but that something higher has been revealed by the Spirit. The Anabaptists and Libertines have in our own day drawn their madness from the same ditch' (*Comment on John 14: 25*); 'This error [of additional revelation beyond Christ] is followed by another, no less intolerable; that having said goodbye to Christ's law, as if His reign were ended, and He now nothing at all, they substitute the Spirit in His place. From this source have flowed the sacrileges of the Papacy and Muhammadanism. For although those antichrists are dissimilar in many respects they have a common starting point: that in the Gospel we are initiated into the true faith, but that the perfection of doctrine must be sought elsewhere, to perfect us completely. If Scripture is brought against the Pope, he denies that we should keep to it, since the Spirit has also now come and has lifted us above it by many additions. Muhammad proclaims that without his *Qur'an* men always remain children. Thus, by a false claim to the Spirit, the world has been bewitched to leave the simple purity of Christ. For as soon as the Spirit is severed from Christ's Word the door is open to all sorts of craziness and impostures. Many fanatics have tried a similar method of deception in our own age. The written teaching seems to them to be of the letter. Therefore they were pleased to make up a new theology consisting of revelations' (*Comment on John 16: 14*).

⁴⁰ 'A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion', II, *Works*, viii. 214.

⁴¹ The outlooks and concerns of Doddridge and Turretin were very similar. Opposed to the anti-Amyraldian *Formula Consensus Helvetica* (1675), 'The younger Turretin was reacting against what he considered to be the overly defined nature of Reformed, scholastic theology because of its divisiveness and lack of concern for personal piety. He preferred to return to Calvin's pastoral emphasis, as well as that on the salvific nature of Scripture' (See M. I. Klauber, *Between Reformed Scholasticism and Pan-Protestantism: Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1671-1737) and Enlightened Orthodoxy at the Academy of Geneva* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press/London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994), 14).

embraced one another, as they certainly do now in heaven, the divine light having long dispersed all disagreements and discord forever!