



Click the bookmark icon to the left.

Wesleyan Theological Journal

Volume 11, Spring, 1976

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Fuhrman, Eldon R. | Speaking the Truth in Love: Dual Emphases in Wesleyan Thought
5-21 |
| Cubie, David L. | Perfection in Wesley and Fletcher: Inaugural or Teleological?
22-37 |
| Howard, Richard E. | Some Modern Interpretations of the Pauline Indicative and Imperative
38-48 |
| Hynson, Leon O. | The Church and Social Transformation: An Ethics of the Spirit
49-61 |
| Isbell, Charles D. | The Origins of Prophetic Frenzy and Ecstatic Utterance in the Old Testament World
62-80 |
| Grider, J. Kenneth | Carnality and Humanity: Exploratory Observations
81-91 |

Click on the bookmark icon on the left of the PDF Reader for quick links to each article.

Digitized text copyright 2008 by the
Wesley Center Online
<http://wesley.nnu.edu>

Presidential Address:

**SPEAKING THE TRUTH IN LOVE:
Dual Emphases in Wesleyan Thought**

Eldon R. Fuhrman

The theology of John Wesley continues to be a subject of absorbing interest. In his report on the current theological situation in Protestantism, Daniel Day Williams has noted that while men like Gordon Rupp and Philip Watson have made Martin Luther the object of recent study, and others like T. F. Torrance have done the same with John Calvin, still others have concentrated upon Wesley.¹ This is a wholesome trend if classical theology is to have contemporary significance. Furthermore, such investigations are especially pertinent to those who identify themselves with a particular heritage.

Those who take this heritage seriously, along with others who study theology from a wider perspective, should welcome any new insights that come from an exploration of the headwaters of this stream.

A. Wesley's Contribution to Practical Religion

Not even a theological investigation can ignore Wesley's constructive influence in the sphere of practical religion. According to William Lecky Wesley's contributions in this realm are greater than any other man who has appeared since the sixteenth century.² Many students of Wesley agree that his accomplishments were large in this area.³ John W. Bready has delineated the moral transformation that resulted in the Western world from Methodism's impact in his book *England Before and After Wesley*. Archibald Harrison has insisted that the work of Wesley and his colleagues is an important factor in promoting unity among Protestants.⁴ In her book, *Blueprint for a Christian World*, Mary A. Tenney has demonstrated the social power incipient in Wesley's concept of perfect love.⁶ Maldwyn Edwards, in his study of John Wesley and the Eighteenth century has insisted that Wesley's ministry among the colliers at Kingswood and Newcastle obviated their unrest and did much to forestall revolt.⁶ J. R. Green has indicated that the spiritual virility of Wesley and his movement exerted a wholesome impact on all levels of English society.⁷ Both Abram Lipsky and Eric North took note of Wesley's efforts to minister to the sick.⁸ Ernest Rattenbury has called

to his readers' attention how easy it was to transfer the framework of Wesley's evangelical organizations to the labor movements of a following generation.⁹ H. O. Workman has reminded members of the Church of England that however much they may have disliked some of Wesley's actions and teachings, "to him is due the revival of personal religion in England."¹⁰ David Thompson, in his book *John Wesley as a Social Reformer*, has emphasized the religious grounds for Wesley's opposition to slavery.¹¹ Wellman Warner, in studying the relation of the Wesleyan movement to the industrial revolution, took note of Wesley's opinion that love is "the never failing remedy for all the evils of a disordered world."¹² He attributes the creation of a social mentality among early Wesleyans to "the moralized initiative of the individual . . . as the mainspring of social welfare."¹³ It is obvious, then, that Wesley's work as a practical reformer has received considerable attention. Indeed, as Harald Lindstrom has said, this is the place where most studies of Wesley begin,¹⁴ even though the historical antecedents for this aspect of the Wesleyan movement are not readily apparent.¹⁵ It was this concern for the amelioration of the lot of mankind that C. E. Villiamy described as "a noble simplicity" in Wesley's labors.¹⁶ Despite the wide diversity of interpreting Wesley's contributions to practical religion, all interpretations seem to agree on one thing—that what Wesley attempted to do was to perform the service of love in the social arena. To purity of intention and the imitation of Christ Wesley adds a third dimension to Christian holiness—the implementation of love.

B. The Theoretical Basis of Wesley's Labors

Notwithstanding the abundance of books about Wesley,¹⁷ added to the impressive list of his own literary efforts,¹⁸ Wesley's status as a theoretical thinker remains in question. J. H. Whitely is quite taken up in admiration of Wesley as a scholar as well as an administrator;¹³ on the other hand, Matthew Arnold, according to George C. Cell, rated Wesley as no better than a third-rate intellect.²⁰ Even Lecky, who has high regard for Wesley in other respects, thinks that Wesley's influence was far in advance of his intellect.²¹

Part of this lack of appreciation may be due to the fact that much of what Wesley wrote was not cast in theological form.²² As A. C. McGiffert has noted, English evangelicalism reacted strongly against the nationalism of the eighteenth century.²³ Consequently, its form of expression was less technical. Furthermore, for Wesley the chief concern was not abstruse speculation, but the ethical nature of the devout life.²⁴ This has been the occasion for some criticism of Wesley as a theologian. The fact that much of what Wesley wrote was not stated in theological language has led John W. Prince to point out to readers of Wesley that:

It must be borne in mind that Wesley was a preacher, and not a philosopher or a systematic theologian.... Consequently oftentimes at points of crucial importance to the investigator he does not enter into elaborate discussion or have deep concern for consistency. This necessitates in several instances a recourse to analogy and deduction in the endeavor to decipher his theories.²⁵

It is for much the same reason that Philip Watson claims Wesley was guilty of a careless reading of Luther. Wesley once accused Luther of being irrational, mystical, and close to antinomianism;²⁶ but Watson believes that if Wesley had taken the time to study Luther more dispassionately, he would have seen that in spite of peripheral differences they were in essential unity.²⁷

It is possible, however, to make too much of this weakness in Wesley as a theologian. In contrast to what was said above, the words of J. A. Faulkner provide a wholesome balance:

Of course Wesley was not a theologian in the sense of Calvin, Hodge or William B. Pope; but he was a theologian in the sense of being interested in theological discussions, of being at home in them, and of being deeply concerned in theological truth.²³

Thus Wesley, the evangelical preacher, was able to put theology to the service of love without being captured in the web of its minutiae. It was a useful means for expressing revealed truth logically and compassionately; it was not an end in itself. For this reason Faulkner said in another place that the movement headed by Wesley "was soteriological, not in the first place theological in the strict sense."²⁹ On this basis John Moore adds that Wesley did not create a new theology but vitalized and humanized the theology already extant; and, as a result, "he gave it point, he gave it direction, he gave it application, and he gave it destiny."³⁰ The end result, according to Rattenbury, was to make Christianity more intelligible to the masses.³¹ But it also made it more appealing, for the Christianity proclaimed by Wesley wed a clear head to a warm heart.

It is not the purpose of this investigation to trace in great detail the influence of thought movements upon eighteenth-century England. It is sufficient for the moment to note that there was a significant trend from the overthrow of Aristotelianism by Francis Bacon,³² to the abandonment of faith as a guide to truth by Herbert of Cherbury,³³ to the advocacy of materialism by Hobbes,³⁴ on to the modified supernaturalism of Tillotson and Locke,³⁵ the deism of Tindal,³⁶ and the skepticism of Hume.³⁷ These moods tended to prevail, even among some churchmen.

In reacting to these trends, the Wesleyan movement chose to pitch the battle on a different field. The way to Christian conquest, according to Wesley, was not only by the use of traditional evidence but by the

reception of Christian grace as well.³³ Convinced that "the inward evidence" of a Christian experience was powerful, Wesley and his associates resolved to be Bible Christians at all events.³⁹ McGiffert thinks that this strategy was successful, for he claims that the survival of faith and devotion during the eighteenth century was due "not to the apologists, but to altogether different influences, of which the great evangelical revival was the most important."⁴⁰ Thus the movement led by Wesley proposed to administer strong dosages of fervent evangelical Christianity, not intellectualism, as the antidote for the ills of that day.⁴¹

Although Wesley did not seek to pose as a great intellect, it is important to note that his predilection for the evangelical and the practical was rooted in firmly held basic ideas. "It is true," as Warner has pointed out, "that the Methodist movement was essentially moral and philanthropic, but it was cast in a theological mold."⁴² This is only another way of saying that for Wesley, truth was to be spoken in love.

C. Wesley as a Theologian of Experience

Wesley's view of Christianity has been often understood as a theology of experience. Cell is cited as an example:

Before John Wesley the word "experience" does not occupy the conspicuous position in the preaching, teaching, or writing of any master of doctrinal Christianity.... In fact, the appeal to experience (in Wesley's theology) is so pervasive and powerful as to determine its historical individuality. It is a theology of experience.⁴³

Along the same lines, Umphrey Lee is convinced that Wesley's emphasis upon Christian experience is his distinct contribution to religion.⁴⁴ Maxim Piette agrees with this interpretation,⁴⁴ as well as Rattenbury, who claims that Wesleyan doctrines may be classified as either those which were formulated out of experience or were received through experience.⁴⁶ He notes further that because Wesley was convinced that Christianity at its center was a matter of life, he knew "Christianity could only be understood by experiment."⁴⁷

Having agreed that Wesley's theology is to a greater or lesser extent a theology of experience, various writers have gone on to explore some of its ramifications in respect to other doctrines. E. C. Mossner noted that Wesley's emphasis upon experience enabled him to avoid the skepticism of David Hume by interpreting faith as "an inward sentiment of instinctive feeling,"⁴⁸ rather than rational assent only. To Butler, Locke, and Hume, this would have seemed like dangerous enthusiasm.⁴⁹ Cell, however, points out that Wesley avoided the peril of enthusiasm by emphasizing "a theocentric doctrine of Christian experience."⁵⁰ Thus Wesley's emphasis on subjective experience had an objective reference with which it was expected to correspond.

Along the same lines of procedure, H B. Workman has related Wesley's use of individual and collective experience to his doctrines of conversion, assurance, and perfection.⁵¹ Even Wesley's Arminian belief in God's universal will of salvation supposedly is based upon this foundation.⁶³ It is Workman's conviction that in its appeal to experience, Methodism not only builds theological structure but also lays claim to its place in the universal Church:

This consciousness has given to its preaching its greatest power, is the explanation of its fervid evangelistic appeals, lies at the root of its special institution of the class-meeting, is the essential qualification demanded from all candidates for its ministry, and is one of the secrets of its hold upon the masses.⁶³

Since Workman's time some modification of an extreme view of Wesley's doctrine of experience, such as seen above, has taken place. For example, Lee has pointed out that for Wesley, experience was always subject to the regulative control of the Bible, especially as interpreted by the Early Church fathers.⁶⁴ Furthermore, he noted that there were ethical, rational, and institutional features in Wesley's theology, as well as the experiential. All of these served as counterbalances to an exclusive appeal to experience.⁶⁶ Yet these modifications do not mean to replace the role of Christian experience in Wesley's theology. Rather, they tend to show, as Lindstrom has pointed out, that while "Scripture was the obvious foundation to which he [Wesley] always referred, . . . it was interpreted in the light of experience."⁶⁶ A further elucidation of this point is made by E. H Sugden: "Wesley's method was, first, to study the Bible with prayer and meditation; then to consult the experience of others; and finally, to examine what had been written on the subject."⁶⁷ By this procedure, then, every hypothesis was verified or discarded, and the conclusions Wesley reached were strengthened or revised.

D. Theological Interpretations of Wesley

For all the general agreement of Wesley as a theologian of experience, his interpreters have found much upon which they disagree. Various strains of the Christian tradition are discernible in Wesley's thought: High Church Anglicanism, Arminianism, areas of agreement with Luther and Calvin, as well as obvious differences; sympathies with Moravian thought have been noted; and there are even similarities to Roman Catholic thought.⁵⁸ But is there a dominant tendency, a unifying idea, or does Wesley's thought remain a conglomerate eclecticism?

In attempting to answer these questions, and others like them, David C. Shipley has noted that interpreters of Wesley have tended to follow one of two lines of procedure "either to concentrate upon a specific doctrine and note its effect upon the rest of Wesley's thought, or else to

orient Methodist doctrine in terms of its general agreement with the Roman Catholic or Protestant traditions."⁶⁹

In a similar mood, Lee is inclined to play down the significance of Aldersgate to Wesley also.⁶⁰ However, he takes a mediating position concerning Wesley's doctrinal heritage. Instead of being either Protestant or Roman Catholic, Lee thinks Wesley's views are actually a synthesis of both traditions, respecting the way of salvation especially.⁶¹ On the other hand, R. Newton Flew is very bold to say that the roots of Wesley's doctrine of perfection are to be found nowhere but in the Catholic tradition.⁶²

As might be expected, there have been some vigorous rebuttals, especially by Cell.

So far as Cell is concerned, he would have his readers believe that Wesley's work, as built upon foundations laid by Luther and Calvin, constitutes not a contradiction but "an essential part of the real bridge out of medieval into modern Christianity."⁶³ He does acknowledge, however, that Wesley borrowed the Catholic ethic of holiness, which he synthesized with the Protestant ethic of grace.⁶⁴

It is not necessary at this point to decide whether Cell has succeeded in answering Piette effectively. It is sufficient for the moment to note that these are examples of the usual methods of interpreting Wesleyan theology.

The discussion concerning Wesley's place in the Christian tradition persists, however. In contradistinction both to Piette and Cell, Franz Hildebrandt is convinced that in Wesley we see neither an extension of Catholicism nor Calvinism but a continuation of the thought of Luther. So evident is the relation between the two, according to Hildebrandt, that Wesley is a mediator of Luther to our own generation.⁶⁶ He claims that an example of this intense kinship is to be seen in their doctrine of the church. "The ecclesiola in ecclesia which Luther saw on the horizon moved with Wesley directly into the foreground," Hildebrandt claims.⁶⁶ In his way Wesley borrowed from Luther, or agreed with him, to reconcile the conflicting ideas of a multitudinous and a gathered people, a formal and a vital church.

Another factor in the ambiguity surrounding Wesley is to be found in the commonly accepted view among nineteenth-century interpreters of Wesley who say that early Methodism followed Arminius. W. B. Pope is an example of what is meant here. He notes that "Wesley's concept of sin as a voluntary transgression of a known law is not only individualistic but Arminian rather than Augustinian."⁶⁷ Hence it follows that Wesley's doctrine of perfection is an extension of Arminian logic.⁶³ Shipley finds the same to be true, in general, for John Fletcher, "the chief theologian of the Wesleyans."⁶⁹

Lindstrom has noted that Reformed and Lutheran interpretations of

Wesley tend to emphasize his doctrine of justification, whereas Arminian interpretations put greater emphasis on Wesley's doctrine of sanctification. It followed, therefore, that holiness groups which look to Wesley as their earthly head have been Arminians.⁷⁰

E. Wesley's Emphasis on Doctrinal Truth

"The distinguishing works of a Methodist are not his opinions of any sort.... We think and let think."⁷¹ For those who interpret Wesley's Methodism as being rather indifferent to doctrinal niceties, this has been a favorite quotation to introduce the claim that confessional standards ought not preclude the fellowship of an ecumenical witness for Christ.

That Wesley seems at first sight to abjure protracted theological discussion may be supported by several of his own statements. In seeking to promote a catholic spirit among religious people, Wesley insisted that personal opinions ought not be allowed to hinder:

I do not mean, "Be of my opinion." You need not: I do not expect or desire it.... You need not even endeavor to come over to me, or bring me over to you . . . Let all opinions alone on one side and the other: only "give me thine hand."⁷²

Further, in the same sermon, a casual reading of Wesley seems to say that agreement in heart was all that was necessary to extend the hand of fellowship. "Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thine heart? If it be, give me thine hand."⁷³

Again, Wesley seems also to think that many disputes and divisions among Christians were due to quibbling about matters of minor importance. In commenting on Matthew 5: 47 in his Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament, he made a strong statement:

Our Lord probably glances at those prejudices, which different sects had against each other, and intimates, that he would not have his followers imbibe that narrow spirit. Would to God this had been more attended to among the unhappy divisions and subdivisions, into which the church has been crumbled.⁷⁴

Unless we are willing to unite in the service of love, Wesley indicates that our warfare against evil will not be effectual.

We have not only one faith, one hope, one Lord, but are directly engaged in one warfare. We are carrying the war into the devil's own quarters, who therefore summons all his hosts to war. Come, then, ye that love him, to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty. ⁷⁵

Thus there is no doubt that Wesley greatly disliked tense discussions over matters, which he believed to be of lesser consequence, particularly if they dissipated Christian love and militated against Christian unity.⁷⁶

But there is another emphasis in Wesley with regard to this matter. In the same sermon where he emphasized a catholic spirit, Wesley went on to cite certain basic doctrines which he claimed were essential to the existence and perpetuity of what he understood as a catholic spirit. These include belief in the being and perfection of God; Jesus Christ, crucified, alive again, and indwelling the heart of the believer; and faith energized by love. 77

Again, in the same sermon, Wesley made a clear distinction between his own views on doctrine as contrasted to Presbyterians and Independents.⁷⁸ Thus Wesley was aware that the movement he led was doctrinally distinctive as well as being a fellowship of love. Each was dependent on the other; doctrine was necessary to the existence of the Church, as Wesley understood it. The service of love was necessary to its mission.

Wesley's relations with George Whitefield illustrate the dual concern for doctrine and fellowship. While they differed widely in matters pertaining to divine predestination, they agreed to maintain a fellowship of love; and upon preaching Mr. Whitefield's funeral sermon, Wesley extolled his spirit:

How few have we known of so kind a temper, or such large and flowing affections! Was it not principally by this that the hearts of others were so strangely drawn and knit to him? Can anything but love beget love? . . . Was it not this, which, quick and penetrating as lightning, flew from heart to heart? Which gave that life to his sermons, his conversations, his letters? Ye are witnesses!⁷⁹

Part of our understanding of Wesley here depends upon being willing to make a clear distinction between primary and secondary doctrines, those which are essential and those which afford room for difference of opinion without any serious disparagement of the truth necessary for salvation. While Wesley never drew up such a formal list of primary and secondary doctrines, he did indicate that the areas in which he was willing to show latitude depended in part on whether he was emphasizing the Church's witness or Christian nurture. On the other hand, with respect to witness, Wesley said:

I ask not, therefore, of him with whom I would unite in love, are you of my church, of my congregation? Do you receive the same form of church government, and allow the same church officers with me? Do you join in the same form of prayer where in I worship God? I inquire not, do you receive the supper of the Lord in the same posture and manner that I do? . . . Nay, I ask not of you (as clear as I am in my own mind), whether you allow baptism and the Lord's Supper at all. Let all these things stand by: . . . my only question is this, "Is thine heart right as my heart?"⁸⁰

On the other hand, with respect to Christian nurture, Wesley was considerably more restrictive. He believed the Quakers were wrong in their rejection of the sacraments,³¹ the Baptists were wrong in their view of baptism,³² and the Calvinists were wrong in their interpretation of predestination.³³ Thus Wesley's latitude in matters of doctrine was not without its limits. To be driven to and fro by every wind of doctrine was "a great curse, not a blessing; an irreconcilable enemy, not a friend, to true catholicism."³⁴ Wesley recognized it was highly improbable that believers would all agree on matters of doctrine. For that reason it was better that they remain in separate denominations, even though they could still exercise a considerable degree of unity in a common Christian witness to a pagan world. A high degree of doctrinal knowledge was not deemed necessary for entrance into the Christian fellowship. A sure knowledge of personal salvation was.

Notwithstanding his emphasis upon living faith, and his apparent tolerance for differences of opinion in matters of form in worship, there is in Wesley a considerable emphasis upon the preaching of "the pure word of God." No matter how Christian in spirit a person may be, along with this he must be "as fixed as the sun in his judgment concerning the main branches of Christian doctrine." He dare not be a man of "muddy understanding," whose "mind is all in a mist." Rather, he should be "steadily fixed in his religious principles in what he believes to be the truth as it is in Jesus."³⁶

Wesley's definition of "the main branches of Christian doctrine" were those that "do not strike at the root of Christianity" in an injurious way. Rather, they are those teachings which are "clearly compatible with a love to Christ and a work of grace."⁸⁶ These include belief in the Bible "as the only sufficient rule both of Christian faith and practice;" belief in God "and His perfections"- "His eternity, immensity, wisdom, power; His justice, mercy and truth"; and belief in Jesus Christ "as the eternal supreme God."⁸⁷ These are the minimal necessities to obtain a "right heart," a heart that submitted to the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ "with renunciation of all trust in one's own goodness."³⁸ It is clear here that "without which, . . . there can be no church at all," and faith was aroused by the preaching of the "pure word of God." In fact, Wesley claimed that the worst Dissenters were not whoremongers, or liars, or Sabbath breakers, or drunkards, but "men unsound in the faith," who "deny the scriptures in truth," who "deny the Lord who bought them," or who "deny justification by faith . . . These," said Wesley, "are gross Dissenters from the Church of England . . . Thus a basic set of beliefs is important.

The single condition which Wesley imposed for membership in the early Methodist societies was a desire "to flee from the wrath to come" and to be saved from sin. Yet these words presupposed the doctrines of

divine sovereignty and judgment, human sinfulness, and the power of divine grace to save man. So important did Wesley esteem these doctrines that each deed drawn up in the purchase of preaching houses was to contain the following clause:

In case the doctrine or practice of any preacher should, in the opinion of the major part of the trustees, be not conformable to Mr. Wesley's Sermons and Notes on the New Testament, on representing this another preacher shall be sent within three months.⁹⁰

Wesley sought doctrinal as well as disciplinary soundness in his American preachers also. On October third, 1783, Wesley wrote them as follows: "Let all of you be determined to abide by the Methodist doctrine and discipline published in the four volumes of Sermons and The Notes upon the New Testament, together with the Large Minutes of the Conference."⁹¹

Clearly, then, Wesley was not indifferent to all doctrine. He attempted to distinguish between opinions and essential beliefs, perhaps not always consistently, because argumentation about nonessential matters tended to erect false barriers between Christians and hinder the work of Christ. Nevertheless, his willingness to "think and let think" did not excuse men from thinking, as Schilling has pointed out.⁹⁹ Commitment to the central affirmations of the Christian faith was not an end in itself, but contributory to man's experience of the grace of God in Christ by the Spirit.⁹³ This was an important "property" of the church.

Elsewhere in his writings, Wesley was explicit with respect to other doctrines he considered to be essential. These included the doctrines of original sin,⁹⁴ the deity of Christ,⁹⁵ the necessity of the atonement,⁹⁶ justification and new birth,⁹⁷ the work of the Holy Spirit,⁹⁸ and the Holy Trinity.⁹⁹ Clearly, then, Wesley did insist on doctrinal fidelity as necessary not only to being sound in the faith, but as to promoting the life of love as well.

F. Wesley's Emphasis on Divine Love

Wesley wrote so extensively on the subject of divine love that a complete exposition of it is out of the question here. But even a brief sampling reveals the comprehensiveness of it and the influence it bore on his theological thought. "God is love," a truth that Wesley claimed brought John more joy and satisfaction than anything in the world when he wrote it in his first Epistle.¹⁰⁰ God created because He loved and expressed His grace in doing so.¹⁰¹ Man, created in God's image, was not only holy and perfect, he was full of loving obedience to the Father as well.¹⁰² He was not only pure and free from sin. He loved the Lord his God with all his heart, mind, soul, and strength, as he lived in obedi-

ence to the law of love in his heart.¹⁰³ Thus, in sinning, man not only died, but "he lost both the knowledge and love of God without which the image of God could not subsist."¹⁰⁴ The objective of redemption was not only to deliver man from hell's punishment but to bring about a recovery of the divine nature by the renewal of men's souls in God's image. This included not only holiness and righteousness but a renewal in love as well.¹⁰⁶ Salvation is not only the gracious act of pardon, it is also "the divine conviction of God's love to us, and that love to God which is both the earnest and the beginning of heaven."¹⁰⁶ Christian perfection is first of all perfect love. In order for this to be, man must be so delivered from evil thoughts until "no wrong temper, none contrary to love, remains in the soul; and that all the thoughts, words, and actions, are governed by pure love."¹⁰⁷ Purity of intention, the imitation of Christ, and the full love of God and our neighbor are factors in describing perfection.¹⁰⁸ The essence of perfection for man is perfection in love; for love is the fulfilling of the law, that is, the evangelical law which replaced the Adamic law when the first evangelical promise was made in the garden.¹⁰⁹ Thus to live by faith meant to live the full life of love; for faith was the condition of entrance into justification and sanctification, whereas love was the objective of it.¹¹¹

Wesley believed that a fully sanctified man fulfilled the law as far as his disposition, thoughts, words, and actions all have their origin in love. But because of his being yet fallible, man makes many mistakes. These are a source of humiliation to him. Yet, in spite of these defects, the fully sanctified Christian may be said to fulfill "the royal law" as long as these shortcomings are due to a lack of knowledge rather than a lack of love.¹¹¹

Thus God's love in creation, in providence, in atonement, in justification, and in full sanctification aims at the reestablishment of the law of love in the human heart. Indeed, Wesley summarized the entire work of God in this light. "Love," Wesley said, "is the end, the sole end, of every dispensation of God, from the beginning of the world to the consummation of all things."¹¹²

It is by love that Wesley sees the Christian as being able to fulfill the law. Whereas the Christian is immune from the condemning power of the law, he is not released from observing it.¹¹³ But it is now written in his heart and he obeys, not in fear but in love.¹¹⁴ It is a love that not only seeks to avoid evil but prompts to do good to one's neighbor.¹¹⁵ This same love constrains us to do the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven.¹¹⁶ Thus the extension of the law of love to one's neighbor as well as oneself becomes the basis for social ethics and the transformation of society, matters of great concern to Wesley, as noted earlier in this paper. God's love to us, seen clearest in Christ's work for us, is to be shed abroad within us by the Holy Spirit. The consequence of this is our

total devotion to God and to others, even as to ourselves. Here is the basis for fellowship with God, for brotherly love and unity among Christian believers Here also is the dynamic for Christian world service.

For Wesley, and hopefully for the rest of us, "The heaven of heavens is love." We should not aim for anything else except more of love. This is as high as we can go until we "are carried into Abraham's bosom "117

G. Conclusion

The intent of this paper has been to examine the dual emphases of truth and love in Wesley's thought, to see if they are mutually compatible. Is there a basic disparity here? Must we choose either truth or love? Must we forego the valid pursuits of scholarship if we go all out in an emphasis on love? Inversely, must we be content to live in the arid wastes of a sterile intellectualism if we go all out for truth? What kind of people are we Wesleyans? Are we emotional sentimentalists only? Evangelicals without a native theology? Or vice versa? Must we live out our existence in an uneasy truce in a kind of no-man's land? Must we be all heart and no head? Or all head and no heart? Who or what are we?

In answer to the questions asked above, the following observations are offered as the material necessary to formulating the answer. First, there is no necessary disparity between truth and love. If Jesus Christ is the personification of truth and the perfection of love, then we Wesleyans can believe that our identity is based upon the fusion of the two, not one versus the other. Second, we can be doctrinally sound without being repulsive in spirit. We can be full of divine love without sacrificing doctrinal integrity. In fact, we believe that each needs the other in order to a full-orbed and balanced presentation. If doctrinal exactitude seems to make us too restrictive to some, we reply that truth spoken in love makes it appealing to others. Third, we are confessional, yet evangelistic. We believe that truth is both propositional and personal. We believe that when theology is put to the service of love, then our message utilizes the trained mind of an Oxford graduate with the warm heart of an Aldersgate experience. Fourth, this equal emphasis makes the Wesleyan message preachable, teachable, believable, receivable, knowable, singable, and transmissible. Fifth, we also believe that truth spoken in love explains Wesley's ability, and ours also, to emphasize social reform as well as personal salvation. Pure doctrine is important to us; so is a pure heart; so is a righteous world. Love is indeed "the never failing remedy for all the evils of a disordered world," as Wellman Warner once said of Wesley. But love is not unstructured. It neither abrogates nor destroys the law; it fulfills it. Thus to Wesley love was holy and Godlike. And so was truth. It may be conceded that Wesleyanism is a spirit, a spirit of love. But this spirit seeks to inhabit a body, a corpus of truth. Finally,

we believe that love and truth need each other. When thus united in a balanced emphasis, Wesleyan teaching continues to make the venerable appeal of Jesus Christ, Paul, Peter, James, and John germane and pertinent, whether we are speaking to the man on the street or the scholar in the classroom.

Reference Notes

1. Daniel Day Williams, *What Present Day Theologians Are Thinking* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), pp. 47-48. See also *Religion in Life* 29 (no. 4, autumn, 1960): 491-639, for a series on "Is There a Neo-Wesleyanism?"
2. William E. Lecky, *England in the Eighteenth Century* 7 vols. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1921), 3:140.
3. Benjamin Jowett makes the extravagant statement Wesley "was a greater present influence on the religion of the Christian world than any apostle or saint or prophet since the Reformation, perhaps . . . since Saint Paul himself." See Benjamin Jowett, *Sermons, Biographical and Miscellaneous* (London: John Murray, 1899), p. 112.
4. Archibald W. Harrison, *The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion* (London: The Epworth Press, 1941), pp. 80-81.
5. Mary A. Tenney, *Blueprint for a Christian World* (Winona Lake: Light and Life Press, 1964), et passim.
6. Maldwyn Edwards, *John Wesley and the Eighteenth Century* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1933), et passim.
7. J. R. Green, *A Short History of the English People* 4 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1895), 4:1608-11.
8. Abram Lipsky, *John Wesley, a Portrait* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1928), pp. 261-82. Eric McCoy North, *Early Methodist Philanthropy* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1914), pp. 36-76
9. J. Ernest Rattenbury, *Wesley's Legacy to the World* (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1928), pp. 87 ff.
10. H. O. Workman, *An Introduction to the History of the Church of England* (London: Rivingtons, 1923), p. 437.
11. David D. Thompson, *John Wesley as a Social Reformer* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1898), pp. 42-61.
12. Wellman Warner, *The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930), cf. p. 213.
13. *Ibid.* pp. 271-72.
14. Harald Lindstrom, *Wesley and Sanctification* (London: The Epworth Press, 1946), p. 1.
15. Newton Flew, *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), p. 313. Flew says Methodism's rise to prominence as a spiritual and moral force in the eighteenth century was like an underground river welling up to the surface from a hidden spring. On the other hand, Franz Hildebrandt is convinced that Wesley synthesized

- preexisting scriptural, practical, missionary, and catholic principles. Cf. his *Christianity According to the Wesleys* (London: The Epworth Press, 1956), p. 12.
16. C. E. Villiamy, *John Wesley* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1931), p. 308.
 17. Francis J. McConnell, *John Wesley* (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1939). McConnell has said that with the possible exception of a few statesmen and scientists, and perhaps a general or two, more has been written about John Wesley than any other Englishman of the eighteenth century. Cf. p. 9.
 18. James R. Joy, "Wesley: Man of a Thousand Books, and a Book," *Religion in Life* 8 (no. 4, 1939): 71-84. Joy has found that Wesley was the author or editor of more than 400 publications.
 19. J. H. Whitely, *Wesley's England* (London: The Epworth Press, 1938), pp. 13-26.
 20. George Croft Cell, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1935), p. 8.
 21. Lecky, *England*, 3:114-20.
 22. Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, 2 vols. (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1881), 2:409, 419. Stephen says that both Wesley and the movement to which he gave rise must be understood as being nonspeculative in nature.
 23. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, *Protestant Thought Before Kant* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), pp. 162-75.
 24. *Ibid.*, p. 167.
 25. John W. Prince, *Wesley on Religious Education* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1926), pp. 11-12.
 26. Philip S. Watson, *Let God Be God* (London: The Epworth Press 1947), pp. 153, 171.
 27. *Ibid.*, pp. 3 ff. Gordon Rupp points out that Wesley read Luther's comments on Galatians on a journey from Markfield to London, June 15 and 16, 1741, and that he read so hastily that he mistakenly concluded that Luther was an antinomian and a mystic. See Gordon Rupp, *The Righteousness of God* (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1953), p. 46.
 28. John A. Faulkner, *Wesley as a Sociologist, Theologian, and Churchman* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1918), p. 38.
 29. *Modernism and the Christian Faith* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1921), p. 220.
 30. John W. Moore, "The Theology of Aldersgate," *What Happened at Aldersgate?* E. T. Clark, ed. (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1938), p. 163.
 31. Rattenbury, *Legacy*, p. 145. Speaking of Wesley's cautious attitude about imposing doctrinal standards on Methodists, E. R. Taylor claims that Wesley "never intended to be an innovator (in doctrine), and he believed that all his doctrines could be brought within the meaning of the Thirty-nine Articles." See E. R. Taylor, *Methodism and Politics* (Cambridge: University Press, 1935), p. 35.
 32. J. A. Dorner, *History of Protestant Theology*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh T. and T. Clark, 1871), 2:66; John Dillenberger, *Protestant Thought and Natural Science* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1960), p. 79.
 33. William Hordern, *A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology* (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1955), pp. 43-44.

34. McGiffert, *Protestant Thought*, pp. 189-92.
35. John Locke, *The Work of John Locke*, 10 vols. (London: W. Otridge and Son, 1812), 1:1-76; 4:3-498.
36. McGiffert, *Protestant Thought*, pp. 213-15.
37. A. J. Ayer and Raymond Winch (eds.), *British Empirical Philosophers* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1952), pp. 298-513
38. Wesley's own words are that "the traditional evidence of Christianity stands, . . . a great way off: . . . It gives us an account of what was transacted long ago . . . Whereas the inward evidence is intimately present to all persons, at all times, and in all places . . . If, then, it were possible . . . to shake the traditional evidence of Christianity, still he that has the internal evidence . . . would stand firm and unshaken." John Wesley, *The letters of John Wesley*, John Telford, ed., 7 vols. (London: The Epworth Press, 1951), 2:384.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 385.
40. McGiffert, *Protestant Thought*, p. 243.
41. Rattenbury, *Legacy*, p. 145.
42. Warner, *Wesleyan Molliment*, p. 57.
43. Cell, *Rediscovery*, p. q2.
44. Umphrey Lee, *John Wesley and Modern Religion* (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1936), pp. 136-37.
45. Piette says, "Methodism from a doctrinal point of view, occupies in every way a unique position, by reason of the primacy it has accorded to religious experience. . . . The Wesleyan Theology of experience has exerted an uncontested influence upon the theories of liberal Protestant theology from Frederick Schleiermacher to William James." Maxim Piette, *John Wesley in the Evolution of Protestantism* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1937), p. vii.
46. Rattenbury, *Legacy*, p. 84.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
48. E. C. Mossner, *Bishop Butler and the Age of Reason* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1936), p. 166.
49. *Ibid.*
50. Cell, *Rediscovery*, p. 15.
51. H. B. Workman, "The Place of Methodism in the Life and Thought of the Christian Church," Introduction to Townsend, et al., *A New History of Methodism*, 2 vols. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909), 1:27-34.
52. *Ibid.*, pp. 34-37.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
54. Lee, *Modern Religion*, pp. 130-43.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 231.
56. Lindstrom, *Wesley and Sanctification*, p. 5.
57. John Wesley, *Standard Sermons*, ed. E. H. Sugden, 2 v015. (Londoll: The Epworth Press, 1921), p. 31. ~
58. W. R. Cannon, *The Theology o; John Wesley* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946), pp. 29 ff.
59. Cf. David Clark Shipley, "Methodist Arminianism in the Theology or John Fletcher," unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, 1942, p. vii.
60. Lee, *Modern Religion*, pp. 189-91; 207-10.

61. Ibid., pp. 144-74.
62. Flew, *Idea of Perfection*, pp.viiff.
63. Cell, *Rediscovery*, p. 5.
64. Ibid., p. 347. Rupp takes issue with Cell here, denying that Wesley derived his ethic of holiness from Catholicism. "From beginning to end," I Rupp claims, "John Wesley believed and preached justification by faith . only.... Nevertheless, it is true, as he put it, that holiness was his point." See Gordon Rupp, *Principalities and Powers* (London: The Epworth Press, 1952), p. 82.
66. Franz Hildebrandt, *From Luther to Wesley* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), pp. 80-81.
66. Ibid., p. 73.
67. W. B. Pope, *A Compendium of Christian Theology*, 3 vols. (New York: Hunt and Eaton, 1899), 3:84.
68. For the nature of English Arminianism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the work of F. E. Pamp is most helpful. The elastic use of the term Arminian is seen in that it could refer to "a theological, a political, or a social dimension of English seventeenth-century culture." See Frederic E. Pamp, "Studies in the Origins of English Arminianism," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1950) p. 1. He notes, further, that Wesley's Arminianism is more humanitarian than it had been in the previous century. Ibid., p. 33. Cf. also Alfred H Pask, "The Influence of Arminius on Wesley," *London Quarterly and Wolborn Review*, October, 1960, pp. 268-63.
69. Shipley, "Methodist Arminianism," pp. xv-xx.
70. Lindstrom, *Wesley and Sanctification*, pp. 7-14. Cannon is an exception to this tendency, however. Standing firmly in the Arminian tradition, he claims that "Wesley's doctrine of justification (not sanctification) was the source and determinant of all the rest of his theology." Cf. Cannon, *Theology of Wesley*, p. 244. Also, it must be remembered, as Abel Stevens has stated clearly, that in the early years of the Methodist societies "Arminians and Calvinists were both to be found." Abel Stevens, *The History of Methodism*, 7 vols. (New York: Carlton and Porter, 1868-60), 1:116.
71. *Works*, 8:340.
72. *Sermons*, 2:139.
73. Ibid., p. 129
74. *Notes*, Matthew 6 :47.
76. *Letters*, 4:216.
76. *Sermons*, 2: 129.
77. *Works*, 6:497.
78. Ibid., pp. 496-597.
79. Ibid., 6:176-76.
80. *Sermons*, 2: 136-36.
81. *Letters*, 2:126.
82. *Works*, 10:193-201.
83. Ibid., 8:336.
84. *Sermons*, 2:142-43.
86. Ibid., p. 143.
85. *Works*, 8:341.

87. Sermons, 2:136-37. On the basis of these doctrines Wesley admonished his preachers to present to unbelievers the threefold doctrine of original sin, justification by faith, and holiness of heart and life. Letters, 4:237.
88. Letters, 4 :298.
89. Journal, 2 :336-36.
90. I bid ., 6: 444-45.
91. Letters, 7:191.
92. Paul Schilling, Methodism and Society in Theological Perspective, p. 34.
93. L. M. Starkey, The Work of the Holy Spirit, pp. 128-29.
94. Works, 9:429.
95. Ibid., 8:340.
96. Letters, 6:297-98.
97. Sermons, 2 :226-27.
98. Letters, 7:231; Works, 8:341.
99. Ibid., 6:200.
100. Notes, 1 John 4:16.
101. Sermons, 1:37.
102. Works, 6:242-43, 66.
103. Ibid., 5:54.
104. Ibid., 6:67-68.
106. Ibid., 7:47-48.
106. Notes, Romans 5:5.
107. Works, 11:394.
108. Ibid., pp. 401, 418.
109. Ibid.
110. Ibid., p. 415; Sermons, 2:80.
111. Works, 11:417-19.
112. Sermons, 2:77.
113. Notes, Romans 3:20, 31.
114. Works, 1 :279-80.
115. Sermons, 2:81.
116. Notes, Matthew 6:10; Sermons, 1:236.
117. Works, 11:430.

PERFECTION IN WESLEY AND FLETCHER:

Inaugural or Teleological?

David L. Cubie

The original title proposed for this paper was "Teleology or Crisis." Further reflection and research indicated its inadequacy. There is no question that Wesley and Fletcher, as well as the modern holiness movement, have taught growth subsequent to regeneration and a crisis moment within this life when the heart is made perfect in love. The open question is whether the crisis experience of Christian perfection as taught by Wesley and Fletcher is inaugural or teleological. That is, whether in their views it is a preparatory experience giving cleansing and power for Christian living and service, or an experience which characteristically occurs near the end of life in preparation for heaven.

The findings represented by this paper indicate: (1) that the crisis experience of Christian perfection as taught by Wesley and Fletcher is primarily a teleological experience in preparation for heaven; (2) that their language portrays a psychological perfection not expected in our contemporary holiness teachings; (3) that the terminology which they usually associate with crisis occurs in a teleological context; and (4) that perfection is usually realized as the culmination of a series of growth-crisis stages.

That the crisis experience was primarily viewed as preparation for heaven is evident in the time that perfection was expected. The "Plain Account" includes various entries affirming that "the generality of believers, whom we have hitherto known were not so sanctified till near death."¹ For Fletcher "it is a long time, even many years before sin is destroyed." It is attained "gradually," "at last," and after "a long time."² Though perfection crisis may occur "ten, twenty, or forty years before," "this instant generally is the instant of death";³ a moment later may be too late.⁴

Perfection's attainment was prophetic that death was near. Mrs. Fletcher, recording Fletcher's own last days, states that he "was ripening fast for glory."⁶ Though death itself could not sanctify, both physical suffering and the anticipation of death were seen as welcome agents of sanctification. Death is "that faithful minister and servant of Christ" to drive us out of a "crafty and indolent nature."⁶ The approach of death creates Judgment Day seriousness both in the ripening saint and the

careless sinner.⁷ Both Wesley and Fletcher accepted the value of suffering. Fletcher tended to seek out suffering with Christ "in his faint, bloody sweat, or in his wracking tortures on the cross." He admonished Miss Ireland, "Draw not back; . . . and let not the grave frighten you." Wesley, while recognizing that "the Lord loveth whom he chasteneth," advised one of his correspondents: "If you can recover your health, you ought; for health is a great blessing." Fletcher in the letter quoted said to Miss Ireland, "Blessed be God for the recovery you mention."

The teleological nature of perfection is seen in the language regarding perfection. The language is either superlative or expresses completion in every aspect of the inner personality, including feelings, and as such portrays a psychological perfection not expected in contemporary holiness teachings. Perfection was not just in the realm of the will or reason. It applied equally to the affections and feelings. As Fletcher wrote to Miss Hatton, "O my friend, we may believe rationally, . . . And shall we not believe affectionately also?" Some of the psychological expectations were "uninterrupted poverty of spirit," "assiduous keeping of our senses,"¹¹ "constant bridling of our bodily appetites,"¹¹ an "exalted way of exulting faith,"¹² a "full and earnest desire to do and suffer the will of God,"¹³ "meekness ruling 'over all my tempers,'"¹⁴ "perfect humility,"¹ "patience in pain,"¹¹ "perfect resignation under losses,"¹¹ "a resolute 'following of Christ without the camp,'"¹¹ a longing "to feel the utmost power of the Spirit's dispensation,"¹⁶ and perfect control over dreams.¹⁷ It is in this language of completeness that such concepts as "entire sanctification," "perfect love," and "fullness of the Spirit" find their commonality.¹⁸ The teleological nature of this language is captured by two other phrases of Fletcher: "God bringing forth the top stone"¹⁹ and "your sun goes down no more."²⁰

Wesley's proof texts contain the same superlative language.²¹ Instead of choosing texts that might imply a second work of grace, Wesley chose those texts which, to use Fletcher's words, express "the privileges of the Christian dispensation at its fulness."²² Probably the most frequently quoted is the following from Ezekiel 36: 25 which, containing Fletcher's capitalization, promises that God will cleanse you "from ALL your filthiness, and from ALL your idols." The conviction of both Fletcher and Wesley was that God would fulfill all His promises in this life. Charles Wesley's hymn, "The Promise of Sanctification," which is so frequently quoted by both Fletcher and John Wesley that it is almost a theme chorus, has the same scripture reference as well as the superlative and the teleological ideas:

*Now let me gain perfection's height
Now let me into nothing fall!
Be less than nothing in my sight
And feel that Christ is all in all.*²³

Not only the language of perfection, but also the concepts usually associated with crises such as sanctification by faith, baptism with the Holy Spirit, eradication, and growth crisis symbols such as birth, death, and healing are teleological in their usage.

Faith for Wesley is a supernatural sight,²⁴ "supernatural" in that it is created by God and "sight" in that it is joined with the witness of the Spirit and such objective evidences as the Scripture and observation to give infallible proof that God's promised grace had been fulfilled. Though this faith is the "only root of whatever is good and holy"²⁵ and the only condition which is immediately and proximately necessary for justification and sanctification,²⁶ it is not a simple catalyst uniting God and man. Instead, faith is complex and exists in degrees. Unlike the Reformers, Wesley and Fletcher do not hold to "faith alone." Instead, faith interrelates with all spiritual graces and works. It grows with these, both helping them to increase and being increased through them. One of Wesley's favorite scriptures is Gal. 5:6: ". . . faith which worketh by love."²⁷ According to Fletcher, "The perfection which he [God] kindly calls us to, [is] nothing but a faithful improvement of our talents, according to the proportion of grace given us.... Faith unfeigned ... will lead you unavoidably up to perfect obedience."²⁸ Christian perfection for Fletcher is the full constellation of all the graces.²⁹ It is "that particular height of sanctification, that full, 'circumcision of the heart,' which centrally purifies the soul, springs from a peculiar degree of saving faith, and a particular operation of the 'Spirit of burning.'"³⁰

Wesley argued against the Moravian, Philip Molther, that "there are degrees in faith; and that a man may have some degree of it, before all things in him are become new; before he has the full assurance of faith, the abiding witness of the Spirit, or the clear perception that Christ dwelleth in him."³¹ Such an individual must use all the means of grace until God grants him fullness of faith and the accompanying graces. Wesley's description of weak faith is that it "is commonly mixed with doubt or fear; that is, in the latter sense, with unbelief."³² He also states:

There are in every person, even after he is justified, two contrary principles, nature and grace, termed by St. Paul, the flesh and the Spirit. Hence, although even babes in Christ are sanctified, yet it is only in part. In a degree, according to the measure of their faith, they are spiritual; yet, in a degree they are carnal....³³

Each state and dispensation³⁴ has its own degree of faith. What Fletcher wanted was "a perfect faith productive of perfect love."³⁵ What Charles Wesley desired was "mighty faith"³⁶ and the "end of faith"³⁷ so that "I, e'en I, shall cease from sin" and be "set at liberty."

For John and Charles Wesley, as for Calvin, the baptism with the Holy Spirit was regeneration or the new birth. Charles refers to his

Aldersgate-related experience as his Pentecost.³⁸ Fletcher developed a doctrine regarding the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which was repeatable and, in its fullness, subsequent to the new birth. To Wesley the looking for a subsequent baptism was "not scriptural and not quite proper; for they all received the Holy Ghost when they were justified."³⁹

Despite the disagreement the function of their ideas is similar. Though for Wesley Pentecost is the new birth, the Holy Spirit witnesses to each successive stage in the Christian life. Similarly Fletcher teaches that the baptism with the Holy Spirit is repeated in a succession of events beginning with the new birth and concluding with glory.⁴⁰ Though crisis is present in "a Baptism with the Holy Spirit," what is occurring in most lives is a series of crises, i.e., of baptisms until perfection is attained. Thus Fletcher would ask not whether a believer had received his baptism, but whether he or she had "received the Comforter in his fulness."⁴¹ Christian perfection is not defined by or identical with an experience. One cannot say, I have been baptized with the Holy Spirit; therefore, my heart is perfect in love. Instead, for Fletcher, each baptism is a divine effusion cleansing the heart as far as faith is able to receive, usually necessitating further baptism until the believer is perfected in love.

Cleansing from sin in Fletcher and Wesley likewise tends to be teleological rather than inaugural. Though both can refer to the "inward root of sin"⁴⁹ and use eradication in a non-technical sense, both terms are rarely used. Original or indwelling sin is not a single-nondivisible entity, which is wholly present in one moment and then removed in a single, radical faith-grace event. Instead, it is removed gradually, the Comforter "expelling according to the degree of our faith."⁴³ Fletcher can also talk about "so much of indwelling sin as we carry about so much of indwelling hell."⁴⁴ Inward sin may be removed gradually by a process of "feeble faith and feeble love" which are "so frequently repeated as to become strong, habitual, and evangelically natural to us."⁴⁶ The gradualness implies a teleological idea and the time in which to attain. Though gradual perfection is normative, all sin may be removed in an instant by a single full baptism of the Holy Spirit in response to a single act of full faith. "Both ways are good."

There is no distinction between SIN and sins. Though singular terminology such as "root" and "indwelling sin" may be used, the plural "indwelling sins" is more common. Fletcher can refer to "these cages of unclean birds."⁴⁷ The contrast between sins, plural, and the sin principle, singular, is not made by either Fletcher or Wesley. Instead, Wesley can refer to perfection as "deliverance from all inward and outward sin," both singular, and then describe both in the plural: "from evil words and works."⁴⁸ As a result, indwelling sin and the carnal mind are removable by a process involving the daily walk and faith of the Christian. The Christian is exhorted to "forsake the carnal mind."⁴⁹

It is within this context that their language of self-mortification, self-abnegation, and self-denial takes on meaning. All indwelling sin may be removed instantaneously, but "God does not usually remove the plague of indwelling sin till it has been discovered and lamented."⁵⁰ "Vile self must be reduced to order."⁵¹ In fact, according to John Wesley, "the more you feel of your own vileness, the more you rejoice in confident hope, that all this shall be done away."⁵² Charles Wesley sang, "I would be by myself abhorr'd."⁵³ Despite the time involved and the gradual means by which sin is usually removed, we must not lose sight of the fact that the one perfection that must exist before one enters Heaven is that of freedom from all sin. There is a crisis of deliverance toward which the Christian is striving and for which he is believing.

For Fletcher and Wesley, Christian perfection, with all of its aspects, was "realized eschatology," that is, without removing the teleological and eschatological tensions in the ideas, they yet affirmed that, because it was God's work, it could and would be fulfilled in the believer provided he met the condition of faith. Though perfection usually occurred many years after the new birth, God can "cut short his work."⁵⁴ As Charles Wesley wrote: "The child fulfills a hundred years, / And ripe before his God appears."⁵⁵ Nevertheless, that which occurs is eschatological. Like the coming of the Son of Man, the day and hour is completely in the hands of God. The content of the experience was high, not easily claimed, and was the result of an unusual degree of grace. Both Wesley and Fletcher were fearful of presumptuous profession and wrote warning the Methodists against it.⁵⁶ Contrary to the tendencies of some since Phoebe Palmer⁵⁷ to "take it by faith," Wesley and Fletcher taught that there should be no profession without the clear witness of the Spirit. It is attainable by faith, but God may delay giving entire sanctification. Why God should delay is a mystery to Wesley, though "God undoubtedly has reasons."⁵⁸ God is sovereign. He has a goal, but He "cuts short his own work" and "justifies and sanctifies" whom He will. " 'May he not do what he will with his own?'"⁵⁹ This eschaton is evangelical. It is composed of answers to promises intended for this life. The Christian is to trust God to perfect him now.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, if God delays, he is to trust the One who has promised. God will not permit any who are faithfully following after holiness to leave this world without it, for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord."⁶¹

The crisis symbols are also teleological. Though death to sin may take place 40 years sooner, it generally occurs a little before physical death. It is a teleological crisis. However long it takes sin to die, "there must be a last moment of its existence, and a first moment of our deliverance from it."⁶² Fletcher, like Wesley, chose death as his most frequent analogy. He used it in dialogue with his opponents who taught that physical death itself was the perfecting crisis: Death came "to the

assistance of the atoning blood."⁶³ Both Fletcher and Wesley denied that death, man's last enemy, could perfect. Perfection had to be a present work of grace. Furthermore, because it is an act of God in response to faith, it need not be "a long, gradual process."⁶⁴

Wesley moved naturally in a concept that the Christian's life or state, instead of two experiences, was composed of three stages preceded by two nonevangelical states, that of the natural man and that of the servant.⁶⁵ Within the tradition of the church the language of stages was common, though the number varied.⁶⁶ Three had become standard. Wesley's preferred terms-(1) little children, (2) young men, and (3) fathers make up the outline for the following description of the Christian life:

It should be premised, that there are several stages in Christian life, as in natural;-some of the children of God being but newborn babes; others having attained to more maturity.... (1) "I write unto you, little children," . . . Because thus far you have attained,-being "justified freely," you "have peace with God through Jesus Christ." (2) "I write unto you, young men, "because . . . "ye have quenched the fiery darts of the wicked one," the doubts and fears wherewith he disturbed your first peace; and the witness of God, that your sins are forgiven, now abideth in your heart. (3) "I write unto you, fathers, because. . . ye have known both the Father, and the Son," and the Spirit of Christ, in your inmost soul. Ye are "perfect men," being grown up to "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."⁶⁷

Note that this outline of the stages terminates in a clear description of a teleological goal.

Within the stages there is an evident pattern of change by way of an interweaving of growth and crisis⁶⁸ toward the eradication of all sin and the realization of all the graces. Regarding sin, (1) a babe does not commit sin; (2) a young man is more than conqueror (i.e., able to place evil thoughts under the Blood as soon as they arise); (3) a father is freed from all evil thoughts and tempers.⁶⁹ Faith and its accompanying assurance move from (1) weak faith which contains an immediate witness to Christ but with many doubts and fears; (2) to a full assurance of faith excluding doubt; (3) to finally a full assurance of hope "having no more doubt of reigning with him in glory" and an experiential knowledge of the Trinity.⁷⁰

The doctrine of dispensation⁷¹ is Fletcher's organizational model for his analysis of the Christian life,⁷⁹ though he does contain references to the states⁷³ and to the stages of life.⁷⁴ This doctrine, though providing an explanation of God's redemptive activity both in dispensations past and among contemporary men in their varied world religions and branches of the Christian church,⁷⁵ was also a means for analyzing the progress of the seeking pilgrim from the first glimmer of religious truth

to the full Pentecostal possession of the Spirit's presence.⁷⁶ As applied to the spiritual quest of the individual, the dispensations are similar though not clearly equivalent to Wesley's doctrine of states and stages. Each dispensation describes a group of men in a faith relationship with God, a relationship which includes both repentance and a potential perfection. Thus the lowest equivalent expressed is the state of being a servant of God.⁷⁷ Wesley's stage of "the babe" is described by Fletcher's dispensation of the Son. These have faith in Jesus, but do not have the Holy Spirit. They participate in "infant Christianity"⁷⁸ and "are shut up in this state of weakness and doubt,"⁷⁹ but they do possess "a degree of humble confidence."⁸⁰ The dispensation of the Spirit can also include those who are babes,⁸¹ but this description is not usual. Those qualities of the abiding witness, victory over sin, and confident faith which Wesley ascribes to the "young man" are the very qualities which distinguish the new experience of the dispensation of the Spirit from the dispensation of the Son.

Though Wesley identifies a crisis at each stage, Fletcher has a distinct crisis only at the beginning of the dispensation of the Spirit and at its perfection, though even these are identified more by the quality of life and relationship attained than by crises. There are two goals for which the Christian living in the dispensation of Spirit strives: freedom from all sin and a perfection of "shame and glory,"⁸² but these are achieved not by one or two distinct crises or stages, but as has already been described, by repeated baptisms of the Spirit.⁸³

The distinction between fathers in Christ, i.e., perfect Christians, and the lesser stages of babes and young men is a matter of degree.⁸⁴ Though the experiential distinctions are not precise, the goals are clearly defined.

The teleological nature of the dispensations is evident in that each successive dispensation is the fulfillment of the preceding. This is true not only historically, but also in the individual. "The enlightened pastor" is one who can recognize the dispensation within which each member of his flock resides, and then leads that one along "from faith to faith,"⁸⁵ his goal being to lead his sheep into the life in the Spirit. The dispensation of the Spirit has a teleological aspect. The goal in it is "Perfection's Height,"⁸⁶ and though the millennium may not come immediately in history, it may be realized experientially.⁸⁷ In a letter to Mr. Henry Brooke in February of 1785, he had resigned himself to the possibility that the Lord would not return during his lifetime to possess Jerusalem, "But my Jerusalem!" he wonders. "Why it is not swallowed up of that which comes down from heaven is a question which I wait to be solved."⁸⁸ Those who know the fullness of the Spirit's dispensation have their own eschatological moment, a foretaste of the dispensations of the millennium and of the glory, which is to come.

While the evidence presented indicates that the expected time for Christian perfection to occur was near the end of life, the intention is not to minimize that interpretation of Wesley's teaching which has been standard within the holiness movement that Christian perfection is an act of God's grace, received by faith, and which may be received now as we are.⁸⁹ That teaching, along with Fletcher's doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, belongs to those "discoveries of faith"⁹⁰ which strongly influenced the fathers of the modern holiness movement and brought them and us into that experience whereby our hearts have been cleansed by faith. What we need to be aware of is the teleological connotation of the language used, lest we apply ideas from them which are inapplicable to an inaugural experience. To apply these ideas would, contrary to both men's sane advice, set the experience too high and go beyond the scriptural description of a Spirit-filled man. At the same time we need to encourage, even as they did, an awareness of the opportunities within the Spirit-filled life which includes the scriptural promises. God desires to fulfill all of these so that we may grow in inward holiness, in manifestations of love for our fellowmen, and in a trusting love for "our three-one God."⁹¹

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1

The Baptism with the Holy Spirit

1. Beyond evangelical freedom from sin and perfect love, Fletcher looked for an eschatological fullness, a special baptism by the Holy Spirit. Fletcher in 1777 was looking for "that ineffable fullness" (Fletcher, To Miss Thornton, 1777, Works, 4: 353) . In the following Fletcher anticipates such a baptism. Of interest is that he expects it not only for himself, but also for the church. Its eschatological nature is also evident in that it may not be fulfilled until the resurrection: "I still look for an outpouring of the Spirit, inwardly and outwardly. Should I die before that great day, I shall have the consolation to see it from afar. Thank God! I enjoy uninterrupted peace in the midst of my trials, which are, sometimes, not a few. Joy also I possess; but I look for joy of a superior nature. I feel myself, in a good degree, dead to praise and dispraise: I hope, at least, that it is so; because I do not feel that the one lifts me up, or that the other dejects me. I want to see a Pentecostal Christian Church; and, if it is not to be seen at this time upon earth, I am willing to go and see that glorious wonder in heaven" (Tyerman, WDS, pp. 359-60).

2. Conversion is a baptism of the Holy Ghost. So is Christian perfection and so also is glorification. Progress is achieved by "another glorious baptism"~ which carries the believer as it did "the disciples of Christ farther into the kingdom of grace which perfects the believers in one." "How many baptisms, or effusions of the sanctifying Spirit are necessary to cleanse a believer from all sin, and to kindle his soul into perfect love?" Fletcher asks, and replies, "If one powerful baptism of the Spirit 'seal you unto the day of redemption, and cleanse you from all [moral] filthiness, so much the better. If two or more be necessary, the Lord can repeat them" (Fletcher, "Last Check," xix, pp. 631-33). Christian perfection is not defined by or identical with an experience. One cannot say, I have been baptized with the Holy Spirit; therefore, my heart is perfect in love. Instead, for Fletcher, each baptism is a divine effusion, cleansing the heart as far as faith is able to

receive, usually necessitating further baptisms until the believer is perfected in love. .

3. Fletcher applied his message regarding the baptism to all men: "1. Unconverted.-Rest in no baptism, but that of the Holy Ghost and fire. Water baptism will condemn you alone. 2. John's disciples.- Promised, the thing promised, the time, O continue praying with one accord! 3. Believers.-You want fresh baptism, till the Holy Ghost, which is grace, fill your soul (Fletcher, "Outlines of Sermons," v, Works, 4:196). His analysis of the Day of Pentecost is interesting in this regard. On that day each believer received the degree of grace for which he was ready. This readiness was not based on a prior conversion experience but upon the individual degree of faith. That some were not made perfect in love he evidences by the "guile of Ananias and his wife, and of the partiality of selfish murmuring of some believers." On the other hand, "Those chiefly, who before were strong in the grace of their dispensation arose then into sinless fathers." Others became "babes in Christ" and others "young men" (Fletcher, "Last Check," xix, pp. 631-32).

Appendix 2

Description of the Stages

The actuality of these stages can be illustrated best by giving a passage from the "Plain Account" at length without omissions or rearrangement except that the stages will be outlined.

[Introduction:] Indeed, how God may work, we cannot tell; but the general manner wherein he does work is this:

[1. The stage of a babe: (a) conviction and repentance of sin:] Those who once trusted in themselves that they were righteous, that they were rich, and increased in goods, and had need of nothing, are, by the Spirit of God applying his word, convinced that they are poor and naked. All the things that they

have done are brought to their remembrance and set in array before them, so that they see the wrath of God hanging over their heads, and feel that they deserve the damnation of hell. In their trouble they cry unto the Lord, [(b) the gift of peace:] and he shows them that he hath taken away their sins, and opens the kingdom of heaven in their hearts, "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Sorrow and pain are fled away, and "sin has no more dominion over" them. Knowing they are justified freely through faith in his blood, they "have peace with God through Jesus Christ;" they "rejoice in hope of the glory of God," and "the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts."

[2. The stage of a young man: (a) Strong temptation and fear of falling:] In this peace they remain for days, or weeks, or months, and commonly suppose they shall not know war any more; till some of their old enemies, their bosom sins, or the sin which did most easily beset them, (perhaps anger or desire,) assault them again, and thrust sore at them, that they fall. Then, arises fear, that they shall not endure to the end; and often doubt, whether God has not forgotten them, or whether they did not deceive themselves in thinking their sins were forgiven. Under these clouds, especially if they reason with the devil, they go mourning all the day long [(b) The Comforter witnesses continually to them:] But it is seldom long before their Lord answers for himself, sending them the Holy Ghost to comfort them, to bear witness continually with their spirits that they are the children of God. Then they are indeed meek and gentle and teachable, even as a little child. [3. The stage of a father: (a) conviction of the fleshly nature:] And now first do they see the ground of their heart; which God before would not disclose unto them, lest the soul should fail before him, and the spirit which he had made. Now they see all the hidden abominations there, the depths of pride, self-will, and hell- yet having the witness in themselves, "Thou art an heir of God, a joint heir with Christ, even in the midst of this fiery trial;" which continually heightens both the strong sense they then have of their inability to help themselves, and the inexpressible hunger they feel after a full renewal in his image, in "righteousness and true holiness." [(b) They are made entire and complete:] Then God is mindful of the desire of them that fear him, and gives them a single eye, and a pure heart; He stamps upon them his own image and superscription; He createth them anew in Christ Jesus; He cometh unto them with his Son and bringeth them into the "rest which remaineth for the people of God" (Wesley, "A Plain Account," 13, pp. 380-81).

That this passage indicates Wesley's basic description of the way of salvation or perfection is indicated by his footnote: "Is it not astonishing,

that while this book is extant, which was published four-and-twenty years ago, any one should face me down, that this is a new doctrine, and what I never taught before? [This note was first published in the year 1765.-Ed.]" (Ibid., p. 381.) Furthermore, Wesley concludes this section of "A Plain Account" by saying: "So that whether our present doctrine be right or wrong, it is however the same which we taught from the beginning" ("Discoveries of Faith," 14, p.236).

Reference Notes

1. "Plain Account," 17 (1745), *The Works of John Wesley*, 5th ed. (London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1872), 11:387. Rpt. of *The Works of John Wesley*, ed. Thomas Jackson (London: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1829-31). Hereafter referred to as Wesley, Works. A letter to him describes the growth until just prior to death as "God's usual method" (1762, *ibid.*, 407). He himself affirms, "I believe this is the case of most, but not all" (1761, *ibid.*, 423).
2. "Last Check to Antinomianism," *The Works of the Reverend John Fletcher*, no ed., n.d. (rpt. Salem, Ohio: Schmul Publishers, 1974), 2:633. Hereafter referred to as Fletcher, Works. See also Wesley, Works.
3. Wesley, "Brief Thoughts on Christian Perfection," 1767, Works, 11 :446.
4. Wesley, "Minutes of Several Conversations," Works, 8 :328. "No soul goes to heaven without perfection" (Fletcher, Works, 2:564).
5. Luke Tyerman, *Wesley's Designated Successor: The Life, Letters And Literary Labours of the Reverend John William Fletcher* (New York Phillips and Hunt, 1883), p. 559. Hereafter referred to as Tyerman, WDS.
6. Fletcher, To Miss Ireland, Dec. 5, 1768, Works, 4:370.
7. To Miss Hatton Fletcher wrote, "A touch of pain or sickness I always find profitable to me as it rivets on my soul the thoughts of my nothingness, helplessness and mortality" (Works, 4:331). He also referred to a young man who, though "long under the rod of God" apparently in illness, "had not been whipped out of his careless unbelief to the bosom of Christ." Fletcher visited him while he was dying and reproved him for his sin. As a result, "he fell under conviction . . . and began to call on the Lord with all the earnestness his dying frame would allow" (*Ibid.*, 370-71).
8. Fletcher, To Miss Ireland, Dec. 5, 1768, Works, 4:371. But, see also Joseph Benson, *The Life of the Reverend John W. de la Flechere* (New York: B. Waugh & T. Mason, 1833), p. 67, for an emphasis on spiritual health including praise and joy. Hereafter referred to as Benson, LJF.
9. Wesley, To Mrs. Jane (Bisson) Cock, June 6, 1790, *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley*, ed. John Telford (London: The Epworth Press, 1931), 8:221. Hereafter referred to as Wesley, Letters.
10. Fletcher, To Miss Hatton, July 17, 1766, Works, 4:335.
11. Fletcher, "Last Check," xvii, 2:569.

12. Fletcher, To Miss Bryan, February, 1767, Works, 4:340.
13. Ibid., To Miss Cartwright, 1775, p. 347.
14. Ibid., "The Test of a New Creature," xi, p. 269.
15. Fletcher, "Last Check," p. 611. All implying perfect control over the psychological state.
16. Benson, LJF, p. 181.
17. Fletcher, "The Test of a New Creature," xx, p. 270.
18. There are many superlative and teleological expressions.
19. Fletcher, To Miss Hatton, Aug. 8, 1765, Works, 4:328.
20. Ibid., "Spiritual Manifestations of the Son of God." Letter iv, p.294.
21. See the sermon "Repentance in Believers," Wesley, Works, 5:156-70, where several texts are listed, including Ezek. 36:25 and another favorite, Deut. 30:6, "The Lord thy God will circumcise . . . with all thy soul"
22. Fletcher, "Equal Check: Essay on Truth," Works, 1:589.
23. Wesley, Works, 6:22.
24. See Fletcher, "Last Check," xix (9), p. 647; Wesley, "The Scripture Way of Salvation," ii, Works, 6:51-52.
25. Wesley, "The Righteousness of Faith," iii, Works, 5:76.
26. Wesley, "The Scripture Way of Salvation," iii, p. 48; Fletcher, "Last Check," xix (9), p. 646.
27. John Wesley, Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament (London: Epworth Press, n.d.; rpt. Naperville, Ill.; Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1958) p. 695. Anders Nygren identifies this use of this text with the Caritas motif. See Nygren, *Agape and Eros* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), p. 128.
28. Fletcher, "Fifth Check," iii, Works, 1:382.
29. Fletcher, "Last Check," i, p. 492.
30. Ibid., xii (viii), p. 566.
31. Wesley, "Journal," Dec. 31, 1739, Works, 1:257.
32. Wesley, "Sin in Believers," iv (12), Works, 5:155.
33. Wesley, "Sin in Believers," v (1), p. 155.
34. See later discussion.
35. Fletcher, "Last Check," xix, p. 627.
36. Ibid., xix (12), p. 655.
37. Charles Wesley, "Love Divine."
38. Charles Wesley, "Journal," May 21, 1738, *The Journal of Reverend Charles Wesley . . . [and] Selections from His Correspondence and Poetry*, 2 vols., ed. Thomas Jackson (London: Wesleyan Methodist Book-Room, 1849), 1:90. Hereafter referred to as Ch. Wesley, Journal.
39. Wesley, "Letter to Jos. Benson," Dec. 28, 1770, Letters, 5:214. Cf. letters dated Mar. 9 and 16, 1771, pp. 228-29.
40. See Appendix 1 for a further discussion on the baptism with the Holy Spirit.
41. See Appendix 1.
42. Wesley, "In the Deceitfulness of Man's Heart," i (4), Work, 7:339. Cf. Fletcher, "Last Check," xix, p. 636.
- 43 Fletcher. "Last Check," xiii (viii), p. 575. Cf. 654.

44. Ibid., xviii (9), pp. 623-24.
45. Ibid., xix (4), p. 636.
46. Ibid., xix (2), p. 636.
47. Ibid., (12), p. 655.
48. Wesley, "On The Discoveries of Faith," 16, Works, 7:237.
49. Fletcher, "Last Check," vii (7), p. 532.
50. Fletcher, "Last Check," xix (1), p. 631.
51. Fletcher, To Lady Fitzgerald, Aug. 28, 1782, 4:362. Fletcher enforces "the practice of a judicious, universal self-denial" by quoting: "If thou wilt be perfect . . . deny thyself, take up thy cross daily and follow me" (*italics mine*), Fletcher, "Last Check," xix (8), p. 644.
52. Wesley, "Satan's Devices," ii (1), Works, 6:39.
53. Ibid., "The Promise of Sanctification," p. 22. Fletcher, with Thomas Walsh, was one of the few "Old Methodists" whom Wesley recommended and whose life conformed to the practice of those examples of Roman Catholic piety, Gregory Lopez and Monsieur de Renty (Wesley, "Life of Mr. Fletcher," 17, Works 11 :364) .
54. Wesley, "Plain Account," 25 (Q. 25), Works, 11:423. Cf. Benson, LJF, p. 278, which quotes the following from a letter of Mrs. Fletcher's: "O pray for me that the Lord would shorten his work."
55. Charles Wesley, "On the Death of Westley Hall," Ch. Wesley, Journal, 2:305.
56. Fletcher, "Last Check," xvii, pp. 611-16; Wesley, "Plain Account," 25 (Q. 32), Works, 11:427ff.
57. See Ivan Howard, "Wesley Versus Phoebe Palmer: An Enter (led Controversy)," Wesleyan Theological Journal, 6, No. 1, 1971, 31-40.
58. Wesley, "The Imperfection of Human Knowledge," iii (4), Works, 6:349. Both Wesley and Fletcher see some possible value for the believer: "First, ... [as] a lesson of humility.... Second, [as] a lesson of faith; of confidence in God . . . of our own ignorance . . . [and] a full trust in his wisdom.... Thirdly, a lesson of resignation" (Wesley, "Imperfection," iv, pp. 349-50. Cf. 348-49; and "Plain Account" 25 [Q. 25], 423). Fletcher suggests that "in all probability he designs them such a bright manifestation as they are not yet able to bear" (Fletcher, "Spiritual Manifestations," p. 292. Cf. 293-94; and "Last Check," xix [3], p. 637). The possibility also exists that God may give a lesser degree of grace than we desire so that we may learn to value all of God's gifts (Fletcher, "Last Check," xix [4], pp. 636-37, 654. Cf. xiv [6], p. 585), and thus be prepared to receive His perfect love.
59. Wesley, "Plain Account," 25 (Q. 25), p. 423.
60. " . . . It is of importance to observe that there is an inseparable connection between three points,-expect it by faith, expect it as you are, and expect it now! To deny one of them is to deny them all; to allow one, is to allow them all. Do you believe we are sanctified by faith? Be true then to your principle: and look for this blessing just as you are, neither better nor worse: as a poor sinner, that has still nothing to plead but Christ died. And if you look for it as you are, then expect it now. Stay for nothing: why should you? Christ is ready; and he is all you want. He is waiting for you: he is at the door! Let your inmost soul cry out,

*Come in, come in, thou heavenly Guest!
Nor hence again remove:
But sup with me and let the feast.
Be everlasting love”*

(Fletcher, "Last Check," xix [10], p. 648).

61. Fletcher, "Last Check," v and xii, pp. 519, 564; Benson, LJF, p. 96.

62. Wesley, Works, 11:442. Cf. 402, 423. Wesley also uses the analogy of birth to express gradualness prior to crisis (Wesley, "The New Birth, [iv t3], Works, 6:74-75). Fletcher has a number of crisis symbols which he uses teleologically. These are: (1) "besieged towns" that capitulate after long resistance, or suddenly; (2) mothers who either deliver after much labor or as soon as labor comes upon them; (3) vegetation which in warm moist climates may spring up quickly or slowly as in the northern climate (Fletcher, "Last Check," xviii, p. 626; To Miss Hatton, Aug. 8, 1766-4.327), (4) illness which may be cured suddenly or by repeated purgatives

(i.e., by the Holy Spirit) until the disease is cured (Fletcher, "Last Check," Y, YiX, pp. 556, 632, 636-37).

63. Fletcher, "Last Check," xvi (9), p. 608- Cf. 610. Some other crisis symbols not implying growth are: (1) ". . . the light of a candle brought into a dark room." "May not the Sanctifier descend upon your waiting soul as quickly"; (2) Burning by the sun, a glass, or flame-how much more may God "with the celestial fire of his love . . . in an instant destroy the man of sin, burn up the chaff of corruption, melt the heart of stone into a heart of flesh, and kindle the believing soul into pure, seraphic love!" (Ibid., xix, p. 636).

64. Fletcher, "Last Check," xvi, p. 610.

65. Wesley, "Spirit of Bondage and Adoption, iii (8), Works, 5:108. We must take them seriously in the claim that they taught nothing new but that which was in harmony with the articles and homilies of the Church of England and find their type of Spirituality within their own church's teaching (see Wesley's Christian Library). Though there are some references to a second crisis, the precise delineation of two works of grace did not occur until the nineteenth century around the doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit (see the articles in the Wesleyan Theological Journal by Ivan Howard, 6, No. 1, 1971- Herbert McGonigle, 8, 1973- and Donald Dayton, 9, 1974). See also my dissertation, pp. 230-70, and Appendix 2 for an analysis of the stages.

66. Macarius the Egyptian, included in Wesley's A Christian Library, states: "There are twelve steps . . . which a man has to pass before he reaches perfection" (Fifty Spiritual Hoinilies of St. Macarius the Egyptian Series 1 of Translation of Christian Greek Texts, trans. A. J. Mason [New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929]) .

67. Wesley, "The Discoveries of Faith," ii (1), 1788, Works, 6 (numbering mine).

68. Wesley, Works, 11:380 (numbering mine). "Neither do we affirm, as some have done, that all this salvation is done at once. There is indeed an instantaneous, as well as a gradual, work of God in his children; and there wants not, we know, a cloud of witnesses, who have received in one moment,

[1] either a clear sense of the forgiveness of their sins,

[2] or the abiding witness of the Holy Spirit.

But we do not know a single instance, in any place, of a person's receiving, in one and the same moment,

- [1] remission of sins,
- [2] the abiding witness of the Spirit,
- [3] and a new clean heart."

69. Wesley, "Plain Account," 13, pp. 380-81. Cf. "Christian Perfection," ii (1-6), 6: 6-7.

70. Wesley, "The Discoveries of Faith," (1788), 14-17, Works, 7:236-38. Cf. 6:6.

71. See John A. Knight, "John William Fletcher and the Early Methodist Tradition," dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1967, pp. 176-90, for a discussion of dispensations.

72. This doctrine was Fletcher's constructive form for theological reflection. Fletcher was Methodism's first systematizer or constructive theologian. Wesley was deeply impressed by Fletcher's doctrine and proposed that God had raised him up for this very purpose. He observed, "I believe that difficult subject was never placed in so clear a light before" (Wesley, "Letter to E. Ritchie," 1775; Letters, 6:137).

73. Fletcher, "Last Check," viii, p. 640.

74. *Ibid.*, vi, ix, xix, pp. 523, 550, 631-32. Note that the dispensations are also three. Fletcher, "An Equal Check: Essay on Truth: Second Appendix," Works, 1:59-91.

75. *Ibid.*, xiii, pp. 573-95; "The Portrait of St. Paul," ii, 3:177, 193.

76. The dispensations are (1) of the Father, (2) of the Son, (3) of the Holy Spirit, with subsidiary dispensations of (1) (a) Gentiles-Adam, Noah, Job, Melchisedec, Socrates, Plato (Fletcher, "Equal Check: Essay on Truth," Works, 2:622-23; 3:175-77); (b) Jewish- (2) (a) John the Baptist (b) Jesus in the flesh; (3) (a) the beginnings of the Spirit's dispensation, (b) the fullness of the age of the dispensation of the Spirit. This fullness is eschatological in its historical realization, and identified at least in imagery with the Second Coming. Fletcher for many years expected an eschatological age of the Spirit to break through in the church of his day (Fletcher, "Portrait of Paul," ii, p. 197- Fletcher's "Letter to Henry Brooke," 1785, in Tyerman, WDS, p. 553). Each dispensation has its own gospel, its own law, its own perfection and salvation (Fletcher, "Fifth Check," iii, Works, 1:381-82; "Last Check," xiv, xv, xviii, pp. 523-25, 561- 63, 597, 620-21). See also his interpretation of the parable of the talents Fletcher, "Third Check"; "Fifth Check, Second Part," iii- "Equal Check Essay on Truth," pp. 144, 382, 587-88.

77. Fletcher's doctrine is very valuable in interpreting Wesley's footnotes to his description of his pre-Aldersgate state of grace. Curnock indicates that these are Wesley's (John Wesley, "Journal," Jan., 1738, *The Journal of the Reverend John Wesley*, ed. Nehemiah Curnock [London: Robert Culley, 1909], 1 :422). These footnotes are in harmony with Wesley's and Fletcher's teachings regarding the man who does righteousness and seeks to do God's perfect will, but who has not yet gained knowledge regarding the witness and life in the Spirit.

78. Fletcher, "Last Check," vi, p. 526; "Portrait of Paul," ii, p. 174.

79. Fletcher, "Portrait of Paul," ii, pp. 170-71.

80. *Ibid.*, p. 195.

81. Fletcher, "Last Check," ix, xix, p. 550 (fn.), 631-32.

82. *Ibid.*, vi, p. 528.
83. The Day of Pentecost had varied results in the life of the believer. See Appendix 1 :3. Cf. "Portrait of Paul," ii, p. 197.
84. ". . . at so great a distance . . ." Fletcher, "Last Check," ix, p.550 (fn.). The successive nature of these is evident also in that like the Galatians, the believer may backslide into the lesser faith of a lower dispensation (Fletcher, "Equal Check: An Essay on Truth: An Appendix," p. 580). Similarly, Wesley taught that both progress and regress are possible in the same Christian life. Perfection may be attained and then lost. It may be gained for a short while, which (attainment), though lost, is a promise of a perfection which once attained never need be lost again. Fletcher, in statements which appear contradictory in the context of the modern holiness movement, can declare in 1781, as Hester Ann Rogers reports he did, "To the praise of his love,-I am freed from sin," and then pray in the same conversation for "that pure baptismal flame! O, for the fullness of the dispensation of the Holy Ghost" (Tyerman, WDS, pp. 468- 69). Similarly, he wrote to Charles Wesley in 177fi, "Thank God, I enjoy uninterrupted peace in the midst of trials.... Joy, also, I possess," and in the same letter state, "I still look for an outpouring of the Spirit inwardly and outwardly. I look for a joy of superior nature" (*Arminian Magazine*, 1795; 18:614). John Wesley also records Fletcher's testimony of having such "faith as to feel no departure from him," yet that he often said, ". . . 'I want to be filled with the fullness of his Spirit'" (Wesley, "On the Death of Mr. Fletcher," iii [12], Works, 7:441).
85. Fletcher, "Portrait of Paul," ii, pp. 177, 193-94.
86. Charles Wesley, "The Promise of Sanctification," Wesley, Works, 6:20-22; frequently quoted both by Fletcher and Wesley; Fletcher, "Last Check," xi, vii, p. 563; "Letter to Mr. Samuel Hatton," April 22, 1763, 4:319, et al.
87. Fletcher, "Portrait of Paul," ii, p. 197; Tyerman, WDS, p. 553.
88. Fletcher, Works, 4:366-67. Cf. "Portrait of Paul," p. 197.
89. Wesley, "Plain Account," 18, p. 393. Cf. Fletcher, "Last Check," xix (10), p. 648.
90. Wesley, "Discoveries of Faith," p. 231.
91. Wesley, To Mrs. Jane (Bisson) Cock, Nov. 3, 1789, Letters, 8:183.

SOME MODERN¹ INTERPRETATIONS OF THE PAULINE INDICATIVE AND IMPERATIVE

Richard E. Howard

The beginning student of Paul is taught that there is a basic distinction in his thought, often termed theological-ethical or theoretical- practical. A minimum acquaintance with Paul's letters reveals that there is a great deal of theology in the so-called ethical sections and vice versa. A more accurate understanding of this distinction in Pauline thought is the interplay of the indicative and imperative moods.² In the simplest terms it is the contrast between what his readers were and what they must be or do. It is the difference between a statement of fact and the voicing of a command or exhortation.

English³ NT scholarship has been remarkably silent about this crucial distinction in Pauline theology. ⁴ Any treatment that has been given is casual and indicates that the writer did not consider this distinction important to Paul's thought.⁵ In contrast, German NT studies reveal an extensive and intensive treatment of the interplay of the indicative and imperative in Paul.

1. Examples of the interplay of the indicative and imperative⁶

All of the imperative or exhortative statements in Paul do not relate to a contrast with the indicative. Paul voices imperative warnings relative to Satan and the temptation that the believer must face.⁷ His reference to the perfection of the believer-sometimes identified as "absolute" and "relative"-should not be identified with the contrast under study here.⁸ Paul makes indicative and imperative statements about "putting on Christ"; but, being in totally separate contexts (cf. Gal. 3: 27 and Rom. 13:14), they do not involve the interplay being examined here. In 1 Cor. 5: 7 Paul uses the metaphor of leaven in both indicative and imperative terms, but the context reveals that he is thinking in corporate ideas (the church) and not of the individual believer, about which this study is concerned.

The investigation here will be limited to the contrast of or the interplay between the indicative and imperative in the life of the believer. In Romans the believers were (ind.) dead with Christ to sin (6: 2-8) but they were exhorted (imp.) to reckon themselves to be dead, to not allow

sin to reign over them or to present their members to sin;⁹ and to instead present themselves and their members to God and righteousness (Rom. 6:13, 19). They were (ind.) freed from sin's slavery (6:18, 22) and yet were exhorted (imp.) to present themselves to God as His slaves.¹⁰

Paul wrote to the Corinthians that they were (ind.) sanctified in Christ and "holy ones" by calling (1:2), to whom Christ had become (ind.) righteousness, sanctification, and redemption (1: 30) and who had been (ind.) washed, sanctified, and justified in the Lord Jesus (6:11). He asked them if they did not know¹¹ that they as a church were (ind.) the temple of God¹² and their individual bodies were (ind.) the temple of the Holy Spirit (6:19). Yet, because of the tragic condition in the Corinthian church, he urged (imp.) them to glorify God in their bodies (6: 20) and to pursue love (14:1) .

Paul reminded the Galatians that they had received (ind.) the Spirit (3:2) and had begun (ind.) to live (enarxamēnoi) in Him (3:3; cf. 5:25). They had crucified (ind.) the flesh (5:24)! But he went on to exhort (imp.) them to walk and march (stoicheo) by the Spirit 5:16, 25). Later Paul rejoiced with the Colossians that they had died (ind.) and risen again with Christ (3:1-3), were no longer (ind.) living in the evil ways of the past (3:7), and had put off (ind.) the old man and put on the new man (3:9-10). Still he commanded (imp.) them to put to death their members on the earth¹³ and to not put back the old clothes on the new man but instead to put new clothes on him.¹⁴ Paul's message to the Ephesians was basically the same, using a different metaphor. They had put off (ind.) the old man and put on the new man,¹⁵ and now he exhorted (imp.) them to walk worthy (4:1), to walk not as the Gentiles walk (4:17), to walk in love (5: 2), to walk as children of light (5: 8), and to walk carefully - - literally as spiritual acrobats (5:15; cf. akribos).

2. Explanations and Evaluations of the Pauline indicative and imperative

Many attempt to explain Paul's contrast of the indicative and imperative, but unfortunately it is often not on the basis of an in-depth examination of Paul's letters.¹⁶ The conclusion of several is that the interaction is a paradox. Some who see the paradox can find no explanation for it and are content to leave it totally unresolved. A familiar statement of this idea is the classic: "simul peccator et iustus" (simultaneously justified and sinner).¹⁷ But A. Kirchgassner¹⁸ and E. Wahlstrom¹⁹ reject the application of Luther's famous dictum to the paradox under consideration. A Korean scholar, Sun Bum Yun, uses the following concepts to describe the irreconcilability of the paradox: "at the same time a sinner and a non-sinner" ("Sunder und zugleich Nicht-Sunder"),²⁰ "he (the

believer) is a holy sinner" ("Er ist ein heiliger Sunder"), and "already but not yet" ("schon und noch nicht").²¹

The same conclusion, that the paradox can never be resolved, is found in such descriptions as "the eternal entering time"²² and "a paradoxical polarity" that contrasts complete deliverance with an incomplete transformation.²³ E. Wahlstrom says that the paradox exists because the believer is always a sinner. He (the believer) inevitably fails to depend on Christ and instead stands alone-hence the repeated imperatives.²⁴ J. Stewart views the continuing paradox as the juxtaposition of fact and duty and as the "present reality" and the "becoming ideal" in the Christian life.²⁵ Others consider the unresolved paradox as due to man's existence in the flesh:

It [the paradox] is simply due to the contrast between the ideal and actual, the ideal suffering the abatement due to the fact that even the "spiritual man" is still in the flesh; the old man, the outer man, the unspiritual man can only by degrees be forced to acknowledge his defeat.²⁶

There is little question that Paul's contrast of the indicative and imperative does appear paradoxical.²⁷ Yet, as A. Nygren wisely observes,²⁸ there is no clash between the indicative and imperative in Paul's mind. In fact, the imperative is given because of the truth of the indicative. Any paradox is in our understanding and not in Paul's thought. To understand the interplay of the indicative and imperative as a necessary tension, because believers are "caught" in the overlap of two ages, is to superimpose on Paul an eschatological theology to which he is a stranger. It stretches the credulity to suggest that "the fundamental theological structure of the whole of Paul's thinking: (is) the tension between the two ages."²⁹ Paul knew well the reality of both realized and anticipated eschatology, but certainly not in terms of a theological system of tension!

Even more unpauline is the suggestion that Paul's indicative and imperative contrast is a reflection on the frustration of the new man living in the body. Such an understanding totally misunderstands Paul's anthropology as well as his soteriology. It makes Paul the proponent of gnostic concepts that would call from him a resounding "me genoito" (horrors); The Spirit enables the believer to put to death the practices (praxeis) of the body (Rom. 8:13);

Others do not view Paul's indicative and imperative contrast as totally irreconcilable. Instead the paradox is described in several contrasting concepts. C. Craig views it as "gift and endeavor or task."³⁰ Several term it "principle and practice" or a minor variant from that.³¹ A. Hunter, describing the paradox as "potential and achievement," suggests that as there are flecks of egg and shell on the newborn chick, so

there are remains of sin in the newborn Christian.³² Many term the contrast as "ideal and actual" or something similar.³³

There are various degrees of expectation or reconciliation with regard to the paradox. L. Thornton explains the paradox as a "double polarity," in which the transformation has already taken place (from one point of view), but is only in "germ" from the other viewpoint. There is fruition in the future. He supports this by a unique interpretation of Rom. 6:5, in which he distinguishes between the crucial act of grafting (einmaligkeit -- once-for-all-ness) and the process of growth. He suggests that those who have died must begin the infinite task of dying.³⁴ L. Marsall pictures the paradox as between being "religiously holy" and actual morality, in which the aim is the progressive release from sin and the progressive moral renewal and transformation. He actually describes this as to become morally what one is religiously.³⁵ A. Schweitzer also sees the prospect of the believer progressively making into reality the death he died with Christ.³⁶

A. Kirchgassner understands the imperative as the subjective appropriation (Verloirklichung) of the objective fact of redemption (Erlösungsgeschehen).³⁷ A. Nygren states that the indicative denotes the believer's freedom from sin that makes possible the imperative "fight" against sin; but because he is living in two aeons, the believer will always be under admonition.³⁸

The imperative is also seen as the confirmation of the indicative. R. Astings describes the paradox as an "inner contradiction" (Wider - spruch), but the new life of the Christian is confirmed (vollsient), as he "wins and works" it over and over.³⁹ J. Weiss gives a graphic description of the "enthusiastic anticipation" of the new life in the believer, that does not correspond to reality. However, the central fact is that, to the believer, the victory is already won by God and is only to be fought through again in the lives of individuals. He describes this as eschatological and thus basically mythological and gnostic.⁴⁰

R. Bultmann contends that the paradox is not a true antithesis, but is the "normal" experience of mystical piety and must be understood in terms of prophetic ecstasy. He argues that this is only the occasional hellenistic variant in Paul, and must be understood on the basis of Paul's "charis theology." The indicative does not represent an ethical transformation in man, and the imperative is in no sense "works." He understands the imperative in terms of a "demand for obedience expressed as a gift."⁴¹

C. Smith suggests a novel interpretation of the paradox. He thinks that the believer begins his new life as sinless in the exhilaration of freedom. Under temptation he retreats into sin, and the imperative is Paul's exhortation that he repeat the process. He candidly admits that this is a "theory" that is deduced and is not explicitly in Paul's letters.⁴²

Another explanation is that of C. Dodd, who maintains that the believer is righteous qualitatively but not quantitatively. Inwardly, before God, his intentions are right; but outwardly, before men, he is the same. Thus Paul can speak both of a finished work and a remaining tremendous moral endeavor. He even suggests that Paul's converts had only died "ceremonially" and thus had not found the climactic experience that was Paul's.⁴³

The fundamental weakness of these interpretations is that they are not based on an exegesis of Paul's letters! Instead they are the result of philosophical and theological speculation on some of Paul's ideas. Such concepts as "principle vs. practice," "potential vs. realized," and "ideal vs. actual" are clearly extra-Pauline and do not accurately represent the manner in which Paul considered the problem. The result of such an approach is that totally unpauline concepts are adopted. Where in Paul does one find such ideas as "growing out of sin," "beginning the infinite task of dying," or even "fighting sin"? The idea of the imperative confirming the indicative, although it is closer, nevertheless falls short of Paul's concept (cf. Rom. 6:11).

The basic problem with Bultmann's solution is that he forces Paul's paradox into the mold of his own "charis theology" and "existential philosophy." H. Windisch effectively challenged Bultmann's conclusions, arguing that Paul seldom traces the imperative out of charis, and does not define faith as an ethical power. Galatians 5: 6, says Windisch, is the only clear place where faith is a power working in obedience (and there is no paradox here). Windisch further rejects Bultmann's contention that in Romans 6 redemption from sin is not perceptible and insists that even a sinner can have a form of obedience. His main conclusion is that Bultmann only traces the imperative to Paul's "grace teaching" (gnadenlehre) and totally ignores his "redemption teaching" (erlosungslehre) and "baptism teaching" (tauflehre) and only touched upon the "Spirit-filled life" (pneuma-besitz). It is Windisch's contention that freedom from sin is found near the "justification teaching" (rechtfertigungslehre) and is sacramental.⁴⁴

Of course, fanciful "solutions," such as Smith and Dodd suggest, are based on conjecture, as the former candidly admits. They add little to understanding the thought of Paul, although they attempt to "modernize" it to fit the situation of man today.

The explanations of Paul's indicative and imperative that have been examined fail to seriously consider the interaction and intrinsic interrelation between the two. For this reason it is necessary to give special attention to a proposed solution of the paradox that has come out of German NT scholarship. It is found in the German phrase "Werde das was du bist" ("become what you are"). Several NT scholars

accepted this interpretation,⁴⁵ while others modified it. R. Buitmann considered it valid in some senses, but not in the sense of idealism-that the ideal man is to be realized more and more.⁴⁶ A. Kirchgassner's opinion is that it is correct with regard to sanctification but not in the sense of freedom from sin.⁴⁷ C. Smith thinks it is acceptable if it is not interpreted to mean growth.⁴⁸ R. Flew rejects the interpretation as an unsatisfactory explanation or description.⁴⁹ Others have "coined" a new phrase, which is quite obviously a related idea -- "Sei was du bist" ("be what you are"). ⁵⁰

Although these interpretations reveal an appreciation of the interaction between the indicative and imperative, they fail to recognize the fundamental objective of Paul's imperative. He does not exhort the believer to become (or be) what he already is, but rather something more than he is. Before turning to what this writer is convinced is a clearer and more significant understanding of the relationship between Paul's indicative and imperative, a brief examination will be made of H. Ridderbos' treatment of the subject in the recent translation of his book on Paul.⁵¹ He views the imperative as "the new life in its moral manifestation" (p. 253), or the "calling of the new life" (255), and even the actualizing of the new life (256). In addition, "the imperative not only has the function of bringing the new life denoted by the indicative to manifestation, but is also a constant touchstone to the latter" (255). Actually the indicative is conditioned on the execution of the imperative in the sense that in the "new obedience" the new life must become evident. So much so that without the imperative the indicative cannot exist (256). Thus it is seen that the two are close and indissoluble, representing "two sides" of the same matter which can't exist separately (256). This must not be understood to mean that the imperative is simply another form of the indicative. The indicative is a possibility which must be realized anew by the imperative (256). The imperative is grounded on the indicative to be accepted in faith once for all and time and again anew -- thus the apparent paradox (257). So both indicative and imperative represent "already but not yet."

Certainly Ridderbos clearly recognizes the vital interrelation between Paul's indicative and imperative. This writer's basic criticism is that the interrelation is couched in such intricate philosophical concepts, relative to the nature of life and existence, that Paul's~impiistic message is "lost in the shuffle." Most importantly, Ridderbos quite obviously does not consider Paul's contrast of the indicative and imperative significant to his basic thought-at least to his soteriology. In a volume of well over 500 pages, with more than 150 pages dealing specifically with soteriology, he spends less than 6 pages on the indicative and imperative.

Conclusion

It has been repeatedly observed in the foregoing study that there was a failure to appreciate how central and basic to Paul's thought is the contrast of the indicative and imperative. It is not peripheral, but is the very warp and woof of Pauline thought-specifically in his soteriology. Even a casual reading of Paul's letters reveals an easily recognizable "formula." He wrote about the fact of the past-rejoicing with the believers about God's grace that had brought deliverance from sin's slavery under which they had once lived. Further, with a pastor's heart, he expressed a concern about the condition of the present. He was disturbed about whether they were using the new resources that were theirs. But Paul's letters don't end there! Repeatedly he voices a challenge for the future.

The fact of the past and the condition of the present are stated in clear indicatives-this was; that is! But the challenge of the future is voiced in ringing imperatives and exhortations-this must be! Paul's corrective is stated with imperative force. If, as this writer is strongly convinced, the Scriptures are God's Message to man, then this is clearly the most profitable way to study Paul. We can't hope to get God's Message through Paul unless we distinguish between the indicative and imperative-between what is and what must be. How else can we receive the contextual message?

When this distinction is made, the message of Paul's letters unfolds. The imperative is based on the indicative. In fact, as they are closely examined, it is discovered that the imperative is voiced because of the fact of the indicative. Further, it is seen that the indicative speaks of what God has done (in the believer) and the imperative depicts what the believer must do (by the power of the Spirit) because of the indicative.

Nowhere is this more pointedly seen than in Galatians 5:25, which is often examined by German NT scholars in their treatment of the Pauline indicative and imperative. "If we live [lit., have life] by the Spirit, let us also march [stoicheo] by the Spirit" (lit.). The indicative acknowledges the believer's new existence, which is new life by the Spirit. The imperative is a challenge to new living, a new obedience by the same Spirit. The indicative of "being" is the basis for the imperative of "doing."⁵²

This is the contrast of the Pauline indicative and imperative! Those to whom Paul was writing were free men-freed from sin's slavery. Now Paul's concern was-how were they using that freedom? They were new men-how were they living that new life? They were spiritual men, who had received the Spirit-how were they allowing the Spirit to live through them? Paul's imperatives meet the challenge of this con-

cern-"use what you have and are!" In other words, they were to use the resources that were theirs because they were new, free, spiritual men. Live by the Spirit! So-rather than "become what you are," Paul's challenge was to "use what you have!"

It would therefore seem that a proper understanding of the Pauline indicative and imperative offers a tremendous biblical resource for a solid proclamation of the Wesleyan message of salvation. This resource has been largely unexplored and unused in the Wesleyan tradition up to now. It has often been observed that John Wesley's definition of Christian perfection in love to God and neighbor effectively voids the charge that his doctrine was a mere peripheral truth or theological provincialism. By defining it in terms of the Great Commandment, Wesley showed that holiness was rooted in the very center of Christ's teachings.

Likewise we, in the Wesleyan tradition today, can also demonstrate by vigorous biblical exegesis that the holiness message is firmly anchored in Paul-not merely in some peripheral ideas (if there are such), but in that which lies at the very center of his thought and is the warp and woof of his entire understanding of the gospel of Christ. Such an exegetical thrust might very well help to remove the stigma that Wesleyan theology all too often bears in evangelical circles-"it is not a biblical theology!"

Reference Notes

1. The term "modern" is to be understood in the broader sense of the "modern period" of NT studies and is not limited to only very recent writings. The bulk of the research for this paper was done in the sixties. However, such recent works in NT theology as G. E. Ladd's *A Theology of the NT* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1974) and H. Ridderbos' *Paul*, tr. by J. DeWitt (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1975) have been examined, as well as the first volume of *Dogmatics of the Christian Faith*, by H. Thielicke, *The Evangelical Faith* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1974).
2. This is more extensive than the use of the Greek imperative mood. It is also expressed by other grammatical forms that depict exhortation or challenge such as the hortatory subjunctive (cf. Gal. 5:25) and *parakaleo* with the infinitive (cf. Rom. 12:1).
3. This is a language and not a country reference.
4. This writer was introduced to the question of the relationship between the indicative and imperative by C. Scott, *Christianity According to St. Paul* (Cambridge: University Press, 1927). He distinguished between salvation as a fact of the past and as a progressive experience. Cf. the book outline.

5. An example of this is G. E. Ladd's recent book, *Theology of NT*, in which his study of Paul covers almost 200 pages, but the indicative and imperative is treated in 1 1/2 pages (524-25) .
6. It will be necessary to limit the identification of the indicative and imperative contrast to some representative examples because the primary objective of this paper is the examination of the various interpretations of the contrast.
7. Cf. 1 Cor. 7:5; 2 Cor. 2:8-11. R. Bultmann relates this to the interplay of the indicative and imperative, cf. *Theology of the NT*, tr. K. Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), 1:332.
8. Cf. R. N. Flew's attempt to make such an identification, contrasting Phil. 3:15 (ind.) with 1 Cor. 13:12 (imp.), *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), p. 52; cf. also A. Hunter, *Interpreting Paul's Gospel* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), pp. 94ff. Cf. the treatment of Phil. 3:15 by the writer, *Newness of Life* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City, 1975), p. 217.
9. An intriguing question we cannot treat here is whether the Roman believers were in imminent danger of sinning or were continuing the practice of sinning. The negative present imperatives (oasileueto and paristauete in vv. 12-13) can be either a "present of past action still in progress" or "linear action being commenced," cf. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of the Greek NT* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1953), pp. 20ff.
10. Rom. 6:13, 19. Cf. the exegesis by this writer, *NOL*, Part IV.
11. Cf. the significance of the repeated question "Don't you know!" Cf. R. Howard, *NOL*, pp. 144-46.
12. 3:16-17. Cf. the plural "you" (este, humeis).
13. Col. 3:5. The unfortunate "translation" in the NASB-"Therefore consider the members of your earthly body as dead to immorality . . ." -is an obvious theological interpretation.
14. Cf. 3:8ff. and 3:12ff. and the vivid metaphor of taking off and putting on clothing, apothesthe, endusasthe.
15. Cf. the argument that the ambiguous aorist infinitives in Ephesians 4:22, 24 should be interpreted indicatively in keeping with the ambiguous aorist participles in Col. 3:9-10. Cf. R. Howard, *NOL*, p. 108, fn. 17.
16. A study of the sources used in this paper clearly reveals the accuracy of this statement.
17. A Koberle defends this concept in his book *A Quest for Holiness* tr. J. C. Mattes (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1936), p. 153. In J. Hering's commentary on 1 Cor. 6:11, he argues that this statement of Luther is proper for Romans 4 but not for Romans 6, *La Premiere Epitre de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens* (Paris: Delachaus et Niestle S.A.).
18. *Erlösung und Sunde im Neuen Testament* (Verlag Herder Freiburg, 1950), p. 152.
19. *The New Life in Christ* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950), p. 121.
20. A. Kirchgassner rejects this concept as well as Luther's, *Erlösung*, loc. cit.
21. *Romer 7.25 und der Pueumatikos* (Seol: Tung-A-Verlag, 1958), p. 67.
22. Cf. S. Cave, *The Gospel of St. Paul* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928), p. 159.

23. Cf. C. Craig, "Paradox of Holiness"; the NT Doctrine of Sanctification," *Inter.*, 6 (1952), pp. 142-61.
24. *New Life*, p. 121.
25. *A Man in Christ* (New York: Harper Brothers Publishers, n.d.), P. 199.
26. C. Scott, *Christianity*, p. 174. H. Robinson has a similar view when he finds hope of the imperative only in the resurrection of the soma (body), *The Christian Doctrine of Man* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911), pp. 129 ff.
27. This varies in Paul's letters. The Contrasts in Romans and Colossians have a more paradoxical character than those in 1 Corinthians and Galatians.
28. *Commentary on Romans*, tr. C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949), p. 242.
29. G. Ladd, *Theology of NT*, 524.
30. "Paradox," p. 153; cf. L. Marshall, *The Challenge of NT Ethics* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1946), p. 260; H. Rall, *According to Paul* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), p. 84. Cf. the German "Gabe und Aufgabe."
31. Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of NT*, 101-2; S. Neil, *Christian Holiness* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1960), p. 99; A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, tr. W. Montgomery (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935), 296ff.
32. *Paul's Gospel*, p. 28.
33. Cf. L. Marshall, *NT Ethics*, pp. 219-20; H. Robinson, *Doctrine of Man*, p. 129; C. Scott, *Christianity*, p. 174; J. Stewart, *Man in Christ*, p. 199, S. Cave (ideal and becoming), *The Gospel of St. Paul* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928), p. 159; V. Taylor (ideal and real), *Forgiveness and Reconciliation* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1948), p. 162; G. Turner (ideally buried and dead), *The More Excellent Way* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Light & Life Press, 1952), p. 76; J. Weiss (idealism and realism), *The History of Primitive Christianity*, 2 vols., tr. by four friends, ed. F. C. Grant (New York: Wilson Erickson, 1937), p. 518.
34. Cf. *The Common Life in the Body of Christ* (London: Dacre Press, 1950), pp. 60ff.
35. *NT Ethics*, pp. 219 ff.
36. *Mysticism of Paul* . pp. 296 ff.
37. *Erlosung*, p. 152.
38. *Romans*, p. 242.
39. Cf. *Dei Heiligkeit im Urchristentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930), p. 217.
40. *History of Christianity*, p. 518. For similar views of the imperative confirming the indicative, cf. H. Rall, *Paul*, pp. 81ff.; V. Taylor, *Forgiveness* p. 162.
41. "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," *ZNTW*, 1924. This basic position by Bultmann has not been substantially altered, cf. *Theology of NT*, 1 :332 ff.
42. *The Bible Doctrine of Grace* (London: The Epworth Press, 1956), pp. 130 ff.
43. *The Meaning of Paul for Today* (London: Collins Clear-Type Press, 1959), pp. 121 ff.

44. Cf. "Das Problem des paulinischen Imperative," ZNTW, 1924, p] 266 f.
45. Cf. R. Astings, *Dei Heiligkeit*, p. 217; C. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Collins Clear-Type Press, 1959), p. 113- L. Marshall, *NT Ethics*, p. 262- S. Neil, *Christian Holiness*, p. 99- J. Stewart, *Ma in Christ*, p. 190.
46. *Theology of the NT*, 1:322.
47. *Erlösung*, p. 153.
48. *The Bible Doctrine of Sin* (London: Epworth Press, 1953), p. 13,
49. *Idea of Perfection*, p. 59.
50. Cf. A. Kirchgassner, *Erlösung*, p. 153; E. Wahlstrom, *New Life* p. 101. Cf. also "be what you may become," J. Weiss, *History of Christianity* p. 518; "realize what you are," S. Neil, *Christian Holiness*, p. 68.
51. Paul.
52. Cf. the references to "being and doing" in Paul; R. Howard, *NOL* subject index.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION:

An Ethics of the Spirit

Leon O. Hynson

I. Limitation and Context

First, I must make clear that it is a paper which deals with a somewhat narrowly defined question in Christian social ethics.

Second, this paper is not an exegetical study of a scriptural ethics of the Spirit. I view this essay not as exegesis but as systematic explication of the biblical ethics of the Spirit.

Third, I wish to distinguish between a theology of social transformation and a strategy for the same. I intend in this paper to wrestle with theology, not strategy. Strategy will be rooted in theology. The urgency of so many human problems may press us to strategy apart from theology. Then we will be tilting at windmills, rushing about beating the air. This is a common mistake of reformers. We should avoid the impatience of an activism which is theologically sterile, as well as a theology which belongs only in the classroom.

II. Task and Purpose

It was Jesus who, having lived out most of His brief life of ministry, prayed concerning His infant community: "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world" (John 17:15-18). The force of these words seems clear enough. Christians belong in the world as Jesus belonged; Christians are models before the world, not copies of it—Jesus was that kind of example; Christians possess a moral dynamic a perfectness which fits them to live in the world, not away from it as cloistered saints, like an aseptic lab culture (growing in artificial conditions) in a stoppered test tube. Jesus was a perfect man, a whole person, sent into this world to make it whole. Christians are sent to live where they may re-present Jesus in their lives of spiritual power.

When Jesus in this context prays for the sanctification of His followers, He is repeating essentially what He said in the Sermon on the Mount, "Ye are salt"; "Ye are light." Sanctification makes men and

women inclusive, not reclusive. It means a life lived for many, not simply for one. To make this claim is not to deny that it is personal; to assert that it is personal is to admit that it is social. Nothing personal is ever truly private, because it in some way will leap from one person to another.

If the Church, then, is to be a moral force in the world, it will become this as it is energized and driven by the Spirit. The church—a driven fellowship! How does the Church live within that spiritual presence so that it may be the leaven that leavens the whole lump, salt to preserve the earth, light to illuminate, energize, and heal? The answer will be found, I believe, in the biblical teaching concerning the Holy Spirit, in what I wish to call an ethics of the Spirit.

This essay is an attempt to spell out an ethics of the Spirit. It is conceived as an exercise in constructive, theological ethics, parallel to James Gustafson's Christ and moral life. Its purpose is the creation and elucidation of a Christian social ethics grounded in the biblical theology of the Spirit. I intend to avoid a monism of the Spirit or an ethics which is not truly Trinitarian. Much attention, however, has been given to the ethics of God the Creator (an ontological ethics, or an ethics of creation), and the ethics of Christ the Redeemer (a Christological ethics, an imitatio ethics, etc.). An ethics of the Spirit has been neglected as surely has the entire theology of the Spirit. This paper will strive toward a correction of this imbalance by wrestling with the ethical significance of the life of the Spirit in the experience of the Christian community and beyond that in human community.

III. History of the Ethics of the Spirit

An ethics grounded in pneumatology has been discredited historically. The struggle of the Church to define and explicate a Trinitarian theology has of course shaped the Church's ethics of the Spirit. The tendency in much Christian thought is toward subordination of the Spirit to the Son and the Father.

A theology of the Second Person often seems dominant, even as it is in the Apostle's Creed, or in the theology of Barth, according to some of his interpreters. Wherever that is the case, a Christological ethics becomes ascendant with such emphasis as suffering, imitation, substitution, and the incarnational.

What is clearly required is a Trinitarian ethics, a complimentary ethics which maintains the integrity of the inner-Trinitarian relationships. Such an ethics will be ontological (rooted in the doctrine of God the Creator), Christological (Redeemer), and pneumatological (Spirit); or, in other words, faithful to the biblical exposition of the work of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is legitimate, I believe to describe this

complementary ethics as an ethics of Spirit, for God is Spirit (John 4:24; cf. also 2 Cor. 3:17). However, in this paper, when speaking on ethics of the Spirit, I refer to that One who is named the Holy Spirit. In delineating an ethics of the Holy Spirit, we may run the risk of Unitarianism of the Spirit, but the clear intention is to develop an ethical of the Spirit which we may integrate with ontological and Christological ethics. If that is accomplished, we may then begin to develop an ethics which is "circumcessionist," meaning that even as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are ever One and ever interpenetrative, so Christian ethics will be integrative, unitive, holistic. We must preserve both unity and diversity (procession may be a better word) in the metaphysics and ethics of Christian revelation.

Perhaps the chief theological peril is a "Unitarianism of the Third Person." An interesting expression of this may be seen in the charismatics. Who remove the cross from the chancel or steeple and replace it with a dove (which raises the issue of theological symbolism). It is one thing to develop a Trinitarian theology which integrates a theology of the Spirit, and quite another to work with a theology of the Third Person which seems to make Him contemporary with the Church while

the work of Father and Son belongs to days past and gone. A theology of the Spirit is always Trinitarian; Father, Son, and Spirit are ever interpenetrative, and no work of God is ever compartmentalized. (Dispensationalism tends in this direction.) To be rooted in the testimony of the ancient faith, found in the Scriptures, one must always do justice to both the monotheism and Trinitarianism of the New Testament.

A Trinitarian ethic is an ethic of the Spirit (or of Spirit). It expresses the creative concern or outgoingness of God from the circle of His infinite completeness or perfection to the circumference of a living human community; the restorative concern or reaching forth of Christ to renew humanity and bring it into the fulness of His life; it is the dynamism the Spirit's concern to universalize and actualize this outgoingness of God and this reaching forth of Christ Jesus. The Spirit proceeds (or goes forth) from Father and Son.² Thus, it is the divine economy to be community with man, making the human spirit self-transcending, like God's Spirit.

IV. Defining an Ethics of the Spirit

By an ethics of the Spirit we specifically intend the scientific (meaning here the science of ethics) analysis of the manifestation of the Spirit in the sphere of moral life. We are describing the moral dimension of the Spirit's influence. When I suggest that the ethics of the Spirit is creative, I do not mean to attribute creativity to the ethical system (not that creativity would detract from it). I rather submit that any analysis

of the Spirit's moral influence will emphasize the creative dimension of the Spirit's work.

This ethics is grounded in the life of the Holy Spirit. It considers the realm of Spirit, both Holy Spirit and human spirit. It asks: How does the Spirit influence the human spirit in the moral dimension? What are the ethical impulses of the Spirit? How is the Spirit related to the Christian's moral task? What difference does the Holy Spirit make (ought He to make) in the moral life of the Christian community or the community of man? It indicates: Here is the way the Spirit works in the moral life, both personal and social, producing goodness, improvement, holiness, and virtue.

A. *ESSENTIAL ASPECT*

We define the ethics of the Spirit as Christian, evangelical, social, and spiritual.

Christian

It is a Christian ethic. This means that the ethical content of the Holy Spirit's work and ministry is ever Christocentric. As the Western church has maintained, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son, i.e., He is the personal "going forth" of God and Christ to man. Jesus said concerning the Spirit: "He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you" (John 16:14).

Evangelical

We further propose an evangelical ethics as integral to an ethics of the Spirit. Jesus taught: "When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth . . ." "And when he comes, he will convince the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment . . ." Further, he declared, "But when the Counselor comes, whom I shall send to you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, he will bear witness to me; and you also are witnesses . . ." (John 16:13,

8; 15:26, RSV). The ethics of the Spirit is infused with the mandate for witness to the good news that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Cor. 5:19). Concurrently we proclaim the good news that life in the Spirit means a life of moral power.

Social

Here we emphasize the social character of the work of the Spirit. His movement in the church and in the world is analogous to the communion of the Trinity. His work in church and world is toward unity and community. The Holy Spirit creates in the church a community of faith and through that community calls the world into that communion of faith and hope and love. The procession of the Spirit is ever social. Within the Trinity there is a procession of Spirit from Father and

Son, toward Father and Son. With respect to the world, the Spirit proceeds toward the world and draws persons toward God and the other person.

Spiritual

Here we emphasize self-transcendence, the essence of spirituality, the capacity of spirit for going beyond the self, participating in the other, taking the other into itself.

We recognize the self-transcending character of the Holy Spirit. This is true even of the human spirit, even though we do insist upon the consistent tendency of man to be curved inward. "Spirit" possesses the possibility of going beyond self.

The name and concept called "spirit" is frequently employed but often misunderstood. Wesley defined spirit as an expression of the image

of God, suggesting that the volitional, ethical, and rational are aspects of the spiritual dimension of man.³

John Macquarrie suggests that it "names a kind of being that is somehow shared by man with the Spirit of God. Spirit is present in and constitutive of man as well as God." This, however, does not define spirit. Macquarrie continues:

Spirit may be described as a capacity for going out of oneself and beyond oneself; . . . Man is not closed or shut up in his being.... To him there belong essentially freedom and creativity, whereby he is able to shape (within limits) both himself and his world. It is this openness, freedom, creativity . . . that makes possible . . . the formation of community, the outreach of love and whatever else belongs to . . . the 'life of the Spirit.'⁴

In a more general sense, Macquarrie argues that spirituality has to do fundamentally with becoming a person in the fullest sense.

B. OPERATIONAL ASPECT

To proceed farther, the ethics of the spirit will consider the creative, sanctitive, liberative, dynamic, and permeative dimensions of the Spirit's work, with specific reference to their Christian social significance. In the earlier categories employed (Christian, evangelical, social, spiritual), the emphasis seemed to be on essence or nature of an ethics of the Spirit. In these second descriptions we are dealing with the operational aspect. We analyze the Spirit's action, the ethos of the Spirit.⁶

A social ethics grounded in the theology of the Spirit will emphasize these five areas.

The Creative Work of the Spirit

The creativity of the Spirit is of crucial significance in an ethics of the Spirit. The Spirit's work possesses a structured, formative character; it includes both form and content. The ethics of the Spirit must consider

this while emphasizing that "the wind bloweth where it will." There is form and content, structure and ecstasy in the Spirit's work. The Spirit of God, we are informed in the Creation story (Genesis 1), moved upon the formless deep.

The ethics of the Spirit will emphasize the creativity of the Holy Spirit and the human spirit; the freedom of the spirit and its responsibility; the openness and development of the moral life of man. Ethics will interpret that developing moral life to the church and the world. This, it may be suggested, is what Paul is emphasizing in his charge "Walk in the Spirit" and in the challenge to reproduce/develop the fruit of the Spirit. In its social outworking, the life of the Christian community will be formative, creative, and unifying. It is the task of Christian ethics to explicate how this will be actualized.

Sanctitive Work

A concomitant emphasis in the ethic we are analyzing is what we are calling the sanctitive. The Spirit's operation in the moral life will be characterized by wholeness, sanctity, integration, purity of heart. In its social dimension, the sanctitive work of the Spirit will mean judgment, healing, growth in righteousness. Nels Ferre has a very persuasive discussion entitled "Distinctive Dimension of Christian Social Action" in his book *Christianity and Society*. He strongly presents the concept of

the sanctitive work of the Spirit in social transformation. Commenting upon the essentials of Christian social action, Ferre suggests as the highest emphasis

the explicit recognition of the direct activity of the Holy Spirit as the incomparably primary dimension of Christian social action-and of the Spirit of God for that matter [Ferre distinguishes between Holy Spirit and Spirit of God], on the level of general social action. To keep institutions under judgment because of their sins is one important aspect of Christian social action . .

However, this is not the center of social action. What is the heart of Christian social action? Ferre speaks forthrightly: "It is not man's wisdom, or experience, or effort, individually or socially. It is the active presence of the Holy Spirit."⁶

Liberative Work

The third point of emphasis in the Spirit's activity is the liberative. Paul's Roman and Galatian letters give particular attention to this work of the Spirit. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8: 2). Living in the Spirit and walking in the Spirit are perceived as the essence of liberty. Liberty for Paul is always truncated and barren except when held in place by the ethical obligation of love.

"For, brethren. we have been

called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another" (Gal. 5:13).

The liberative dimension of the Spirit's work is bounded by ethical guidelines. This liberty is a fruitful ground wherein love, joy, and peace may develop. There is no law against love and joy and peace. However, there is a law which enters into their growth. They will not mature where liberty has forfeited its ethical grounding.

The liberation emphasis is of crucial significance in much contemporary theology-Black liberation, women's liberation, "third world" liberation-and of other revolutionary movements in our time. An ethics of the Spirit will not take us from these spheres of action. It will call us out into the world where slaveries of economics, human indignity and oppression, poverty, and disease, hold persons under purgations as severe as the medieval fires were portrayed.

Peter Hebblethwaite's essay "The Politics of the Holy Spirit" warns against naive attempts to politicize the Spirit.⁸

Dynamic Work

The fourth concept, which we consider in the operational dimension, is the dynamic. An ethic of the Spirit emphasizes the Spirit's empowering work. There is a moral force which the wind of the Spirit brings to the ethical spheres of life. Without this force creativity and sanctity remain lifeless concepts, structure without substance, body without breath. In the dynamic of the Spirit may be developed the creative and sanctitive characteristics in human community. In this empowerment- Ferre calls this "transpowering role of the Spirit"⁹-we may see believers undergirded to carry out the world-transforming mandate which has been given to the Christian Church. "Ye are the salt of the earth," Jesus said. "Ye are the light of the world" (Matt. 5:13-14). We must resist the futility of hiding our lights under a bushel.

Permeative Force

Finally, we must stress the permeative power of the Spirit in the church and the world. The influence of the Spirit is present throughout the earth. We may speak of this aspect in terms of common or prevenient grace. The Spirit is salt and light and water and wind. He permeates the sphere of spirit. The Spirit bloweth where He will.

In the history of Christian ethical thought and expression, several types of response to society have become manifest. H. Richard Niebuhr has been very influential in his discussion in *Christ and Culture*. His fivefold typology is highly useful and sometimes very subtle. A less complex typology may be employed which describes the Christian response to culture as the pattern of either domination, separation, or permeation^o The first pattern leads to political and triumphalist interpretations of the church. The second suggests a sectarian and pacific

interpretation, a theology of the Cross. The third pattern entails a theology of the Spirit, a pattern of involvement in the world and penetration of its structures with the dynamism of love.¹¹ The ethics of the Spirit is an ethics of faith, hope, and love, offering the most scripturally balanced, holistic framework for shaping the world. While there are surely authentic scriptural elements in each of these responses, they lack the full orb of the transformist position.

V. The Community of the Spirit

In the Acts of the Apostles, the Church is presented as preeminently the community of the Spirit. As the community of the Spirit, it is concerned with all things spiritual. If we can agree that the spiritual is somewhat synonymous with becoming a person in the fullest sense, and if we can hold that in a Christocentric context, then we may argue that the Church must participate in all spheres of action which enhance personhood.

The community of the Spirit is a "driven" community, an ecstatic organism, a surging spirit. Driven from its sacred enclosures, its interior temples by the Holy Spirit, the spirit of the Christian man stands beside other human spirits. The spiritual community thus becomes a transforming community for man, dedicated to man, challenging and transforming spirit. The community of the Spirit is a community of faith and love. As John Wesley would spell out this concept: "There is no holiness but social holiness." "Holy solitaires" are no more genuine than "holy adulterers"!¹³ The community of the Spirit is self-transcending by its very nature as a spiritual fellow ship. "Spirit" means going forth from, proceeding from, self-overcoming. This is the theological basis for a Christian social ethic. Or, put differently, an ethic of the Spirit is the beating heart of a Christian social ethic.

The Christian community belongs in the community of humanity! What metaphors best symbolize the penetration of the world community by the Christian community? The Church as: island? Peninsula? Beachhead? River? Ocean with tributaries?

None of these seem sufficient. The best metaphor is wind, breath, life-giving, vivifying. Here the Church is seen as the "community of the wind." Wherever the wind blows, there is change, transformation the community of the Spirit, blowing in the wind, breathing upon the structures of the age, transforms. The life-giving Spirit in the Church reproves of sin, creates right relationships, and warns of judgment to come.

The community of the Spirit alone is able in the Spirit to transcend itself and to become immersed in the structures of the world, to be witnesses and martyrs, a sanctitive agency. Its forum is less the cloister or the sanctuary than the marketplace. Its redemptive work is carried out in full view of the world. He who said, "Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid," was himself slain, not in some remote dungeon but on a hill. The public spectacle of martyrdom challenges the pretensions of the world; the Cross casts its shadow across the ways of Caesar and denies his claim to lordship. Martyrs of the Church and living witnesses so penetrate the structures of the age that the dying Roman Empire summons its apologists to charge the Church with its declining health. The Church's rejoinder is given in Augustine's City of God. The empire's ill health is the result of its pride. It is striking that the Church should be credited with such an infiltration. That, however, is what the Church will be in the world. The living Church is bent upon personal and social transformation. Even if it deliberately avoided all themes except personal salvation, its concern for the community of humanity would break out everywhere. Christianity, which does not-begin with the individual does not begin. Christianity which ends with the individual, ends. The Church spends and is spent in creating righteousness and in challenging unrighteousness, in personal and community forms.

VI. Theological Content of an Ethic of the Spirit

Here it becomes important to raise another question. What is the content of an ethic of the Spirit?

The answer to this question takes us back to our earlier suggestion that the ethic is creative, sanctitive, liberative, dynamic, permeative. This we may present as the form of the ethic. But what or who is it which is creative and sanctitive? The Holy Spirit who creates and sanctifies! The content of His creative, sanctitive work is-faith, hope, and love. Faith, hope, and love are theological virtues and spiritual virtues. Each includes inherently the spiritual or self-transcending quality, i.e., the person who possesses faith, hope, love, lives in the Spirit and goes forth from the enclosed circle of distrust to faith, from fear to hope, from self-love to agapeic commitment. Faith, hope, love are spiritual graces and are clearly ethical in content.

The ethic of the Spirit is an ethic of faith. This is relational in expression. It is characterized by trust, conversion, renewal, repentance, and justification. Each of these implies change. Trust means giving oneself away in dependence on another (or going out from one's self). Conversion is becoming a new person, a man for others. Repentance and justification are relational changes, the mind and attitude of God toward man and man toward God being transformed and brought into a unitive state.

An ethic of faith is personal and social. As applied to the social situation, it would imply that the Spirit is at work in the efforts, which exist to bring change of mind among men. Attempts at healing the discords which rend human societies, the distrust between economic institutions and labor, the political alienations, the social gulfs, are the result when the Spirit works faith in the Church and the Church works out the ethic of faith in the world. The Spirit is at work in the world through the Church and even without the Church. The Church never works dynamically apart from the Spirit.

The ethic of the Spirit is an ethic of hope. Hope is a continuously restorative power, characterized by an ultimate optimism and balanced by a preliminary measure of both confidence and doubt about the completion of that which man sets out to do. What this means for Christian social ethics is the overcoming of the apocalyptic pessimism so prevalent in some current evangelical (is this the Good News?) discussions. It is equally a corrective to the glorious but unrealistic dreams of progress espoused by some Christians in the nineteenth century.

Lycurgus Starkey, writing concerning the Wesleyan interpretation of the Holy Spirit's work of sanctification asserts-

A social gospel grounded in the Holy Spirit's work of sanctification would need no buttressing by the enlightenment's illusions of inevitable progress and natural perfectibility.... Just as God purposes to bring individual Christians to a holiness of heart and life, so through his church God works to bring about a person-in community holiness to the whole of society as a foretaste and indispensable part of His coming Kingdom....

God works for the transformation of men and society; hence we must work.¹⁴

A spiritual ethics is, lastly, an ethic of love. Agape epitomizes the work of the Spirit. As Paul so triumphantly announces to the Corinthians: "Love . . . beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things." Love believes, love hopes. Love is the greatest of all because it actualizes faith and embodies hope. Paul sums up the essence of walking in the Spirit by asserting the ethical challenge to love (Gal. 5: 6, 13-14, 22-25) .

It is this central concern, which represents the genius of the Wesleyan

ethic. As Mildred Wynkoop has emphasized, the social ethics of Wesley is the ethic of love, social love that permeates the world and works toward its transformation. 1

VII. Conclusion

In his chapter "Spirit and Spirituality," Macquarrie comments upon the positive possibility of spiritual achievement by an individual but questions whether groups are able to realize that elusive quality. Social conflicts abound, demonstrating how unspiritual the life of society is. Can this ever be changed? he asks. Will social morality always be "a matter of power politics"? It is true that groups will rarely give up power unless forced to.

But surely Christian spirituality envisages a broader strategy than the spiritualization of the individual. In calling the church "the community of the Spirit" we are implying that here there is . . . a society with the capacity to go out from itself. It has been said that the church is the only society, which exists primarily for the benefit of the nonmember. To be sure, the church has been often just as defensive, self-regarding and unspiritual as any other group. But whenever and wherever it is learning to be truly the church, the community of the Spirit, it is introducing a new dimension into the social situation, one that gives hope for an eventual transformation.¹⁶

In conclusion, we may call the Church to a Christian discipleship in all spheres of life. If the Church, with its vision of righteousness and wholeness, is excluded from social involvement, then whom will the Church suggest for the task? The sectors of power and influence, professions and business, labor and politics, have no adequate ethical ground from which to re-create, sanctify, and energize. These sectors of power all have particularized ethical norms for self-regulation, but lack an ethic equal to the depth of human demand and need.

George Forell, in answering the question: "Why did the church not speak up against Nazism?" said, "Now, this church should have probably said more. But when all is said and done, the only people that said anything were the churches. Certainly the legal profession said nothing. Certainly the medical profession said nothing. Certainly the schools and the university professors said nothing." There was no university Kampf, or a medical association Kampf. The only Kampf in Germany was the Kirchenkampf⁹⁷ This illustrates my claim that the community of the Spirit is able to speak because it possesses the moral force. The ethic of the Spirit offers both the structure and substance of a "categorical imperative" to humankind. The ethics of the Spirit offers the dynamic for its actualization. This ethics of the Spirit is the ethics of the Church. Even now in our apocalyptic time, the Spirit is moving

over the face of the world; and through the community of the Spirit, God is commanding: "Let there be light"; and behold, light breaks forth, and God says. "It is good."

Reference Notes

1. John Wesley, *Standard Sermons*, ed. E. H. Sugden (London: Epworth Press, 1961), 1:382-89; "Sermon on the Mount," IV.
2. Lucien Richard, "John Calvin and the Role of the Church in the Spiritual Life," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* (summer, 1974), p. 489, writes: "The Holy Spirit is God's personal presence among us in such a way that in the Spirit we attain God's own personal being."
3. Wesley, *Standard Sermons*, 2:227-28; sermon: "The New Birth."
4. John Macquarrie, *Paths in Spirituality* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), pp. 40, 44.
5. Cf., John H. Yoder, *Karl Barth and the Problem of War* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1970), pp. 18, 23-24. Ethos has to do with action; ethics with a description of action.
6. Nels Ferre, *Christianity and Society* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), pp. 114-51, especially p. 136.
7. Hannah Arendt, *Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1968), pp. 143-45, likens the Nazi death camps to torments of hell.
8. *Frontier* (autumn, 1975), pp. 143-45. Hebblethwaite states that the official churches have "institutionalized" the Spirit, the charismatic movement has "monopolized" Him, while the liberation theology especially its Latin American expressions, has called Him to the revolution. "Thus the Holy Spirit enters politics." The author rightly suggests that we must develop criteria for the avoidance of a politicizing of the Spirit, who "always lies ahead of and beyond our projects." However, to argue that the Spirit is ahead of our projects, without seeing His presence in human efforts, is to miss the teaching of an ethics of the Spirit.
9. Ferre, *Christianity*, pp. 156 ff.
10. Cf. George W. Forell, ed., *Christian Social Teachings* (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1966), p. xi for his typology.
11. Cf. Hendrikus Berkhof, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), pp. 102-3 where the author stresses a pneumatological change in which the "age-old structures of man's life with their dehumanizing effects are replaced by the transforming powers of the Spirit . . ."
12. *Systematic Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 3: 111-12.
13. *Works* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1958-59)
14:321-22.
14. *The Work of the Holy Spirit: A Study in Wesleyan Theology* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), pp. 160-61.
15. *A Theology of Love: The Dynamic of Wesleyanism* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City, 1972). See my "The Social Concerns of Wesley: Theological Foundations," *Christian Scholar's Review* 4, No.(1974), pp. 36-42; and "Christian Love: The Key to Wesley's Ethics," *Methodist History* (October, 1975), pp. 44-55.

16. Macquarrie, Paths, pp. 50-52.

17. George W. Forell, "Luther and Conscience," *Bulletin of Gettysburg Lutheran Theological Seminar*?/ (winter, 1975), pp. 1~19.

THE ORIGINS OF PROPHETIC FRENZY AND ECSTATIC UTTERANCE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT WORLD

Charles D. Isbell

Introduction: A Working Definition of Ecstasy

Many scholars have written on the subject of ecstasy in the Old Testament world. Two of them have given definitions which establish a base from which we may work in this inquiry. T. H. Robinson defines ecstasy as follows:

It consisted of a fit or attack which affected the whole body. Sometimes the limbs were stimulated to violent action, and wild leaping and contortions resulted. These might be more or less rhythmical, and the phenomenon would present the appearance of a wild and frantic dance. At other times there was more or less complete constriction of the muscles, and the condition became almost cataleptic.... Face and aspect were changed, and to all outward appearance the Ecstatic "became another man." An additional feature was insensibility to pain, and the extravagant activities of the Ecstatic frequently included violent slashing and cutting of his own body and limbs.¹

The incomparable work of J. Lindblom on the prophets includes this definition of ecstasy:

An abnormal state of consciousness in which one is so intensely absorbed by one single idea or one single feeling or by a group of ideas or feelings, that the normal stream of psychical life is more or less arrested. The bodily senses cease to function; one becomes impervious to impressions from without; consciousness is exalted above the ordinary level of daily experience; unconscious mental impressions and ideas come to the surface in the form of visions and auditions....

In religious ecstasy, consciousness is entirely filled with the presence of God, with ideas and feelings belonging to the divine sphere. The soul is lifted up into the exalted region of divine revelation, and the lower world with its sensations momentarily disappears.²

These two definitions of the same word are sharply different. For Robinson, ecstasy is understood almost totally in physical, outward

terms; while for Lindblom, the key ideas are consciousness, "the presence of God," exaltation above "the lower world with its sensations,"~ and "mental rapture." For this study, ecstasy may be described as related to either of these two basic ideas, i.e, strange outward behavior and/or significant mental stimulation or alteration.

Having stated these issues, the theses of this paper may be admitted. They are three in number. (1) There is far less ecstasy in the world of the Old Testament and in the Old Testament itself than the secondary literature would have one believe, for primary texts which explicitly state or describe ecstasy as defined above are quite rare. (2) There must be a rather sharp line drawn between early ecstasy and classical prophecy. (3) Ecstasy, when it does appear in the Hebrew Bible, is to be understood as strange actions rather than as strange utterances

I. Ecstasy in the Ancient Near East

"The Report of Wen-Amun" about his journey to Phoenicia ca.1060 B.C. includes a passage relevant to the subject of ecstasy. While Wen-Amun was in Byblos, the prince of Byblos made an offering to his gods, and during the ceremony, "The god seized a page of his pages and he put him [in] ecstasy."⁴ The following paragraph explains that the page continued his "ecstasy" from morning to night, and then the story continues with no further reference to ecstasy of any kind. However, any attempt to determine the specific nature and extent of the "ecstasy" which gripped the page involves many problems. John A. Wilson pointed out in his translation of this passage that "the determinative of the word ' (prophetically) possessed' shows a human figure in violent motion or epileptic convulsion."⁶ It is this opinion which most scholars have followed without question in assuming the attestation of something ecstatic in the Wen-Amun text.

But two things are noteworthy in this regard. First, the determinative which Wilson described above is one variation of a common "action determinative" which is normally the figure of a man in a rather upright position. In the Wen-Amun text, the man is pictured seated rather than upright, and his arms are raised Whether this particular position is intended to indicate someone "in violent motion or epileptic convulsion" may be open to question, especially in light of the second point, namely the uncertain meaning of the noun h3wt. Goedicke believes that the word "appears to denote a seizure in which the person afflicted is no longer himself but is possessed by a spiritual power."⁸ Erman and Grappow take the determinative to mean simply a dancing man, and they translate h3Wt itself as "the ecstatic."⁹ It must be noted that the only two occurrences of the word h3Wt are found here in the Wen-Amun text,

i.e., in new Egyptian. It is obvious that this one piece of evidence, involving a determinative which may be interpreted in several different ways and a noun of difficult etymological origin, is not enough upon which to build a case for ecstasy in eleventh-century Byblos or Egypt. Much more evidence would be required, specifically new texts which employ h3wt often enough to enable one to grasp its full range of meaning.

A similar problem concerns the Zakir Stele,¹⁰ an eighth-century text in Old Aramaic from Syrian Hamath which speaks of a divine answer coming from BaCal hamayin through "seers"¹¹ and "foretellers." The translation "foretellers" here is at best uncertain. The Aramaic word s Celdn, which probably means something like "enumerators" or "expert predictors,"¹² but a jump from "visionaries" and "predictors" to "ecstatics" is not warranted from the text itself.

This paucity of extrabiblical material from Byblos and Hamath only serves to underscore the importance of current studies in the various types of prophetic material known from the Mari letters. Of the hundreds of letters from Mari, about 27 deal with prophetic-type activities. These letters are important not only because they predate all biblical material by several centuries, but also because they come "from an area that is the larger focus of Patriarchal activities."¹³ Herbert B. Huffmon has grouped Mari prophets under four headings: the "answerer,"¹⁴ the assinnu,¹⁵ the "ecstatic," and "Private Persons."

The "ecstatic" prophet is Huffmon's designation of the Akkadian noun muhhum (feminine muhhutum), a word which von Soden felt should be regarded as simply a phonetic variant of mahhum. However, Malamat is probably correct in adopting the suggestion of Landsberger that "the spelling muhhum is not a phonetic variant of mahhum (as assumed by von Soden, WO I, p. 400), but rather the form quttul, designating a (bodily) defect . . . corresponding to Hebrew qittel."¹⁶ One is reminded here of common Hebrew words like Ciwwer, pisseah, heres, 'illem, keheh, etc. If Landsberger and Malamat are correct, the muhhum at Mari would exhibit some bodily defect which would make him identifiable in public, whether a defect acquired at birth or inflicted later in life in order to qualify him for the office of muhhum. But this does not inform one about his function.

From the Mari texts themselves, Huffmon is able to cite a text in which "muhhu-ecstatics" used music in their ritual, and there is a reference to "watered-down beer" which Huffmon feels "may possibly reflect a situation in which ecstasy was partly induced by alcohol."¹⁷ But beyond that, it is difficult to see how ecstasy was involved in the work of the muhhu-prophets. In other texts from Mari one learns of a muhhum who claimed to be sent from the god, one reads of bold messages delivered to the king or to the citizens of the town of Terqa, one isolates subjects like "the cultic interests of the god, the general safety of the king, and a

matter of whether or not to build a city gate."¹⁸ But one searches in vain for descriptions of frenzy, seizure, babbling, or indeed any physical or mental abnormality whatsoever. Thus Malamat is entirely correct in stating that "there is no specific reference to . . . ecstatic stimulation . . . in Mari,"¹⁹ a point also made by Walters with a slightly different emphasis: "the presence of ecstasy is certainly not as clear at Mari as it is in I Sam 19: 23f."²⁰

Huffmon also uses the idea of ecstasy in his translation of two texts which deal with prophets other than the muhhum type.²¹ In the first,²² an assinnu named Shelibum "became ecstatic."²³ In the second,²⁴ a young woman named Ahatum "became ecstatic."²⁶ Now the words which Huffmon is translating "became ecstatic" are both N forms of mahahum> mahum, which as a verb is commonly assumed to mean "to rage" or "to go into a rage."²⁶ Since both Shelibum and Ahatum were in the Temple at the time of their experience, it seems reasonable to conclude that the use of mahum to describe their actions²⁷ constitutes strong evidence to support the translation of Huffmon. Be that as it may, it is noteworthy that immediately following their becoming "ecstatic," both Shelibum and Ahatum delivered oracles in the form of advice to Zimri-lim from the goddess Annunitum.²⁸ This accords well with the regular functions of Mari prophets as attested in other texts which, as noted above, seem to have little connection with ecstasy.²⁹ One can only assert that whatever their state of mind which the verb mahum describes, the sobriety and clarity of the statements made immediately thereafter cannot be gainsaid.

This then is the extent of extrabiblical material relating to "ecstasy." A difficult Egyptian determinative and a twice-attested new Egyptian noun, an Aramaic word of uncertain meaning and origin, a difficult Akkadian root which occurs in the Mari texts in connection with "prophets." To quote Huffmon again, this evidence is "very sparse indeed."³⁰ It would seem that the debate between men like Noth, who insist that the Mari prophets "actually form part of the prehistory to [biblical]

prophecy,"³¹ and others who insist that the phenomenon of Israelite prophecy is absolutely unique,³² is getting the cart before the horse. While the connection between Mari prophecy and Israelite prophecy is undeniable, the role of ecstasy in the two cultures cannot be determined without far more evidence.³³

II. n-b- and ecstasy in the Hebrew Bible

In the Hebrew Bible, the root n-b-' occurs 11~ times in verbal forms, 8734 times in the NiphCal conjugation and 28 times in the HitpaCel.³⁶ Perhaps the most commonly accepted definition of the root is that the oldest verbal forms describe some form of "religious ecstasy

with or without song and music,"³⁶ while later uses of the same forms indicate "essentially religious instruction, with occasional predictions."³⁷ But the lines are not quite so easily drawn as the lexicon would indicate. There is the extreme position of T. H. Robinson, that "the Hebrew word for Ecstatic is Nabi', . . . and the verb used of ecstatic behaviour is a reflexive [Robinson means the HitpaCel] form of the root from which the noun Nabi comes."³⁸ But there is also the textual evidence that warns against the making of a sharp distinction between the NiphCal and the Hitpacel simply because both forms are often found together in the same passage with obviously identical meaning. In addition, there

is the evidence from the translators of the Septuagint who never distinguish between the two Hebrew conjugations, rendering both by propheteuo in every case.⁴⁰ In this connection, it is at least of passing interest that the Septuagint never once translates nb' ~ith existanai, the nominal form of which is ekstasis,¹ or with mainesthai.⁴²

The use of nb' to describe ecstasy is attested in the following biblical passages.

1 Sam. 10:1-13

This passage all~ 1 Sam. 19:18-24 may be called the loci classici of biblical ecstasy. Having been anointed by Samuel (v. 1), Saul was sent forth with promises that three signs ('otot) would occur, the third of which involved "a band of prophets" (hebel neb~'im)i Leaving Samuel, Saul was given "another heart" (leb 'aher) by God and the three signs predicted by Samuel did come to pass. Thus Saul met a band of prophets who were "prophesying" as they came down from the high place with

harp, tambourine, flute, and Iyre (v. 5). At that moment, the ruah 'elohlm "rushed" (tislah) upon him, and he "prophesied among them" (v. 10). The words "prophesying" and "prophesied" in this passage are either HitpaCel or NiphCal (v. 1]) forms of nb' which obviously mean neither foretelling nor forthtelling. The unusual sight of an aristocrat like Saul "prophesying" was surprising to those who observed it, evoking questions like "What has happened to the son of Qish? Is Saul also among the ecstasies [nebi~m]?" "Who is their [the ecstasies] father?" It is noteworthy here that the people "saw" something unusual in the behavior of Saul. This should be contrasted with the reaction of the crowd described in Acts 2, whose amazement is four times traced to what they heard from the 120 (cf. vv. 6, 8, 11).

1 Sam. 19:18-24

This passage contains an alternate aetiological explanation of the saying, "Is Saul also among the ecstasies?" In his efforts to find and kill David, Saul three times sent messengers to Nayot, a city in the territory of Ephraim to which David had fled and where he had joined Samuel and the hebel nebi'im. Several things indicate the midrashic character of

this passage. First, it is unlikely that David would have fled north in a time of trouble instead of south to the region where his family lived. Second, Samuel is nowhere connected with the ecstasies except in this story; and indeed, in both the early and the late Samuel Sources,⁴³ Samuel is specifically distinguished from the ecstatic bands. Third, while the late source has Saul and Samuel never seeing each other following their Gilgal dispute (1 Sam. 15:35), this passage has Saul "prophesying in the presence of Samuel" (v. 24). Four, "the surprise at Saul's frenzy, which is expressed in the proverb, was in place at the beginning of his public career, when his psychological abnormality was unknown, but is quite out of place at this stage, when his character must have been well known."⁴⁴

In short, the value of this passage lies in the information, which it contains about prophetic ecstasy as a group phenomenon, not as a source of historical information about Samuel, Saul, and David. One fact is clear. The contagion of group ecstasy lures one, two, yea, three envoys from Saul into the frenzy of "prophecy"! Finally, even the king himself, anxious to capture his most hated foe, is caught up by "the Spirit of God" and "prophecies." This "prophesying" was done in a group, all members of which had stripped themselves naked in the process,⁴⁵ and the entire experience so overwhelms Saul that he lies naked for 24 hours (v. 24). If this passage accurately reflects operating procedure for an ecstatic group,⁴⁵ nudity and frenzy were an integral part of "prophesying." Here again, one should note the interchange of HitpaCel and NiphCal forms of nb', as well as the fact that neither characteristic of classical prophecy, foretelling or forthtelling, is attested.

1 Sam. 18:10

1 Sam. 18:10 reads as follows: "On the following day [i.e., the day after the women had sung about the military prowess of Saul and David in terms of 'thousands' versus 'ten thousands' (v. 7)] an evil divine spirit⁴⁷ rushed upon Saul and he went into a rage inside the house." Here the verb "went into a rage" is a HitpaCel form of nb' which the King James Version has slavishly rendered as "prophesied." But the verse speaks neither of foretelling nor of forthtelling, nor even of the "normal" characteristics of ecstasy noted in the passages discussed above. Thus the comment of one interpreter that HitpaCel nb' here "has reference to ecstatic utterance"⁴⁸ is simply not sustained by the text and borders on eisegesis. There is no indication that Saul made any kind of a sound at this moment, and one would expect that a person preparing to throw a javelin at a hated opponent would keep very quiet about it. Still, there remains an honest question about the behavior of Saul in this incident. It exhibits gross jealousy about the exploits of a younger, more talented man. It certainly reflects social and emotional

immaturity. A modern psychiatrist has aptly described it as "severe manic depressive illness, depressed type, with paranoid features."⁴⁹ But in what way could Saul's behavior qualify as "ecstasy"?

I Kings 18:17-40

The episode of Elijah and the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel has been discussed by many scholars;⁵⁰ the basic facts of the story are well known. The challenge of Elijah to the prophets of Baal was intended to set the record straight in the thinking of the people of Israel. As deVaux has pointed out, "It was not just a question of deciding whether the holy mountain belonged to Yahweh or to Baal, or which of the two was stronger: the test was to decide once and for all which was God. And if Yahweh was God, then Baal was nothing."⁵¹

Allowing the Baalites to go first (v. 25), Elijah stood aside to observe whether or not their god could answer "by fire." "From morning until noon" the Baalites called upon Baal to answer, "hopping [or 'hobbling,' yefassehu] around the altar which they had made" (v. 26). Spurred on by the mocking taunts of Elijah,⁵² "they cried out loudly," and, in accordance with their custom, they slashed themselves (yitgodedu)⁵³ with swords and lances until blood spurted out upon their bodies (v. 28). When noontime passed with no response, they "continued in ecstatic frenzy" (yitnabbe'u) into the afternoon, ⁵⁴ still with no response (v. 29). Certainly everyone can agree that this passage describes "ecstasy"; precisely the type of description is given here which was absent from the Mari texts and from the Wen-Amun story-frenzy, self-mutilation, loud outcrying, etc. What should also be clear in the passage is the difference between the obviously ecstatic Baalite prophets and the prophets of Yahweh who were their contemporaries. Elijah was not ecstatic. He did not dance, slash himself, or "prophesy."⁵⁶ On the contrary, "in contrast with the desperate, ecstatic frenzy of the Baal prophets, the dignity and serenity of Elijah"⁵⁶ stand out sharply.

It is true that with "the hand of Yahweh" upon him (v. 46), Elijah was able to run 17 miles -5 faster than the royal chariot. But it should be noted that this report adds nothing to the major theme of the Carmel- Horeb sequence,⁵⁸ and thus could be viewed as an editorial addition to the Elijah cycle of tradition. Still, if setting an Olympic record for the 17-mile dash be termed "ecstasy," it is at least vastly less damaging than the frenzied activities of Elijah's opponents,⁵⁹ and it is at the same time clearly unrelated to unintelligible utterance of any kind.

1 Kings 22:1-286

In much the same way that 1 Kings 18 contrasts the frenzied prophets of Baal to the composed prophet of Yahweh, this passage contrasts one independent prophet to ca. 400 puppets of the crown. The following

facts are apparent from the narrative. (1) A person could "prophesy" either good or evil and still be termed a "prophet."⁶¹ (2) The source of "prophecy" was considered to be Yahweh.⁶² (3) The difference between a false prophet and a true one was believed to be demonstrable by a reference to the outcome of a prediction given by a prophet concerning an event in the immediate future.⁶³ In this passage, the event at hand was a proposed battle against Syria to take place at Ramoth-Gilead.

What about ecstasy in this passage? Were the 400 royal prophets ecstatic in the moment described by verses 10 and 12? According to the text, they simply predicted an Israelite victory at Ramoth-Gilead. True, Zedekiah showed a flair for the theatrical, but using horns of iron as an audiovisual aid seems a bit different from using a sword to slash oneself, dancing several hours without pause, or calling out vainly for an answer from one's god

What about Micayehu ben Yimlah? Do his visions in verses 17 and 19-23 qualify under the Lindblom half of ecstasy? Or is he too simply delivering a prediction with flair and style? At the very least, one must admit that by the time they reach written form, the messages of both Zedekiah and Micayehu are totally understandable. And there is also clear evidence (vv. 24-28) that both Zedekiah and Micayehu maintained enough composure to exchange quite pointed arguments. Both realized that one of them had to be proven wrong, and both realized that the proof would consist not of their contrasting predictions, but simply upon the results at Ramoth-Gilead. Nothing in the text indicates that either man was dependant upon the unreal (ecstasy) as a tool to aid him in ascertaining the real.

Num. 11:16-35

The final passage to be considered in this section has been variously interpreted. In verses 16-17 and 24-25, there is an explanation of the founding of the institution known in the narrative as the 70 elders. The basis of their authority in administrative affairs derived from their reception of a portion of the ruah which Moses himself possessed, a ruah which verse 29 very clearly identifies as belonging to and stemming from Yaweh. Lindblom's understanding of the passage is instructive.

A symptom of their sharing in the spirit of Moses was a fit of ecstasy was something alien to them.⁶⁴ Thus the narrative seeks to emphasize the high authority of the institution of the seventy elders and at the same time distinguish them as a civil and administrative class from the class of the ecstaticnabis (sic!).⁵⁵

The origin of "ecstatic prophecy" is what Lindblom feels the editor here traces to the activities of Eldad and Medad⁵⁶ (vv. 26-30), who remained in the camp but "prophesied" nonetheless.⁶⁷ When Moses was

asked to restrain them, he calmly replied that he would be happy if every single israelite would become a nabi' (v. 29) by receiving the Spirit of Yahweh. This reaction of Moses seems strange if in truth the actions of Eldad and Medad were ecstatic. Was Moses wishing that the

entire nation would go into ecstatic frenzy? Was that the purpose for which Moses wished the Spirit of Yahweh to be put upon each individual? One thinks not.

The "Spirit of Yahweh" is crucial in this entire passage. Moses possessed the Spirit of Yahweh. The 70 elders needed to receive the same Spirit as authentication of their appointment to positions of leadership in the community. But also Eldad and Medad received the Spirit of Yahweh (v. 26). Now Lindblom's assertion that these 2 were recipients of the Spirit of Yahweh because later traditions remembered them as the founders of the movement of ecstatic prophecy in Israel seems

strange in light of the fact that neither man is ever mentioned again in all of the Scriptures.⁶⁸ Is it not simpler to view Eldad and Medad simply as 2 average men upon whom the Spirit of Yahweh chose to rest for no other reason than that "the wind blows where it wants to"? Indeed, the reaction of Moses seems to indicate quite plainly, not that Eldad and Medad were viewed as special founders of a very restricted group of ecstasies who alone had continued to partake of the Spirit of

Yahweh in the subsequent history of Israel, but rather that at this early period in Israel's life everyone in the group should have been encouraged to view himself as good a candidate for the Spirit of Yahweh as were Eldad and Medad.⁷⁰

But what of ecstasy here? If Eldad and Medad were ecstatic when the Spirit of Yahweh rested upon them, were the 70 elders also ecstatic when they received the Spirit outside the camp? Was Moses an ecstatic because he possessed the Spirit? And again, did Moses hope that everyone in the entire community would become ecstatic in testimony to the coming of the Spirit upon them? The text does not allow one to answer any of these questions affirmatively.

Rather, one is led to the conclusion that above all the possession of the Spirit of Yahweh was understood to mean anything but ecstasy to Moses and the 70 elders. In their function as administrative officials there would have been a premium placed upon sobriety of judgment and clear communication with the populace, which are the exact opposite of ecstatic frenzy. And it is qualities such as these—clarity of expression, sound judgment, etc.—rather than ecstasy which Moses coveted for every individual in the community.

III. The "Crazy" Nabi'

In three places the adjective meshuga^C is used to describe a prophet;⁷¹ the common opinion is that such a description is one of the "character-

istic signs of ecstasy as we know it from paganism."⁷² The word itself may be defined from a passage in 1 Samuel 21, where David, fearful of Achish, the king of Gath (v. 13, Eng. 12), "changed his behavior⁷³ before them [the Philistines], acted like he was crazy in their hands, wrote⁷⁴ on the doors of the gate, and let his spittle run down onto his beard" (v. 14, Eng. 13). The response of Achish to his servants upon seeing David in this condition was as follows: "Look! You are seeing an 'ish mishtageaC. Why did you bring him to me? Do I lack meshugaCim, that you have brought this one lehishtageaC before me?" (Vv. 15-16, Eng. 14-15) .

With this description in mind, we turn to Hos. 9: 7, where we are told that "the nabi' is a fool ('e1.-il), the man of the ruah is meshugac." In this connection, the concept of "spirit" once again is important, for here too, as in the earlier passage from Numbers 11, there is an equation made between a nabi' and one who possesses, or is possessed by, the "spirit." Lindblom has written that "the spirit is always Yahweh's spirit, ⁷⁶ a more or less substantial dynamis, a force emanating from Yahweh; the spirit is always sent by Yahweh and runs Yahweh's errands."⁷⁶ Thus one is reminded of Obadiah and his fear that he would be unable to find Elijah when he might need him, for the Spirit of Yahweh would have carried him to an unknown location.⁷⁷ And one remembers also that it was the Spirit of God⁷⁸ which affected Saul so profoundly, at times moving him to ecstatic frenzy,⁷⁹ at other times moving him to uncontrolled depression and anger,⁸⁰ and sometimes, as 1 Sam. 16:14 describes it, simply "tormenting him."⁸¹ This verse clearly illustrates Lindblom's point about the ruah as the agent which "runs Yahweh's errands.'⁸² The RSV has translated the entire verse as follows: "Now the Spirit of the Lord (YHWH) departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord (YHWH) tormented him." Here it should be noted that there are two agents of Yahweh, both called His ruah, one of which is "evil" (raCah). Once Yah-weh has rejected Saul as king of Israel,⁸³ He sends His ruah to torment him, to take possession of him for the purpose of leading him to destruction. In a similar way, the nabi' of Hos. 9:7 who is termed a "fool" is one who has been possessed by the Spirit of God and by that Spirit has been led to say or do crazy things, things which would be considered "abnormal." In both cases, the "spirit" is Yahweh's agent, to constitute one man as a divine spokesman, but to lead another to ruin and disgrace.

There are two other places where a nabi' is described as meshugaC. A young prophet is so termed by Jehu for his seemingly crazy prediction about the imminent fall of the dynasty of Ahab.⁸⁴ Jeremiah is so classified because of apparently contradictory and foolish statements to his exiled compatriots.^{8~} It is difficult to believe that either of these two men should be termed ecstatic. They seem to be described as meshugaC, not because of crazy behavior comparable to that of David, but because

their predictions and advice go against the accepted situation, the majority opinion. Their messages were certainly plain and understandable to everyone who heard (or read) them. It is true that craziness or madness was widely regarded as a sign that one was in contact with the divine world, and A. R. Johnson is certainly correct in his remark that the prophets "probably would not quarrel with this equation."⁸⁶ But to add ecstasy to the equation would be going beyond the evidence. Madness as signified by abnormal behavior and "ecstasy" which removes one from contact with reality are hardly the same thing.

IV. Ecstasy and the Literary Prophets

So far, this investigation has been limited to the period prior to the appearance of the classical or literary prophets. Because the assigned subject specifies inquiry about "origins," a full discussion of the literary prophets would be out of order here. But it should be noted, if only briefly, that the connection between the early ecstasies and the classical or literary prophets of later periods has never been explained satisfactorily. Perhaps the majority opinion is that the most direct link from the early period to the classical period is nothing less than the ecstatic experiences shared by both groups. Here one may cite the statement of T. H. Robinson that "the Ecstatic was the direct ancestor of the Prophets whose words have been preserved for us in the Old Testament,"⁸⁷ or the equally strong statement of Lindblom, that "it would be a serious mistake to dissolve the connection between these [the classical] prophets and . . . the primitive or early prophets."⁸⁸

The reasons for affirming such connections are manifold. There are the descriptions of Jeremiah reeling "like a drunken man . . . overcome by wine" (23:9) or "deceived" by Yahweh (20:7-9),⁸⁹ of Ezekiel⁹⁰ in a seven-day trance (3:15) or lying on his left side for 390 days and then on his right side for 40 days (4:4-8), of Isaiah, Habakkuk, and others who had ecstatic or at least highly unusual experiences.⁹¹ Added to these are the "visions" of the classical prophets, which Lindblom has classified as "pictorial" (Ezekiel's inaugural vision, the vision of the bones in the valley, the majority of the visions in the Book of Amos, etc.) or "dramatic" (Isaiah's inaugural vision, the vision of the downfall of Babylon in Isaiah 21, Jeremiah's inaugural vision, and the unusual vision of Ezekiel recorded in chapters ~11 of the book which bears his name) .⁹²

But these connections between the early ecstasies and the later litterateurs must not obscure the fact that there are certain basic differences between the two groups as well. The late Abraham Heschel has contributed a masterful survey of precisely such differences in his chapter on "An Examination of the Theory of Ecstasy," an essay which is of

fundamental importance in this regard.⁹³ Here are two items which Heschel believed differentiated the ecstatic from the literary nabi'.

A. Ecstasy cannot be an essential element of prophetic activity, else "Moses, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah would have to be disqualified as prophets, since no trace of ecstasy is found in their experiences."⁹⁴ Incidentally, to this rather impressive list of Heschel may be added the names of Abraham and Aaron, both of whom received the title nabi',⁹⁵ but who were not ecstatics by any definition.

B. Drunkenness, which makes available to man things inaccessible in a state of normal consciousness, is roundly denounced by the classical prophet.⁹⁶

C. While the ecstatic thirsts to become one with God, "prophetic consciousness is marked by a shuddering sense of the unapproachable holiness of God."⁹⁷

D. The ecstatic loses his identity in the search "to become invested with the fullness of deity . . . [but] the prophetic personality, far from being dissolved, is intensely present and fervently involved in what he perceives.... The prophet is responsive, not only receptive."⁹⁸

E. While the ecstatic seeks to induce his state of rapture through "dramatic gestures, dance, music, alcohol, opium, hashish, the drinking of water of a sacred well, or the blood of an animal, . . . moments of inspiration come to the prophet without effort, preparation or inducement. Suddenly and unexpectedly, without initiative, without aspiration, the prophet is called to hear the Voice."⁹⁹

F. While the ecstatic must cease to be conscious in order to be inspired, the prophet never forgets the world with its scandals, its callousness, its corruption. "The intensity and violence of the prophet's emotions do not cause his intelligence to subside."¹⁰⁰

G. "Ecstasy is an experience which is incommunicable.... Prophecy, on the other hand, is meaningless without expression."¹⁰¹

H. "Ecstasy is a state of being, an act of transmuting the self; the experience of the prophet is an act of receiving a word, a gift of knowledge, an act of understanding. The prophetic act leaves an utterance behind; ecstasy leaves behind a memory of a moment that cannot be put into words."¹⁰²

I. "What is important in musical acts is that something happens; what is important in prophetic acts is that something is said."¹⁰³

J. "In all forms of prophetic experience the content, the word, proceeds from a personal Inspirer rather than from the mysterious Unknown. Prophetic inspiration differs from both ecstasy and poetic inspiration in that it is an act in which the prophetic person stands over against the divine person. It is characterized by a subject-subject struc-

ture: the self-conscious active 'I' of the prophet encounters the active, living Inspirer."¹⁰⁴

Conclusion

To conclude this investigation, it is necessary to return to the three original theses of the paper postulated at the beginning. Here is a brief review of each thesis.

1. There is far less ecstasy in the world of the Old Testament and in the Old Testament itself than the secondary literature would have one believe, for primary texts which explicitly state or describe ecstasy are quite rare. In other words, it is important that the exact nature and extent of the evidence be understood. Outside the Hebrew Scriptures, the evidence is sparse indeed, as the survey of extrabiblical material revealed. Moreover, ecstatic material in the Hebrew Bible itself must be used with great caution. Take away the experiences of Saul, an unbalanced person who was a politician rather than a spokesman for God; take away the description of the Baalites, whose actions stand in sharp contrast to those of "God's man" Elijah; and the hard evidence relating to ecstasy among Israelite prophets has been drastically reduced.

2. There must be a rather sharp line drawn between early ecstasy and classical prophecy. Although the work of Heschel cited above rather handily takes care of this point, H. H. Rowley's words of caution should not be overlooked in this regard. "That there was an abnormal element in even the greater prophets of the Old Testament may be allowed; but this does not mean that all prophecy was 'ecstatic', or that every oracle was born in a special abnormal experience."¹⁰⁶ Rowley's words serve not only to balance the passionate pleading of Heschel, they also stand as a reminder that there is no reason to conclude from the present evidence that every prophet had frequent ecstatic experiences which forced him "to put aside his own personality and intellectual processes and enter a different state of consciousness."¹⁰⁶ In the words of Nussbaum, "the literary prophets were endowed with astounding mental health, which allowed them to tolerate emotional stress without sliding into psychosis or aimless ecstasy as Saul did before their time."¹⁰⁷ This is indeed high praise from a psychiatrist, and his point is well taken. But it is doubtful that either Nussbaum or any other modern psychiatrist would describe the great classical prophets as "normal," whatever that is. What really needs to be stressed is that, while no one would deny the abnormality of the classical prophets, the connection between abnormality and ecstasy must be established in each individual case rather than assumed for every prophetic experience. Thus not only do the literary prophets stand out from the early Israelite ecstasies (Saul, the hebel nebi'im), the preclassical Israelite prophets also differ in many ways from their pagan contemporaries. This was demonstrated to be

particularly apparent in the case of Elijah and the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel.

3. Ecstasy, when it does appear in the Hebrew Bible, is to be understood as strange actions rather than as strange utterances. This fact is equally true both at Mari and in early Israel. To cite Heschel again, "The office of a prophet, which consists of setting forth a message in blunt and clear terms rather than in dark oracles and intimations, must have its source in moments of comprehension and understanding."¹⁰⁸ But the importance of comprehension must also be underscored at the moment of delivery too. While their audiences sometimes ridicule~ what they identified as strange behavior, they seldom had trouble understanding what was being said. Their behavior may have seemed strange, but the messages of the prophets of Yahweh were above all straightforward, unambiguous, and totally understandable.

Reference Notes

The following abbreviations are- used in the footnotes below:

ANET Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, ed. J. B. Pritchard, third edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

ARM Archives royales de Mari (publiees sous la direction de A. Parrot et G. Dossin), Paris.

BAR The Biblical Archaeologist Reader (New York: Anchor Books).

BDB F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

CAD The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

JBL Journal of Biblical Literature.

JRH Journal of Religion and Health.

KAI H. Donner and W. Rollig Kanaanaische und aramaische Inschriften

KB L Kohler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958)

VTS Vetus Testamentum, Supplements.

1. T.H. Robinson, Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel, second ed., (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., Ltd., 1953), p. 31. Hereafter, Prophecy.
2. J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), pp.4-5 Hereafter, Prophecy.
3. In addition to the material presented below, cf. Herbert B. Huffmon, "Prophecy in the Mari letters," BAR 3:200-203. Note in particular the references in which Huffmon classifies many types of material-delivery of favorable oracles, delivery of a divine message by a *ragintu* ("forth-

- crier"), etc. Note also Huffmon's citation of Oppenheim: "Divine communication by means of ecstasy or through persons who could be called prophets was not at all typical of Mesopotamia" (p. 202). Huffmon does not discuss the occurrence of a nominal form of nb' on an ostrakon from Lachish (Text 194.20 in KAI, 1:35), about which Donner and Rollig have commented, "welche Funktion der heir genannte 'Prophet' hatte und wer, er war, lasst sich nicht mehr feststellen" (KAI, 2:193). The "Plague Prayers of mursilis" (translated by Goetze in ANET, pp. 394-96) should be compared with the intercessory prayers of Moses or David rather than with ecstatic material of any kind.
4. Hans Goedicke, *The Report of Wenamun* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), p. 53. Hereafter Wenamun.
 5. On this phrase in Egyptian, cf. Goedicke, *Wenamun*, p. 56.
 6. John A. Wilson, "The Journey of Wen-Amun to Phoenicia," in ANET, p.26, n. 13.
 7. Goedicke, *Wenamun*, p.53.
 8. Ibid.
 9. Erman and Grappow, *Worterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache* (1929), vol. 3, sub h3wt. This reference was furnished to me by my former student, Karen Rehm.
 10. Cf. Rosenthal's translation of the text in ANET, pp. 501-2, and Black's comments and translation in *Documents from Old Testament Times*, ed. D. Winston Thomas (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961), pp. 242-50. The Aramaic original is printed in KAI, 1:37.
 11. Aramaic hzyn. Cf. Hebrew hzy.
 12. Cf. KAI, 3:39. Donner and Rollig have "Zahler" and "Zukunftskundigen." See also their comments in Band II, p. 208.
 13. Huffmon, "Prophecy," p. 203.
 14. In Akkadian, apilum. Cf. Lods, "Le verbe apalu, 'repondre,' d'ou derive ce mot, etait employe specialement comme le terme correspondant hebreu, C&na, pour designer la revelation accordee a un consultant par la divinite." See his "Une Tablette Inedite de Mari, Interessante pour l'Histoire Ancienne du Prophetisme Semitique," in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, ed. H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1946), p. 107. Note also CAD, vol. 1, part II, p. 170, and Abraham Malamat's "Prophetic Revelations in Mari and Bible," VTS, 15 (1965), pp. 211-14.
 15. Generally identified as a "male cult prostitute, possibly a eunuch." Cf. Huffmon, "Prophecy in the Mari Letters," p. 209, although CAD, vol 1, part II, p. 341, refutes this.
 16. Malamat, VTS, 15 :210-11, n. 4. Cf. also Huffmon, "Prophecy" p. 211 and the references there, and Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestucke* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1912), p. 168.
 17. Huffmon, "Prophecy," p. 211.
 18. Ibid., p. 213.
 19. VTS, 15:211.
 20. "Prophecy in Mari and Israel," JBL, 89 (1970), p. 79. Dr. Walters kindly furnished several items of bibliography pertaining to Mari which are cited elsewhere without complete acknowledgment of his help.
 21. Both texts are published in copy only in ARM, 10, pl. 5.
 22. Ibid., 7.

23. Huffmon, "Prophecy," pp. 209-10.
 24. ARM, 10:8.
 26. Huffmon, "Prophecy," p. 214.
 26. Cf. W. von Sodon, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, sub mahum, which von Sodon has translated by "rasen" (G) and "ins Rasen kommen" (N).
 27. Mahum normally is used in connection with the pouring out of water. Cf. mahahu ina me, "mit Wasser verrühren," in Carl Bezold, *Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuch handlung, 1926), p. 168.
 28. For the text of these speeches, cf. Huffmon, "Prophecy," pp. 210 and 214.
 29. This point is also made by Malamat in VTS, 16 :211.
 30. Huffmon, "Prophecy," p. 200.
 31. Martin Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 186. But cf. also Noth's statement on p. 188, that "the words of the Old Testament 'writing prophets', in particular, can in no way be compared with the statements of the Mari divine messengers."
 32. Notably H. M. Orlinsky, quoted by Huffmon, "Prophecy," p. 200.
 33. Mention should be made here of the evidence for a ritual, ecstatic dance contained in passages from such classical authors as Heliodorus, Herodian, Apuleius, et al. These passages are grouped together and discussed by Roland de Vaux in "Prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel" in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (New York: Doubleday, 1971), pp. 240-46.
- Although de Vaux feels that these authors may be echoing "extremely ancient traditions," he nonetheless admits that they "are all more or less late texts" (p. 246). Accordingly, they are not included here in the discussion of "origins" or prehistory of biblical ecstasy.
34. KB, p. 586, count only 86 NiphCal references.
 36. Cf. BDB, 612, and Shlomoh Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae* (Tel Aviv: Sumptibus Schocken Hierosolymis, 1969), pp. 711-12.
 36. BDB, p. 612.
 37. Ibid.
 38. Robinson, *Prophecy*, pp. 30-31.
 39. Cf. 1 Sam. 10:10-11; 1 Kings 6:10-11; 2 Kings 22:8, 10, 18 (Hit), 12 (N); Jer. 33:20; Ezek. 13:17; 2 Chron. 18:7, 9, 17 (Hit), 11 (N). See further below.
 40. Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954), 2:1231-32.
 41. Ibid., 1:496-97.
 42. Ibid., 2:892.
 43. On the two sources of Samuel, cf. George B. Caird, "The First and Second Books of Samuel" in *The Interpreters Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), 2:855-65. For a three-source postulation, cf. Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 268-81.
 44. Caird, *Interpreter's Bible*, 2: 988.
 45. The phrase gam hu' (twice in v. 24) indicates that Saul simply did what the other ecstasies were already doing.

46. And what reason could be given for its fabrication by an editor?
47. Or, "an evil spirit froqn God," ruah 'elohim raCah. Cf. 1 Sam. 16: 14.
48. Cf. W. T. Purkiser, "The Books of Samuel" in Beacon Bible Commentary (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1965), 2:260. Cf. also R. B. Y. Scott, *The Relevance of the Prophets* (London: The Macmillan Co., 1944), p. 46.
49. Kurt Nussbaum, "Abnormal Mental Phenomena in the Prophets," *JRH*, vol. 13, no. 3 (1974), p. 197.
50. See above all de Vaux, "Prophets," pp. 238-51. Also instructive is the article by Szikszai, "Elijah the Prophet" in *IDB*, 2-88-90 and the bibliography given there.
51. De Vaux, "Prophets," p. 238. See also de Vaux's citation of verses 21, 24, 38-39, which he notes "leave us in no doubt" about the stakes of the contest (p.238, n. 5).
52. See the comments of de Vaux on this verse, "Prophets," pp. 24--44.
53. This custom was expressly forbidden to Israelites on behalf of dead loved ones by the Deuteronomist (cf. Deut. 14:1). On the Canaanite custom, cf. Robinson, *Prophecy*, pp. 30-37.
54. On the phrase, "until the time of the offering of the oblation" (RSV), see Norman H. Snaith, "I Kings," in *The Interpreter's Bible*, 3:154.
55. The verb nb' is not used to describe him in this chapter, although he does refer to himself as a nabi of Yahweh (v. 22).
56. Szikszai, *IDB*, 2:89.
57. Cf. Snaith, *Interpreter's Bible*, 3:159: "The distance from the scene of the sacrifice to the entrance to the Pass of Jezreel is about seventeen miles."
58. On which see Snaith, *Interpreter's Bible*, 3:12-13.
59. On this passage, see Lindblom, *Prophecy*, p. 58. See his note 22 and the references there.
60. See also 2 Chron. 18: 1-27.
61. See verses 8, 18.
62. See verses 14, 23-24, 28.
63. See verse 28, and cf. Deut. 18 :22.
64. This is his understanding of the phrase, welo' yasafu in verse 25.
65. Lindblom, *Prophecy*, p. 101.
66. See the very instructive article by Sid Z. Leiman, "The Inverted Nuns at Numbers 10:35-36 and the Book of Eldad and Medad," *JBL*, vol. 93, no. 3 (1974), pp. 348-55.
67. Verses 24 and 25 show clearly that Eldad and Medad were not numbered among the original 70 who received the Spirit at the tent of meeting. The phrase wehema baeketubim in verse 26 must mean simply that they were full members of the community.
68. On their role in later Jewish tradition, see Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968), 3 : 251-
69. Cf. John 3 :8: "to pneuma hopou thelei pnei."
70. Note that ruah me'et YHWH in verse 31 obviously means sent especially by Yahweh. Cf. Arabic ra'ha, riyhum.
71. Cf. Hos. 9:7; Jer. 29:26; 2 Kings 9:11

72. Cf. Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel*, translated and abridged by Moshe Greenberg (New York: Schocken Paperback Edition, 1972), p. 95.
73. On this word, a Hitpolel from the root hll, see also Jer. 26:16- 46:9- 50:38- 51:7; Nah. 2:5. This root should not be confused with hli hithallel, "to praise."
74. Lit., "made a mark," (a taw), wawetaw.
75. But see Num. 24:2, where it is the Spirit of Elohim that comes upon Balaam- elsewhere we learn that Balaam must speak only what Yahweh orders or puts in his mouth (cf. Num. 22:18; 23:3, 5, 8b, 12, 16, 26; 24:11, 13) or what Elohim commands (cf. Num. 22:20, 38; 23:8a, 19- 20). In many other places the "spirit" may be either that of Yahweh or Elohim. Cf. note 78 below.
76. Lindblom, *Prophecy*, p. 57.
77. 1 Kings 18:12.
78. That ruah YHWH and ruah 'elohim are often synonymous is attested by 1 Sam. 10:6, 10.
79. 1 Sam. 10:6, 10; 19:23.
80. 1 Sam. 18:10; 19:9.
81. BiCatatu.
82. Lindblom, *Prophecy*, p. 57.
83. Cf. 1 Sam. 16:1.
84. See 2 Kings 9:1-13, especially verse 11.
85. See Jer. 29: 24-28, especially verse 26.
86. A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1962), p. 18. See also his note 4 and the references there.
87. Robinson, *Prophecy*, p. 35.
88. Lindblom, *Prophecy*, p. 105.
89. On this passage, see Lindblom, *Prophecy*, p. 195.
90. On Ezekiel, whom T. H. Robinson says "lets us see more of the character of the ecstasy than any other prophet" (*Prophecy*, p. 147), see Thiering, "The Biblical Source of Qumran Asceticism," *JBL*, vol. 93, no. 3 (1974), pp. 442-44, and Lindblom, *Prophecy*, pp. 198-99. Note also Nussbaum's remarks that Lindblom (followed without comment by Thiering) is incorrect in using the term aphasia to describe Ezekiel's experiences in 3:26; 24:27; 33:21-22, because aphasia "is an organic, not suddenly reversible, affliction of the brain" ("*Abnormal Mental Phenomena in the Prophets*," *JRH*, vol. 13, no. 3 [1974], p. 197).
91. For a convenient summary of the references dealing with this idea, see Lindblom, *Prophecy*, pp. 197-202.
92. Lindblom, *Prophecy*, pp. 124-31.
93. Abraham J. Heschel *The Prophets* (New York: Harper and Row, Harper Torchbooks Edition, 1962), 2:131-46. Hereafter, Heschel.
94. *Ibid.*, p. 132.
95. See Gen. 20:7 and Exod. 7:1.
96. Heschel, 2:134-35.
97. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
98. *Ibid.*

99. *Ibid.*, p. 138. On the cultic dance, accompanied by music, used to stimulate ecstatic experiences, see Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (London SCM Press, 1961), 1:310-12.
100. Heschel, 2:139.
101. *Ibid.*, pp. 140-41.
102. *Ibid.*, p. 142.
103. *Ibid.*, p. 144.
104. *Ibid.*, pp. 145-46.
105. H. H. Rowley, "Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets," in *From Moses to Qumran* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), p. 115.
106. *JBL*, vol. 93, no. 3, (1974), p. 442.
107. *JRH*, vol. 13, no. 3 (1974), p. 198.
108. Heschel, 2: 143.

CARNALITY AND HUMANITY:

Exploratory Observations

J. Kenneth Grider

What ought we Wesleyans to mean by carnality, and how ought we to view the difference between carnality and humanity-including acquired human aberrations such as prejudices?

While I do not presume to understand fully what carnality is, in distinction from what is essentially human and the acquired aberrations of the human, I should like to make some exploratory observations about what it does and does not consist of; and about what we therefore are cleansed from and not cleansed from when we receive by faith the Pentecostal experience of entire sanctification through the baptism with the Holy Spirit. I should like also to discuss essential human nature such as temperament, and aberrated human nature such as acquired prejudices and hostilities.

Some of these observations, of course, are tenuous. All of them are given here with a "respond please" at the bottom.

Constituents of Carnality

Carnality is not necessarily evidenced by hostility or anger or nervousness in which a sanguine person might become red-cheeked and might be lacking in interpersonal equilibrium. Such reaction might stem not from an Adamic detriment, but from natural temperament; or from righteous anger as obtained in Jesus when He cleansed the Temple; or from what Jesus felt when He healed a person on the sabbath and was questioned about it, "and he looked around at them with anger" (Mark 3:5); or from resentment toward a parent or a fellow church member due to aberrating experiences in one's early life; or from nervousness due to physical or emotional problems. It is only the detriment due to Adam's bad representation of us, which detriment we come into the world with, that we are cleansed from when original sin is expelled at the time of our entire sanctification. That is a great deal to be cleansed from, actually, as I will be suggesting as we talk about carnality further. Wesley even felt (incorrectly, I think) that the change at our entire sanctification is "immensely greater than that wrought when he [anyone] was justified."¹ Yet, although to be cleansed from carnality is a

significant matter, it is less that to be cleansed from what is essentially human, such as temperament and the sex drive--and the 101 deficiencies that we come by during this life (e.g., prejudices).

Carnality is not in itself culpable. No guilt attaches to it. Thus, no one will ever go into perdition for Adam's sin alone. It is true that "all sinned" when Adam sinned, according to Rom. 5:12, where the aorist *hemarton* appears, which does not mean "all have sinned" as in the KJV, but "all sinned." He really did sin when our representative did, even as a college really does lose a race when its representative loses. But because of an unconditional benefit of the atonement, the "free gift" referred to in Rom. 5:15-17, which was given to all, the guilt of Adam's sin has been waived--although the depravity itself, the bias to sin, is cleansed only when believers are baptized with the Holy Spirit. In support of this kind of view H. Orton Wiley says, "Thus the condemnation which rested upon the race through Adam's sin is removed by the one ablation of Christ. By this we understand that no child of Adam is condemned eternally, either for the original offense, or its consequences. Thus...culpability does not attach to original sin."² John Wesley was of the same opinion, as is well known.

A spin-off of this way of seeing the matter is that it is incorrect to preach "holiness or hell." Justification is what changes eternal destiny; not entire sanctification. The exhortation to "pursue after holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. 12:14), refers to holiness in the broadest sense, begun in regeneration.

The imperative to receive cleansing from carnality is that one will then be in the establishing grace (1 Thess. 3:13) and will not find himself leaning away from God due to the carnal propensity to sin, and will experience the countless benefits of the Holy Spirit's pervasive indwelling presence.

I am using carnality, here, principally as the sin which remains in the believer after justification--the state or condition of sin (not an entity, not a thing), which inclines the believer to acts of sin). It is not to be thought of as a physical substance, of course, but as a state which is relational--in which, being deprived of special helps of the Holy Spirit, we become estranged from God and biased toward acts of sin. When this exists in the unbeliever, its strength is greater than when in the believer, because it is not then countered by the Holy Spirit (who indwells a person after he becomes a believer, according to Gal. 5:17 and Rom. 8:9).

Although the word carnality might suggest to some that it is simply that aspect of the Adamic detriment which relates to the body, our life in the physical flesh, I see the word, in the Scriptures, to include the entire detriment we have received from the racial fall in Adam. This is why Paul said to the Corinthian Christians, "babes in Christ," who

were filled with envy and strife, and who were divided in to four factions (although the actual word for "divisions" is not in any early extant manuscript) that they were "yet carnal" (I Cor. 3:3). They were not among the *pneumatikoi*, which I think is the same in Paul as not being among the *teleioi*; but instead were carnal.³

While the word for "carnal" is a cognate of *sarx*, and while *sarx* has many meanings, including the body, and the soft material on the e bones of the body, it is often used, particularly by Paul, in an ethical sense, as the opposite of being in the Spirit. Thus we read in Kittel, "For Paul, orientation to the *sarx* or the *pneuma*, is the total attitude which determines everything.... Life is determined as a totality by the *sarx* or the *pneuma*."⁴ Those who are "in the flesh" cannot please God (Rom. 8:8); but those who are "in the Spirit" (Rom. 8:9) can, it is implied. One might "live after the flesh" (Rom. 8:13); and yet, they that "are Christ's" (Gal. 5:24), are truly Christ's, "have crucified the flesh" (Gal. 5:24).

John Wesley referred to carnality by many terms. He called it "pride, self-will, unbelief."⁵ Particularly as it indwells believers, he called it a "bent to backsliding," "sin in a believer," and "a proneness to depart from God."⁶

Not now thinking so much about what it is in the believer, but of what it is in the unbeliever, it is a total corruption of our nature--a total depravity, arising from being deprived through Adam's fall of certain ministries of the Holy Spirit.⁷ Some Wesleyan theologians have not taught this; they have taught that only the moral nature of man, and not, e.g., his rational nature or his physical nature, suffered due to the Fall; and some of them, as we shall see presently, do not teach that the moral nature is fallen to the extent that not good decisions are possible apart from grace.

A.M. Hills says that "Motive is anything which may operate as a reason for action or as influence to it,"⁸ and I see this as a good definition of motive. But he taught that fallen man can implement even a motive to a good action apart from grace. He writes, " We can set aside unworthy motives, and cease thinking of unworthy things; we can enthrone the rational and the moral in our lives, over the incitements of the appetite and passion, and thus escape the doom of being the passive victims of impulses to evil."⁹ continuing this kind of clear Pelagianism, he says, "Therefore we are free moral agents, truly the author of our character, and justly responsible for our conduct."¹⁰ And he continues to reveal his acceptance of the modernism of his time (this book was published in 1931) by saying, "We must have this capacity for moral and religious motives, or we are only animals."¹¹ More Pelagian word could hardly be chosen that when he writes, "This conviction of a self-determining power, or a control of the will belonging to us, is as universal as man."¹² No seventh of Romans at man's citadel, here, in which the unregenerate

are enslaved to sin; so that the good they would do, they cannot do; and the evil that they would not do, they do (Rom. 7:15). Jesus said, "Without me ye can do nothing" (John 15:5). He told us that "a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit" (Matt. 7:18), and made it clear that of himself man is corrupt, when He said, "How can ye, being evil, speak good things?" (Matt. 12:34). And he said, "No man can come to me, except the Father draw him" (John 6:44). We are free if the Son has made us free, according to John 8: 36.

James Arminius, who actually was accused of Pelagianism, taught nothing of the sort. Of fallen natural man he said, "In this state, the free will of man towards the true good is not only wounded, maimed, infirm, bent, and weakened; whatever except such as are excited by divine grace."¹³ He also says, "Our will is not free from the first fall; that is, it is not free to good, unless it is made free by the Son [see John 8: 36] through the Spirit."¹⁴

John Wesley taught similarly. Speaking of John Fletcher and himself, he says that they ". . . absolutely deny natural free will."¹⁵ Wesley continues, "We both steadily assert that the will of fallen man is by nature free only to evil."¹⁶

Wesley taught that "there is in every man a 'carnal mind,' which is enmity against God; which is not, cannot be, 'subject to' His 'law': and which so infects the whole soul, that 'there dwelleth in' him, 'in his flesh,' in his natural state, 'no good thing.'"¹⁷

S. S. White, my distinguished predecessor, seemed to teach an inclusive Fall when he wrote, "Original sin is a condition in which all the faculties of man, understanding and will, and affections have been perverted. It is a total corruption of the whole human nature."¹⁸ Yet he did not believe that carnality, or original sin, makes the body sinful. He says, in the same book, "Thus the chief foundation-stone of those who reject eradication-belief in the body as sinful-is proved to be unscriptural."¹⁹ I myself understand that the body, too, is infected by carnality. Paul seems to have meant to teach this when he said, "I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members" (Rom. 7:23, RSV). Paul also says that "your bodies are dead because of sin" (Rom. 8:10, RSV). And he adds that God "will give life to your mortal bodies" (Rom. 8:11, RSV), as though their bodies needed it. The body, also, is included in the complete or whole or entire sanctification which Paul prays that the Thessalonian believers might come to enjoy. He says, "May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly [*holoteleis*]; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless" (1 Thess. 5: 23, RSV).

S. S. White had perhaps understandably (because of the era) so imbibed the Kantian moralism of his principal theology teacher, Drew's

Olin Alfred Curtis,²⁰ and the view of his professors at Chicago University, the bastion of American modernism when White received his Ph.D. degree there in 1939, that he refuses to admit that fallen natural man is unable to do any good thing. He writes, "Like God, man is capable of acting consciously toward an end, and aware of the fact that there is a right and wrong between which he can and must choose."²¹ He also says, "On the other hand, the man who is born in sin still has a sense of right and wrong, still has a capacity for God, and on occasion can do that which is in itself good."²² White even gets carried away in this kind of teaching to such extent that he writes, "No wonder Shakespeare said, 'What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form and loving, how express and admirable! In action, how like an angel! In apprehension, how like a god!'"²³

Although in the same book White talks about a "racial bent to sin,"²⁴ and says that "man is a fallen being,"²⁵ he is a Wesleyan theologian who, like A. M. Hills just before him, nudged Wesleyan theology away from Wesley's view, as Chiles says that so many Methodist theologians have done.²⁶

The Human and Its Aberrations

One whole set of deficiencies that we come by during this life, and that are not nullified when the carnal mind is expelled at the time of our entire sanctification, is prejudices.

Take racial prejudice. It is not inherited from Adam; we do not enter the world with it. We acquire it from our environment. Black children hear their parents and others speak derisively against whites, and young whites hear blacks bad-mouthed by their parents and others. And the prejudice has more than mere word estimations as its source. The odd appearance of a person of a different race is a small part of it. Added to that are differences in culture, training, economic status, ways of expressing faith. The Apostle Peter was guilty of anti-Semitism in reverse, being prejudiced against Gentiles, and it obtained well after the time of his entire sanctification at Pentecost. Peter said to Cornelius and other Gentiles, "You yourselves know how unlawful it is for a Jew to associate with or to visit any one of another nation; but God has shown me that I should not call any man common or unclean" (Acts 10: 28, RSV). After a time of two-way conversation with them, Peter added, "Truly I perceive that God shows no partiality, but in every nation any one who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him" (vv. 34-35, RSV). The routing of Peter's learned prejudices about the dietary differences between Jews and Gentiles and about God's supposed favoritism towards his kind of folk, the Jews, occurred through the Holy Spirit's special instructions to Peter well after the time

when he had had the Adamic depravity cleansed through the Pentecostal baptism with the Holy Spirit.

And even this special revelation of God did not assure that Peter would conduct his life consistently under social pressures. He was still subject to mistakes, to too great a desire simply to please people. That is why, more than 14 years later than the time of Peter's ministering to the Gentile Cornelius by special revelation, Paul needed to help him. Paul says, "But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned. For before certain men came from James, he ate with Gentiles; but when they came he drew back and separated himself, fearing the circumcision party" (Gal. 2:11-12, RSV). And Paul adds, "I said to Cephas before them all, 'If you though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?'" (Gal. 2:14, RSV).

If Peter's Pentecost did not rout his prejudice against Gentiles, nor his too-great desire to please people, we may suppose that our Pentecost will not nullify such matters either. People today who have had their Pentecost might, e.g., still be prejudiced against persons from a certain area of the nation. A church board member of a New England church might be thought to have a very poor suggestion to make to the board just because he hails from the deep South and evidences it by this dialect every time he speaks. The New Englander might have been educated at exclusive Harvard, or at least brought up under its shadow, and he might hold a stereotype image of a Southerner as unenlightened even if the person might have been trained in a university of the South. One might think that no good thing can come of Nazareth; or Arkansas; or staid Vermont; or a liberally oriented denomination; or out of a sharecropper family; or from the Rockefellers; or from the West "where all those cults flourish"; or from women.

Peter, who was impulsive enough to cut off a person's ear in the Garden of Gethsemane (John 18:10), was still impulsive by temperament after his Pentecost. His baptism with the Holy Spirit had no sooner happened than he stood up and started preaching right out there on the street to the jostling throngs of pilgrimagers.

And Peter and John decide to go to the Temple at three o'clock in the afternoon to thank God for what has happened, and they help a beggar to be healed of his lameness, Peter doing all the talking. It is as though, if John had quietly made a suggestion, Peter would have said, "Who asked you to say anything, young fellow?" (see Acts 3:1-11). And a crowd gathered around, marveling at what had happened, and Peter did all the talking again (vv. 12-26). John might have been called one of the sons of thunder, but he was no match for the forthright Peter. All he was good for was to keep Peter company when the two apostles were slammed into jail overnight (4:3). Again, the next day,

when the two were tried, John, a full-fledged apostle, the one Jesus loved the most (John 19:24; 20:2; 21:7, 20), wasn't even permitted to say anything in his own defense. Peter did all the talking again (Acts 4:5ff). Both men were officially on trial before Annas the high priest, and both were asked to defend themselves, but John was silent as King Tut. John later wrote much more of our New Testament than Peter did, and he seems not to have been quite as "ignorant" (Acts 4:13) as Peter was, since only Peter needed a secretary to write down one of his Epistles. So John might have been more articulate than his fellow fisherman and more calm in the defense. But he got to say exactly nothing, according to Luke's account. All he was good for, again, was to go back to jail with the big sanctified talker.

If a person today tends to talk too much, or otherwise to act impulsively because of a sanguine temperament, entire sanctification will not transform him into a different type of human being. However, with the Holy Spirit indwelling a person in a pervasive fullness, he has a "TelePrompter" inside him all the time, and this will help the sanguine person and the person of mild temperament more and more to bring his temperament into subjection to God's will.

I even tend to believe that homosexuality, as a tendency, will not always be extirpated when we are converted or when we are sanctified wholly. It is probably a learned trait. Even if it is helped along by a congenital trait, it only obtains pronouncedly in a small percentage of persons.²⁷ It cannot be a characteristic of carnality, else all persons would be so troubled. When carnality is extirpated, therefore, homosexuality as a tendency might or might not be corrected. God might choose to work this special kind of miracle on behalf of a person even as he might extirpate the tendency toward drug use at the time of one's entire sanctification. But to be changed to a heterosexual, as I see it, so that there would be no more propensity towards a person of his own gender than a heterosexual person feels, might not necessarily happen at one's conversion or at one's Pentecost. Again, the individual is enabled by the Holy Spirit's indwelling fullness to order life as God directs. As I tend to see the matter, and the manner seems to require our attention increasingly these days (witness the homosexual denomination that might soon ask for membership in the National Council of Churches, and the controversy over ordaining and marrying homosexuals especially in the United Methodist Church ²⁸), we should counsel a homosexual to believe that God will regenerate him and sanctify him wholly; and that, if he is not changed in his gender interest by a special miracle, he should not fulfill his homosexual desires with a partner even as a heterosexual does not fulfill his sexual desires with a partner except in God's plan of marriage. Perhaps his inclination will be gradually changed. It is possible

that Paul's vigorous opposition to homosexuality in Romans is opposition to its practice (1: 22-32).

Entire sanctification is a sanctification, a cleansing, that is entire. No carnality, or original sin, remains to deprave our faculties, to incline us to acts of sin. Carnality has infected, as a fever does, our entire nature, including the body and the reason and the will and the emotions, and carnality is entirely extirpated. This state or condition of a bias, a leaning towards the life of sin, is crucified, destroyed, eradicated if you please. Even so, entire sanctification is not a panacea; it does not right the derangements due to aberrating experiences that have happened during this life. Besides what I have already spoken of, there are numerous other psychological and physical and social problems that are not corrected when entire sanctification occurs-although we then have the help of the pervasive indwelling of the Holy Spirit in a growth in grace through which there can be a gradual lessening of these problems. Only glorification, another word for immortality, will extirpate them completely; and even then, we will not be gods.

Among human aberrations that cannot be treated carefully here are the inclination towards tobacco and alcohol and drugs. Again, I tend to believe that they are acquired desires, that they are not necessarily extirpated when one is converted or when Adamic sin is expelled. If it is suggested that they are expelled in all persons, including persons at a rescue mission, at justification, when the "washing of regeneration" (Titus 3:5) cleanses us of acquired depravity as such, I would suggest that I question whether this universally occurs. The acquired propensity to sin that we are cleansed of in the laver of regeneration is probably a cleansing that helps us to reorder our lives so that we are enabled to break with the life of or the practice of these and other sinful habits (see also Eph. 5:25-27, RSV). We would be enabled not to use tobacco or alcohol or drugs, but they might not be simply revolting to a person who has had the habits, in the way they are likely to be to others.

Conclusion

What ought Wesleyans to believe, then, about carnality and humanity-including the acquired human aberrations such as prejudices? As I see it, we ought to differentiate between carnality and humanity better than sometimes we have done. We ought to mean by carnality, especially that in unbelievers, the entire detriment we receive from Adam's bad representation of us. That is, we ought to mean by it original sin, and we ought to understand that it consists of a depravity which affects all the aspects of human nature: reason, will, emotions, the body. Because of the Fall, and therefore due to carnality, or the flesh, or indwelling sin (Rom. 7:17, 30), or "sin" or "the sin" (see Rom. 5:8), the reason is

not trustworthy, making revelation in the Scriptures and in Christ so imperative; the moral nature is fallen, so that we cannot do any good thing without the aid of special grace; the emotions are fallen, so that our affections are not set on things above, but are "inclined toward evil and that continually"; and even our bodies are sinful, and need to be cleansed by a sanctification that is entire (1 Thess. 5: 23) .

As I see it, further, we ought to place in the human area whatever is essential to human nature as such-e.g., the sex drive, the desire to be appreciated, the desire for self-protection, the various kinds of temperament. The carnal infection of them is extirpated at our entire sanctification, but they remain. This is what is meant when it is said in Wesleyan circles that entire sanctification does not dehumanize us.

Besides this, I have meant to say that in entire sanctification we are cleansed from whatever detriment we receive from Adam, and therefore from whatever spiritual detriment we come into the world with, but not necessarily from learned or otherwise acquired mental or emotional or physical aberrations. Among these are prejudices of sundry kinds, hostilities that we seek by the Spirit's help to control or overcome, homosexual tendencies, tobacco and alcohol and drug propensities, etc. The Holy Spirit, after our Pentecost, indwells us pervasively, i.e., not hindered by indwelling sin; and he helps us not to disobey God willfully due to any of these aberrations, and more and more to become liberated from them-until glorification, when the liberation will become complete.

It follows from this kind of understanding that we ought not to expect overmuch of the grace of entire sanctification: at that time Adamic sin is extirpated, but not human traits as such and not aberrations that have been acquired environmentally. It also follows that much charity is called for in our interpersonal relations within the Wesleyan movement because (1) we cannot necessarily tell what are carnal and what are human attitudes and reactions and actions in other persons; and (2) we ought not to expect entire sanctification to extirpate from people the aberrations which we acquire during this life, such as prejudices and hostilities.

Implied in all this is my view that the subconscious (or unconscious) is not cleansed in entire sanctification, as E. Stanley Jones taught.²⁹

Also implied is my view that we should not say that the self is crucified at entire sanctification. It is the carnal infection of the self that is crucified (Gal. 2:20; 6:14), not the self itself. The self is trued up; it is more truly itself than previously, not crucified.

Implied also is my view that we ought not to say that after entire sanctification our motives are pure. They are pure in that they are not mixed with carnality. They are not pure, however, in the sense that they are acceptable. They are inward bases for doing what we do, and they can stem from the human nature as such, or from acquired aberrations

of the human nature (prejudice, hostilities, etc.); and grace might need to work on them. That our motives are pure is a similar error to that in which people say that this grace gives us purity of intention. Again, the intention is not carnal; but we might very well intend by an action to satisfy a human desire to be appreciated, or an aberrated interest; and the intention would not be at all pure in the sense of being commendable, but instead one that needs some touches of growth in grace.

I think that what I have been meaning to say, mainly, is that we should claim neither too much nor too little for the grace of entire sanctification through the baptism with the Holy Spirit--but especially that we do not claim too much for it, since that has been the direction in which Wesleyan have most frequently erred. I have meant to say, too, that what we are, we are by the grace of God.

Reference Notes

1. John Wesley, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*, p. 61. I question Wesley at this point because to be justified changes our eternal destiny, and because at this time we pass from death to life, and because we are then made children of God by adoption. Even the power over us of inbred sin is broken at justification, i.e., the enslavement to inbred sin. In entire sanctification the being of original sin is itself extirpated.
2. H. Orton Wiley, *Christian Theology* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press), 2:135.
3. See Charles Ewing Brown, *The Meaning of Sanctification* (Anderson, Ind.: The Warner Press, 1945), pp. 43-46.
4. Edward Schweizer, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich Kittel, 7:135.
5. John Wesley, "On Sin in Believers," *Four Sermons* (London: Wesleyan Methodist Book-Room, n.d.), p.13.
6. Ibid.
7. The believer has the Holy Spirit indwelling him, according to Gal. 5:17, along with the *sarx*; but the unbeliever, apart from prevenient grace, is, due to carnality, dead to God. Original sin is not even partly cleansed at regeneration, and yet its effect in a believer is not as great as in the unbeliever.
8. A. M. Hills (Pasadena, Calif.: C. H. Kinne, 1931), 1:356.
9. Ibid., p. 362.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid., p. 364.
13. James Arminius, *The Writings of Arminius*, ed. Nichols (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1956), 1:526.
14. Ibid., P. 528.

15. John Wesley, in Burtner and Chiles' *Compend of Wesley's Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954), pp. 132-33.
16. Ibid.
17. John Wesley, *Standard Sermons*, 2:223.
18. S. S. White, *Eradication Defined, Explained, Authenticated* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1954), pp. 35-36.
19. Ibid., p. 66.
20. See his *The Christian Faith* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Kregel, 1956).
21. S. S. White, *Essential Christian Beliefs* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, n.d.), p. 27.
22. Ibid., pp. 34-35.
23. Ibid., p. 98.
24. Ibid., p. 33.
25. Ibid., p. 32.
26. See Chiles' *Theological Transition in the American Methodism: 1790-1935*, (N.Y.: Abingdon Press, 1965). Chiles treats various Methodist theologians from Wesley's time to the time of such men as Miley and Curtis and A. C. Knudson and shows the increasing Pelagianism in Methodist theological history.
27. Some authoritative opinion estimates it, however, as high as 10-15 percent. See Norman Pittenger, "A Theological Approach to Understanding Homosexuality," *Religion in Life*, winter, 1974, pp. 436 ff., p. 441.
28. James Clemons says that the homosexual denomination, Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan community Churches, is not 15,000 in membership and therefore almost meets the minimum denominational size of 20,000 for NCC membership; but that many of its members are evangelical fundamentalists and would be opposed to such affiliation. See the same article for recent dissension over homosexual ordinations and marriages in the United Methodist Church. See his "Christian Affirmation of Human sexuality," *Religion in Life*, winter, 1974.
29. See his testimony as a frontispiece in Chas. Ewing Brown's *The Meaning of Sanctification*. The testimony was written for Dr. Brown's book.