

Click on the bookmarks icon on the left of the PDF Reader
for quick access to each article.

Wesleyan Theological Journal

Volume 4 — Spring — 1969

The Crisis-Process Issue in Wesleyan Thought <i>Leslie R. Marston</i>	3
A Wesleyan View On Preaching <i>Mildred B. Wynkoop</i>	16
John Wesley the Physician <i>David Stewart</i>	27
A Wesleyan View of the Spirit's Gift of Tongues in the Book of Acts <i>Charles W. Carter</i>	39
A Wesleyan View on the Quest for Objectivity <i>Walter H. Johnson</i>	69
Twentieth Century Evangelicals Look at Bible Translation <i>Stephen S. Paine</i>	79

Editor
Charles W. Carter

**Digital texts copyright 2008
Wesley Center Online
<http://wesley.nnu.edu>**

THE CRISIS-PROCESS ISSUE IN WESLEYAN THOUGHT

LESLIE R. MARSTON, Ph.D.

(Bishop-Emeritus, Free Methodist Church)

I. INTRODUCTION

In the definition of Christian holiness the crisis-process problem has become a subject of keen discussion in Wesleyan ranks today, even as a century ago it had become an issue in historic Methodism.

The scope of this paper is threefold. First, to sketch the background of the problem set by John Wesley's persisting devotion to the term "Christian perfection" as essentially synonymous with the term "entire sanctification" to designate a second crisis in Christian experience. Second, to present a point of view which differentiates the two terms by identifying "Christian perfection" with the continuing process of spiritual growth from the new birth to life's end, and conceives of "entire sanctification" as a normal event of heart-cleansing and love-infilling occurring within the life-time process. Finally, to develop this approach by reviewing the writings of a leader in the holiness movement of a century ago whose position, strangely enough, has been obscured if not lost to the present century.

II. JOHN WESLEY AND THE MYSTICS

In John Wesley's prolonged quest for holiness as the ground upon which, in his thinking, he must claim justification in God's sight, he became enamored with the Christian mystics and their pursuit of perfection. Some of these mystics were what Albert C. Outler (1) has called voluntaristic and others quietistic. By the former we understand Outler to mean activists who take Jesus Christ as their pattern, and strive by a sirenuous legalism to achieve a perfection in accord therewith. Such was William Law, an older contemporary of Wesley and his mentor for a critical period of his quest.

The quietists, on the other hand, were subjectivists who sought inward union with Jesus Christ by way of prayer, passive contemplation, and detachment from the world because of its inherent corruption. By demeaning the human body as inherently evil and removed

from the spirit by an impassable gulf, some quietists drifted into crass antinomianism on the assumption that vile deeds of the body could not possibly come into contact with, and thereby contaminate, one's spiritual being.

In his questing years, the spiritual emphasis of the quietists appealed to Wesley, but he drew back from their influence when he observed the antinomian trend of their teachings. But this was not until the choking grip of subjectivism had brought him very near the brink of tragedy. While on his Georgia mission he analyzed the hazards of the quietistic mystics in a letter to his brother, Samuel, Jr., in which he made this confession: "I think the rock on which I had nearest made shipwreck of faith was the writings of the mystics: under which I comprehend, and only those, who slight any of the means of grace." (2)

He had followed also the path of activism by most dutifully performing good works. Upon his return from America, however, he came under the influence of the learned and pious Peter Bohler and by him was convinced of the futility of works-righteousness. About a fortnight prior to his Aldersgate deliverance, Wesley wrote a sharp rebuke to his former counselor, William Law, charging him with teaching obedience to the law and Jesus Christ as the pattern of the law's fulfillment, but failing to point him to simple faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour. (3) By this time Wesley had accepted intellectually Peter Bohler's tutelage in salvation by faith, but he had not yet grasped its full meaning in the assurance of personal salvation.

III. JOHN WESLEY DISCOVERS THE WAY OF FAITH

A few days later this assurance did come to him, and although for several months thereafter he was beset by severe inner struggles, he did not again sink into the morass of his former miseries of mysticism. When, because of these struggles, for a time he so completely lost his assurance of salvation that he asserted that no longer was he a Christian, nevertheless he stoutly affirmed the validity of the experience of divine forgiveness he had received at Aldersgate.

Some call the later Wesley a mystic on the basis of his Alders-

gate conversion and his emphasis thereafter on a heart religion. The scope of this paper does not permit extended discussion of this claim, but we venture to offer a few observations. The later course of Wesley's active and fruitful life reflects an inner organization by which he far transcended his earlier mysticism. Outler writes of his mature view of perfection as calling for "holiness in the world... active holiness in this life." (4) He who had sought the reality of God earnestly, but in vain by mystical routes, both voluntaristic and quietistic, entered at Aldersgate into a personal relationship with God through faith in Jesus Christ as his Saviour.

His early failures and this later discovery of the way of faith point up the difference between "mystical religion" and "personal salvation"--a distinction his spiritual descendants should hold clearly in focus while facing the dazzling blur of the world's present religious confusion. Mysticism is the quest for reality by way of man's own capacities, whether subjectively or objectively exercised. Evident to all is the legalism of the voluntaristic mystic, and Wesley came to discern also that even his quietism had been a form of self-salvation. But true faith is the response, not of a special mystical faculty or of any power of one's being, but of one's essential self--his entire being--to the call of God.

IV. WESLEY'S PERSISTING EMPHASIS ON CHRISTIAN PERFECTION

Now we return to pre-Aldersgate Wesley and the writers who so largely influenced him in his early adult years. In *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* (5) Wesley has outlined the steps of his approach to the doctrine of Christian perfection over a period of more than forty years, beginning with the year of his graduation from Oxford University and his ordination as deacon in 1725.

According to his retrospect, in 1725 Wesley read Bishop Taylor's *Rules of Holy Living and Holy Dying*. This led him to dedicate his entire life to God--his thoughts, words, actions--so deeply did the book impress him with the importance of purity of intention. In 1726 he read *The Christian Pattern* by a Kempis, from which he understood that "simplicity of intention, and purity of affection" are "'wings of the soul' without which she can never ascend to the mount of God" --

here indeed is language of the mystic!

A year or two later he read William Law's two classics of devotion, *Christian Perfection* and *Serious Call*. These led him "to be all devoted to God--to give Him," he said, "all my soul, my body, my substance." And then in 1729, Wesley reports, he became a "a man of one book." He resorted to the Bible "as the one, the only standard of truth, and the only model of true religion." Thereby he was brought to see religion "as a uniform following of Christ, an entire inward and outward conformity to our Master." On January 1, 1833 he reports a sermon which he preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, on the subject "The Circumcision of the Heart." In that sermon he defined a "circumcised heart" in terms of cleansing, holiness, and becoming "perfect even as the Father in heaven is perfect." This was more than five years before his Aldersgate conversion!

And Wesley extends the record, adducing still other instances to attest his having advocated Christian perfection long before the publication of *A Plain Account* in 1765. But these instances, and those recounted above more specifically, point alike to the conclusion that to John Wesley, and to his favorite authors with a leaning toward mysticism, Christian perfection signified, not so much a state of grace initiated by a spiritual crisis subsequent to the new birth, as a life-time striving to reach the Christian ideal by following Jesus as pattern. These earlier teachings and searchings did indeed hold to the scriptural standard of holiness of heart and life, but Wesley seems not so specific on a second crisis during the period covered by his retrospect as he had become at the time he wrote *A Plain Account*.

V. CRISIS-PROCESS: TOWARD A SOLUTION

Can it be that there is a valid concept of Christian perfection applicable to any and every stage and phase of the Christian life, both before and following the crisis of entire cleansing? In the course of Wesley's evangelistic endeavors following Aldersgate, he observed that a second crisis occurred in the experience of many believers some time after their conversion crisis. We ask, did Wesley incorrectly identify this second crisis with the initiation of the Christian

perfection he long had advocated? Should he not have related this second crisis to that perfection by defining it as the consummation of the process of sanctification which, he had consistently taught, begins in regeneration? Has the confused thinking concerning crisis and process developed in measure from Wesley's equating Christian perfection with entire sanctification, whereas the former may be a lifelong perfecting process and the latter an event of the moment, experientially realized and belonging within the context of that perfecting process?

A century after Wesley an affirmative answer to such questions was offered by one now little remembered within American Methodism.

VI. BENJAMIN T. ROBERTS

As a young man Benjamin T. Roberts had chosen the law as his profession, but when nearing his bar examination he was converted; and then began his preparation for the Methodist ministry. Thus it happened that in Wesleyan University Roberts became a classmate of Daniel Steele with whom he shared academic honors and, from Wesleyan, he received the degrees Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. His career following his university training combined the Christian ministry, church administration, and religious journalism.

From 1860 to his death in 1893 Roberts edited and published *The Earnest Christian*, an independent family magazine similar in character but, some would say, journalistically superior to the more widely known *Guide to Holiness*. In his *Story of Methodism*, A.B. Hyde said of Roberts, "He was a brilliant and effective speaker, and a concise, clear, energetic writer." (6) A contributor to such a standard work as McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature* characterized Roberts as "a writer of considerable power" whose "editorials, tracts, and essays display argumentative ability, and the faculty of uttering truth concisely." (7)

This brief of Roberts' career and accomplishments has been presented to establish his competence in the religious and literary fields. We forego discussion of his far-seeing concern with social, economic

and ecclesiastical reforms as not relevant to the purpose of this paper.

VII. THE HOLINESS TEACHINGS OF ROBERTS

Following the death of B. T. Roberts in 1893, his son, Benson H. Roberts, compiled from his father's editorial writings, which had extended across the third of a century, a book of 256 pages under the title, *Holiness Teachings*. (8) Timothy L. Smith, well-known scholar within Wesleyan ranks today, has characterized this book as emphasizing "the ideal of perfect character toward which he (Roberts) believed perfect love and all other authentic religious experiences tend." (9) We list herein six emphases of *Holiness Teachings*, five of which are stated without amplification. The sixth, because of its direct bearing on the crisis-process issue, is considered here more in detail.

(1) *Initial sanctification*. Sanctification begins with the new birth by which the sinner becomes "in an important sense, a holy man," with power over his impulses to sin.

(2) *Entire sanctification*. In entire sanctification, full cleansing comes with a man's complete surrender of every power and possession to the Holy Spirit's control, such that all his motives become promptings of perfect love to God and to all men.

(3) *The human element*. Entire sanctification renders a man not one whit less human, depriving him of no trait or power with which he is constitutionally endowed by creation.

(4) *Backsliding*. If the vital connection of faith for cleansing is broken, the holiness of the sanctified yields to the invasion of corrupting tendencies to sin, and these propensities may lead again to the outward transgressions of a backslidden state.

(5) *Perfect love*. The vital core of entire sanctification is perfect love expressed to God and man through all one's powers of soul, strength and mind, however widely these powers may vary in degree and in rate of progress with different

persons.

As thus briefly stated, these emphases may seem commonplace. But supported in the book itself by Roberts' pungent phrasing of his clear insights and by his lucid applications and scriptural citations, they offer a clear guide to holiness. Moreover, they provide a framework in which Roberts' distinctive contribution to the crisis-process issue may be viewed.

VIII. CHRISTIAN PERFECTION

In the term "Christian perfection" we reach the point at which Roberts diverged from the traditional Wesleyan usage to give a broader meaning thereto than that included in either "entire sanctification" or "perfect love." Roberts applied the term to the entire span of a sincere Christian's development toward full maturity. It was his claim that the biblical command to be perfect refers, not to any specific step or crisis in the Christian life, but to its every phase and stage. He wrote:

The command "be perfect" does not express any well known, definite act like the command "repent"; nor any particular experience like being "born again." It is taken in a wider sense; with a greater latitude of meaning. It applies to a child of God in various stages of his experience. A blade of corn may be said to be perfect in a dozen different stages of its growth. But if, before it is ripe, it stopped growing, it would not be perfect. So, at a certain period of his experience, a person may be said to be a perfect Christian, and yet his attainments in piety be small in comparison with what they are after fifty years of toil and sorrow. (10)

Roberts illustrated this point further by drawing upon the increasing perfection of the intellectual powers, which at one stage may be perfect but later reach higher perfections with further growth and discipline.

A young man leaves the district school for the academy. He has studied hard and begins to reap some of its fruits. The teacher, proud of his pupil, says: "He is perfect in his mathematics. He can solve every problem in the hardest arithmetic."

After three years in the academy with a mathematics lesson every day, he is sent to college, recommended as "perfect in mathematics." He is well versed in algebra, geometry and trigonometry. After studying mathematics in college four years, having completed his course, he graduates with the highest honors of the mathematical department. He then goes to some special school and spends perhaps three more years in studying mathematics as applied to astronomy or to civil engineering. Then again he is pronounced perfect in his well-mastered study. At the end of a life of unremitting study, we hear him say with the immortal Sir Isaac Newton, "I seem like a child standing upon the shore of the ocean gathering pebbles. I have picked up here and there a pearl, while the great ocean of truth lies unexplored before me."

So when one becomes a Christian his conversion may be perfect; when his heart is purified by faith he may be perfectly sanctified; and still after years of growth in grace we hear him saying with Job when he got sight of God, "Wherefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." Yet God had twice pronounced him perfect. (11)

Thus Roberts maintained that Christian perfection is not a definite step to be taken by faith, as regeneration or entire sanctification, but is a continuous process and inclusive category involving day by day obedience and discipline, and warns that "we must not confound the perfection which the Gospel requires with perfect love or entire sanctification. The Scriptures do not use these terms as synonymous." And he cites passages:

We never read in the Bible of any being made perfect by faith. We read of persons being "justified by faith" (Rom. 5:1; 9:30; Gal. 3:24), of being "sanctified by faith" (Acts 15:9; 26:18), but never once of a person being made perfect by faith. Quite another element enters into the making of the saints perfect.

"For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings" (Heb. 2:10). The perfection which the Gospel enjoins upon the saints can only be attained by fidelity in doing and patience in suffering all the will of God. A symmetrical, well-balanced, unswerving Christian character is not obtainable at once. (13)

If Roberts here rightly divides the Word of truth, the final perfection of the Christian is not an instantaneous gift of God's grace to be received alone by the prayer of faith, but comes in the lifelong processes of a ripening Christian character. "We are to seek it," says Roberts, "as a well disposed boy seeks a vigorous manhood by shunning the vices and overcoming the temptations to which he is exposed, and by doing faithfully the duties to which he is called." (14)

Conceived thus, Christian perfection is not static, given once for all as a state of grace in which the Christian may rest. It is a conquest leading to further conquests by faithful service and patient endurance.

IX. WESLEY AND ROBERTS

Nowhere in his Holiness Teachings did Roberts refer to Wesley's "second-crisis" concept of Christian perfection as differing from his own life-process" concept. Perhaps he discerned in Wesley's writings a hint of the insights that had come so clearly to him. Certainly his intent was not critical opposition to Wesley's concept, for then he must have made a direct attack. His purpose could have been to clarify a cloudy spot in Wesley's analysis of Christian experience.

In his later maturity Wesley wrote what strongly inclines towards Roberts' position. In one of his letters he states that there are two ways "wherein it pleases God to lead his children to perfection: doing and suffering." Also worthy of note as pointing to Wesley's vague anticipation of Roberts' life-process concept are these words concerning Christian perfection in A Plain Account: "It is improvable. It is so far from lying in an indivisible point, from being incapable of increase, that one perfected in love may grow in grace far swifter than he did before." (15)

John L. Peters has observed that in such a statement, "Wesley implies a distinction which he generally fails to maintain . . . between entire sanctification as an event and Christian perfection as a continuing process of which that event is a part." It would be difficult indeed to formulate a more adequate statement of Roberts' distinction between entire sanctification and Christian perfection

than this phrasing by Peters. Peters further asserts of Wesley's statement that here, "Wesley displays one of the most significant, and neglected, facets of his teaching." (16)

Regarding entire sanctification Wesley and Roberts were in agreement. Neither held to a doctrine of "gradualism" which repudiates a crisis in the entire cleansing of the heart and its infilling with love, and each maintained that the sanctification initiated in regeneration is consummated in cleanness-- a completed act, as signified by the j" aorist tense of the verb "cleanse" (katharisomen) in II Corinthians 7:1, ". . . let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God " (KJV).

Furthermore, both Wesley and Roberts held that beyond the event of heart-cleansing and its correlated infilling of love, there is in the normal course of Christian experience a continuous progress in holiness as signified by "perfecting" (epitelountes) in the passage above cited. This love, although perfect in quality, is capable of increase in degree and in scope of application to ever-widening areas of life's relationships, even as Peter admonished Christians to "grow in grace and in a knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (II Peter 3:18, KJV).

But as already noted, Roberts explicitly set forth in Holiness Teachings what seems contrary to the general tenor of Wesley's position, in holding that spiritual progress of the sincere Christian prior to the second crisis of entire sanctification may properly be ascribed to progress in Christian perfection. Wesley applied the term Christian perfection only to such progress as follows the post-conversion crisis of entire cleansing.

X. BY WAY OF CONCLUSION

Near the close of A Plain Account of Christian Perfection Wesley wrote: I say again, let this perfection appear in its own shape, and who will fight against it? It must be disguised before it can be opposed. It must be covered with a bearskin first, or even the wild beasts of the people will scarce be induced to worry it. (17)

Hopeful as Wesley may have been that A Plain Account would tear off the bearskin and correctly disclose the distinctive teachings of Methodism, it seems that a corner of the bearskin still covered at least one area. Further unveiling was left to one of Wesley's devoted followers of the succeeding century. In the light of this unveiling as described in the preceding pages, and at the risk of incurring the charge of presumption, we conclude with two observations:

(1) Much of the centuries-long confusion and controversy following upon Wesley's choice of the term "Christian perfection" might have been avoided had he not identified this favorite concept of his questing years with the second-crisis experience of early Methodists, and if instead he had applied the term to the normal progress of the obedient and fully trusting Christian, from the new birth through every stage to the ultimate perfection of eternity.

(2) The somewhat stultifying figure of "states of grace" (should we say "plateaus"?), lamented by Wesley himself, might then have yielded place to the figure of an ascent--a continuous upward progress in the spiritual life of the Christian, in which occurs the crisis-event of entire sanctification, and following which, in consequence of the Christian's deliverance from the drag of inbred sin, the angle of ascent more nearly approaches the vertical--that ultimate perfection of eternity (see Heb. 6:1; 12:22-24). A Diagram Representing "Plateau" Versus "Dynamic" Concepts of Christian Experience

Diagram Representing “Plateau” Versus “Dynamic”
Concepts of Christian Experience

Unavailable

Documentations

- (1) Albert C. Outler, Ed. John Wesley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 252.
- (2) John Telford, Ed. The Letters of John Wesley (London: Epworth Press, 1931), I, p.207.
- (3) Nehemiah Curnock, Ed. The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M. (London: Epworth Press, 1938), VIII, 319, et. seq.
- (4) Outler, op. cit.
- (5) John Wesley, A Plain Account of Christian Perfection (London: Epworth Press, 1952), p.5, et seq.
- (6) A.B. Hyde, The Story of Methodism (New York: M.W. Hazen Co., 1888), p. 319.
- (7) N.S. Gould "Free Methodists" in Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876), pp. 187~189.
- (8) Benson H. Roberts, Compiler-Editor, Holiness Teachings Compiled from the Editorial Writings of the late Rev. Benjamin T. Roberts, A. M. (N. Chili, N.Y.; Earnest Christian Publishing House, 1893), 256 pp.
- (9) Timothy L. Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform (New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957), p.131.
- (10) Benson H. Roberts, op. cit. p. 209. et seq.
- (11) Ibid., 210, et seq.
- (12) Ibid., p.212, et seq.
- (13) Ibid., p. 211.
- (14) Ibid., p.212.
- (15) John Wesley, op. cit. p.8.
- (16) John L. Peters, Christian Perfection and American Methodism (New York Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), p.52.
- (17) John Wesley. op. cit., p.110.

A WESLEYAN VIEW ON PREACHING HOLINESS

MILDRED B. WYNKOOP, Th.D.

(Professor, Philosophy and Religion, Travecca College)

I. INTRODUCTION

How often ought one to "preach holiness"?

There are two extreme responses, both of which arise out of a misunderstanding of what holiness preaching is. One says, "Don't overdo it. Preach it once a month, or once a quarter, or once a year." The other says, "Preach it every time you go into the pulpit." And those who listen to him are apt to say, "We are tired of holiness. We wish our preacher would give us some food. We are 'emotionalized' into immobility."

In both cases the problem lies in the fact that holiness is interpreted too narrowly. It may mean a dry doctrinal sermon in which the bare theological bones are counted and properly located. Or it may mean a constant exhortation to a certain "experience" with no future growth beyond it. The difficulty rests mainly in the limitation of the meaning of holiness to the attainment of a second experience.

II. HOLINESS PREACHING MAJORS ON CONTENT, NOT METHODOLOGY

It is the thesis of this study, drawn from every specific element in it, that there is a danger of stressing methodology until the moral, personal and life relevance is almost totally obscured. Considered biblically, when this is the case, however correct it may be in stressing the crisis issues, the preaching is no longer holiness preaching. Every biblical exhortation was to a specific moral decision reaching into the farthest areas of life.

Biblical preaching will major on the content of the word holiness, pressing its demands upon the heart and life. It is basically a Christ-centered word. Every facet of the use of the word is bound up inextricably with Christ and His demands on us. And this is totally in keeping with the biblical idea of holiness as centered in God.

To major in preaching on any other emphasis, or to overstress any one element over another within the total gospel approach, is to take the risk of "running out of sky." Only this spiritual, dynamic approach is capable of extended life and infinite increase. Only the moral demands of the gospel, as given us in the New Testament, can provide an adequate preaching substance which never grows old. Under it people come into salvation, mature in it and retain a perennial interest. Any other approach to holiness ends in a dead-end street. The possibilities are soon exhausted and formalism is the inevitable consequence for lack of relevance.

A. *Moralism has been tried and found wanting.* Hebrew moralism is the classic example. It is easier to "keep law" than to be right. Keeping the law, however, without being right ends in the self-righteousness which is both repulsive to the on-looker and spiritually disappointing to the law-keeper. When the dynamic of holiness theology wanes, its ideals tend to be translated into a moralism which isolates people from the life in which they need most to be immersed. Moralism ends in spiritual bankruptcy.

B. *Intellectualism or rationalism has "too low a ceiling."* Greek philosophy is the classic example. Its passion is to capture and preserve in logical formulae and precise expressions every detail of the Christian faith. The genius of Greek thinking gave the Christian church its ecumenical Christological creeds. But when it failed to keep practical concerns in its range of thinking it ran into the dead-end of fruitless controversy in which the Eastern Church became entombed. It is possible to talk holiness theology into a grave. To know its content requires a corresponding obligation to do its truth. When this fails, the doctrine becomes a headstone to the grave of those who have betrayed it.

C. *Works is a dead-end street.* Catholicism is its classic example. Perfection that is earned by self-denial, acts of penance, and good deeds is not Christian perfection. It is superficial and spiritually barren. The whole thing ends in a legalistic system of meritorious ritual that can and has issued in moral bankruptcy. The spiritual ceiling is too low.

D. *Psychological patterning also has a low ceiling.* "Experi-

ence," if it be not guarded, becomes either a dismal source of truth--as in liberalism, or an irrational test of truth--as in emotionalism. Experience, or the life relevance of salvation truth, divorced from objective norms of truth, ends in a dangerous confusion about emotional states. Any preoccupation with psychological states must end in false tests of the true and a virtual denial of moral life. In the interest of a wholesome presentation of the message of holiness it must be said that there is a danger of emphasizing the psychological aspect of experience so largely that the moral relevance is almost obscured.

None of these approaches can maintain the spiritual dynamic of the New Testament gospel message. All of them begin in a truth, but tend to reach the climax of their truth and then decline. If they are to survive, they must be maintained in some unspiritual way. The ceiling is too low again. There is no "future." They run out of spiritual sky. Only the spiritual and moral approach characteristic of the New Testament message continues to throb with life century after century, and--more miraculously--throughout the expanding life of a person. The true holiness message does not exhaust itself in issues which are discarded by a growing psyche. Maturity cannot outdate it. Properly preached, "holiness" has no ceiling. It is as big as the future and more challenging than the deepest capacity any person can possibly fully explore.

III. HOLINESS PREACHING IS CONCERNED WITH MORAL ISSUES

Holiness preaching grapples with moral issues and includes the secondary matters, such as methodology, only insofar as these help to relate the moral imperative to human experience. But even here, great care needs to be exercised. It is not the task of a preacher to convict his listeners of sin, particularly the ultimate forms of sin which lie so deep in the human heart that only the Holy Spirit can uncover them (John 16:8). Wesley had a good word for us here. To the question, "In what manner should we preach sanctification?" he answered,

Scarce at all to those who are not pressing forward; and to those who are, always by way of promise; *always drawing, rather than driving* (Italics mine).

It is not the task of the preacher, moreover, to tell anyone where and when this inner cleansing is to take place. In the zeal for "results" there has grown up a patterned methodology which is pressed with so much urgency as to dangerously threaten the real issues, namely, "If you come to the altar today you will go home 'sanctified.'" A spirit of haste dissipates the spirit of depth. Dwayne Hildie speaks significantly to this important consideration thus:

This invitation was further implemented by an enthusiastic corps of altar workers who followed pretty much a set pattern which would include proper instruction, encouragement, singing--nearly always ending in an exhortation to 'take it by faith.' But if we project human methods on the seeker to the extent that he really does not pray through, we send him home with an empty heart and with no real work done. We can only estimate his reaction and disappointment when, within forty-eight hours probably, he can discern not one bit of difference in his life. (2)

The moral commitment is so deep, so personal, and so intimate that no human being can accompany another into the depth of that act. No humanly structured haste can do more than hinder the solid, painstaking way of the Holy Spirit with a human heart. It takes time for the "I" to divest itself of its self-righteous garments. Or, it takes time for the "I" to push past the impersonal things with which it identifies itself into a naked self-awareness capable of the kind of commitment to Christ that will change the whole atmosphere of the self.

Preaching holiness is preaching Christ. Preaching Christ is pressing upon the heart that kind of truth which Jesus pressed. If there is one way to describe it, it would be the challenge to straight thinking. It has been argued that it was the manner of Jesus' preaching that gave offense. He claimed to be the authority and that was not palatable to the ecclesiastical mind. But, as John Baker said, it was rather

His deliberate policy of driving men back to the point of self-examination, beyond their conventional attitudes, beyond their prejudices and their proneness to deceive themselves and to make excuses for their behavior. (3)

Baker makes a strong and acceptable point of this matter. Christ was constantly doing and saying things that would force a reappraisal of personal motivation. "On each point Christ puts the emphasis where it was rarely put-- upon the inner thought and motive preceding the action." He broke good rules-- failing to wash before eating, for example-- in order to attack the loose thinking of His age. He called no one to follow Him under false pretenses. "He gave them no theories to swallow whole--He lived with them so they could thoroughly examine His claims."(4)

But Christ's most telling exposures had to do with the more subtle forms of self-deceit--those which covered unholy motives with worthy ideals. Jews desired and prayed for the kingdom, but Jesus showed them in parable and preaching that a pious desire apart from a clean heart and an accompanying personal commitment was hypocrisy. Christ wanted to save men and women, but He could not do that until they became honest with themselves, stopped making excuses, and gave up their pretenses. "That was why he put such emphasis on straight thinking." (5)

Preaching Christ is, also, preaching the deepest continuing moral responsibility for a life of Christian expression--not only in words (how formal they can become), but in action. Love is the atmosphere of holiness, and love is the expenditure of the self. In the best sense of the word, holiness cannot happen in a moment. It may begin in a moment, but as love cannot mature without expression, so holiness, which is love, cannot exist apart from the life expression of it.

IV. HOLINESS PREACHING, PROPERLY EMPHASIZED, POINTS TO CRISIS

The biblical approach to that crisis, which in holiness theology is called "the second work of grace," constitutes the heart of the Christian gospel. No psychological methodology, theological terminology, or mathematical designation can obscure the stark moral meaning of crucifixion with Christ.

The Scripture passages demanding a "putting off" of sin, a "putting on" of the new man, or requiring obedience from the heart, or a

presenting of the self as a living sacrifice, are not mere advisory admonitions but the very essence of the gospel appeal. Forgiveness is never considered the summum bonum of the Christian life. The New Testament is largely and principally written to Christian believers, and it is not all comfortable reading. Biblical reading gives us the impression that great danger exists that the grace of God may be received in vain, that the Spirit may be grieved, that the sin of our first parents may be repeated in us. The urgent calls to self-purging, pursuing sanctification, perfecting holiness, yielding to God, bringing thoughts captive to the obedience of Christ, and many others, are not to be lightly regarded. If not heeded, they all carry serious consequences.

All of these urgent exhortations drive one to the place of total moral commitment. The dangers relative to probation are great enough without the added hazard of an uncommitted heart which is itself impurity and which is always the source of enmity against God. Probation does not end with the new birth. To maintain a committed heart is the responsibility of those under probation.

Commitment completes moral experience. Moral integration is in preparation for the temptations of the enemy which can precipitate spiritual breakdown. We are told that very few German Christians maintained their integrity under the torture of the Russian prison life. However that may be, none of us knows how he might react to the sudden shock or prolonged testing which in some form awaits us in life. It is not the strong will that prevails, but the heart that has met the full force of Christ's demands. The relatively low level on which many Christians meet their "waterloo" testifies to the shallow commitment they have made.

The crisis of which we speak is that moment to which the Holy Spirit drives us in his relentless searching of our motives when we meet a deeper test of fidelity to Christ than any other we will meet in life. No self-induced emotion on the matter will do. Only the Spirit can show us the true motivation of our hearts. Only He can prompt a right response from the chastened heart. In this hour we are able to see the depth of ugliness in self-love and a more frightening sight we will never see. In this illumination one is made more, not less, de-

pendent upon the continuing mercy of God. A care and sensitivity never before known replaces any measure of self-assurance that the freedom of the Christian life may have produced.

The continuing cost of that freedom is an ever-deepening commitment commensurate with the ever-new expansion of personality and its capacities. When Wesley talked about a "moment by moment cleansing," he meant that this deep alignment with God's will had to be maintained, preserved intact, guarded carefully, and not left to disintegrate by default.

We have an example of this testing in our Lord Himself. The temptation experience was a part of the learned obedience. He met everything in that wilderness experience that He would meet in the course of his ministry. The "guy lines" were drawn tight. If there were flaws in them, they would show up. When we notice the thrust of each approach of Satan and relate it in Christ's later ministry we can see the areas of stress and know much about the key spots in the redemptive purpose. No Christian can expect to enter the full responsibility of service who has not himself been "led of the Spirit into the wilderness," there to be tested to the limit.

It is no wonder then that the preacher's message as he preaches Christ has to do with more than simply the privileges of the gospel. It has also its deepest responsibility.

V. HOLINESS PREACHING HAS CERTAIN BASICS

Among the several basics of holiness preaching are the following:

A. *Present Christ.* Press the claims of Christ, His love, His sacrifice for sin, His absolute Lordship. These must be made a living reality in the practical life. Press this, with all it means on everyone, sinner and saint alike. It is Christ who saves, He who calls, and He who convicts of sin and invites to discipleship and Christian service. No biblical preaching can by-pass Christ. It is Christ who validates, gives perspective to and sets the bounds around holiness preaching.

B. *Press for a personal moral encounter with God.* There is a place,

out alone with God, where each person must face for himself the issues of his moral and spiritual life. In that place he cannot order the procedure or determine the rules. The final obedience is to God, not to men. All the conflicting clamor of human advice and human norms of approval must be stilled in the presence of Him with whom we have to do. Moral life must begin here, and cannot begin until a high price has been set on spiritual integrity. This means that we dare not barge into that intimate encounter which we are arranging for others with our interpretation of God's requirements. We have done what is demanded of us when we have patiently cleared the way and led the feet of needy men into the presence of God. "Judge for yourselves whether we should obey God or men."

C. *Hold up the Cross.* There must come a death to self, but we must be careful that it is the right cross at the heart of our preaching and not one of our own making. There is a cross for the preacher, for he must have a clean heart in order to preach a clean, selfless, winsome message. His cross will keep him criticized and tender. It is a two-edged sword cutting both ways. It is not true that holiness makes Christianity too hard, but it is often true that the uncritical and undiscerning holiness preacher makes it hard in the wrong places and in the wrong ways. There is a cross for the hearer, but it must be the cross that Jesus presents. Let the human barriers to God be torn down in order that the sin barriers may be disclosed. It is Jesus who says, "Follow me." Let His voice be heard.

D. *Press for Decision, clear, clean and sharp.* The very structure of moral life demands decisiveness. It is not always easy to explain which of the many, crises in life is "second." But when under the guiding and prodding of the Holy Spirit the deepest self is brought face to face with God and the responsible decision of the self is a "yes" to God and His will, not simply as a sentiment but as a life motivation, and the Holy Spirit "takes over" with our deepest consent, the denotation "second" seems strangely appropriate. It is a different kind of response than the first. Each represents phases of the moral life. One is an acceptance of the responsibility of being in Christ and in grace.

E. *Press for a continuing commitment.* The need for decision in

ever-increasing and significant moral crises never ends. As personality enlarges and comes into new perspectives, as character develops, as temptation strikes with subtle force, as the expanding self creates new situations demanding moral responsibility, as the whole of life is seen to need spiritualization, new tensions are created which must be met with the same watch-care with which the first was met. Spiritual and moral deterioration sets in at the first careless moment. Cleansing is maintained only in the presence of the Holy Spirit. Holiness is not merely something "possessed" but a relationship to be maintained by a life of love to God and man. "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and death," said Paul. Death in the moral realm, as in the natural world, is held back by that strange integrating power called life. But when life ceases disintegration begins, both in the natural world and in the moral and spiritual realms as well. We must "walk in the Spirit" or forfeit life.

F. *Exhort to Growth in Love.* Love is necessary to the maintenance of holiness. The dimension of love, which is the practical dimension of holiness, cannot be neglected. Love is enlarged by use. That takes time and practice. It changes the whole perspective of life's values. It mellows, beautifies, and enriches the personality. Where love is lost, holiness is lost. Love is the adhesive power in human relations. It must increase or be forfeited. The test of holiness is love. It is a very practical and objective test, and the test which must often be applied to holiness profession. The deepening of love is an effective check on one's own testimony. It reveals progress in holiness or heralds its absence.

It will be seen that nothing is lost by a biblical presentation of holiness. The questions relating to the "second crisis" tend to dissolve in the dynamic of the moral appeal, but nothing of the decisiveness and victory of "second" is lost. The questions relative to perfection fall away when the moral nature of God's continuing demands of the expanding and maturing personality is understood. When "cleansing from all sin" is seen in its relation to a total commitment to God and the abiding of the Holy Spirit, the crude, materialistic or arrogant features of carnal humanity become less a barrier to its meaning. When love is seen to be the necessary atmosphere of a holy

heart and actually its description, the harsh, legalistic, self-righteous pretensions are rejected and holiness becomes the desirable and desired will of God.

VI. HOLINESS PREACHING CONSERVES THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE

The "last word" is an intensely personal word. I have a deep rebellion, a "beef," against the critics of the Christian religion. It is said that to be a Christian requires an inhibition of life and vitality and creativeness. But Christian faith is not a negation of life. Rather, everything we find in the Bible suggests that God is trying to liberate us from sin, failure, false ideals, low ceilings, smallness, and individualism. God wants us, in this life, to live fully, creatively. Being good is not simply not doing some things, but living out the dynamic of God's purpose.

A. *A pure heart is essential.* Without it Christianity is a smothering of life's impulses and grace would be an enemy of normal personality. There is a basic urge to self expression without which wholesome personality is impossible. An impure urge is death. God does not merely suppress the urge to evil. He cleanses the heart of double motives.

There is a cross in the Christian life, but the cross is not an end of the self. It is an end of the sin that shackles the self and blocks the way to goodness. The cross is always at the beginning of life. The whole of real life lies beyond it.

Rather than Christ curbing our personal development, He requires that we put our whole personality to work. This puts a new light on our Christian faith. It is not a retreat but a moral obligation to advance.

B. *Christ will not let me rest.* In His presence I cannot relax and rest on any supposed belief in Him which dulls moral sensitivity. He will not let me settle for less than my best--not yesterday's best but today's best. When I have done a job He confronts me with a bigger task--one too big for me. When I am selfish, He rebukes me until it smarts. When I am insensitive He has a way of prodding my

conscience into activity. When I cry and pray for a little heaven in which to go to heaven, He shows me the hell in which other people live. It is not time for heaven yet.

C. Purity is not an end in itself. Purity permits the personality to live in full expression of love to God and man. It is the power of a single-hearted devotion and must be kept intact by a daily fellowship with God.

Documentations

- (1) John Wesley, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* (Chicago: Christian Witness Company, n.d.), p.32.
- (2) Dwayne Hildie, *The Preacher's Magazine* (Kansas City, Missouri: The Beacon Hill Press, 1958), p.14.
- (3) John Baker, *The Expository Times*, March, 1956, p.179.
- (4) Loc. sit.
- (5) *Ibid.*, p. 181.

JOHN WESLEY, THE PHYSICIAN

DAVID STEWART, M.D.

*(Instructor in Psychiatry, University of Louisville,
and Private Practitioner of Psychiatry)*

It is surprising to this particular Methodist layman to find that he has difficulty in being objective about John Wesley. This was brought to his notice during research for this presentation when a historian referred to Wesley in a jocular and slightly derisive manner as "Brother John." Although this is an appellation to which Wesley might have taken no offense, it seemed at the time to be a tasteless way to refer to the Father of Methodism, a man who has assumed for many people a quality of being an ideal.

In his running battle with the medical and theological establishment it is difficult, from our two-century vantage point, not to cheer Wesley on. He lived in a time of much illness when rapacious medical frauds seemed to be the rule rather than the exception. Other missionaries, to this day, have been forced to treat sickness in a tradition as old as Christianity. Where therapeutic vacuums existed, something moved in. Ministers were intellectually and emotionally suited, or susceptible, to this move. They have always noted injustice, inadequacy, avarice or ineffectiveness in medical practice; and before the doctors organized such a tight union, the ministers were not hesitant to speak out.

I found that this profoundly enigmatic character of Wesley troubles me. Perhaps we know so much of him from his massive writing that generalization becomes inane and details confusing. It is the proverbial blind-man-with-the-elephant situation, and one must be careful not to see in Wesley just what one wishes.

It is safe to say that his background was characterized by the sort of influences which are inclined to yield a character of notably compulsive characteristics. Mother Susanna herself tells how she did it, "I insist upon conquering the will of children because this is the only strong and rational foundation of a religious education without which both precept and example will be ineffectual. But when this is thoroughly done, a child is capable of being governed by the

reason and piety of its parents till its own understanding comes to maturity when turned a year old they were taught to fear the rod and cry softly; by which means they escaped abundance of correction they might otherwise have had." (1)

This seems to approximate a definition of the parental attitudes inclined to produce the compulsive or anal character. The traits are produced by intense indoctrination in good behavior and cleanliness in infancy in order that the child may be socially conformed. The child is doing his best to gain control of his instinctual impulses and the amount of trauma which occurs here will influence his nature.

Signs of this type of personality include a strong urge to orderliness, cleanliness and frugality. If these traits become prominent, the individual may be said to have a compulsion neurosis. He will be exceedingly punctual and precise, loving order and striving for cleanliness and perfection. On the other hand, such a person may show a profound obstinacy. More details may be found in texts of psychiatry and psychology. This is not to diagnose Mr. Wesley as having a compulsion neurosis. But such a diagnosis is not necessarily a depreciation. It is often a power source for a most effective person.

Considering the amount of practice with child raising that Mrs. Wesley had, it is safe to say that she had developed a system which fitted her own particular inclinations, and also it fitted the austere situation in which she had to raise this large brood.

One need only note the more prominent characteristics of Wesley to see that he was a deeply compulsive person, given to rigidities. It may be stated that these characteristics served him both well and badly. The name "Methodist," although originally carrying a certain mocking quality, was very well chosen. But this rigidity and discipline of life led him to his educational achievements and much of his later effectiveness. It did, however, make him unbearably stubborn; capable, for example, of refusing communion to the girl in Georgia who jilted him. This he did for motives that seem so unworthy that he could surely not afford to see these motives in himself, and he let this tawdry episode terminate a missionary career which was undistinguished at best.

It was safe to say that he could be a difficult man with whom to work, brooking little dissent or opposition. In his earlier and more acidulous years he must have been the scourge of people less adept with the spoken and written word. Even those closest to him must have felt the firmness and contentiousness in his character. "Jack wouldn't satisfy the most pressing needs of nature," stormed his father, "unless he could find a reason for it." (2)

These observations are presented for two purposes. One is to indicate some details of the character which could produce so massively and in so many areas. A second is to show the profound influence on his life of his conversion experience. A shy, brilliant, groping, contentious, frustrated dud was thereby transformed into the great kinetic force to which even western civilization is indebted; he became a minister so cosmopolitan and erudite that he can be classed as one of the more influential medical practitioners of his day and the greatest public health authority of the eighteenth century.

In order to understand Wesley's ideas of medical therapeutics we must recognize other things about his life and times. Insight is obtained if we realize that in December 1716 and January 1717 the Wesley household was convinced that its home was inhabited by a very lively and noisome ghost, since publicized as the Epworth Poltergeist. A highly detailed account of this may be found in *The Encyclopedia of Witchcraft and Demonology*. (3) It has been suggested that Wesley himself may have suppressed some of the written material about this Poltergeist in order to protect his sister Hettie who was somewhat suspected of being the medium which fomented the phenomena.

The culture of his time was such that evil spirits were seen as ubiquitous, giving a terrifying yet secure explanation to the unexplained. A Protestant handbook, Michael Dalton's *Guide to Jurymen*, published in 1627, gave seven signs of bewitchment. The very first sign was "When a healthful body shall be suddenly taken and without probable reason or natural cause appearing."

At that time that most evil book *The Malleus Maleficarum*, or *The Hammer of Witches* written by the German Dominicans, Kramer and Sprenger, was first published in 1486 and was published in English

editions up to 1669, well after the birth of John's father. This is one Catholic book which was widely accepted by Protestants and it must be supposed that copies of this would have been available to Wesley as a student at Oxford. Witches were still being burned in England in the early 18th century. Perhaps such things contributed to his statement that "The giving up of witchcraft is, in effect, giving up the Bible." (4) Nonetheless his therapeutic modality showed at least uncertainty as to the validity of certain accepted magical treatments, and at other times led him to downright iconoclastic rejection of some authorities and their therapies. One gets the impression that he really may have come to question the theory of witchcraft as it applied to human illness, but was unable or unwilling to give it up entirely.

Another thing directing his attention toward physical problems was his own poor health, some of it falling into the area we might call psychosomatics. His brush with death by burning at age six, the real hunger that marked the years of his childhood, his father's imprisonment, and the quality of hostility which pervaded their existence may have left scars on the personality instead of the body. Such a child today, considering background and experiences, would surely be attending a Child Guidance Clinic for care.

Also what we would call delusion was the stuff of which belief was often formed. They were not all delusions. Some were simply inaccuracies bolstered by general acceptance and an amalgamation of faith with paleologic thinking, the natural result of unscientific man doing his best to understand the whys of life. To people of the eighteenth century, just as to primitive people today, the human body was wide open to spirits which moved about inside as if the body were hollow. If this concept is granted as valid, then the pain or affliction can attack at a certain spot and move about from hereto there, eventually coming to rest in an especially morbid area. Then good medicine may loosen the hold of the illness and drive it out. Pictures of such cures may be seen in ancient lithographs.

Yet we must note that even today our own culture is still resplendent with words and concepts having their origin in medical theory of other milleniums. For example, the word hysteria is derived from

the concept of a uterus which wanders about through the body causing varied difficulties. Less than one hundred years ago Freud drew uproarious laughter among colleagues when he referred to hysteria in males, a concept which they considered patently absurd because the organ, and presumably the disease, was naturally found only in the female. Perfectly healthy uteri have been removed by competent surgeons in this country, even in very recent times, because presumably they were in some way related to undefined but vaguely related psychic symptoms.

Then the word melancholia means literally "black bile," supposedly in excess. It is a word still heard, though without official medical status, and quite often applied to depression, although it dates back 2,500 years to the time of Hippocrates.

We can surely not afford to be smug. Americans will spend two billion dollars on quackery this year, a sum greater than the cost of all medical research being done in the United States, or greater than the entire cost of all medical education in this country. Quackery flourishes only with its constant companion, delusion, and we have much less excuse for it than our ancestors two hundred years ago.

There are several features of prime interest that characterize Wesley's therapeutic approach. For one thing, we note his devotion to frugality with drugs, a feature which must have endeared him as much to his followers as it infuriated the gentlemen of the faculties of medicine at the universities and perhaps also the apothecaries who made their living by selling medications. Also notable is his strong tendency toward pragmatism in therapeutics. He was obviously in favor of whatever worked, and he would cheerfully recommend certain treatments as being strictly tried and tested, often on himself.

Another feature was that he obviously used the principle that almost any sort of intervention is therapeutic, provided it is harmless and the sufferer believes that it has a chance of helping.

The very simplicity and straight-forward practicality of his treatments was inherently effective in many cases. The afflicted knew that something palpable was being done. He knew that he was being

nursed, treated, and fluttered over, whether with a warm puppy to the abdomen or soft toast poultices. This same human tendency toward improvement, even with a worthless treatment, is manifested today in our country in such matters as the recent krebiozen cancer cure scandal in Chicago. The faith of the patient in the therapy is of the greatest importance. We just have trouble defining it.

One of the more outstanding qualities with which Wesley can be credited was his remarkable ability to interpret human behavior. An especially striking instance is described in the journal in which he wrote of a woman who was being vigorously treated for stomach pains by the regular practitioners. He scorned these men for not realizing that her symptoms were caused by grief over the death of her son. Wesley clearly saw the parallel and described it appropriately. (5)

It was more than a century later that Dr. George M. Beard presented a paper entitled "The Influence of Mind in the Causation and Cure of Disease and the Potency of Definite Expectation." This was one of the original papers on what has come to be called psychosomatic medicine, or better, "Medical Psychology." Certainly man has long observed the relationship between emotions and physiology. Homer mentions the influence of fear on the viscera, but few had described it more directly than did Wesley, and few had used such precepts better in therapy.

Perhaps the most important single feature in Wesley's therapeutic approach was his unconscious utilization of a precept which he could not have known or defined. I refer to "homeostasis," a concept formulated by the physiologist, W.B. Cannon. Dr. Cannon states that there are mechanisms operating to keep certain physiological variables, such as concentrations and temperatures and pressures, within limits consistent with the normal function of the organism. (6)

This means that if the individual is chilled, mechanisms move to increase heat production and, therefore, body temperature. If the body is infected defense mechanisms begin to try to destroy the infecting agent and, secondarily, raise more defenses with antibodies which will make a repeat infection with the same organism less likely or impossible. If the body is injured then it immediately sets about re-

pairing itself as rapidly and as completely as possible.

The practice of medicine without the aid of homeostasis would be a very discouraging matter. When his natural homeostatic proclivities are rendered inoperable, either by the severity of the offending condition or by senescence, the patient's condition is described as terminal or hopeless. There is, therefore, an exquisitely sensitive physiologic gyroscope within each organism responding to the slightest nudge which tends to push the organism off course. The only good medical therapy is designed to supplement this natural mechanism, supporting and strengthening it and never rendering it inoperative. Meddlesome medicine is practiced today as it was a century or a millennium ago, but it is fortunately less common. We could excuse it in earlier times, but such is the state of medical science today there is seldom excuse for tampering with homeostasis.

This is one reason that your physician acquaintances become angry when faced with quackery as exemplified by a bad medical doctor and at least irritated with quackery such as spurious cancer cures, chiropractic, and the like. I imagine that the best doctor you know has an instinctive feel for homeostasis. He probably does not call it that, and he may not be consciously aware that he is supporting the concept but this "feel" for the natural resources of the body in distress is the most subtle part of the medical education. It comes gradually, hopefully increasing with experience. It gives the family doctor the ability to treat an upper respiratory infection conservatively, awaiting the reaction of the body to this physiological insult, hoping to avoid the use of antibiotics. It lets the obstetrician know just how much more a laboring woman can do and how much more she and her baby can stand, and it lets him know the point at which he must intervene. The mark of a good surgeon is not his inclination to operate but his caution, his ability to watch and wait alertly for the body to stabilize itself if it can. In the oldest extant oath of the physician, written a thousand years before Hippocrates, is found these words, "Do the sick no harm." As a potential patient you can take comfort that this concept is being taught as strongly today as ever. Wesley seemed to have a feel for homeostasis.

This brings us to the subject of Wesley's medical writings. His

style was marked by beautiful prose, often woven into a delicate filigree, but filled with needles for the adversaries that he obviously hoped would read it. I hope his speaking voice was up to his vocabulary and syntax. His medical writings also showed the same devotion to order which has been previously noted.

In all likelihood he produced three different volumes. The third one, espousing the use of static electricity in the treatment of illness, was published anonymously in 1760 under the title of *The Desideratum*. Two years earlier he had published a book *Advice with Respect to Health, Extracted from a Late Author*.

But by far the most important of his three books was *Primitive Physic, or an Easy and Natural Method of Curing Most Diseases*. This was first published in 1747 and went through many impressions and editions. The total number of copies printed is unknown, but it must have been one of the all-time medical best sellers.

This remarkable little book contained a very long preface in which the author pilloried and abused many of the standard medical practices and practitioners of his day. He also included some rules for good health which would need only moderate up-dating to be useful today. Following this was a list of two hundred and eighty-eight diseases and disorders, being treated by about nine hundred remedies using about one hundred and sixty drugs. Royalties from the sale of this book totaled an amazing equivalent of \$150,000, practically all of which was given away or was used to print more copies of the book for free distribution.

The details of his therapies will not be emphasized in this paper. Copies of the book are easy to come by since it was reprinted by the Epworth Press in 1960. Perusal of it makes for an interesting and edifying hour.

There seems little reason to believe that Wesley was a plagiarist. He seemed comfortably to give credit to many authorities of his day, and he quoted from their publications or borrowed their treatment. He had great respect for Doctors Sydenham and Willis, Cheyne and Tissot and others. The names of these men are familiar to doctors today.

There is a relaxed, familiar uncomplicated quality about the book. It is innocent of diagnostic hints so that the user of the book is not troubled with details of this nature. Generally speaking, the book is directed toward the symptomatic relief of chronic, rather than acute, disorders. The word "cure" is tossed about carelessly, and the user of the book could find great room to maneuver therapeutically within its covers.

There was some attention to magical treatments. Fevers were treated with pills of cobweb, cramps were treated with a roll of brimstone under the pillow. Treacle plasters, perhaps with soot, were used for fevers. A live puppy held on the abdomen was recommended for intestinal obstruction. In fairness it must be noted that these treatments were those recommended by recognized authorities, and were not Wesley's own concoctions. The puppy treatment was borrowed from the great Doctor Sydenham although he had actually recommended a kitten. To his credit we must note that Wesley avoided most of the truly bizarre or dangerous or revolting treatments of his day.

Outweighing the oddities was a large number of treatments that were generally harmless and often reasonable. Water was his great favorite. It was usually prescribed cold, sometimes as sea water or perhaps flavored with tar. It could be rubbed on, soaked in, or swallowed copiously. Cold water drunk cured such diverse things as ague, cholera, a cold, a cough, colic, palpitation of the heart, sore throat or bloody flux, gout of the stomach, sweating, plague, kidney stone or even ascites. Various baths were recommended no less than sixty times in his book, and one is again reminded of his compulsive nature with its emphasis on cleanliness.

It is of special interest to note the threads that bind the thinking of some primitive people to the treatments of Wesley. I have personally seen in Africa the use of the entrails of a snake as a poultice for the cure of snake bite, a practice recommended by Wesley. Cow dung poultices are likewise in favor in many undeveloped regions of the world, just as they were in eighteenth century England.

Another tie to modern times is seen in his footnote to the condition of nettle rash. He says, "In Georgia we call it, the prickly

heat." For the sake of researchers in the next century, I might comment that in 1968 Georgians, and all the rest of us too, still call it "prickly heat."

Only a few of his treatments were downright dangerous or repulsive. He was known to recommend human excrement for certain conditions. But he permitted bleeding the patient for few conditions and deplored the almost universal use of this malignant remedy by physicians and, although he recommended the use of metallic mercury for certain conditions, he agreed that it was dangerous.

In certain other areas he was ahead of his time. He clearly recognized the nature of scabies or itch. He stated that it was caused by a small insect in the skin, as it most certainly is, and treated it with sulphur, a very effective treatment, but it was another hundred years before this concept was accepted by most physicians. His theory that some diseases were airborne and could be contracted by inhalation was obviously correct.

Very few of his medications are still in use today. Digitalis certainly is. Tincture of male fern is occasionally recommended for tape worm infestations. The derivatives of opium still are employed widely, and sulphur has certain limited uses.

It would be comforting to say, in this age of enlightenment, that all of our current treatments are significant, effective and safe, but some of Wesley's treatments were no more spurious than some of ours. The wide-spread use of vitamins for every condition is an absurdity of our generation. The writer would be surprised if one vitamin pill in a thousand used in this country is necessary or has any laudable effect of a physiological nature. Many tranquilizers fall into the same general area. The widespread demand for antibiotics in uncomplicated colds or other viral infections is unscientific, totally ineffective and in many cases damaging, even though they are widely used.

In conclusion we can say that this most exceptional man seemed to have a basically hopeful view of people, which is a remarkable quality in one of his background and experience. He studied medicine, which was no great task in his age, and then happily withstood, perhaps even invited, the criticism of practitioners. He instinctively

used basic principles of human nature, but he used them for people rather than against them. He did not bring an intellectual approach to his medical pursuits, and he was at times ambivalent and confused. As has been stated, "Wesley was curious and inquisitive, but he was a better logician than observer, like many in his time, and it was a time when reason was valued much more highly than accurate observation. As Leckey says, Wesley had an exaggerated passion for reasoning but neglected premises." (7)

As with many of those who seek to do good, he refused, in the face of great need, to neglect the body while he was dealing with the soul. To his great credit, it must be acknowledged that he avoided the mixing of his theology with his treatments. To have done so would have increased the criticism of each field.

Man is at his highest when he does the best he knows to do. If ignorance or even delusion modifies what he does, then he may be wrong, but it is in accord with reality as he sees it. The great crime is to do nothing at all, and in this respect we must accord Mr. Wesley a major place in even the medical history of his century. He was as qualified as most of the physicians of his time and more so than many of them, and in addition he had a quality of unselfish devotion which must characterize the true therapist, the one who treats ills for the sheer fascination that comes when mortal man tilts with the forces of death and destruction. If he did little good with his drug therapies he did much good with his rules for healthful living. On the basis of his record we may welcome the Rev. Mr. John Wesley into the company of physicians. He was an honest doctor and, therefore, a good one.

Documentations

- (1) Wesley's Journal, p.94
- (2) Today's Health, Dec.1964, p.20
- (3) R. H. Robbins, author and editor, The Encyclopedia of Witchcraft and Demonology (Crown Publishers, 1959), pp.170-173.
- (4) Wesley's Journal, May 25, 1786.
- (5) Wesley's Journal, IV, p.313.
- (6) W.B. Cannon, The Wisdom of the Body (New York: Norton, 1939).
- (7) G. Dock, "The Primitive Physic of Rev. John Wesley," Journal of American Medical Association, Vol. LXIV, No. 8, 1915, p. 633.

Other Useful References

- Riddell, "Wesley's System of Medicine," New York Journal of Medicine, Vol.99, 1914, pp.64-68.
- Barager, "John Wesley and Medicine," Annals of Medical History, Vol. 10, 1928, pp. 59-65.
- Lichtwardt, Ancient Therapy in Persia and England.
- W. J. Turrell, "These Electrotherapists of the Eighteenth Century," Annals of Medical History, Vol.3, 1921, pp.361-367.
- "John Wesley and the Art of Healing," The British Medical Journal, 1906, pp. 987-988.
- "A Medical Tract by John Wesley," The British Medical Journal, 1902, pp. 780-799.
- W.J. Turrell, John Wesley, Physician and Electrotherapist (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938).
- Wesley Hill, John Wesley Among the Physicians (London: The Epworth Press, 1958).

A WESLEYAN VIEW OF THE SPIRIT'S GIFT OF TONGUES IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

CHARLES W. CARTER, Th.M., D.D.

(Professor, Philosophy and Religion, Taylor University)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Gift of the Law on Mount Sinai, the gift of His Son through the Incarnation at Bethlehem, and the gift of the Holy Spirit with His varied manifestations at Jerusalem during the Jews' Feast of Pentecost constitute three of God's greatest and most benevolent acts toward man. However, it is only with the last of these three divine gifts that we are concerned primarily in this study, but more especially with the accompanying divine phenomenon of the "other tongues," or different languages as recorded by Luke in the Book of Acts. Luke records this phenomenon, as it occurred initially, in Acts 2:1-4 thus:

"And when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place, and suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire, and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance (Acts 2:1-4). (1)

Luke says further, in verse 6, "and when this sound was heard (the "sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind," v.2) the multitude came together (some say as many as three million may have been present for the feast (2)) and were confounded, because that every man heard them speaking in his own language." Again the historian of this event remarks in verses 8 and 11, concerning the reaction of the multitude, "how hear we, every man in our own language wherein we were born? . . . we hear them speaking in our tongues the mighty works of God."

II. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SPIRIT'S GIFT OF TONGUES AT PENTECOST

Concerning the Greek word *glossai*, translated "tongues," Thayer understands it to mean the gift of foreign tongues." (3) It is a logi-

cal, moral and biblical necessity that any purported miracle should demonstrate its moral purpose and value in order to validate its claim to be miraculous. Rail has well said that "within Christian writings... miracles must be judged by the principles of the Christian faith and according to their moral meaning and spiritual value." (4) On the basis of these principles, the divine miracle of the gift of different languages at Pentecost, as recorded in Acts 2, was amply justified by the fruits of the gospel proclaimed through these media, in that about three thousand persons from the assembled multitude were converted to Christ and added to the Church (v.41).

It must be faced in all honesty from the very outset that the word unknown, in relation to the Bible "gift of tongues," does not occur in the original Greek of the New Testament, nor is it used in the American Standard or other modern versions. The word unknown occurs only in italics in the King James Version of the New Testament, indicating that it was added by the translators, and that misleadingly, in a futile attempt to clarify the meaning of the word "tongues." Thus, properly speaking there is no "unknown tongue" in the original language of the New Testament. The Greek word glossa, (5) meaning a tongue or a language or a nation of people distinguished by their language, is consistently used in its various forms throughout the New Testament, except where the Greek word dialektos (dialect), meaning "conversation, speech, discourse or language . . . the tongue or language peculiar to any people," (6) is employed.

Webster defines the word tongue as "The power of communication through speech . . . Act of speaking; esp., a spoken language," and the new Random House Dictionary defines a tongue as "the language of a particular people, region, or nation, i.e., the Hebrew tongue. A people or nation distinguished by its language" (Isa. 66:18; Rev. 5:9). Hence a tongue, in this sense, is an articulate, intelligible speech or language used for the purpose of communicating symbolized ideas or judgments from one person to another. This definition of a tongue accords with the biblical use of the word throughout the New Testament. With the occurrence of the miracle of languages at Pentecost the disciples "began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts 2:4), and the multitude exclaimed, "How hear we, every man in our own language wherein we were born?"

we hear them speaking in our tongues the mighty works of God" (Acts 2:8, 11).

It was the more amazing to the multitudes that they should hear the disciples speaking to them distinctly and intelligibly in their varied languages since these men were Galileans and presumably uneducated and provincial. F. F. Bruce remarks on this fact that

The reversal of the curse of Babel is probably in the narrator's mind . . . The Galilean dialect was so distinctive and difficult for non-Galileans to follow that the disciples released from the peculiarities of their local speech and their sudden capacity for speaking in tongues understood by the motley crowds then in Jerusalem could not fail to be remarked. when once the attention of the people had thus been attracted, Peter seized the opportunity to stand up with the other Apostles, and addressed all who were within earshot. (7)

Again, in the case of Cornelius' household, it is said that the Jews accompanying Peter heard them speak with tongues (glossai, languages) and magnify ("extolling," RSV; "exalting," NASV; "acclaiming the greatness of God," NEB; "glorifying," Phillips) God" (Acts 10:46). One observes:

It was a gracious accommodation to man that God provided the miracle in the realm of languages . . . Whatever sophistication any of us may acquire in using other languages, we will always find a special appeal to a message given to us "in the tongue in which we were born." That is to say, even if the polyglot multitude in Jerusalem might have "made some sort of sense" out of a one - language presentation on the Day of Pentecost, the impact would have been immeasurably less than it was. This suggests. . . God's adaptation of His dealing in our human involvement in the "mother tongue. (8)

Vincent notes that the "other tongues" of Acts 2:4 means

strictly different, from their native tongues, and also different tongues spoken by the different apostles (cf. Matt. 4:24). . (The Spirit) kept giving them the language and the appropriate words as the case required from time to time. It would seem that each apostle was speaking to a group, or to individuals.

The general address to the multitude followed from the lips of Peter.
(9)

To the objection of some that this was not so much a miracle wrought on the disciples, causing them to speak in other languages, as a miracle of hearing wrought on the listeners, Wesley replies:

The miracle was not in the ears of the hearers (as some have unaccountably supposed) but in the mouth of the speakers. And this family praising God together, with the tongues of all the world, was an earnest that the whole world should in due time praise God in their various tongues. (10)

Bengel observes on this incident that the disciples, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, began

to speak languages of which they had been before entirely ignorant. They did not speak now and then a word of another tongue, or stammer out some broken sentence, but spoke each language as readily, properly, and elegantly as if it had been their mother-tongue. They spoke not from any previous thought, but as the Spirit gave them utterance. He furnished them with the matter as well as the language. (11)

Likewise when this phenomenon occurred at Ephesus, Luke states that "they spake with tongues, and prophesied" (Acts 19:6). Both Clarke and Matthew Henry take the position that this "prophesying" was preaching in the miraculously given "tongues" (glossai languages) to people who could not have heard and understood the gospel message distinctly otherwise at that time.

III. THE RATIONALE FOR THE SPIRIT'S GIFT OF TONGUES AT PENTECOST

The Spirit's gift of tongues at Pentecost, in the foregoing sense, was necessary to meet the demands of the opportune situation that existed at Jerusalem during the Pentecostal feast when fifteen different linguistic groups, perhaps as many as three million people, were present and most would soon return to their respective countries to carry the gospel which they had heard.

There were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men, from every nation under heaven. And when this sound (the sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind) was heard, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man

heard them speak in his own language. And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying, Behold, are not all these that speak Galileans? and how hear we every man in his own language wherein we were born? (Acts 2:5-8).

Blaikie notes that these Jews, "unable to pay due regard to the ordinances of Moses in the different countries of their dispersion . . . seem to have made very great effort to come to Jerusalem to the annual festivals." (12) There follows a list of fifteen different nations which were represented at the Jerusalem Pentecost, into whose countries Jews of the dispersion (Diaspora) had been born, and whose languages they spoke, together with many gentile proselytes to the Jews' faith and "God fearers" from among the gentiles who were present at the Jerusalem Feast of Pentecost.

The objection that these "multitudes" of the dispersion would not have come to the Feast of Pentecost had they not known they would get much from a one-language observance can hardly be sustained. First, it was expected, if not actually legally required, of every Israelite to attend these feasts at Jerusalem and thus appear before the Lord, if such was within his ability. (13) Second, religious worship is a greater influence on men than religious language, important as is the latter. Third, in like manner every faithful Moslem is required once in his lifetime, if at all possible, to make the Pilgrim-age to Mecca (the Hal), and longs to do so. "In case of incapability a Moslem may send a substitute on this sacred duty." (14) Certainly a vast percentage do not understand intelligibly the Arabic language, even though they may have memorized sections of the Koran. And even a greater number have no knowledge of the Arabic language used in the religious services at Mecca.

The Diaspora is a term referring to the Jews who were scattered throughout the ancient world during and following the Exile. In all, there were five of these dispersions which took place before the coming of Christ. The first occurred in about 722 B.C., when the Ten Northern Tribes of Israel were conquered by the Assyrians, taken into exile, and eventually scattered among the nations. The second occurred in about 586 B.C., when the Southern Kingdom was defeated and the Jews were carried into captivity by the Babylonians and sub-

sequently planted in separate colonies throughout the whole of the 127 provinces of the Persian empire, all the way from India to Africa, by the Persians who succeeded the Babylonians (Esther 1:1; 3:8-15). It is common knowledge that the Jews of the Northern Kingdom never returned from their exile, and that only a small percentage of the Jews of the Southern Kingdom returned to Palestine after some seventy years of exile. Concerning the other three pre-Christian Jewish dispersions, Benjamin W. Robinson states:

During the third century B.C., when Egypt controlled Palestine, Jews migrated in large numbers to Alexandria, so named after Alexander the Great. There they formed a considerable colony in the city, adopted the Greek language, and translated the Old Testament into Greek. In the second century B.C., when Syrian power became dominant in Palestine, the Jews migrated northward and settled in large numbers around Antioch. They went farther into Cilicia, following the line of march of Alexander over into the cities of Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece. After Pompey and the Roman armies conquered Palestine in the first century B.C. the dispersion of the Jews gradually reached to the ends of the Roman Empire. (15)

In order to comprehend the fuller significance of the necessity for the miracle of other languages on the day of Pentecost, it is necessary to examine briefly the character of the hearers to whom the gospel was preached at the Jerusalem Feast of Pentecost, as recorded in Acts 2. Luke states that there were dwelling at Jerusalem, 'Jews (some omit the word "Jews"), devout men, from every nation under heaven" (Acts 2:5). This vast multitude would have consisted of the Jerusalem and Judaeans Jews and proselytes who resided more or less permanently in Jerusalem. However, as previously noted, there was also a vast host of the Jews, together with their proselytes and God-fearers, present from the lands of the dispersion.

The language problem at Pentecost, represented by this "multitude," is suggested by the presence of "Parthians," "Medes," "Elamites," and Mesopotamian Jews, from the nations beyond the Roman Empire and the influence of Rome where the Israelites had been carried captive and scattered by the Assyrians and Babylonians in 722 and 586 B.C. (cf. II Kings 17:6). These Jews "had by this time ceased to use the Hebrew and had adopted the mother tongues of the coun-

tries whither they had been scattered." (16) "Mesopotamia," the chief Jewish center of which was Babylon, famed for its rabbinical schools, and formerly the point of the "confusion of tongues" at the halting of the construction of the Tower of Babel, receives special notice by Luke. "Judea," probably as distinguished from Galilee, the home of Christ's disciples, was naturally represented. "Cappadocia," "Pontus," "Asia," "Phrygia" and "Pamphylia" represented the countries of Asia Minor from which foreign-born Jews and proselytes had come to Pentecost. Egypt, where according to Philo, the famed Greco-Jewish philosopher of Alexandria, a million Jews resided and formed a large part of the population of the city and imbibed much of the Hellenic culture, including language, having been lured there by Alexander the Great, sent its representatives to the Jerusalem Pentecost. North African "Libya" and the North African Greek city of "Cyrene," a quarter of whose great population consisted of Jews with full citizenship rights, who had been sent there by Ptolemy Soter, also sent representatives to the Jerusalem Feast of Pentecost. It is of special interest that it was Simon of Cyrene who bore the cross of Christ enroute to Calvary (Matt. 27:32), that there were those of the synagogue of the Cyrenians who disputed with Stephen on the occasion of his martyrdom (Acts 6:9), that Christian representatives of Cyrene first bore the gospel to the Greek population of Antioch of Syria (Acts 11:20), and that there was a Christian prophet, Lucius of Cyrene, in the Antioch church who played an important part in launching the first Christian missionary journey of Paul and Barnabus (Acts 13:1). "Strangers" and "sojourners from Rome," both "Jews" and "proselytes," were present. And finally, inhabitants of the large Mediterranean Island of "Crete" and of the "Arabian" peninsula are named as having been present at Pentecost. All of these born Jews, together with their proselytes and God-fearers, had come for the Pentecostal Feast.

These dwellers at Jerusalem, strangers, Hellenistic Jews, Gentile proselytes and "God fearers" exclaimed, "we hear them speaking in our tongues the mighty works of God" (Acts 2:11). Even if it be allowed that Luke's reference to dialects should indicate local variations in the Greek and Aramaic languages, it is necessary to note that dialects may and often do vary so greatly as to amount practical-

ly to different languages, as far as the effective communication of the gospel of Christ is concerned. Therefore, a miracle of speaking would be necessary to cover these varied dialects at Pentecost, to say nothing of the distinct languages that may have been represented. And second, besides the Jerusalem and Hellenic Jews present at Pentecost, there were many proselytes" and "God fearers." A proselyte was an individual of non-Jewish nationality who had come to see in the Jewish religion the true way of worship and was fully converted to the Jewish religion and accepted all its regulations as binding upon him, including circumcision. While the "God fearer" resembled the proselyte in being of non-Jewish nationality, and in his conviction of the spiritual truth of the Jew's monotheistic and noble ethical ideals, he was unlike the proselyte in that he did not submit to the elaborate Jewish ceremonialism and strict legalistic requirements. Nor was he willing to assume the social disadvantages imposed upon gentile proselytes to Judaism. These "God-fearers" did, however, readily accept the Christian faith which was not shackled by the Jewish requirements, and thus they constituted the greater percentage of the Christian converts from the synagogues of the empire, as also those in Jerusalem. (17) Consequently, while he was permitted to worship in the Jews' synagogue, he was regarded by them as ceremonially unclean and was considered as an outsider. Many more "God fearers" were converted to the Christian faith than were Jews or proselytes. These "God fearers" were found both in Jerusalem and out in the countries of the empire and beyond. The total of the Jewish communities outside Jerusalem may have reached 150 by the time of Paul, Benjamin Robinson thinks. (18)

Earle states concerning Acts 1:7, in which the multitudes at Pentecost recognized the Christians who spoke in their respective dialects as Galileans, that "Galileans were noted as narrow provincialists. It was doubly remarkable, therefore, that they were speaking many different languages" (19) (cf. Matt. 26:73; Mark 14:70; Luke 22:59).

Earle further remarks that the expression

'Our own language' is literally 'our very own dialect.' While these were evidently all Jews (at least in religion), they had been born and brought up in different lands, and the language of their own locality constituted their mother tongue. (20)

Likewise Blackwelder states:

At Pentecost the speakers were Galileans (2:7). Their natural languages were Aramaic and Koine Greek. The audience was composed of Jews and proselytes (2:10) who had assembled at Jerusalem for the feast of Pentecost. These visitors knew (for the most part) Aramaic and Koine Greek, but there were local dialects used in the various countries from which they had come. To their amazement these pilgrims heard the Galileans declaring the things of God in the manifold dialects of the Diaspora. Under the impetus of the Holy Spirit, each Christian was speaking in a language that he had not acquired, and it was understood immediately by representatives from the land familiar with it . . .

Thus Jesus' promise, given in connection with the Great Commission, that believers would speak in *kainais glossais* (Mark 16:17), (if this passage should be genuine) was demonstrated at the Pentecost Feast when the disciples presented the gospel to strangers in their own vernacular. The linguistic ability imparted on that occasion was symbolical of the universality of the gospel (cf. Mark 16:15; Matt. 28:19; Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8; Rev. 5:9; 7:9; 10:11; 14:6). It showed that God's revelation is not limited to the Jews nor the Hebrew language (cf. Joel 2:28-32).

The Lukan account leaves no doubt about the intelligibility of the utterances. Three times it is stated that the disciples were heard speaking in the definite dialects of the listeners (Acts 2:6, 8, 11). In verse 11, the dative of the strong possessive pronoun *hemetrais* is used with the term *glossai* as the hearers call the vocal expressions 'our own languages.' Each listener recognized immediately the indigenous dialect of his native land (v.8). (21)

Some scholars think there were about 250 synagogues in Jerusalem. Millers note that by A.D. 70 Jerusalem had scores of synagogues and that they were also found in such rural towns as Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30), with many located in cities such as Damascus (Acts 9:29). These authorities state that estimates run as high as four to seven million Jews of the Diaspora who had more than a thousand synagogues by this date. (22) Another authority states: "The Rabbinical writers say that there were 480 synagogues in Jerusalem; and though this must be an exaggeration, yet no doubt all shades of Hellenistic and Aramic opinions found a home in the common metropolis." (23)

These assembled multitudes at Pentecost heard the Galilean disciples preaching Jesus, his resurrection and consequent universal lordship, "the mighty works of God" (v. 11), "every man in our own language wherein we were born" (Acts 2:8b).

From the foregoing considerations it becomes evident that this initial occurrence of "tongues" is to be understood as the use of the bona fide languages and/or dialects of the people present at Pentecost when the Spirit was outpoured, who otherwise would have been incapable of hearing intelligibly the good news that Jesus Christ was risen (Acts 2:32, 22, 27, 41), and that they were spoken by men who themselves were ignorant of the languages which they were using. It has been well said that "we see in this event, which seemed to obliterate the barriers of nationality and language, a reversal of the separation and confusion of tongues (24) (cf. Gen. 11).

The language problem in the Roman empire, and the regions beyond Rome, has long constituted one of the major difficulties in understanding the divine gift of languages as that phenomenon appears in the New Testament. However, even though the Koine Greek has been considered the universal language of the ancient world in the first century, it must be recognized that there were vast numbers of people who could not communicate intelligibly in the Greek and were dependent upon their native dialects for a meaningful understanding of the gospel. (See Appendix on Languages.)

The miracle of the proclamation of the gospel in the different languages of those present for the Jewish Pentecost, which resulted in the great spiritual awakening that followed the outpouring of the Spirit, appears to anticipate the fulfillment of the Great Commission of Christ (Matt. 28:18-20; cf. Acts 1:8), as suggested by the universal representation of redeemed humanity which is so vividly depicted in the book of Revelation. The record reads:

And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests; and they reign upon the earth (Rev. 5:9-10).

And again the Revelator states:

After these things I saw, and behold, a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation and of a/I tribes and peoples and 'tongues,' standing before the throne and before the Lamb, arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands; and they cried with a loud voice, saying, salvation unto our God who sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb (Rev. 7:9-10).

IV. THE PURPOSE OF THE SPIRIT'S GIFT OF TONGUES AT PENTECOST

The gift of tongues was God's extraordinary provision at Pentecost. While holding that "the gift of tongues was an ecstatic utterance of praise," a position impossible to defend when all the facts of Scripture are considered, Maclean nevertheless admits that almost all of the early Church Fathers, including Origen (185?-254?), Chrysostom (347?-407), Theodoret (396-457), Gregory of Nyssa (331-394), and Gregory of Nazianzus (329-457), understood this miraculous gift of tongues, as recorded in Acts, to consist of bona fide languages or dialects given for the purpose of evangelizing the nations. The proclaiming of the "mighty works of God," primarily the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead and His consequent universal lordship, was made intelligible to the people of the fifteen nations enumerated in Acts 2 by reason of the miracle of languages, with the result that some three thousand were initially converted to Christ and added to the church (Acts 2:41). This event in itself is sufficient to establish the fact that the divine gift of languages was for the purpose of evangelization.

In perfect accord with the evangelistic purpose of the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost is the prediction of Isaiah, which prediction looks ultimately to the Gospel Age and quite probably embodies Pentecost itself. Says the prophet: "The time cometh, that I will gather all nations and tongues (*Italics added*); and they shall come, and shall see my glory and I will set a sign among them . . . and they shall declare my glory among the nations" (Isa. 66:18, 19). And it is in conjunction with the Great Commission that Mark records the promise of the phenomenon of "new tongues" (though the genuine-

ness of this passage is highly suspect; Mark 16:15-17).

V. CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING THE SPIRIT'S GIFT OF TONGUES AT PENTECOST

In summary, the occurrence of the miracle of "other tongues" (languages) at Pentecost was manifold in its significance.

(1) The miracle was wrought in and through the Christian disciples at Pentecost by the divine energy of the Holy Spirit, by whom they were filled on that occasion (Acts 2:4).

(2) It was administered in a practical way through the disciples under the superintendence of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:46), and thus it consisted of Spirit-inspired utterances," and not of a miracle of hearing by the multitude, as some have mistakenly supposed.

(3) It was made necessary by the presence of the multitudes speaking some fifteen different languages and/or dialects at Pentecost, who could not otherwise have heard intelligibly the gospel of Christ's resurrection from the dead, which provided salvation for them (Acts 2:11, 32-36).

(4) It consisted of correct and intelligible bona fide languages and/or dialects which were clearly understood by the hearers (Acts 1:8, 11, 37).

(5) It served as the vehicle for God's message that produced in many of the hearers the divinely intended result of repentance unto salvation (Acts 2:37-39).

(6) It was instrumental in bringing about the conversion of approximately three thousand hearers at Pentecost who were baptized and added to the Christian church (Acts 2:41).

(7) It was attested as a genuine miracle by its moral value manifested in the spiritual enlightenment, conviction, and conversion of about three thousand people at the Pentecostal Feast.

(8) Luke's record in Acts 2 is the most clearly definitive account of the "gift of tongues" which we have in the New Testament. Though tongues are referred to definitely in three other recognized genuine New Testament passages (Acts 10, 19, and I Cor. 12-14), it is only in Acts 2:1-11 that the meaning is made explicit. Here it is manifestly a divinely given vehicle of linguistic communication for the evangelization of the multitudes in a situation that demanded and justified it, and as a token of the universal message and mission of the Christian gospel.

(9) While First Corinthians was probably written somewhat earlier than Acts (I Cor. c. A.D. 55 or 56 - Acts c. A.D. 63 (25)), the question of tongues did not arise at Corinth until nearly a quarter of a century after its occurrence at Pentecost. (26) Luke, the author of Acts, was the companion and fellow worker of Paul during most of his second and third missionary journeys, as also during his two years Caesarean imprisonment, and his voyage to Rome and imprisonment there. (27) Consequently it is most certain that Paul would have supplied him information for the Acts record covering those periods when Luke was not with him (especially Acts 10 and 19), and would have approved the interpretation of the events that Luke recorded, though Luke may have gotten his information concerning Pentecost and other events up to the appearance of Paul from other sources, unless indirectly through Paul, (see Acts 8:1-4; 9). In any event his thorough acquaintance with Paul's views on the subject of "tongues, as also other theological issues, seems almost certain. There is absolutely no biblical evidence of any difference of opinion between Luke and Paul on this "tongues" question, or any other issue in fact. Therefore, on the basis of these facts we would agree with Black-welder when he says,

We may assume that the viewpoint of Acts is decisive for what Paul writes in I Corinthians 14

Some expositors begin by attempting to reconstruct the situation at Corinth and then either try to make Luke's account fit what they surmise occurred at Corinth or suggest that there were two different categories of the gift of tongues. Such an approach is unsatisfactory, for it is Luke who describes what the gift was. Paul writes (to the Corinthians) to correct false ideas regarding it. Therefore, if we are to avoid speculation about speaking in tongues, we must get our bearings from the basic treatment which is given in Acts 2:1-11 If the true gift of glossolalia is manifested, it will be according to the pattern of Acts 2:4-11 (28)

Blackwelder is on solid ground when he denies that there is any scriptural evidence that anyone under the influence of the Holy Spirit ever spoke in an "unknown tongue." Since glossai means languages, and languages are means of personal communication, they will necessarily be known to some people. (29)

(10) That the gift of tongues, as recorded in Acts 2, was for evangelization purposes, rather than for the personal edification of the believer, as is claimed by the advocates of the "unknown tongues" doctrine, is further evident from the absence of any mention of tongues in Acts 2 beyond its initial employment in preaching the gospel to the polyglot multitudes present at the Feast of Pentecost.

After the approximate three thousand converts had been baptized and were received into the fellowship of the church (2:41), no further mention of tongues is found in relation to these believers in the Acts record. Indeed they were edified in the apostles' "doctrine " "fellowship," "breaking of bread," "prayers," acts of charity, rejoicing, "singleness of heart," and by "praising God," with profound resultant spiritual and moral influence on their non-Christian neighbors. This beneficent influence produced converts to Christianity among them daily (2:42-47), but nowhere is there further mention of tongues among these converts. Nor was there further need for tongues now that the multitudes at Pentecost had heard the gospel distinctly and intelligibly in their own languages.

(11) It is necessary to note that a careful examination of the structure of Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, as recorded in Acts 2, clearly reveals that the burden of his message concerned the crucifixion and the resurrection of Jesus Christ with His consequent lordship, facts which were designed of God to produce repentance. and saving faith in the minds and lives of his hearers (Acts 2:22-40). It is only Luke, the author of Acts, and not Peter, who records that the disciples spoke forth the gospel by miraculous aid in the various

languages of the people present. This concern with the death, resurrection and lordship of Jesus Christ likewise characterized Peter's subsequent sermons, as also those of Stephen and Paul. There is no evidence that the thought of tongues was in any of their minds, if we are to judge from the contents of their recorded sermons. Peter's words, "he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear" (Acts 2:33) necessarily refer to the transforming effects of the gospel on the hearers under the Spirit's energy which they observed ("ye see"), and the fact that they heard distinctly the gospel in their own languages ("and hear"; cf. Acts 2:11).

(12) Thus it may reasonably be allowed, within the foregoing framework of interpretation, that the divine gift and use of languages in Jerusalem at Pentecost signified the beginning of the universal missionary program of the gospel as it is set forth clearly by Christ in Acts 1:8, though Christ does not there, nor anywhere else in fact (unless Mark 16:16-17 be credited as genuine), mention "tongues."

Furthermore, there are but two clear references to the gift of tongues in the Book of Acts besides the incident in Acts 2, and they both afford an adequate justification for the gift by reason of the evangelistic opportunities they afforded. One is at Caesarea where the household of Cornelius (a "God-fearer," Acts 10:22) was baptized with the Spirit and spoke in tongues (glossai Acts 10:46) glorifying or exalting God. Cornelius was a Centurian, or more likely a captain of a cohort (from 300 to 600 soldiers, RHD). These soldiers were recruited from various parts of the Roman Empire and consequently represented a wide variety of linguistic backgrounds. Thus the message of the gospel could be conveyed more intelligibly to them in their own languages (glossai languages) by this special gift of God.

On this incident Clarke observes: "They had got new hearts as well as new tongues (glossai, languages); and, having believed with the heart unto righteousness, their tongues made confession unto salvation; and God was magnified for the mercy which he had imparted." (30)

Twice while relating this incident before the Jerusalem church, Peter identifies it with the disciples' reception of the Holy Spirit

and the accompanying phenomena at Pentecost (see Acts 11:15, 17). Clarke says on verse 17: "... the Holy Spirit, and its various gifts and graces, in the same way and in the same measure in which he gave them to us Jews." (31) Henry and Scott comment on Acts 10:46 thus:

They spake with tongues which they had never learned. They magnified God, they spake of Christ and the benefits of redemption, concerning which Peter had been preaching to the glory of God . . . Whatever gift we are endowed with, we ought to honor God with it, and particularly the gift of speaking. (32)

The other, third and last, occurrence of tongues in Acts (19:6) was at Ephesus where Paul laid his hands upon the twelve disciples and they were baptized with the Holy Spirit and spoke with other tongues (glossais, languages) and prophesied. Ephesus was a great linguistic, as also religious and cultural, center, comprised of people from all over the ancient world. The principle attraction was the worship of Diana or Artemis, the multi-breasted Asiatic fertility goddess. These twelve disciples likely became the twelve elders of the Church of Ephesus who helped Paul evangelize western Asia Minor during his three-years stay at Ephesus. Thus these languages in which they spoke would have enabled them to accomplish their evangelistic task. This interpretation is supported by Clarke thus:

They received the miraculous gift of different languages; and in those languages they taught the people the great doctrines of the Christian religion; for this appears to be the meaning of the word *prophateuon*, prophesied, as it is used above. (v. 6) (33)

Henry and Scott understand this occurrence, recorded in Acts 19:6, in like manner with Clarke.

. . . they spake with tongues, and prophesied, as the apostles did, and the first gentile converts (Acts 10:15, 17). They had the spirit of prophecy, that they might understand the mysteries of the kingdom of God themselves; and the gift of tongues, that they might preach them ("the mysteries of the Kingdom of God") to every nation and language (34) (cf. Matt. 28:18-20; Acts 1:8; Rev. 5:9-10; 7:9-10).

In each of the three foregoing occurrences of the miraculous gift of languages we have witnessed their justifying need for the effective evangelization of the polyglot unconverted peoples. But, also, each of these three instances constituted a new ethnic and geographic challenge for the introduction and advancement of the Christian religion. At Pentecost the polyglot Jews, including proselytes and Godfearers, were confronted with the gospel in languages intelligible to them. At Caesarea the Roman gentile world, represented by the ubiquitous military forces, received the gift of languages that they might the more effectively spread the faith which they had received. And at Ephesus the Asian gentiles may well have represented the great ancient Greek and non-Roman Asiatic world. As Artemis (or Diana), an imported Asiatic fertility goddess, whose main image was at Ephesus, was worshiped by "all Asia and the world" (Acts 19:27, RSV), so from Asia Minor the gospel might spread to all of Asia and the ancient world.

(13) Finally, as it is beyond the author's stated purpose in this study to deal with the problem of "tongues" as that problem appears in I Corinthians chapters 12 through 14, only brief reference will be made to it here.

The tongues problem at Corinth arose more than twenty years after the initial gift of language occurred at the Jerusalem Pentecost. Paul was thoroughly familiar with the Pentecostal and Caesarean event through his associations with Peter, Luke, and others who had been present. Furthermore, Paul was personally involved in the occurrence at Ephesus. Nowhere does he attempt to make any distinction between any of these later occurrences of "tongues," where he considers them genuine, or of the initial occurrence at Pentecost. Had there been differences in the genuine occurrence of tongues, if such existed, at the later events, it is most improbable that Paul would have failed to mention such differences. Therefore it is safe to assume that the occurrence of the gift of tongues as described by Luke in Acts 2 is the norm by which the three subsequent New Testament occurrences must be interpreted, insofar as they were genuine, bona fide gifts from God.

That Paul was forced to deal with the "tongues" problem at Cor-

inth in at least three, and possibly four, different aspects appears evident from the account in chapters 12 through 14 of I Corinthians.

From the standpoint of its polyglot situation, with its myriads of commercial, marine, military, governmental, tourist, philosophical and general transient population from all over the Roman Empire and far beyond, Corinth far surpassed Ephesus, Caesarea, and even Jerusalem, where the phenomenon of "tongues" had occurred previously. Consequently there is good reason to assume that a bona fide gift of diverse languages may have occurred in the church at Corinth to meet the need for evangelizing this transient population. Thus there existed at Corinth a situation that justified and validated the miraculous gift of languages, as at Jerusalem, Caesarea, and Ephesus.

However, Paul may well have been dealing with another factor at Corinth. The evidence seems quite conclusive that in certain instances in the Corinthian situation Paul is simply giving instructions concerning transient visiting believers from other parts who knew only their own native languages which were foreign to the Corinthian Greek speaking church (see Acts 14:11). Moved by the spirit of the meeting, they would wish to worship by vocalizing their prayers, giving witness to Christ, or delivering an exhortation. Paul instructs these to worship in silence before God, unless there should be present an interpreter of their language, lest their unintelligible language seem to the Corinthian believers like heathen gibberish (bar bar), or the babblings of a madman.

A third factor, as some have pointed up, may have been a special divine gift of an understanding of the deeper insights into the Hebrew language of the Old Testament which was, for the most part at least, a dead language by that time. Thus for the Christian teachers to read, by divine enabling, the Scriptures in their archaic language would have constituted an "unknown tongue" (language) to the listeners, without an interpreter equally inspired to translate the meaning into the language of the people.

But the fourth, and final, "tongues" problem at Corinth obviously consisted in a confusion and consequent counterfeiting of the genuine miraculously bestowed gift of *bona fide* language, as experienced

at the Jerusalem Pentecost, at Caesarea, and at Ephesus. Many in the church at Corinth had worshiped at the shrines of the lustful goddess Aphrodite Pandemos and of Cybele, in which worship trances and ecstatic experiences accompanied by unintelligible and thus meaningless utterances were common. Some in the church at Corinth may well have heard about, or even observed, the bona fide gift of languages, and then confused the phenomenon with ecstatic "unknown utterances" at the pagan shrines. Having been addicted to the latter, they carried these pagan practices into the church where they sought to display their misdirected talents in competition with those who spoke with the genuine gift of languages, in order to witness to those of foreign speech who were present in their services. It is not strange that they should have done so when it is recalled that Paul had to deal with other pagan practices also which were brought into the church at Corinth by these former worshipers at the shrines of Aphrodite Pandemos and Cybele, including idolatrous worship, sexual immorality, gluttony, rivalry, strife, and other evil practices. Thus, these subjective, if not sometimes demonical, ecstatic experiences with which Paul dealt in his Corinthian correspondence were, in large part at least, counterfeits of the genuine, divinely given experiences of bona fide languages.

Concerning these aberrations at Corinth Mould remarks, significantly:

Paul had the good sense to try to divert this type of experience away from a mere expenditure of emotional froth into an ethical channel (the edification of others) and to bring it under the control of reason (I Cor. 14:19, 26). . . The principle of control which Paul emphasizes is the principle of love (I Cor.13).. . In Paul's thought the most genuine manifestation of the Spirit is to be observed in the Christian life of ethical integrity and altruistic service. This same principle of ethical and rational control. Paul applies to other types of ecstatic experience, as in II Cor. 12.

Thus where it was genuine at all at Corinth, the gift of tongues was the same as at Jerusalem, Caesarea, and Ephesus. Otherwise it was spurious and something to be discarded as worthless and even dangerous to the church. (36)

APPENDIX
LANGUAGES AND DIALECTS OF THE FIRST CHRISTIAN CENTURY

It has been questioned by some whether the linguistic situation at Pentecost, or anywhere throughout the Roman world, was such as to require the gift of languages that is suggested in Acts 2. Mould appears to support this skeptical view when he says, "One common language, Greek, was spoken everywhere." (37) However, elsewhere he seems to contradict this position when he states that Aramaic was the language which the Jews spoke, and then adds that some Jews, especially those who returned to Palestine after long residence abroad, did also use Greek. He further notes that a special synagogue was provided for these Greek-speaking Jews. Latin, he notes was the official language of the governing class, though it was not understood by the common people. He holds that biblical Hebrew was used in religious services, but it was not understood by the Jews and the Scripture lessons required translation into the vernacular Aramaic following their reading in the original Hebrew. (38)

Thus this authority, at one time stating that Greek was the common language spoken everywhere, at another time admits that four different languages were in use: namely, Greek, Latin, Aramaic, and Hebrew. Others who assume that there was but one universally spoken and understood language throughout the Roman world of the first century seem likewise unable to escape a contradiction.

Of course it is well known that the Greek was very widely spoken throughout the lands conquered by Alexander the Great and where the Greek culture was spread. However, it appears that the Greek language was, for the greater percentage at least of the non-Greek population, a sort of lingua franca. To say that the Greek language and culture had been spread as far east as the Indus River, or even beyond, down into Egypt and possibly North Africa, is one thing, but it is quite another to say that all these people were readily conversant in the Greek language. The Greek colonists planted in these various areas would naturally have been, but it does not appear likely such would have been true of the majority of the non-Greek peoples out in the empire, and beyond.

Even to say that Greek was the lingua franca of the Roman empire is not to say that all or even a majority of the non-Greek peoples were readily conversant in Greek. The author lived for many years in British Africa where English was the official language and was used largely for trade and travel purposes. However, for the most part it was necessary to speak the native language of the people directly, or through an interpreter, if one wished to communicate with them clearly and understandably on matters of importance beyond their very limited understanding of English. And, of course, in many instances a majority of them knew no English after more than half a century of British occupation. The same has been true in India, and also in French colonial possessions. This was doubly true when one wished to convey the message of the gospel to the people. Many times the author has spoken through two and even three interpreters at once in British Africa in order to communicate the message to several different linguistic representative groups present.

Certain scholars of repute, both earlier and contemporary, support this position. One such authority notes that

Greek and Latin words were current in the popular "Hebrew" of the day: and while this Syro-Chaldaic dialect was spoken by the mass of the people with the tenacious affection of old custom, Greek had long been well known among the upper classes in' the larger towns, and Latin was used in the courts of law, and in the official correspondence of the magistrates, (*Italics added*) (39)

The diversity of languages used even on certain occasions in Jerusalem is further indicated by the previous authorities who point out that

On a critical occasion of St. Paul's life, when he was standing on the stairs between the Temple and the fortress, he first spoke to the commander of the garrison in Greek, and then turned around and addressed his countrymen in Hebrew; while the letter of Claudius Lysias was written, and the oration of Tertullus spoken, in Latin (Acts 21:22:23:24). (40).

Josephus notes that in the Temple area on a parapet of stone where the flight of fifteen steps led from the outer up to the inner court, there were notices posted on pillars spaced at equal distances, some of which were in Greek and some in Latin forbidding any Gentile to enter the sacred enclosure of the Hebrews. (41)

Likewise John records that a superscription was placed over Christ's Cross, by order of Pilate, bearing the cause of the Saviour's condemnation, which was "written in Hebrew, and in Latin, and in Greek" (John 19:20). It has been observed that Hebrew represented the language of religion, Latin the language of government, and Greek the language of culture. It seems evident that three languages were necessary to this official publication, even in so Jewish a city as Jerusalem.

Edersheim even recognizes different dialects within the Aramaic language by the first century when he states,

The language spoken by the Jews was no longer Hebrew, but Aramaean, both in Palestine and in Babylon; in the former the Western, and in the latter the Eastern dialect. (42)

Edersheim further notes that

In fact, the common people were ignorant of pure Hebrew, which henceforth became the language of students and of the Synagogue. Even there a Methurgeman, or interpreter had to be employed to translate into the vernacular the portions of Scripture read in the public services, and the addresses delivered by the Rabbis. (43)

This fact certainly lends weight to Lightfoot's position that the tongues (languages) and interpretations at Corinth may have been, in part at least, a divine gift bringing the then little used Hebrew language of the Scriptures into the language of the people at Corinth. In fact Edersheim raises the very question of this possibility when he asks, "Could St. Paul have had this in mind when, referring to the miraculous gift of speaking in other languages, he directs that one shall always interpret (1 Cor. XIV. 27) (44)

Fisher sees the Greek as the language of the East, but the Latin as prevailing in the West. He states,

Greek at length grew to be the language of commerce, the vehicle of polite intercourse, and a common medium of communication through all the eastern portions of the empire. The Latin tongue, the language of the Roman officials and of the Roman legions, was carried wherever Roman conquests and colonies went. West of the Adriatic, especially in Italy, Gaul, Spain, and North Africa, it prevailed as the Greek prevailed elsewhere. (45)

Hurst expresses doubt that all the Jewish worshipers at Pentecost

spake or understood the same language when he says,

There were Jews in the sacred city from all parts of the known world... The miraculous gift of utterance was imparted. The multitude of Jews was attracted to the place where the disciples were. Each worshipper, whatever his language (Italics added), understood the preaching. (46)

Jackson and Lake clearly indicate that the Greek was not as universally used and understood as some scholars assume.

In many places (Italics added) still farther east the Greek language was at least understood and Greek ideas were not unfamiliar . . .

Local languages and dialects long persisted among the lower classes and in the remoter districts Greek was a common medium for polite and learned society. (Italics added) (47)

Machen's remarks on the linguistic situation of the first century are illuminating.

The empire of Alexander, indeed, at once fell to pieces after his death in 323 B.C.; but the Kingdoms into which it was divided were, at least so far as the court and the governing classes were concerned, Greek Kingdoms (Italics added). The ancient languages of the various countries did indeed continue to exist, and many districts were bilingual--the original local language existing side by side with the Greek. (48)

Perhaps no one has made clearer the polyglot character of the world of the first century than the renowned contemporary scholar, Henry J. Cadbury. He calls attention to the fact that this is strongly hinted at in the case of the Ethiopian nobleman who was converted under the ministry of Philip (Acts 8:26-39). Having asserted that the nobleman most probably read from the Greek prophecy of Isaiah, and that Philip apparently conversed freely with him without linguistic difficulty, Cadbury nevertheless admits that the situation presents a linguistic problem.

The history and language of the ancient Ethiopians are imperfectly known. In spite of the valiant efforts of Professor Griffith its inscriptions are only half understood. Whatever language a treasurer travelling from Jerusalem might read in his copy of Isaiah he did not read Greek on the pyramids of his kings and queens at home. Those are inscribed 'sometimes in hieroglyphics which appeared to imitate approximately the Egyptian hieroglyphics and sometimes in a curslye script unlike anything hitherto known.' *The whole civilization*

indeed is unhellenic and dominantly or decayedly Egyptian (*Italics added*).
(49)

Thus it would seem that even if it is admitted that the Ethiopian nobleman personally read and spoke Greek, which is logical in his position as a high government official (treasurer of Ethiopia under Candace the queen; Acts 8:27), nevertheless his unhellenized country and people may have been quite ignorant of Greek. In this event the gospel could have reached them effectively only by someone who either had a special divine gift of their language or who had learned it, or who spoke through an interpreter. In any event these people seem to have represented a linguistic situation that was probably many times multiplied throughout the ancient world of the first century, a situation that justified the miraculous gift of languages at the Jerusalem Pentecost. Cadbury (50) appears to hint at a somewhat similar linguistic problem at Damascus in Paul's day where certain Arabic words appear in Luke's account in Acts of Paul's escape from Damascus.

Again, concerning the Lycaonian speech at Lystra referred to by Luke in Acts 14:11, Cadbury asks:

Why then does Luke mention that the old native language was used by the crowd? Probably he wished to explain why Paul and Barnabas did not object to being called Gods. They did not understand what was being said; it was the action of preparing sacrifice which first made quite plain to them what the crowd was driving at--the bulls and garlands.

But in representing the Lycaonian language as breaking through, the historian's account is quite lifelike. These old dialects did survive though not much in written form . . . It (the Lycaonian language) is referred to as late as the fourth century as still spoken there. The neighbouring dialects like Cilicia and Phrygia had also their dialects and of the Phrygian language we know much more.
(51)

Another most interesting and significant situation which has a direct bearing upon the language problem of the first century is found at the island of Malta where Paul was shipwrecked on his voyage to Rome. Cadbury expresses doubt concerning the identity of the natives, but he feels sure that "The chief of the island was a Roman--the Publius whose father Paul cured of fever and dysentery." (52) That the inhabitants were barbarians, a word which carries a strong linguistic suggestion, is twice specified by Luke (Acts 28:2, 4). Luke's statement concerning these islanders conversing among themselves--"they said one to another" (Acts 28:4)--when they witnessed Paul's harm-

less deliverance from the viper, may carry a suggestion of private consultation in their own native language which was not understood by Paul and his companions. Concerning these inhabitants of Malta Cadbury remarks, "The natives, whatever their non-Hellenic tongue, are barbarians. Their alien speech foreboded to any Greek unfriendly treatment, especially to shipwrecked strangers. Their kindness is therefore merely one of the series of providential escapes of this charmed hero" (53) (Paul; italics added) .

Writing of the Greek of the New Testament, A.T. Robertson says,

In all essential respects it is just the vernacular Koine of the 1st Cent. A.D., the lingua franca of the Gr-Rom empire, the legacy of Alexander the Great's conquest of the East. This world-speech was at bottom the late Attic vernacular with dialectical and provincial influences. (54)

Robertson's witness makes clear two things. First, the koine Greek was the lingua franca of the East. Webster defines lingua franca, as the term is used here, as any hybrid language used widely as a commercial tongue, such as pidgin English. The author is thoroughly conversant with pidgin English and has used it extensively in British West Africa for general travel and commercial purposes, where it is used widely as a second language by many of the tribesmen and coastal peoples. However, few, if indeed any, would hopefully attempt to converse with the Africans in pidgin English on serious matters, or proclaim the gospel to them in this tongue. In fact, in the British courts during litigations or other serious court business, interpreters were invariably employed, in preference to the use of the pidgin English--the British West African lingua franca.

Second, Robertson's witness makes clear that the koine was modified by "dialectical and provincial influences." Thus it would appear that the koine itself, though widely used as the lingua franca, at least in the East, manifested sectional variations of a sufficiently serious nature as to produce dialects within itself. This is of course not to mention such dialects, previously mentioned, as existed among certain non-Greek-speaking peoples.

In his treatment of the North Galatian theory, William Ramsay states:

We may confidently say that no other towns (except Colonia Germa) in North Galatia possessed a Greek-speaking population to which St. Paul could preach; in fact it is exceedingly doubtful if Tavium could have contained many people who were familiar with the Greek at this period. In the rest of the country it seems certain that only a few words of broken Greek were known to the population, whose familiar tongue was Celtic. According to Jerome they retained their native language as late as the fourth century. (55)

From the aggregate of the foregoing witnesses to the linguistic situation in the Roman empire and its remote borders in the first Christian century certain quite definite conclusions may be drawn.

First, the Greek language and culture had widely spread and predominated especially in the East.

Second, the Latin language and culture extended over most of the West and was predominant there.

Third, the Greek was the language of culture and learning where ever it was spread, especially among the upper Greek-speaking classes, while the Latin was mainly the language of the government.

Fourth, Greek was a sort of lingua franca in the empire, but especially of the East. Many non-Greeks spoke and perhaps also read the Greek language, some with greater and others with lesser felicity.

Fifth, the Jews outside Judea were bilingual, by and large, speaking the Greek and the Aramaic, the latter in at least two different dialects, the Eastern and the Western.

Sixth, there were evidently vast numbers of barbarians, as also possibly many proselytes to Judaism (Acts 2:10), who at best had an imperfect knowledge, if indeed any knowledge, of either the Greek or Aramaic. These barbarians, and perhaps many of the proselytes and God-fearers knew and spake only their own native dialects and languages.

Seventh, these multitudes of barbarians and proselytes who had

not been assimilated to the Greek, or even Latin, culture and language could be adequately reached with the gospel message only through their native tongues.

Eighth, in the light of the foregoing factors which obtained in the first Christian century, the divine bestowal of the gift of diverse languages and dialects at Pentecost, at Caesarea, at Ephesus, and even at Corinth, in part at least, for the purpose of evangelizing the polyglot peoples, who for various reasons gravitated to these centers, is amply justified by the needs represented by them and the results of the proclamation of the gospel to them.

Documentations

- (1) All Scripture quotations in this article are from the American Standard Version of the Bible unless otherwise indicated.
- (2) John Matthews, *Speaking in Tongues* (John Matthews, Publisher, 1925), p. 20.
- (3) Joseph Henry Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (New York: American Book Company, copyrighted 1885 by Harper and Brothers).
- (4) Harris Franklin Rail, *New Testament History, "A Study of the Beginnings of Christianity"* (New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1914), p. 145.
- (5) Thayer, *op. cit.*
- (6) *Ibid.*
- (7) F. F. Bruce, "Acts," *The New Bible Commentary*, ed. F. Davidson (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), p. 902.
- (8) Harold B. Kuhn (Prof. Philosophy and Religion, Asbury Theological Seminary) in a letter to the author.
- (9) Marvin R. Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, rep. 1957), I, 449.
- (10) John Wesley, *One Volume Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, rep. n.d.), Acts comment on 2:4. Clarke's position is the same as Wesley's, though more explicit.

- (11) Bengel, *One Volume Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, rep. n.d.).
- (12) William G. Blaikie. *A Manual of Bible History* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1940), p. 369.
- (13) J. R. Dummelow, ed., *A Commentary on the Holy Bible* (The Macmillan Company, 1936), p. 821.
- (14) Robert Ernest Hume, *The World's Living Religions* (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1924), p. 229.
- (15) Benjamin Willard Robinson, *The Life of Paul* (Chicago: The University of Chicago press, 1928), p. 9.
- (16) Elmer W. K. Mould, *Essentials of Bible History* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951), p. 524.
- (17) *Ibid.*
- (18) Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
- (19) Charles W. Carter and Ralph Earle, "The Acts of the Apostles," *The Evangelical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan House, 1959), p. 31.
- (20) *Ibid.*
- (21) Boyce W. Blackwelder, "The Glossolalia at Pentecost," in *Vital Christianity* (Anderson, Indiana: The Warner Press, March 10, 1963), p. 6.

- (22) Madeline S. Miller and J. Lane Miller, *Harper's Bible Dictionary* (New York: Harper and Brothers, publishers, 1955), p. 717.
- (23) W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howsom, *The Life and Epistles of Saint Paul* (Hartford, Connecticut: S. S. Scranton and Company, 1899), p. 56.
- (24) *A Commentary on the Holy Bible*, ed. J. R. Dummelow (New York: Macmillan Company, 1936, rep. 1951), p. 821.
- (25) Everett F. Harrison, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), pp. 226--227.
- (26) For an extensive treatment of the tongues problem at Corinth, the reader is referred to the author's "Introduction" to and exposition of I Cor. 12-14 in Vol. V of the *Wesleyan Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965).
- (27) These facts are evidenced by Luke's use of the personal plural pronoun "We" in his Acts record indicating his presence with Paul at those stages of his life and missionary work. See these "We" sections in Acts 16:10-17; 20:5-21:18; 27:1-28:16.
- (28) Blackwelder, *op. cit.*
- (29) *Ibid.*
- (30) Adam Clarke, *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: "Commentary and Critical Notes"* (New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, rep. n.d.), p. 769.
- (31) *Ibid.*, 767.
- (32) Matthew Henry and Thomas Scott, *Commentary on the Holy Bible: "Matthew-Acts"* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, rep. 1960), p. 472.
- (33) Clarke, *op. cit.* 842.
- (34) Henry and Scott, *op. cit.* p. 505.
- (35) Mould, *op. cit.* p. 521, 522.
- (36) See the author's full treatment of the "tongues" problem at Corinth in his "Introduction" to I Corinthians and his "Exposition" of I Corinthians chapters 12-14 in *The Wesleyan Bible Commentary*, *op. cit.*, V, 109119; 196-223.
- (37) Elmer W.K. Mould, *Essentials of Bible History* (New York: The Ronald Press, 1951), p. 558.
- (38) *Ibid.*, p. 472.
- (39) Conybeare and Howsom, *op. cit.*, pp. 2. 3.
- (40) *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- (41) *War*, V. 5, 2; cf. VI. 2, 4.

- (42) Alfred Edersheim. *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1904), p. 10.
- (43) *Ibid.*
- (44) *Ibid.*
- (45) George Park Fisher, *History of the Christian Church* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915, rep. 1931), p. 9.
- (46) John Fletcher Hurst, *Short History of the Christian Church* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1892), p. 4.
- (47) F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, "The Acts of the Apostles"* (London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1920, rep. 1945), pp. 220, 221.
- (48) J. Gresham Machen, *New Testament Greek for Beginners* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962), pp. 1, 2.
- (49) Henry J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1955), p. 17.
- (50) *Ibid.*, pp. 19-21.
- (51) *Ibid.*, pp. 21, 11.
- (52) *Ibid.*, p. 23.
- (53) *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 25.
- (54) A.T. Robertson, Art. "Language of the New Testament," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, gen. ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1939, rep. 1957), III, 1827.
- (55) W.M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 70* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, rep. 1954), p. 82 n.

THE QUEST FOR OBJECTIVITY: A WESLEYAN VIEW

WALTER H. JOHNSON, Th.D.

(Chairman, Department of Philosophy, Seattle Pacific College)

I. CONCRETE FACTS

The history of thought reveals recurrent expressions of the desire for objectivity. Various words have been used to express this continuing hope. The word empiricism has been a verbal symbol for what has also been called the "concrete facts" of experience. When materialism was the dominating philosophy, it seemed assured that man had achieved the hard facts upon which all tenable truths could be based. As early as Aristotle, Platonic idealisms and subjectivisms were rejected in favor of more scientific or empirical methods in the search for truth. Later observations, however, revealed that the apparent objective method resulted in a congealed position known as Aristotelianism. This interesting fact in the history of thought--shown in the tendency of man to begin with a hypothesis based upon an empirical or object approach to truth, followed by the congealing of these inductive facts into a system of absolutism--has repeatedly characterized man's search for the "concrete facts" of truth.

The "idols" of Francis Bacon picture the difficulty with which we face this problem. Bacon sought for the "expurgation of the intellect," to achieve a mind free from human frailties and subjective tendencies that obscure a true empirical approach to truth. Experience, however, since Bacon, has shown that the mere naming the "idols" of the tendency of man to be human in his interpretation of truth has not eliminated the subjective factor.

The interesting illustration given by Sir Arthur Eddington called "Eddington's elephant" suggests that man in his desire for scientific objectivity has actually found, instead, abstractions and subjective interpretations. The elephant, according to Eddington's parable, instead of being a live animal on the side of a hill, has been turned by science into a two-ton mass on an angle with a friction element created by grass. The final result suggested by Eddington is that sci-

ence instead of achieving the concrete facts has actually turned a life situation into an abstraction that presents a limited concept of truth.

Even *Life* magazine has recently given editorial consideration to this problem under the heading, A Discipline That Needs Some:

It's a pity no scholar has ever thought to do his doctorate on the number of creative minds that have been driven clear out of the academic world by the stultifying demands of 'scientific method' misapplied. Certainly in the social sciences, the tyranny of methodology and sheer jargon has long since got out of hand . . .

The quest is for a way to disentangle the true disciplines of scholarship from the whole materialistic and behavioristic approaches to existence--twin blights that have debased so much of 20th Century thought and ethics. (1)

This quest has profound significance not only for the various academic disciplines but for western civilization itself. One expression has been the materialistic Marxist dogma that has influenced so many minds and masses in all contemporary civilizations.

Our suggestion is not that empirical truth is invalid, but that empirical truth "misapplied" is a limited aspect or facet of total truth.

II. THE INFLUENCE OF AFFLUENCE

One barrier to pure objectivity has been the economic influence of affluence. More philosophical and theological positions have changed because of potential book sales and salary increases than from pure reason.

Plato was one of the first, in *The Republic*, to note the difficulty of man's achieving the purely objective point of view. After the very thorough training suggested for the philosopher-rulers, Plato at the conclusion of *The Republic* suggests that even the "Ph.D." graduates in the field of Platonic idealism would need protection from the temptation of property and things. A system of guidance for these leaders of *The Republic* was suggested which would protect them from themselves, from their subjective natures, which Plato called the "psy-

chological problem."

As Plato observes, "justice would be simple if men were simple." The communal state suggested by Plato for his philosopher-rulers is really an admission of their continuing humanity and the possible influence of economic factors on their decision making even after extended, intensive training in the school of ideas. Furthermore, they were forbidden the having of wives because of the possible influence of wives on the decisions of the philosophers. The aggressive, prodding wife who drives her husband to seek greater economic and political power is, evidently, not a recent invention.

Sociologists have pointed out the influence of affluence upon the decision making of men. Their studies indicate that religious groups are profoundly influenced by the growth of affluence within the community of the denomination. That which we cannot afford is usually considered worldly. When we have sufficient to buy the things heretofore condemned, we no longer consider such things "worldly."

The simple basic economic factors have often influenced the so-called "objective judgments" of scholars. The failure of the scholar to meet and to combat the Nazi movement in Germany, the Fascist movement in Italy, and the Communist take-over in Russia is one of the many occasions of academic incompetence. Only a few religionists and intellectuals were able to withstand the combination of economic, social, and power pressures brought to bear in Nazi Germany, and, of course, with Dietrich Bonhoeffer, some of these men died rather than succumb to the intellectual and economic dominant forces at the time.

Such failures by the academic community have caused many to question the absoluteness of traditional, scientific, authoritarianism. Some go so far as to suggest that the use of the word "inductive" should no longer characterize the study of science. Brown and Stuermann take this position.

Scientific activity takes on, for many, the characteristics of a religion.
"Scientifically tested," "endorsed by men of science," and "established by
scientific research" are typi-

cal of phrases used frequently and insistently by commercial and political propagandists, by businessmen and clergymen and by housewives and students. Such expressions can, of course, be used properly and wisely. On the other hand, they are often used to persuade, to confirm prestige on some idea or product, to pick an unwise objective. Even more tragic is the perverse use of the name of science to try to make some contemporary view point--in politics, economics, religion, etc.--appear to be a superior or final truth .. ." A misconception that must be described for proper understanding of scientific processes is that they are "inductive" or "empirical" while non-scientific disciplines are "deductive" or "theoretical." This bifurcation reflects a failure to recognize the dominant role that deduction and theory plays in even the most elementary scientific studies The contention that induction is the basic method of thought or procedure in science cannot be adopted without qualification, if it can be accepted at all. Whether there is such a thing as pure induction, starting with the particular and reasoning to a general rule, is highly questionable," "The principle mechanics of thought or inference in the scientific process is deduction. (2)

Many of us would not care to equate the scientific process with deduction. However, it is significant to observe the strong reaction against empirical dogmatism among such recent scholars. The suggestion that the "scientific method" and "science" have become status symbols by which not only products but ideas have been sold should be given serious thought. The human tendency to allow affluence to influence judgments should be watched carefully to ascertain whether the often quoted adage is true that "man can stand anything but prosperity."

III. ANTI-INTELLECTUALISM

Roadblocks in the quest for objectivity have appeared in various forms. In the recent past the philosophy of religious empiricism was seen in the writings of Schleiermacher, an advanced and devotional form of anti-intellectualism. Religious mystics have always contended that their direct apprehension and intuitive cognition of the will of God gave valuable insights. Strong views in this direction were advanced by what has often been called religious liberalism. The values of this movement, however, were limited by the lack of definitiveness.

Devotion without definitiveness led to the extreme of anti-intellectualism. Basic concerns for truth values voiced by many were stilled with the suggestion that adequate emphasis upon pietistic religious experience of God excluded the necessity for guide-lines of truth.

The latest university student power rebellions have been in part against the entrenched orthodoxies of a scientism which the young feel has dehumanized them. Strangely enough they have a semantics which had previously become almost symbolic of the past and traditionalism. They are against the "Establishment". They are "Disestablishmentarians".

Perhaps the most violent anti-intellectual revolt against the "objective facts" of the scientific method has been the dynamic contemporary movement of existentialism. The "I-It" of Martin Buber symbolizes the world of objects and scientism against which existentialism finds itself in opposition. The "I-Thou" of innerexistential confrontation rejects any system that would violate its individual freedom and subjective awareness of truth.

The philosophy of Paul Tillich emphasizes "ultimate concern" and these ultimate concerns cannot be comprehended within the limited truth-judgments of the scientific method. It is imperative that we go beyond the test tube and laboratory to truly comprehend "life", contends the existentialist.

A fascinating lingering question concerning this movement which needs discussion is whether both atheistic and theistic existentialists express their true underlying assumptions, or adopt a Kantian superhistorical semantics to escape discussion of fundamental dichotomies created by their irrevocable acceptance of empirical dogma?

It is a strange phenomenon of our time that the great intellectual institutions have been caught in such violent upheavals of anti-intellectualism. The existentialist verbally contends that the extreme use of the scientific method, which in many cases excluded personal involvement in the search for truth, violated man's respect for himself and subjugated his personal integrity of experience to the cold impersonal domination of the machine, the microscope, and the labo-

ratory. Existentialism is shouting that "all life is a meeting" as suggested by Martin Buber. Life is more than body. Truth is more than hormone secretions. Respect for individual choice must never be obscured by the determinism of mechanistic science.

The extremes of this revolt, of course, contain the seeds of its own destruction. Already we see brief articles suggesting the re-investigation of the place of reason in the pursuit of truth. It is no doubt safe to anticipate the not too distant swing of the pendulum in favor of a rationalism which has been thoroughly discredited by the anti-intellectualisms of many intellectual institutions today.

IV. OBSCURANTISM

Thoughtful men in both science and metaphysics have been greatly disappointed at the extremes provoked by obscurantisms on both sides of the dialogue in quest for objectivity. Religionists, philosophers, and scientists have all in turn contributed to the confusion and disaster of this quarrel. Alfred North Whitehead, in *The Function of Reason*, observes,

Obscurantism is the inertial resistance of the practical Reason, with its millions of years behind it, to the interference with its fixed methods arising from recent habits of speculation. This obscurantism is rooted in human nature more deeply than any particular subject of interest. It is just as strong among the men of science as among the men of the clergy, and among professional men and business men as among other classes. Obscurantism is the refusal to speculate freely on the limitations of traditional methods. It is more than that: it is the negation of the importance of some speculation, the insistence on incidental dangers. A few generations ago the clergy, or to speak more accurately, large sections of the clergy were standing examples of obscurantism. Today their place has been taken by scientists--the obscurantists of any generation are in the main constituted by the greater part of the practitioners of the dominant methodology. Today scientific methods are dominant, and scientists are the obscurantists. (3)

This seems to strike at the basic root of our human dilemma in the quest for objectivity. As Aristotle found the "objective facts" and congealed them into one of the most dogmatic systems of all

human history, men have always erected ivory towers of obscurantism from which they have voiced ex-cathedra statements of "final judgments" or "concrete facts". It is so difficult for us human beings to become self-conscious enough to make proper evaluations of our own inherent subjectivity. After all, we are first of all men, then scientists, poets, philosophers, and religionists.

There is a truth in Martin Buber's emphasis that all thinkers walk a 'narrow bridge' of scholarly investigation. We all operate intellectually from a precarious position. As Emerson suggested "man had his choice between truth and repose, he cannot have both." There is indeed, as Buber suggest, a holy insecurity" in intellectual honesty.

The basic question, then, of our discussion is, with all the precariousness that surrounds our venture, is it important that we continue the quest for objectivity? Most of us who attempt to be relevant to our age would agree that the quest for objectivity must not be discontinued. We have viewed with considerable interest the gradual erosion of the so-called "concrete facts" of empiricism. Scientific observations by Heisenberg, Lobochevsky, and contemporary physicists would seem to indicate the willingness of mathematicians and physical scientists to admit the limitations of earlier congealed positions. Scientists and philosophers of science have turned from the dogmatism of original positivism to logical positivism. They have traditionally understood observation in terms of inspection by a microscope. The microscope is still one of the basic investigative tools and the values derived from it continue, but the scientist has broadened his perspective of truth. Logical positivism in some situations has developed into phenomenology in which scholars not only question the absoluteness of the scientific facts but question the possibility of finding meaning at all in material and philosophical inquiries. The dialogue has continued in the schools of linguistic analysis so that it has become difficult for many to hold any concept having fundamental meaning that can be understood and communicated to others.

We have also noted the violent and at times emotional reaction of existentialism against the systematization of truth presented by what is now considered classical materialism of the scientific world.

Our problem of relevance in the context of contemporary thought is a difficult one. Shall we join the reactionary movements that repudiate honest intellectual disciplines that have pursued objective truth? Most of us share the hope of the intellectual that it might be possible to achieve some degree of objectivity in the pursuit of truth. In fact, the evangelical¹ may yet be one of the strongest supporters of a mature science which is probing its way in a climate of subjectivism and non-cognitivism.

The problem becomes one of the basic methods in approaching objectivity. It would seem that the earlier advocates of extreme objectivity attempted to build a cyst around the private world of objective truth. It was their point of view, spoken or implied, that those who did not accept the basic frame of reference from which they concluded the "only tenable facts," were incapable of objectivity.

A more productive approach would suggest that we are all products of environmental and training circumstances that have led to certain basic beliefs in philosophy, science or religion. We have observed the dangers inherent in insisting that our own individual perspective is the only possible route to objectivity. The declaration of one's position as the only objective position simply compounds the difficulty of achieving objectivity. It creates a doctrinaire dogmatism which is as absolutistic as the clerical dogmatism it originally opposed. With Alfred North Whitehead we observe that the dominant power structure of any particular age controls the obscurantism of that age. If Whitehead is right that scientism is the obscurantism of our age, and it would seem to recommend careful observation of any "decrees" issued by this prevailing power structure.

Klausner and Kuntz, in their recent book *Philosophy: The Study of Alternative Beliefs*, (4) suggest in the title and in the book that philosophical assumptions are actually beliefs, that a basic philosophical frame of reference is arrived at by what may be called a leap of faith. To be sure, logic and reason contribute to the formation of assumptions, but in all areas of life that seem to really matter to man--in metaphysics, in politics, as well as in religion--belief goes beyond pure logic and pure reason. The simple admission of this fact, that we are human beings and conditioned by factors of training and back-

ground, would seem to be the best beginning in the search for objectivity, because if we can admit our humanity, we can perhaps more honestly guard against the emotional extremes and intellectual vagaries which the history of thought has shown us to have.

V. CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE QUEST

In our quest for Objectivity, therefore, we suggest at least three observations for our consideration of contemporary assumptions. First, we should give respectful consideration to a viewpoint no matter how extreme it may seem to us at first. If we expect respectful treatment from others. It is imperative that we reciprocate by giving fair presentation of developing viewpoints whether or not our immediate reaction is positive or negative. Secondly, it would seem helpful intelligently to qualify any written or spoken philosophical or doctrinal position. This suggests the honest proving of beliefs to ascertain the facets of truth that are really congruous with an intellectually honest position. Finally, it would seem important to attempt to relate the new concept to the total of past, present and future thought and life. Many have, to be very specific, given fair, honest and intelligent investigation and qualifications of Hugh Hefner's Playboy philosophy, but the final concern is the question of relevance (5) In the light of the history of thought and action, does Hefner give constructive suggestions or simply confound our confusion? In an age inflamed by fiction, the entertainment world and the communication media, is Hefner's contribution a creative, constructive one, or does it add to the difficulties of those who would attempt to give guidance to youth who are already inclined to experiment with the Commandments?

Is one truly relevant who cleverly ascertains the trends of the statistical majority of an age and joins heartily in support of the views that will give him the vote and sales for his magazine or book? To be relevant, one must objectively consider the next step in this dialogue. What will Neo-Hefnerism present? Hefner has already been under a considerable amount of pressure for his own level of "puritanism" which excludes the ethics of the homosexual.

The quest for objectivity, then, must continue, but must not be

based on an exclusive philosophy of dogmatic empirical science, but must begin with the humility of human admission that social, intellectual, and religious influences have contributed to our present judgments. Scientists, religionists, philosophers and other disciplines can contribute together in this honest, respectful quest for objective truth.

Documentations

- (1) Life, September 24, 1965, p.4.
- (2) Brown and Stuermann, Elementary Modern Logic (New York: Ronald Press, 1965), pp.214-215.
- (3) Alfred North Whitehead, The Function of Reason (Boston: Beacon Hill Press, 1929), pp.43-44.
- (4) Klausner and Kuntz, Philosophy: The Study of Alternative Beliefs (New York: Macmillan Press, 1961).
- (5) John Robinson, Honest to God (London: SCN Press Limited, 1963).

TWENTIETH CENTURY EVANGELICALS LOOK AT BIBLE TRANSLATION

STEPHEN W. PAINE, Ph D.
(President, Houghton College)

I. CHRISTIAN REFORMED INITIATIVE

To the men of the Christian Reformed Church goes the principal credit, humanly speaking, for the chain of actions which has finally eventuated in the undertaking of a new translation of the Bible in modern English by scholars of known evangelical commitment. The Synod of the Christian Reformed Church has from time to time interested itself in various Bible translations. In 1953 a committee was authorized to make a careful study of the Revised Standard Version. The result was a scholarly paper seventeen pages in length, kindly but critical, presented to Synod the following year.

The Synod of 1956 was overtured by the Seattle Consistory as follows: "That the Christian Reformed Church endeavor to join other conservative churches in sponsoring or facilitating the early production of a faithful translation of the Scriptures in the common language of the American people." Synod referred this overture to the professors of the Old and New Testament Departments of Calvin Theological Seminary for study and report. The committee immediately contacted other evangelical communions and institutions, asking them the question, "Is your denomination or group prepared to make a concerted effort to convince the people that the production of a Bible translation. . . is an urgent requirement for the effective use of God's Word, and that it must consequently receive the support of all those interested in the use and study of that Word?"

Even while waiting for replies, the committee reported to the Synod of 1958, stressing its feeling that a modern version of the Bible constituted a need for the evangelical public.

The Committee on Bible Translation of the Christian Reformed Church was continued by Synod up to its session of 1966, and since that time there has been a committee named to continue work in this area. This Committee on Bible Translation for several years met faithfully and frequently, and in its annual reports to Synod made some

very keen observations as to the factors involved in the undertaking of a new Bible translation.

II. NAE CONCERN

No doubt spurred by the activity and inquiries of the Christian Reformed Committee on Bible Translation, the Commission on Education of the National Association of Evangelicals at its meeting in Buffalo, New York, in April, 1957, appointed a committee of three members "to study the question of NAE's participation in the possible project of a new English translation of the Old and New Testaments." This committee made contact immediately with the secretary of the Christian Reformed Committee, asking suggestions for "a workable combination of evangelical forces for the approaching of a task such as this." Preliminary inquiries were also addressed to some of the more likely publishers, although it was realized that there was nothing very definite about which to talk at that early date.

The Christian Reformed Committee in its report to Synod of June 11, 1958, had recommended that "Synod instruct its committee to approach those bodies that had shown an interest in this project with a view to drawing up of tentative plans." Thus there was even then a desire to work out cooperative arrangements with any who might be interested. It was not until April 11, 1961, however, that an informal meeting of members of the two committees actually occurred. This was at the time of the NAE Convention in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and the meeting was in the Pantlind Hotel.

From the very beginning the NAE Committee was hampered in its activity by the great distances separating its members and by the lack of finances for continuing meetings. In general the Committee had to be satisfied with work sessions at the time of the NAE Conventions, and this meant that when members were unable to attend the NAE Convention the work was further hindered.

III. JOINT INVESTIGATION

On December 22, 1962, there was a joint work meeting of the two committees at Calvin Theological Seminary in Grand Rapids. Dr. Ralph Stob of the Christian Reformed Committee was named as chairman.

The principal attention of the combined meeting was focused upon the objective of calling a gathering of evangelical scholars to consider the question whether a new translation is required and possibly to take initial steps moving toward the production of such a work. It was felt that this undertaking must be broadly based and not limited to the interest of specific denominational or interdenominational groups. Subcommittees were named to consider (1) the issuance of invitations (Dr. Burton Goddard, chairman), (2) the preparation of agenda (Dr. Earl Kalland, chairman), (3) translation policy (Dr. Marten Woudstra, chairman). It was decided to allow these subcommittees time in which to hold separate meetings and test their ideas by discussing them with other scholars.

On December 29, 1964, just prior to the meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society at Nyack Missionary College, another meeting of the Joint Committee was held at the Missionary College. Dr. Marten Woudstra was named as chairman. At this meeting the subcommittees made their reports of progress and it was decided to fix upon a definite time in August, 1965, for the proposed meeting of scholars. Chicago was chosen as the place of meeting, and later developments fixed the location at the Trinity Christian College in Palos Heights, Illinois.

IV. THE PALOS HEIGHTS CONFERENCE

The Palos Heights Conference on Bible Translation took place on August 26 and 27, 1965. About thirty scholars were present, representing various denominations and institutions. Papers were read analyzing some of the more recent and well-known Bible translations, in particular the Revised Standard Version, the New English Bible (NT only), and the New American Standard Bible (NT only). Other papers outlined the type of problems to be met in such a large undertaking as that of a new Bible translation. There was a careful discussion of the feasibility of attempting a new Bible translation at this time.

After the various discussions had been concluded, Dr. Burton L. Goddard was elected temporary chairman of the meeting and a regular business session was held. As a starting point the following statement was adopted: "It is the sense of this assembly that the preparation of a contemporary English translation of the Bible should be under-

taken as a collegiate endeavor of evangelical scholars."

Realizing that there would be need for a continuing committee to implement this purpose and that fairly careful consideration should be given to the selection of this group, the meeting by resolution named the ten members of the Joint Committee as a constitutive group to establish a continuing committee of fifteen, of which at least five of the members of the appointing committee were to be a part.

V. COMMITTEE OF FIFTEEN

This "committee of fifteen" was given a threefold mandate as follows:

- (1) To prepare a digest of the Palos Heights Conference for distribution to leaders of evangelical denominations and schools and to other responsible parties, soliciting their response.
- (2) To explore ways of establishing communication with the committee of the RSV with a view to making suggestions for revision.
- (3) To set up preliminary ground rules for the work of translation and preliminary principles of such translation work.

Immediately following the adjournment of the conference, the members of the Joint Committee met to set up the continuing Committee of Fifteen and to provide for a few alternates in case of inability to serve. Plans were also made to call the initial meeting of this new committee immediately following the Convention of the Evangelical Theological Society in Nashville, Tennessee, the following December. Satisfied that by now the objectives of the Joint Committee had, to all appearances, been discharged and accomplished, the Joint Committee now provided for its own termination.

The new Committee of Fifteen met at the Free Will Baptist Bible College in Nashville on December 29, 1965. It was convened by Dr. E. Leslie Carlson, and Dr. Marten Woudstra was elected as chairman. All but three of the original appointees were present.

The Committee proceeded to give consideration to the various parts of its mandate from the Palos Heights Conference on Bible Transla-

tion, realizing full well that this Conference which had provided for its existence was not a continuing body to which a report could be made, and feeling that the Committee itself must therefore be given a certain amount of discretion in fulfilling its responsibility.

The first and principal item of the mandate seemed to be contained in the Palos Heights decision "that the preparation of a contemporary English translation of the Bible should be undertaken as a collegiate endeavor of evangelical scholars." To implement this it was decided to proceed at once to call a general conference on Bible translation for the following purposes:

- (1) To involve at the earliest possible moment representatives of Christian denominations and other organizations having a high view of Scripture and involved in a major way in the use of Bibles in the English language.
- (2) To bring the program to the attention of potential Bible publishers.
- (3) To consummate a full organization for the program.
- (4) To publicize the venture.

A subcommittee with Dr. Goddard as chairman was set up to implement this decision, and a Bible Translation Conference was held at the Moody Memorial Church in Chicago on August 26 and 27, 1966, just a year after the Palos Heights meeting of Bible scholars. I shall refer again to this Chicago conference.

VI. RELATIONSHIP TO REVISED STANDARD VERSION

A somewhat difficult part of the Committee's assignment was the charge to explore "ways of establishing communication with the committee of the RSV with a view to making suggestions for revision." The Committee realized at once that the primary decision to proceed with a new translation, which had already been made at Palos Heights and with which the Committee was in agreement, had the inescapable effect of making any such overtures to the RSV committee a mere transfer of information, rather than an earnest solicitation for amendment of unscholarly translations, with the implication that if the objections

were satisfied the new venture would be abandoned. This kind of approach had already been discussed at Palos Heights in the light of the experience of a committee of the Missouri Synod Lutherans.

The Committee of Fifteen therefore provided that with reference to this mandate regarding the RSV, "this Committee for the time being discharges its responsibility by requesting its editorial committee in process of translation, to build up a list of RSV and NEB passages to which objection is felt, for the purpose of making these available to the RSV and NEB committees at a proper time."

The Committee of Fifteen also took cognizance of the suggestion of the Palos Heights Conference that "they set up preliminary ground rules for the work of translation and preliminary principles of such translation work." A three-member subcommittee under the chairmanship of Dr. Ro Laird Harris was established to be the interim editorial committee,

VII. THEOLOGICAL BASE FOR THE TRANSLATION PROJECT

Prior to the Chicago conference of 1966 the committee adopted the simple name "Committee on Bible Translation." Although recognizing that we are not striving for an "evangelical translation" of the Bible, but only for a good and a fair translation which will permit the Bible to speak as it wants to speak, the Committee realized that any translation will unavoidably reflect the presuppositions of the translators. Hence it was felt to be quite important to provide that this translation should be the work of scholars who accept the claims of Scripture as to its divine authorship and complete authority. The Committee therefore adopted the following statement of policy:

In harmony with the expressed objective of the program of the translation it seems desirable that each person engaged in the work of translation should be clearly on record as to his beliefs. Everyone is to subscribe to the following doctrinal statement (or to a similar statement expressing an equally high view of Scripture): "The Bible alone, and the Bible in its entirety, is the Word of God written, and is therefore inerrant in the autographs."

The constitution, referring to the creedal requirements of members of the Committee on Bible Translation mentions specifically the state-

ments on Scripture found in the Westminster or Belgic or New Hampshire Confessions or the credal basis of the NAE as being satisfactory doctrinal criteria.

VIII. ENTER THE NEW YORK BIBLE SOCIETY

Present at the Chicago convention were representatives of the New York Bible Society, the oldest such corporation in the United States, thoroughly evangelical in its sympathies and doctrinal position. The Rev. Youngve Kindberg, Executive Secretary of the NYBS, and Mr. James W. Straub, one of its Directors, were impressed with the timeliness of this translation project and its possible importance for all voluntary agencies for the dissemination of the Bible in whole and in portions.

These men also, though realizing the probable great cost of the project, began to think in terms of financial sponsorship. and they intimated to the members of the Committee that they would be praying about the matter and conferring with the Directors of NYBS. During the ensuing months there were various consultations on this matter,

The Directors of NYBS first agreed to finance the travel and meeting expenses of the Committee while considering the larger venture, and finally in the spring of 1968 voted to assume the responsibility of raising the funds for the entire venture. This was a great step of faith, since the project is estimated to go to \$850,000. Though the translation is to be made available to missionary agencies, yet there will be opportunity through regular marketing channels to recoup some--perhaps much--of this expense.

The NYBS was desirous that the Committee produce first the Gospel of John for separate publication, then the full New Testament, and finally the Old Testament.

IX. POSITION PAPER

At a meeting in Grand Rapids, on July 11, 1967, the Committee adopted a position paper setting forth briefly its view of the need for a new English translation by evangelical scholars and its specific aims in undertaking to meet this need. The need was summarized

as follows:

Only with one version in common use in our churches will Bible memorization flourish, will those in the pew follow in their own Bibles the reading of Scripture and comments on individual Scriptures from the pulpit, will unison readings be possible, will Bible Teachers be able to interpret with maximum success the Biblical text word by word and phrase by phrase to their students, and will the Word be implanted indelibly upon the minds of Christians as they hear and read again and again the words of the Bible in the same phraseology. We acknowledge freely that there are benefits to be derived by the individual as he refers to other translations in his study of the Bible, but this could still be done in situations in which a common Bible was in general use.

Without pointing out individually the deficiencies of the various existing translations, it may be said that no one of them gives promise of acceptance as a standard version among the churches which have a high view of Scripture. For many years those who do hold such a view of the Bible have failed to put forth an all-out effort to give to English readers a translation of the Bible which represents the best documented text, the most accurate translation, and the best literary style for effective communication. It is the aim of the Committee on Bible Translation to work for these results.

In meeting this need the Committee adopted the following nine guidelines:

- (1) At every point the translation shall be faithful to the Word of God as represented by the most accurate text of the original languages of Scripture.
- (2) The work shall not be a revision of another version but a fresh translation from the Hebrew, Aramic, and Greek.
- (3) The translation shall reflect clearly the unity and harmony of the Spirit-inspired writings.
- (4) The aim shall be to make the translation represent as clearly as possible only what the original says, and not to inject additional elements by unwarranted paraphrasing.
- (5) The translation shall be designed to communicate the truth of

God's revelation as effectively as possible to English readers in the language of the people. In this respect, the Committee's goal is that of doing for our own time that which the King James Version did for its day.

- (6) Every effort shall be made to achieve good English style.
- (7) The finished product shall be suitable for use in public worship, in the study of the Word, and in devotional reading.
- (8) The project shall be a representative cooperative endeavor so that the finest scholarship may be applied, so that the version may be as free as possible from the individual theological biases of the translators, so that constructive criticism from many and varied quarters may be brought to bear on the work in its formative stages, and so that the churches may be prepared adequately to receive and use the new translation when it becomes available.
- (9) Those engaged in the work of translation shall not only possess the necessary requirements of scholarship, but they shall also look upon their labor as a sacred trust, honoring the Bible as the inspired Word of God.

The Committee after considerable consultation selected for its work the title "The Holy Bible - A Contemporary Translation." Certainly Holy Bible should continue to be the name of the book, it was felt, and the subtitle is descriptive, non-flamboyant, and yields a convenient acronym--ACT.

X. MODUS OPERANDI

The Committee was desirous of organizing its work to insure a maximum of conference and criticism. The initial basic translation teams number five: a principal and an associate translator who are to produce the first draft. This in turn is to be reviewed by two other scholars conversant with the language, and finally an English stylist will criticize its literary qualities. After editing by the co-translators, the product goes to the NT or the OT Intermediate Editorial Committee, composed of the principal translators of the basic teams. From here it

goes to a General Editorial Committee of twelve to fifteen persons. The Committee on Bible Translation itself makes any necessary final decisions.

XI. FIRST THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Even before the final decision of the NYBS to sponsor the project, a translation team led by Dr. Ramsey Michaels of Gordon Divinity School was busy on the Gospel of John. Dr. Michaels' specialty is the Johannine literature. By summer several chapters were ready for the NT Intermediate Editorial Committee, which met at Wheaton College. The OT Committee was also at work in Denver.

It became evident at once that the real task of the summer would be to settle upon a style level for the new translation. Already quite a few basic decisions had to be made. Also there had been much discussion of the relative desirability of a fairly word-for-word style, such as the ASV and the RSV, as compared with a so-called "equivalent-idea" style as seen in Phillips in the New English Bible.

The material as it came in from Dr. Michaels and his team was very spirited, keen, and definitely of the equivalent-idea style, although exhibiting a very high degree of deference for the words of the Greek text. Oft-repeated connectives like (kai) and (ouv) were often translated by varying English connectives ("and", "so", "now", "then", "accordingly", and so on). Sometimes, where they appeared over tedious for good English style, they were dropped--a liberty taken by the KJ and many other good translations. But aside from this almost every individual word in the Greek was reflected by some word, intimation, or nuance in the translation.

The successive editorial work of the Intermediate and General Editorial Committees and of the Committee on Bible Translation had the effect of making the style more conservative and word-for-word, but it did not, in our opinion, obliterate the freshness and vividness of the basic translators. It still awaits evaluation by trained stylists and by representatives of various reader publics.

XII. A FEW SAMPLES

Although all work remains tentative and not for publication, I take

the liberty of citing sample treatments from the fourth Gospel. The text of John 1:11, 12 illustrates a couple of principles followed by the translators. The passage reads:

He came to what was his own, but his own people did not accept him.

Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God.

The translators have contrived to show the difference between the neuter ("What was his own") and the masculine ("his own people") substantive adjectives. In the verbs "accept" and "received" they have tried to preserve the delicate shading between (παρελαβον) and (ελαβον). They have altered the Greek order slightly by bringing the closing phrase of verse 12 into immediate apposition with its parallel phrase, "to all who received him."

Verse 14 includes three words which made the committee study. Here is the verse:

The Word became man and lived for a while among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the Only Son from the Father, full of grace and truth.

First came the word (σαρξ), flesh, which was a word used for humanity in general: "all flesh shall see it." The committee decided to use the word for specific humanity: "man". Next the word (σκεινω) to tent, called for attention. The circumlocution "lived for a while" seemed the most natural solution. Then that word (μονογενεστηος), only begotten. The committee with great reluctance conceded that we do not today use the word "begotten" in the English language. And "Only Son" is certainly the full logical, if not linguistic, equivalent.

In verse 18, where the best text now reads monogenestheos, and then mentions Jesus as being "in the bosom of the Father," the translators have tried to be faithful to the text by saying,

No one has ever seen God, but God the only Son, ever at the Father's side--he has made him known.

As has no doubt been noticed, the Greek aorist is sometimes translated as a perfect, as this was felt often to be more faithful to the original thought. Imperfects are translated participially when this is necessary in order to make clear their linear quality. But where the context itself makes the type of action clear we have not laboriously used the participle and copulative in every case as have some translations.

Nor has the Committee abandoned the use of the historical present as have some. We have not felt bound to translate all the Greek historical presents just so, but at times the action nicely uses an exact transfer, as in verse 15:

John bears him witness. He cries out saying, "This was he of whom I said,
'He who comes after me has surpassed me, because he existed before me.'"

Against the misgivings of several of us, the Committee opted for quotation marks, with the interpretative burden involved. The discourse of Jesus in John 3 is carried through verse 21 instead of stop ping with verse 15, as some have done. John 3:16 is purposely kept close to its familiar format, and reads:

For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes
in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life.

Such then is the tremendous task in which the Committee is engaged, and such have been the providences by which God, we believe, has led us to it. Our humble desire is that these labors shall serve the Word of God and the people of God. Only as God himself works through us can this high design be realized.