

T D Hersey, Box 216
Moravia, Iowa 52571
July 28, 1979

Dear Brother Wayne,

The copy of the WTJ that you sent has arrived, and I hope that I can do it justice in my analysis of its contents. Looking thru it the first time for some kind of clue for the particular matter that had your attention, as mentioned in your letter, did not disclose anything special. So I'll look more particularly for it the second reading thru. I face certain handicaps this time. According to the weatherman, a stalled high-pressure dome over the Bermudas, is drawing the smog from the industrial section of Pennsylvania and mixing it with hot and humid moisture from the Gulf of Mexico, and giving us very oppressively muggy weather that is a killer for those who have resperatory weaknesses. So I felt more like taking a siesta of somnulence rather than a fiesta of succulence in the first reading of this issue of the WTJ.

Furthermore, the extensive reviews that I wrote for the previous issues of the WTJ, left me rather mentally spent. I do not usually get such a barrage to do all within a few weeks time. Besides, I've been having dialogs with others of radically different traditions. For instance, I just completed and sent a multiple-paged letter to a professed atheist. About herself, she had written that in her childhood she had received religious instruction, but that at the age of fifteen, she became an atheist and has maintained that position since. With her letter, she sent a pamphlet that she had received from some friend in the Feminist Movement, who is trying to establish a religion for women radically different from traditional religions that are all from the masculine viewpoint.

This atheist wanted nothing to do with this female religion any more than she wanted anything to do with male oriented religions. So my response to her letter and the inclosed pamphlet, was to be a dialog to show that I could understand both her atheism and also the theology of this feminist religion. It has no name and I don't know whether it has much of an organization yet. A quarterly publication is put out trying to formulate its course, with the title "Spiritual Celebration." The pamphlet had six items designated as "Tenets of Faith." (I don't suppose that there are any fellows in the WTS who would give any attention or response to atheists or feministic religionists.) Well, this has been more challenging to me as a contemporary concern in the lives of people seeking a relevant faith, than examining a traditionalism that no longer speaks to people today.

On hand for me to review and respond to, is another quarterly publication put out for Catholic priests, in a spectrum that ranges from the ultra-conservatism of an American Catholic sect that refused to accept the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope that was established a 100 years ago, thru regular Catholics, liberal Catholics, Anglican Catholics, and Canadian Catholics. I receive this quarterly without charge as those involved in it have been impressed with what I put out in the AMEN SIG Newsletter. Occasionally, they reprint what I put in the Newsletter. In the Fall issue, they may carry an article on the general topic of "The Sexuality of the Clergy", and deals with such questions as: Should women be allowed to be ordained? Does marriage disqualify a man from being an effective Priest? Should homosexuals be regarded as unqualified for serving and receive ordination? I am very sure that what I wrote would be endorsed by the leadership of holiness denominations, but I am likewise almost certain that it would not be regarded as suitable for publication even in the Preachers Magazines.

The Charismatics have not yet become theological minded enough to enter into any dialog with me. I have had several exchanges with a Jew, more from the stand point of his cultural traditions rather than from any serious interest in his religion, as he does not attend synagogue services at all. And I have even had an exchange with a Jehovah Witness, and it is up to him whether he'll continue in any dialog. I even had a letter from a former class mate at MWC, somewhat of reminiscing and discussing the prospects of the age of retirement and what to do about it, or "Is there no discharge from this war?"

1st Address So I'll begin with the "Musings" of the one who spoke at the banquet last November. He was impressed by the number of students who are attracted to the meetings in recent years. But I wonder whether he or any of the membership know the reasons why these students are attending. Are they finding that the prospects of a pastoral ministry in a very secular-minded era, is requiring them to have a preparation that they are not getting? Even thirty-five years ago, the best I could get from my Marion College education, did not adequately prepare me for a pastoral ministry. It was of a kind that prepared for evangelistic ministry, or a scholarship ministry of teaching in seminaries, but not for pastoral ministry. Thru the years of my ministry, I have served 20 congregations, primarily in preparing for the retrenchment conditions and the transitions to the merging of denominations.

The address gives me the sense of an echo of what another address might have been a 100 years ago, of scholars seeking for freedom to search for truth for a church that was prospering and becoming too comfortable to be overly radical and zealous. In the present address an idea is raised about opening the fellowship to include others of the Conservative outlook on life but of non-Wesleyan traditions, and "Keswick, the Charismatic Movement, and Fundamentalism" are specifically mentioned. The notable element in common in their fellowships, is their lack of scholarship, and their zeal for evangelism seems to be more effective.

"These contacts could infuse new life into our own biblical, theological, and historical understanding." I do not know about the effectiveness there might be to "infuse new life", but it would certainly broaden the range of other viewpoints away from the narrowness of an exclusive traditionalism. I am reminded of the observation of Eccl 1:18, "For in much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow." And another quotation from an English poet, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, Drink deep or shun the Piraean Spring," indicating that if one's knowledge is superficial, it does bring more grief than benefit. And in an association of exclusivists, I wonder whether their scope is broad enough to expose their own shortcomings.

The enlargement of my understanding and acceptance of the virginal conception and birth of Jesus, was made possible from my reading of a book by Harry Emerson Fosdick, who was outspokenly against the record of that occurrence. It is a book which Conservatives probably do not read, "The Modern Use of the Bible." His main thesis in that book was worthless because he did not apply principles of interpretation which he elucidated in the book. I did make use of them, and came up with a stronger understanding of the Virgin Birth than I had had before.

The speaker was mistaken in his opinion that the world is "increasing hostile to the Gospel." The hostility is against the misrepresentation that is made of the Gospel, modify and obscuring it from its pristine forth-rightness. It is the religious establishment that substitutes its traditionalism that is the most opposed to the Gospel, just as it was in Jesus' day. It was to the extent that John Wesley got beyond the traditionalism of his day, that his ministry with the Gospel was so effective. Those that have made a fetish of Wesley and established a traditionalism in his name and on his works, that is the biggest obstacle to the Gospel today. We must remember that all theology and all doctrine, is at most only a philosophical interpretation and no substitute for religious experience.

"Increased writing and publication of Wesleyan-Holiness literature", was a point that was emphasized -- and which I have advocated for nearly forty years. Unfortunately, most scholars of the Wesleyan persuasion, are too busy with such incidentals of life that prevent them from any time to express themselves in writing, that such a venture is not likely. As the head of the department on religion at Marion, you are so tightly scheduled with administration, that you have no time available to be writing for any possible contribution that you could have published, or even articles in the Wesleyan Advocate. I receive that paper

and very little of it is not reprint, and I have no knowledge of what other Holiness denominations are doing with their official papers, but no consistent policy of using original articles. The emphasis seems to be on lay witnessing that does not deal with basic issues, but some innocuous observation about life.

Then the address turns to the "discussion of baptism", which is the major emphasis of the Charismatic Movement, but which is not the source of the effectiveness of that Movement. Its effectiveness is in its diversity rather than its insistence of conformity. It has extensive publication, because representatives in the movement tend to be independent of one another. They do their own writing and their own publication of their books, rather than directing all such efforts thru some bottle-neck of a central headquarters or publishing company. That "baptism" is emphasized, is primarily because the Charismatics have come out of the Baptist denominations in their back-ground. It was only as the Holiness Movement of the 19th century began to decline into denominations that it was excluded from those of the Baptist traditions. That exclusion led those of the Baptist traditionalism, to look for more in the event of Pentecost for something more than an anniversary celebration of the origin of the Church.

I am old enough to remember when the Asbury center of Holiness emphasis began making its distinction from the Charismatic movement, by changing its periodical's name from the "Pentecostal Herald" to simply, "The Herald". (I do not know whether it is still published or not, but the early copies of the latter publication did not compare with the quality of the former. If holiness has no earlier base than Wesley, then it is as much an aberration as is the Charismatic Movement, which subsists primarily in the Acts of the Apostles and the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Yet there is no research under way to discover writings on the subject in the archives of the Catholic Church, to compare with the emphasis in the Wesleyan traditionalism.

Wesley was part of that tradition of looking for the ideal standard for Christian experience, in the primitive Church of the Apostolic era. All reform Movements that have arisen in the history of Christianity, have sought for the original pattern of Christian life in that way. Overlooked by all, is the fact that the early Church was built entirely on the traditions of Judaism -- and not on the Old Testament Scriptures. For Judaism is not the religion of the people of Israel during their history as a nation, but a development of a traditionalism that originated while they were in exile. Christianity is likewise not a religion that originated with Jesus of Nazareth, but likewise among the Jews during their history in exile. The basic truth of the Gospel is in neither Judaism nor Christianity, but in the ministry and message of Jesus of Nazareth. The Church at Pentecost had closer connection to the Jewish Charismatics today, of those who are by birth and by culture Jews, but have had very little contact with synagogic traditions and emphases.

The concluding point of the address, was "to reaffirm our commitment to the final authority of an infallible Bible." Let's face it; he did not really mean what he said or even think of what he said. The "final authority" is not in a literature in the languages of men, but in God only. The Bible is an object that can be manipulated to conform to any theological interpretations that men are inclined to make of it. "Biblical theology" does not refer to the contents of the Bible, but to some theological interpretation of the Bible exclusive of the culture in which it was written. It is the Holy Spirit that leads us into all truth, exclusive of all theologies of men, with their attempts to define and to restrict the grace of God within the limitations of the way they think God ought to extend it, particularly if they were God.

Digression And this brings me again to focus attention on that leading doctrinal position of the Bible "In the plenary-dynamic and unique inspiration of the Bible as the divine Word of God, the only infallible, sufficient, and authoritative rule of faith and practice." How many members of WTS understand exactly and

unanimously the meaning of that statement? All may affirm their allegiance to it, but from a **sentimental standpoint rather than from an intellectual understanding of its meaning, its origin, and its implications.** How many know exactly what the word "plenary" means? Who was the first one to use that word in reference to the Bible? What constitutes what the Bible is, and what was the basis for establishing that constitution? For the Bible includes more and less when considered from the standpoint of Catholicism, Anglicanism, and Evangelicalism. Does "plenary" apply to the version of the Bible that has more contents or less contents? Wesley accepted the Anglican version which has the most extensive contents, including apocryphical books that Romanism did not accept and Evangelicalism does not accept any of them.

Or going on to the next word, dynamic, we find it to be more familiar as to its meaning but not from this technical sense that is being emphasized. What is the specific meaning intended here? As used, it is only a half-word, since it is hyphenated with "plenary", so that the meaning is further obscured into ambiguity. Even from my own standpoint, I do not attach my faith to anything that is vague, for anything that cannot be clearly expressed tends to be unimportant. And we are not done with the prolixity of adjectives before we arrive at anything substantial in this statement, as we come to the next one "unique", and the first one that is precise and unequivocal in its meaning, but not in its application, to a very ambiguous noun. "Inspiration" is a word too heavily loaded with connotations, so that anyone can find his own meaning in it, and modifying it with "unique" emphasizes that latitude. From the philosophic standpoint, this declaration is right in line with Humanism, altho probably intended to transcend Humanism. For it emphasizes the human aspect of attainment rather than disclosing any idea of revelation from a divine standpoint.

Suppose we were to use simple words such as: We believe in the fully-powerful and only intuition possible is the Bible. This includes the basis idea that is contained in the technical jargon. Also disclosed is the fact that it expresses humanistic experience rather than anything about God, for so far God is not mentioned. And we have yet to define the precise meaning of the word "Bible", so let us consider exactly what it is, to the extent that it is available to us.

It is assumed that the Bible is strictly what the original writers of its contents put it down directly from God. In actual fact, the only Bible we have is the result of the work of copyists and translators and revisers. Not only that, it is agreed by those of every persuasion, that whatever truth the Bible is intended to contain or to convey, cannot be appropriated from the intellectual standpoint. That means that exegesis and interpretation must be used for anyone to know what the Bible message is. All denominations of the Church resort to theologians or ecclesiasts to be the authentic exegete or interpreter. Most give mouth-service that the Holy Spirit is the only authentic interpreter but to only select individuals who are granted special inspiration, and thus not available to every person directly.

But we aren't done with redundant adjectives, or ambiguous nouns. For the Bible is defined "as the divine Word of God. The word "divine" has the same meaning as the phrase "of God". Sandwiched between these two adjectival expressions, is the ambiguous noun "word". It is ambiguous, because a word is either in writing or in speaking. The Hebrew and Greek versions of the Bible are precise in the terms that were used. Wherever the expression "Word of God" is used in the Bible, it was always on the basis of a spoken word and never on the basis of a written word. From the Bible record in its original languages, it is disqualified as the Word of God.

Nor is the statement complete at this point. The adjective "unique" is to be repeated in the adjective "only", and the hyphenated adjective "plenary-dynamic" is likewise repeated in the adjective "authoritative." Two more ambiguous adjectives are to be inserted, "infallible", and "sufficient". Even a prelim-

inary investigation for the meaning of "infallible" would disclose that its application is untenable. For its specific meaning is: incapable of being used to deceive, i e, It is impossible for the Devil to use the Bible to deceive others with such use, and that obviously is not true. Inerrant would be a less ambiguous adjective, but it seems to have accrued a connotation that makes it theologically unacceptable to the formulators of this statement of faith.

And what about the adjective "sufficient"? The implication is that all we need to know for religious experience is what we read in the Bible. It is assumed that we do not acquire the ability to read, nor need anyone to explain anything of the Bible to us. It implies that we can do anything we please that the Bible does not expressly forbid, and are totally restricted from doing anything that the Bible does not expressly command us to do. These applications are obviously untenable, but they are the only logically consistent intention in the word "sufficient." It can be further inferred in the use of this word, that we are under no obligation to instruct others in the Bible, since they don't ^{need} anything except the Bible itself to find all that they need to know.

Now these adjectives are applied to a noun that puts restrictions on the exercise of our faith. For the noun "rule" prohibits any extension of faith beyond the limitations placed on it within the imposed "rule". Thus, we cannot use our faith intelligently, since intelligence is a personal capability that we do not acquire from the Bible, but directly from God. Nor can we accept the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the use of our faith, since the activity of the Holy Spirit is not limited within the pages of the Bible. And to the logical conclusion, there is no need for Wesleyan traditionalism, since it represents an interpretation of the Bible and not the contents of the Bible. The whole point is, that someone can formulate a statement of faith which seems to sum up what one may feel about the Bible, without thinking at all about its implications, and those who do not actually think ~~thru~~ thru the statement, can affirm it as an expression of their faith without actually knowing what the statement declared.

^{2nd Address} Well, to go on to the first address that purports to be a thoro examination of the word "baptism" from the biblical standpoint as it relates to the "Spirit." Unfortunately, it is not thoro enough to be truly scholarly, in comprehensiveness and extension. Let's say that it represents a preliminary examination of the subjects, in which a depth study will disclose the areas for further investigation. For the "general analysis of the baptism terminology thru-out the NT" should not be considered from the standpoint that it was "used metaphorically or theologically." Those who wrote the New Testament, were not using the terms from that standpoint but directly reporting events in the ordinary usage of language. The New Testament was written in the Greek language which was not used in Palestine except in secular dealings with peoples from other lands. In daily living and religious interests especially, the Aramaic dialect was exclusively used.

So the use of the Greek terminology based on the root of bapto, must be studied from the standpoint of its use, (if any) in the LXX version of the Old Testament from the Hebrew words to the Greek words on the bapto root. But the speaker does not take that procedure, but takes a theological attitude toward which words he will examine and dismiss quickly those uses that do not fit his theological stance. Thus, he regards "ritual cleansings" as not theological, altho that is exactly what John the Baptist was doing, not according to the temple traditionalism but by a new precedent of his own formulation. In Christian traditionalism, a theological interpretation is made of what John was doing, but from his own standpoint, and in the understanding of those who submitted themselves to his ministry, the practice of baptism was on the basis of the Jewish traditional understanding of the terminology. The ritual ablutions did not refer to actual washing with water but the use of water in a symbolic sense of separation of oneself from the externals of life. The baptism performed by John, was not a matter of giving people a bath, but of using the water as a barrier between their old way of life, and some new way of life that they were venturing into.

Therefore, the scholarly procedure would be to consider that every use of the terminology, was with an understood meaning distinct from the literal meaning of the Greek root bapto. In the ordinary sense, any contact that a person makes with water other than drinking it, swimming in it, obtaining fish from it, or using it as an element of transportation by means of a boat, the use of such contact is for cleansing, whether washing the body or washing clothes or dishes or anything else. From a religious standpoint, such cleansing signifies a separation that removes the taint of the secular from ones life so as to be fit for sacred that is made available in life. The water is thus a material and visible substance that is used to emphasize a separation and transition from one condition in life to another condition in life.

All the references that the speaker gave, in which he emphasized that they had metaphorical significance, had no primary difference from all other uses of the terminology which he dismissed. In Christian traditionalism, the water has been emphasized (except among Quakers). To the initial writers of the New Testament, it was the ritual separation that was emphasized. So, were we to use a word that had the symbolic meaning for baptize, and use it exclusively without using the word baptize, we'd have the New Testament meaning in mind, and would not have the dichotomy of interpretations between those of the Holiness Movement and those of the Charismatic Movement. Purification and separation are in one sense, synonymous terms. Their basic distinction is that purification emphasizes inward experience and separation emphasizes external experience. The inward experience affects the conditions of ones life and personality. The external experience affects the relationship one has with everything else.

When Jesus asked, Are ye able to be baptized with the baptism I am to experience? was He speaking of the internal emphasis, or the external, or both? What did He mean when He asked, "How am I constrained until it is accomplished?" When Paul asked his question, "Do you not know that all of us... have been baptized into His death?" was he referring to water as the Baptists emphasize? Altho water is emphasized in the reference to Noah's experience, and of Moses' leadership of the children of Israel, it was for the purpose of emphasizing that the experiences were not by means of contact with the water, and those who did make contact with the water, were destroyed by the water. What is emphasized is a separation from an old way of life to a new way of life that is irreversible without being destroyed by the very waters that destroyed those who were left behind in the old way of life.

But since the speaker did not go back far enough and deeply enough into the meaning and application of the symbolic meaning in Baptism, he veers off into the traditionalism that has divided Christians into differing emphases, all of which digress from the biblical base they presume to use and interpret. The biblical emphasis was from...to, Christian traditionalism emphasizes in or into. The biblical emphasis was from an old way of life to a new way of life; traditionalism emphasizes a baptism in water or in the Spirit and into a body, and the main objective of LIFE is ignored and missed altogether. Having started from an imperfect premise, the speaker arrives at an incomplete and imperfect conclusion: "Baptism language without exception always has reference to a common experience of all believers and of their entrance into a body." The "common experience of all believers" is LIFE, and NOT "entrance into a body." LIFE is their actual experience, relationship to a BODY is a theological interpretation, that has no particular relevance to religious experience.

It would be rather inconsequential for me to comment further on the speaker's discussion on "Being Baptized in the Holy Spirit", as it is based on the English translation that makes use of the preposition "in", that represents a traditionalism that digresses from the basic significance of the meaning of baptize. The first contrast is between what John can do and what Jesus can do. John can provide a ritual act, but Jesus can provide the life-transforming act. The real con-

trast is not between water and the Holy Spirit, but water and fire, in a symbolism of these two words, water emphasizing the destruction of an old way of life (i e Noah and Moses) and the transformation ~~if~~ a new way of life. To attempt a contrast between water and the Spirit, is to reduce the Spirit to a substance, instead of regarding the Spirit as that person of God that is beyond man's control. Man can make ritual use of water and ritual use of fire, but man cannot make ritual use of the Holy Spirit.

The speaker introduces traditionalism of messianic theology and dispensational theology, both of which are irrelevant to religious experience. He examines the different traditional interpretations of what the Holy Spirit did, to come upon believers, or to fill believers, ignoring the fact that these are theological interpretations attempting to describe what happened, at a time when the nature of the Holy Spirit as a person of God, was not known or understood. We must remember that this record is about Jews, whose philosophic concept of deity was very strongly monotheistic, and any concept of the Trinity was entirely beyond their comprehension. This is true today among the Charismatics, who regard the Spirit not so much as a person of God but as an activating principle in their religious experience of life.

My approach to Bible study, is to disregard as far as possible all theological restrictions and traditional interpretations, to find out exactly what the Bible message is. In this brief analysis that I am making of this address I have discovered a more convincing confirmation of the holiness experience of heart purity and a more intimate relationship with God. In the Charismatic emphasis, I find no separation from worldliness which true holiness emphasizes as basically essential. The charismatics place more emphasis on gifts from God rather than any kind of an adequate relationship with God. True holiness insists on a change of life, a transformation of life, and that is what I find in my own deeper study of the symbolism in baptism at the lower level of ritualism and at the higher level of fulfilled religious experience. I am willing to abandon Wesleyan traditionalism to know the truth of the Gospel and of religious experience. What I find is more a confirmation of its basic message.

But this address becomes entangled with theological concerns for using the "right" technical terminology, such as the two steps or two works of grace, initial and entire sanctification. The result is too much of a mechanical construction of actual experience which is not compartmentalised as theology would make it seem to be. There are those who profess that they sought for the experience of the first work of grace, and then at the same occasion or the next day sought the experience of the second work of grace, and realised that. I highly question that they have acquired any religious experience at all. For a genuine religious experience produces a transformation of life and an effective relationship with God.

Over thirty years ago while I was at Marion College, I received an insight analogy of spiritual experience of new life, related to the natural experience of our birth into this world. Our arrival into this world begins at the moment of conception when we are truly a living being and something more than a mere extraneous growth in our mother's womb as pro-abortionists would have us to believe. Nine months later is the time of our birth, when we are separated from our mother's to begin living for the development of our personality. Well, the "new birth" spiritual experience has resemblance to our natural birth that has its crisis moments of conception, from non-existence to existence, and of birth from a living organism to an entirely independent organism. The second crisis in spiritual experience has resemblance to our natural puberty, when we are now complete in our physical existence for the total natural purpose of our life on the earth. We don't arrive at puberty the next day after we are born, and I seriously question anyone being able to arrive at the second crisis spiritual experience the next day after the first crisis was experienced.

3rd Address The final section on "Other Related Terms" is largely a concern with theological interpretation that seems more like a digression to me into other matters, so I go on to the next address on "Entire Sanctification and the Baptism with the Holy Spirit." This is to be a discussion over differences between theological positions, both of which are incomplete interpretations. "Entire sanctification" is an emphasis that tends to stall those of the Wesleyan traditionalism, to a life that does not continue to develop after arrival at the second work of grace, which is "entire" and therefore total, and there is nothing more to do than to sit down in complacency and maintain that state of grace which one has attained. There is no further growth in grace and they that are affected become stagnant in sanctimiousness.

The doctrine "Baptism with the Holy Spirit" is simply another theological position which has not had that discernment to discover the intended truth, and as was disclosed in the analysis of the preceeding address. This address examines the historical struggle in Wesleyan traditionalism that goes no farther than Wesley himself went. His greatest obsession in life was personal salvation and holiness, and the doctrine of the baptism with the Holy Spirit did not register with him as being a part of contemporary religious experience.

So the several theologians in Wesleyan traditionalism are examined and compared for their positions one way or another, and there seems to be a vagueness with all of them on how to relate the terminology as synonomous or otherwise. It is the proposition in this address to examine the expression "baptism with the Holy Spirit", 1st in the ministry of Jesus, with the comment made that it was used only once on the lips of Jesus in Acts 1:5. Unfortunately, the speaker overlooks the fact that Jesus spoke in the Aramaic dialect and not in Greek to His followers, and Acts 1:5 represents a translation of whatever Jesus said. This fact is not noted by the speaker, who instead traces it back to the proclamation of John the Baptist, comparing what he was doing with the One who was to come after him, to fulfill on a higher the work that he was doing. But before we can understand what John was saying, we need to have in mind the background of his life to know why he was saying it, and thus disclosing the significance of what he was saying.

The Gospel of Luke gives us some information on the background of John the Baptist that is significant. We find that he was the son of a priest who served at the temple. From this we can surmize that when he came to the age of twelve, approximately the same time that Jesus did, that his education to serve in the priesthood was to begin. Becuase the record of Jesus' genealogy had no name for a natural father, He was disqualified from having any opportunito for training for any religious service. John remained at Jerusalem to begin his priestly education, and Jesus went home to Nazareth to involve Himself in secular living until such a time as He was led of the Spirit to fulfill His mission in the world. John had first-hand observation of what temple service was, of the manner of living of the Saducees and the Pharisees, the Scribes and the Lawyers, and to come to his decision about his own mission in life in service to God. We read in other of the Gospel records, that part of his education involved withdrawing himself into the wilderness, which was not something unique because others also withdrew themselves for deeper religious devotion than they could find in the temple worship at Jerusalem.

In the public record of his ministry, we find John being examined by representatives from Jerusalem, of those who felt a responsibility for the religious life of the people and keeping it from corruption with other religions. As the son of a priest and one who had been trained for the priesthood, he knew exactly why they were approaching him with their questions. So he was not intimidated by them and could answer their questions in such a way that they could have no case for bringing charges against him, --- and they didn't. The ritual of his baptism was in conformity to the traditional ceremonialism which was something

more than can be found in any precedent in the Old Testament, just as was true with other traditionalisms against which Jesus spoke during His ministry. I am inclined to think that his ministry of baptism had no uniqueness about it or he would have received opposition from those who investigated him. The same prophetic utterances in the OT that could have been related to his ministry was all a part of the traditionalism that was common for all of them.

There ~~is~~^{was} a most important principle in Judaism at that time, which the speaker did not notice in his attempt to find the origin of a precedent for the baptism ministry of John. And that principle was the obsessive emphasis on separation, which is the meaning of the word Pharisee. And the Essenes were extremists in their extent of separation. The Zealots were political in their practice of separatism. That principle was basic to all practices of ablutions, purifications, and baptisms; and only as we understand this essential characteristic of Judaism at that time, do we find an immediate precedent for John's ministry. It was not particularly unique in any isolated sense, and even Jesus had to compete with many others who professed to be the Christ. John's imagery of the threshing floor was not something new to his hearers, for separation is the basis of that reference.

On the next point in the address on the Ministry of Jesus and the Baptism with the Holy Spirit, we must orient out thinking to this principle of separation, whenever reference is made to baptism, and not to the aspect of the water that was involved, and which was only ritually symbolic to the Jews. When we examine the Gospel records in comparison with one another, we should note that Mark and John begin, at those occasions when Peter and John had come to the ministry of John the Baptist. Luke and Matthew give brief backgrounds to the life of Jesus before He came to His baptism. The reports of Jesus' baptism is in the imagery of the Baptist's own witness concerning Jesus, and which he did not immediately recognize at the time.

It was probably between the time that Jesus left the scene and the next morning, that it occurred to John, that the One who was to come after him, had been disclosed to him. That tremendously excited him, for he had known Jesus as a near relative for most of the life of both of them. He knew where to send his followers to locate Jesus, but they failed to find Him, because He had been led of the Spirit into the wilderness for the forty days that He was totally separated from contact with others. And we can be sure that John made the most of having found the One who had come after him, and was constantly sending his followers out to locate Him. And all Jerusalem was emptied of the people who came to John's baptism. This included the Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and the temple courtiers whose hypocritical lives were well known to John and he could speak sternly to them, Ye vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?

There is no point in theologizing about the witness of the Baptist as definitive of when the Holy Spirit "endowed" Jesus for His mission in life. The work of the Holy Spirit on the life of Jesus began to moment that His mother accepted the prospect of becoming His mother, and ^{He} was planted in her womb as a conception. The works of God are not determined or restricted by the theological speculations of men; but the traditional theological rationalizations of men tend constantly to obscure the works of God from the minds of men. So the address dwindles away into a theology of dispensationalism, in the interpretation of the experience of Jesus. He is regarded as a Man without a message and born only to become a sacrifice and to die.

The second point of the proposition in this address, takes up "Baptism in the Spirit in the Earliest Church." We have another with a traditionalistic viewpoint here, and some language barriers. What is usually understood as the

Church of Pentecost, is not what it actually was, a Movement exclusively within Judaism comparable to the origin of the "denominations" of Judaism today, and called Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform. Its existence was so localized that there is very little reference to it in the works of Josephus in his attempt to define the culture, history, and religion of Judaism. The earliest Church did not become designated as "Christian" until after it began to be extended to the Gentiles under the ministry of the Apostle Paul. The only record that we have of the earliest Church, was written by a non-Jew, and the emphasis that he made not only in his version of the Gospel record of the life of Jesus, as well as his report of the origin and expansion of the Church, was that it was for all people and not just for the Jews.

There is another distinction about these two books by Luke. He wrote them on the basis of the traditionalism of his own life, with such symbolic imagery by which he understood Divine events to take place. The concept of the Spirit was something new to him. More familiar to him was the concept of Daemons, or intermediary spirits between God and Man, and designated as angels (messengers). Thus, Zacharias had a vision of an angel in the temple, that informed him of his prospects for having a son. And it was the vision of an angel that Mary was informed of her prospects of becoming a mother of a son. And it was the vision of an angel that the shepherds were informed of the birth of a Savior. Anything that Luke wrote about the Spirit of God, was with a different understanding than that of the Jews from the standpoint of their traditions.

Thus, when^{v2} come upon the expression of being "filled with the Holy Ghost" in Acts 2:4; 4:8; 4:31; 6:3; 7:55; 9:17; 11:24; 13:9; they do not represent a new dispensation to Luke, for he uses the same expression in his Gospel, as we find in Luke 1:15, 41, 67; 4:1. And these earlier references have no connection with baptism, or that religion was not already "interiorized". The third feature noted in the address about Luke's Gospel "on the Spirit as the agent of prophecy", we find the same emphasis mentioned in John's Gospel in the words of Jesus, that the work of the Spirit was to "lead us into all truth". This is the main work of the Spirit, with the "power" of the Spirit to be for the one purpose "to witness" to the truth about God and the message from God.

But the address would focus all references to the Spirit to the principle of baptism, which is an emphasis that I don't think that Luke makes. The significance of the "Gentile Pentecost" was not a matter of what Luke believed about baptism, but rather in making specifically clear his theme thru-out both his books that the Gospel was for all people and not just for the Jews. With Peter, there was a concern for water baptism, even in face of a situation of people manifesting the presence of the Spirit in their lives before water baptism rather than a consequence of it. It is more likely that Luke's attitude about water baptism was similar to that of the apostle Paul, who emphasized that he was not sent to baptize, and his only occasions for performing the ritual were incidental to establishing leadership in the church.

In answer to the question, "What then is Luke doing?" I think that the speaker gives a theological answer that completely missed what Luke was doing. The very title of his second book excludes that he intended any emphasis on the origin of the Church. He very definitely was contrasting the ministries of the apostles Peter and Paul. Of the 28 chapters, the first fourteen are primarily of the ministry of Peter, and chapters 16 to 28 are exclusively about the ministry of the apostle Paul. Chapter 15 is determinative council that established the Church to be for all people as emphasized by the apostle Paul and was involuntarily arrived at by the apostle Peter. We can read our own theological interpretation of emphasis on the Church as the beginning of a new dispensation, but I do not think that was the emphasis in the mind of Luke. For him the new order began with the acts of God reported in the first chapter of his Gospel, and not of the event that occurred at Pentecost.

4th Address The next address was on the subject of Eschatology from the standpoint of process-theology about which I am not fully informed. Even the quasi-definition that is given in this address is hardly enlightening: "Process theologians endeavor to explore creative possibilities of human existence and even God Himself." I have a copy of Hal Lindsey's book "The Late Great Planet Earth", and simply makes no sense to me at all. Maybe it is because I am so conscious of the presence and greatness of God in the universe, and his highest outlook on life is at the level of Humanism without a consciousness of the reality of God. Is it also true that process theologians are also restricted to the level of Humanism in their search for an interpretation of life?

So to the question, "Why not a Wesleyan eschatology?" I would ask, Why at all? Eschatology is primarily a concern about the future and is not of faith or trust in God. Its motivating cause is an outcome of failure to cope with present conditions of life, so what preparations should we make to be ready to cope with future conditions that will be better or worse than those of the present. Wesley was raised in traditions that focused on making preparations for the future, and trusting the Church altogether to provide the necessary means of grace to take care of the future. But the conditions of the Church of his day caused Wesley to question the adequacy of the Church to make full provision for his welfare in the future and he looked for more assurance about his salvation than the Church offered. His observance of the Moravians led him to feel that they had realised such an assurance for themselves, and that if he looked beyond the traditions in which he was raised, he too could find it.

There is another approach for dealing with impossible present conditions so as to accept life as it comes to us and to endure the circumstances that rather than looking for a way of escape from them. This approach was developed in Judaism in the production and use of apocalyptic literature, of which much is available for us today in the apocryphical books, which Wesley had but did not make much use of them. The books of Daniel and of Revelation, are the only ones that Evangelicals consider, but without understanding because an understanding of the intention in all such literature must be known before any of it can be adequately understood. Wesley did not make such a comparison study primarily because circumstantial conditions of life were not impossible for him and soteriological resources were effective in the experience of the Moravians.

But those in the Wesleyan traditionalism have been separated from the Anglican traditionalism with its more extensive Bible, and instead have restricted themselves to the shortest Evangelical version of the Bible, and so are in a dilemmic situation of being neither Evangelical nor Anglican in their use of the Bible. This has led them to a position of "evasive theology" with some looking toward the evangelicals, and others back to Wesley in his Anglican traditions. The position taken in the address, is toward Wesley with his incomplete views on the subject. It still remains evasive theology, because if Wesley were living today in circumstances that required the apocalyptic approach, he would have developed his views on the subject beyond the extent of his day.

In the address, an attempt is made to formulate a Wesleyan eschatology on the basis of Wesley's soteriology. "The basic elements" that are discussed, do not touch upon the essential elements in eschatology, which as expressed in the words of Jesus are: "He that endureth unto the end shall be saved." The first element of "full salvation" is a matter of personal readiness for life and the remedy for sin, purpose of eschatology is a matter of provision against the overwhelming evils of tribulation in the world, external to ones person, requiring one to have endurance against persecution and torture. The emphasis in the prospect of the Second Coming of Christ, is intended to support those who are tempted to surrender to the evils of the world because they seem to be too great to be overcome. This encouragement for persevering against tribulation, is the intention in all apocalyptic literature. Thus the salvation from sin and the deliverance from evil, are two different needs in life.

The second element of "Salvation in History", is primarily the Social Gospel, and the belief that the evils in the world can be alleviated, and thus tribulation can be averted. Wesley was optimistic enough to think that this could be possible, and that tradition has been the basis for the Salvation Army, and likewise in the main denomination of United Methodism. It was the emphasis of Orange Scott in his founding of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of churches. It is the emphasis of Quakers who not in the Wesleyan tradition. Evangelical eschatology does not have that optimism and does not see the fulfillment of the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth, without the return of Christ to finish what He began. Wesley's dream that "Christianity will prevail over all and cover the earth" tends to be utopian, and is similar to that of other dreamers.

Turning to the third point which brings the address to its close, is "Salvation as Eschatology." (Altho I now note there is a fourth point.) I am inclined to think that Wesley simply did not give attention to the ultimate end of all things even as he was not interested in the ultimate beginning of all things. And to seek to relate eschatology to his soteriology and apocalypticism, is to misconstrue what eschatology is, and millennialism is still another subject. His interests were emphasize "incentive for evangelism and social action as instruments of God's redeeming work in the world."

The final point attempts to stretch Wesley's views to fit the contemporary "process" theology. That seems to be something new under the sun, but I wonder whether it is more simply another synonym for "evolutionary." However, on his attitude toward theology, I am inclined to think that Wesley kept it open-ended and incomplete, whereas Wesleyan traditionalists tend to think of it as a closed system that must be stretched and adapted to any other interpretation that comes along. The over-all impression I get from this address that it represents the tactic of taking any text imaginable to cover only one subject, just so that it repeats the emphasis on being saved and sanctified and satisfied.

5th Address On the next address, most of the observations made on the earlier addresses on the same subject, would apply. Does this speaker add anything more that had not been brought out before? The introduction summarizes three streams of traditions that have an emphasis on holiness. Those on the right emphasize victoriousness over inescapable sinfulness, and those on the left ignore sinfulness altogether in an emphasis on gifts from God. Those of the Wesleyan tradition are regarded as in a central position, and those closest to the Biblical testimony of what Christian life ought to be. My observation is that all three take a theological position on the basis of their traditions, and then each attempt to find the most proof-texts from the Bible to support their position. The real question should be, where should one start in search for the truth in the Bible that will be corrective of all three courses, since none of them are altogether right? The basis for this study is in the expression "Baptism in the Holy Spirit".

The observation is made that "the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is one of the most difficult of biblical doctrines." In the first place, let us reword that statement for accuracy: The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is not a "biblical doctrine", but a theological problem that is the most difficult to find decisively in the Bible. Note that I am specifying "doctrine" and NOT information. There is considerable reference to the Holy Spirit in the Bible, and the problem has been how to interpret and understand the information on the subject, to be formulated into a doctrine. It was noted that in the history of Christianity, there has been division rather than agreement on a generally accepted doctrine on the Holy Spirit, and in the almost universally accepted "Apostles Creed", doctrine on the Spirit is very vague.

Five particular problems are listed on the application of the expression "baptism in the Holy Spirit", altho the speaker calls them "considerations" rather than problems. Five more "areas" of theological interpretation are listed in which there seems to be general agreement, altho I am inclined to think that the intention is more of those in the middle designating areas in which there is no essential

disagreement with those to the right and to the left. But the procedure is not to be a study of the Bible, but rather a study of the various theological traditions, that are assumed to have already rightly interpreted the Bible. If this were true, there would be a uniformity of agreement rather than a minimum of disagreement, so this address will not solve any problems.

Instead, the discussion that begins on "The Biblical Evidence" is a digression into the problem of hermeneutics of the basis on which one should proceed to formulate doctrine. The issue between the two views is not resolved, since the basic question, Where should one begin? is not faced nor answered. The problem is that resolving the issue was based on what Luke wrote in the book of Acts, whereas to understand his use of his terms, we should have started in the 1st chapter of his Gospel, where we find not reference to "baptism" but we do find reference to the Holy Spirit, and the phrases that he associates with the Holy Spirit, that gives us an indication of the idiom that he will be using in each further use of the expression. The expression that he uses to apply to Mary the mother of Jesus and the parents of John the Baptist, relate to their experiences before these men began their ministry and mission in life.

From the unresolved problem of hermeneutics, the speaker proceeds to the next point of "The Wesleyan Tradition," and makes note of the fact that Wesley made no emphasis that baptism in the Holy Spirit represented fulfilled holiness. The conclusion is reached that he did not go as far as the traditionalism after him in making the association. So the address is brought to a conclusion with a disclosure that the precedent began with Fletcher whose interpretation was endorsed by Wesley on the basis that he was Wesley's chosen successor to carry on Wesley's work, altho Wesley remains silent on whether he agreed or disagreed with every line of thought that Fletcher advanced. I am left with the feeling that there has been a blind acceptance of traditionalism that advanced no further than the theoretical that was accepted as conclusive before all the facts were in.

6th Address This concern seems to be considered in the next address. Instead of blindly accepting a traditional interpretation on the basis of because someone said so, questions are being raised as to why the precedent was started in the first place. The speaker notes the "exploration" into the roots and implications of the theology. There are many who are fearful that such exploration is liable to be destructive, and we'll lose the gold of our heritage. I've practiced such exploration for years and have found more substantial basis for all the elements essential to spiritual experience than that made available thru traditionalism. That is why I am frustrated with the lack of dialog in the WTS, and this brings me to examine what dialog is, so I'll enlarge upon that before continuing with the address. Is this the address that you wanted me to discover as being unique in the WTS?

But first about dialog. I write these in-depth analyses of the articles in the WTJ, and you wish that you could enter into dialog with me, and you can! For dialog does not consist of in-depth thoughts expressed answered by in-depth responses. Note in all magazine articles that are designated as interviews, in fact, all discussion occasions which are probably held at the annual conferences of the WTS. A dialog consists of the one side asking questions, and the other side providing answers. In every instance the questions are briefly expressed and the answers are given in detail. The importance of the dialog is determined by the quality of the questions that are asked, in other words questions that require more than a yes or no answer, or an obvious answer. Well, I could enlarge on this matter further, but I'll lay it on the table for the address.

One aspect of this address that is significant to me, is that the speaker is a woman who has been encouraged by the influence by the feminist movement, to do her own thinking and to express her own views. There is more that I can get from her address than from the repetitious and constant summarizing that is represented in all the other addresses. For me, "scholarship" is not manifest in how well one can skillfully summarize traditionalism and find substantiation in the thoughts expressed in previous addresses or books written. In one paper that I

received from the bishop of the most ultra-conservative Catholic sects in America, there was an article authored by a woman of that denomination giving her views and from her own standpoint as a woman, why she thought that women should not be ordained for the priesthood in the Church. There was the least likelihood of it ever being remotely possible in that denomination, since it parted company with the Roman communion when the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope was instituted. What she wrote was very convincing because she did not resort to any of traditional arguments against women becoming ordained as priests. In fact, a precedent was broken in the presentation of her views, as all views expressed previously in that paper had always been by men.

In this address a question is indirectly raised, Why has John Wesley been our mentor? The question is not explicitly asked, for the speaker quickly offers the observation, "The genius of John Wesley, is that it is not only grounded in sound Christian theology but that it transcends formal theology to link into the dynamic of practical living." This statement is more complimentary than it is explicit. The "sound Christian theology" of John Wesley, does that mean of his own initiation, or the traditional theology that he inherited and was the base of his course in life? Then there is the implication that "practical living" is a superior stance that "transcends formal theology." Actually, this emphasis is the typical feminine point of view and attitude about theology. It isn't a matter of "transcendence", but rather a failure of most theologians to reduce their formulations down to realization in spiritual experience, and is the main reason why the study of theology never brings one into spiritual experience. The expression "practical living" is merely a covert way of saying that activism is essentially an evidence of reality in life regardless of whether a person knows what he is doing.

Now this speaker does venture forth into new territory, not so much into theological roots as into theological branches. There are two levels of the traditionalism that branched in America, which is not noted in this address in a specific sense. And there are other factors that are not noted. What she refers to as the "great divide", was actually on the basis of a separation on the one hand of the ecclesiastical traditionalism, that allowed no initiative or responsibility to the laity. The other factor, was the distinction between the social class structure in England and the classless social structure in America, which meant that the laity did not become subservient to the clergy. The tradition of Methodism was of the ecclesiastical structure, and congregations had no voice in deciding what ministers should serve over them.

The separation began when congregations decided to become independent and to choose independent ministers to serve them. This was a consequence of the Congregationalism that prevailed in other American Churches, primarily of those in the Puritan tradition, as well as the Quakers, the Baptists, and the Lutherans. With no ecclesiastical policy to restrict her, Phoebe Palmer opened up the emphasis on holiness to everyone regardless of their church affiliations. The same practice is being used today among the Charismatics, who have extended their influence into Catholicism and Judaism. These movements are primarily lay-oriented and are led by ministers that accept that independence from ecclesiasticism. The Wesleyan Methodist Connection of Churches was the bell-wether leader of the movement of independence from an intransigent ecclesiasticism, in the one area of Wesley's (genius) where he was the weakest.

That there arose a body of literature at this lower level of traditionalism from Wesley, was largely because Wesley's writings were not adaptable to the American way of life and culture. It could have been the pattern of producing a literature strong in the traditions of his writings, had there been an inclination in the ecclesiastical establishment to produce it. So obviously, the Holiness movement developed with all kinds of ideas and ideals brought out of the many traditions that were other than Wesleyan. "Where the holiness emphasis became detached

from its Wesleyan context, other theological roots were needed to structure the holiness message." But the address does not specify what those roots were, and so the discussion becomes vague and unenlightening. Statements are made of "interpretations of sanctification that clashed with historic Christian faith." No examples are given, so what was in the mind of the speaker remains obscure.

Specifically, what is meant about Wesley's strength being in "his synthesis of theology and life within the Hebraic biblical context rather than the Hellenistic dualism which has continually plagued the Church?" "The experience of Christ when explained systematically is put into a philosophical framework of the interpreter." For example, what is she talking about? Maybe I agree with what she has in mind, but she is not disclosing any point of reference on which I can have a basis for agreeing or disagreeing. She nearly gives an example of what she has in mind, that "Wesley taught the essential oneness of God, altho he accepted the biblical trinitarian distinctions without trying to explain them." This statement is later applied as a contrast to the declaration by some holiness interpreters that Jesus saves, but the Holy Spirit sanctifies.

She alludes to three recognizable streams of Wesleyan traditionalism, with the only clue of what they are, in the foot-note of the title of a book that evidently suggests these three streams. The address continues with statements that are not illustrated with points of reference to which one could focus ones attention and have the line of thought in mind. It seems that the Holiness movement was carried on without literature about the works of Wesley, but with the works of others. She refers to a completed sanctification that is compared to a development of sanctification after the crisis experience.

"A Critique of the whole Wesley" is intended to mean something, but I do not get any clues from the address of what it should mean. About one-third into this section is the statement: "By a whole Wesley is meant a grasp of the whole interaction of his theology with what human persons really are in their own being and with their human problem, and in society and its problems." Possibly the redundancy can be removed from this statement, and it could be reduced to more simple and precise terms to disclose what it is intended to mean. Does this mean his understanding of how his theology relates directly to the human situation? What problems of society are distinct from a human problem? What persons are not human or really what they are? Or is it our grasp of understanding the interaction between his theology and the human problem in society? The statement to follow seems to be unrelated to this statement, of our not divorcing "ourselves from our context to be a holy person." What is this "context"? Line after line, statements are made that seem to have no meaning or connection to what precedes or follows.

It is stated that what Wesley contributed to the Church was not an eclecticism but a synthesis, under which four items are listed: 1. The Church, 2. Theology, 3. Sanctity, and 4. Crisis. But these words do not disclose what is synthesized. Presumably "Church" denoted a closed society and its outreach, "Theology" denoted doctrine and its practice, "Sanctity" somehow joins an individual to society, and "Crisis" was introduced to personality development in morality. The catalyst for this fusion is in love, but the basic milieu seems to be morality. This neat system was probably successful in England where everyone was located by parishes, and everyone was in his or her proper "place" in the social system, and ones religious activities and interests were closely observable by others.

"In the early part of the nineteenth century this wholeness, or synthesis, began to break up". In England? or found to be inappropriate in America? It is assumed that this "break up" was under the influence of a difference between an "historical and an apocalyptic interpretation of existence." From a theological point

of view, that could be the abstract way of saying it. In ordinary and non-technical language, the "historical" applied to the kind of culture that prevailed in England, and the "apocalyptic" applied to the uncultured life that prevailed in America. The English culture was in a settled familiarity with everyone in any community or shire; and in America, life was in a constant change of moving and meeting unknown strangers, whether one moved or not.

But the highly technical theology of history as Wesley saw it in England, is certainly a contrast to the apocalyptic in America, but I'm not sure how Keswick is mixed into it. And the discussion under the third point of "The Synthesis" is certainly beyond any experience I know anything about. The observations are so esoteric, that I'll need someone who can understand it, to translate into some kind of logic that I can understand. And evidently we are not yet confronted with the most technical theological issues that must be pre-coded "with ground-rules and methodology." So as I proceed to "this deeper level", I am somehow to "operate but (CERTAINLY) without being aware of what is going on." And so: "The roots of theology begin here."

This woman who is a Wesleyan theologian is certainly giving an address that is beyond my depths for understanding what her line of thought is. Under the heading of "Methodology", an observation is made about the statement: "I believe in the Holy Ghost." This is supposed to be a question, about which some arbitrary principles are suggested. The listed number are five, and apparently they apply to some doctrine of the Holy Spirit, rather than any confrontation or consciousness of the Holy Spirit. From what I can make out about "1. The History" of doctrine of theology of the Holy Spirit, seems to have been a series of ideas about the Holy Spirit, and all have been abandoned. The truth seems to be that the Holy Spirit is not concerned with the theological speculations of men. My belief in the Holy Spirit is based strictly on the Scripture, from which my affirmation is: I believe in the Holy Spirit as the Revealer of all truth, and the Destroyer of all error. Every speculative theology about the Spirit otherwise, represents a refusal to submit to the ministry of the Holy Ghost.

There then follows three items on "semantics." The first one concerns the "dynamics of language." Language, of course, is a philosophical invention that makes communication possible. Should I accept the proposition that "words are repositories of packed in understanding of shared human experience"? I believe not. Words to me are only symbols that designate realities of human experience but do not represent human experience. By use of words, human experience cannot be transmitted from one person to another. At most, words only help to interpret human experience only after it has occurred. The problem of transmitting doctrine from one generation to another by means of language, has been the one basic to my approach to all theology about Christian experience.

The second item is designated as "Theological semantics." Before we have any discussion on this subject, it must be noted that "theological" is not the correct word to be used here. Theology must be kept unconfused as a word dealing with thoughts about God, and not thoughts about religion. The discussion that followed in the address, was not about God but about religion. "The process of transferring biblical ideas"--- is a concern of religious semantics, and only in theological semantics when dealing with ideas about God in the Bible. The languages used by the original writers of the Bible, were formulated in cultures that were unfamiliar to modern minds, but there is really no difficulty in translation, but rather to find words that are approximate or identical in meaning. This is true with the most complicated idiomatic expressions. "The plethora of modern versions, translations and paraphrases", is only because each theological tradition wants the Bible to be re-written to adapt to that theological tradition.

"Biblical writers used the human words people understood," obviously because no other kinds of words were available to be used! But it was something more than words that could be understood. When the first verse of Genesis was written, the word GOD was not used, nor was the word FIRST CAUSE used. These words could have been used, as the meaning that they expressed was known and understood. But the point is that those words had no special significance to the people who first heard the statement of the creation of the heavens and the earth. The only word that had the special significance for them was The ALL-POWERFUL ONES. Religious language as such, began when the Bible was translated from one language to another. Some words were not translated, simply transliterated because they were presumed to have special religious meaning. But all words are only philosophical fabrications, and Transmitting the Scriptures from one language to another, more often represented of exchanging one philosophical outlook on life for another. Obviously, when the philosophy was changed, the concept of the word was changed and not literally transmitted into the next language.

"Divine revelation" from the semantic standpoint is something quite different from that of a doctrinal standpoint. From the doctrinal standpoint, God spoke by divine revelation 2,000 years ago and has been silent ever since. From the semantic standpoint, if these words represent reality, then "Divine revelation" is a constant activity of God who at no time from ancient times to the very present, has ever been silent for even one moment, to every person who lives on the earth. Nothing has ever been lost of divine revelation from any words used, as words are philosophical constructions invented by men, and the revelation of God is not attached to or limited by the words of men, but is directly to the mind and spirit in man, which man then attempts to reduce to some expression in language.

The third item has the same misconception as the previous one. So before we consider "Scriptural Holiness and Semantics", let's make the proper use of semantics and use the appropriate words. What is "Scriptural Holiness"? We are not asking the question from a doctrinal standpoint, but from the semantic standpoint. Are we speaking about a spiritual experience? or a theological interpretation of such an experience? or a definition of the experience as may be delineated in the Bible? From the discussion that follows it would seem that the third application is what is in mind. A very good point is made against the practice that many make of basing their religious understanding on the basis of "The Bible says..." But let's go farther than the speaker did. It is more accurate to say, What Paul wrote about a certain situation. or, According to the record in the Gospel of John, Jesus said Thus and so, on a given occasion.

Now all this attention on semantics, was intended in some way to apply to the next principle of "Wesley's Theology" about the Holy Spirit. The fact is that he didn't have very much, not because he could have, if he wanted one, but because he evidently thought it unnecessary to give any attention on such a project that had no practical relevancy to his main business in life. It takes just common sense and no great scholarship to see that. Even further, it was evidently a constant principle in his life not to jump to conclusions on any subjects, as a consequence of assurance and conviction that what he knew was the whole truth about life. It was good to have the assurance that he had a right relationship with God, but he would not close the door on any possibility that there was more that had not yet been disclosed to him.

But such is not the position of the speaker of this address which proceeds into the next discussion on a "Survey of Theological Concepts of the Holy Spirit in the Church." For observations are made about "the failure of the Church to develop a doctrine of the Holy Spirit." It is suggested that the linguistic line of words thru Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, German, and English, "shows the ways that the "Holy Ghost" has suffered at the hands of language." To me, such study shows no such thing. The concept of the Spirit remains uniformly the same thru all those languages, without changing into other concepts as is true with the whole of Deity.

It is the speaker who misunderstands the report in the book of Acts, the experience of the disciples with the Holy Spirit. "Peter's very important explanation in Acts 2, the interpretation of the Holy Spirit follows pagan lines." In that account, the verbatim words of Peter were not reported. This book of Acts was written by a non-Jew and in the Greek language, for those whose thought patterns were "pagan", i e non-Jewish. What Luke did report was a translated paraphrase of what Peter said, and changed to fit the understanding of those who would be reading the book of Acts. The experience of the disciples was not something new from the standpoint of the Christian dispensation, but was the same as the experience of Mary and Elizabeth and Zacharias in the Jewish concept of the Spirit of God actively making contact with those responsive to the Spirit.

No study or analysis was made for this address in the Patristic era, of the struggle to define the nature and place of the Spirit in the unfolding concept of the Trinity of God. Instead, a jump is made to the Middle-Ages, to Thomas Aquinas who was actually ignorant of the essential work of the Holy Spirit in the revelation of God to Man. The next jump is to the Reformation, and omitted is any consideration of those Pre-Reformation movements of communities that did give more direct attention to the Person of the Holy Spirit. Overlooked also is the substitution that was made in Catholic Church for another person to take the place of the Holy Spirit, namely, Mary the mother of Jesus. Actually, this substitution has been the means for opening the way for a closer concept of the Holy Spirit, and which has been greatly hindered by the mental attachment to all traditions that have no place for reaching clearly concepts.

"The foundation of modern theology took shape" out of Humanistic philosophy. as is evident in "the principle of individuality and and its consequences of a new social conscience." Mysticism is not an experience of focusing ones attention toward the Holy Spirit, but of disciplining oneself from the Humanistic standpoint to obtain truth by means of such discipline rather than submitting oneself to the Holy Spirit to lead one into all truth. Wesley "rejected the philosophical battle-ground and stayed solidly in biblical affirmations." Would that those in the Wesleyan traditionalism had done the same, but that have not. A series of questions are raised, and very good ones which are not answered. The quoted statement by Wiley is in the right direction: "The Holy Spirit was a fact of experience before (becoming) a problem of philosophy."

"Tritheism is not dead," but it is not a religious concept as it is a philosophical concept along with Dualism, monotheism, pantheism, polytheism, theism, and atheism --- ALL are philosophical concepts in the minds of anyone who has not experienced or understood the experience of an awakened consciousness of the reality and presence of God. "Enthusiasm" is a very ancient attempt at making an improper response toward God, and choosing instead spectacular demonstrations that impress others that one is associated with God. A variety of methods and means have been used in the experience of enthusiasm. Dancing is perhaps the earliest method of working up enthusiasm. Resort to narcotic and psychedelic drugs has been another method. Reference to deifications have been on exciting characteristic that has been used. It is easy to see how the phenomena of wind storms have been the most exciting in the traditions of developing concepts of the Spirit.

"To seek temporary elations and ecstatic experience is to seek the superficial." This is obviously true and is the consequence of superficial preaching, by those that ^{seek} spectacular results. It is also true as a phenomenon of mass meetings, in which people are impressed and influenced by the spirit of the crowd. Thus it was a problem for Jesus and John the Baptist, and their most effective work was done when there were only a few people gathered together. The strategy of gathering a large number of people together to evangelize them, is not a Spirit inspired method of fulfilling ones witness for God. Deep spiritual elation is possible only to those who withdraw for the company of others to focus their whole attention on seekig God. To claim that Wesley was not a "rabble rouser" is true

only because of what he did for those who responded to his preaching, which is in great contrast to the method of mass evangelists today. He maintained personal contact with them, either directly or by personal letters to them -- NOT by form letters! That we have as much knowledge of him as we have, is because of the letters that he wrote to individuals. How many evangelists today make that practice? Even pastors and teachers do not write letters to former parishioners or students, and as a consequence, none attain the greatness of Wesley nor have great followers as he did. And those who seek for the secret of his success, fail to find what they are looking for and attain only an elaborate traditionalism as a substitute.

Therefore, the conclusion of this address failed to reach the "roots" of Wesley's way of life. That he was "the most informed, historically and theologically, of all his colleagues, (and) worked within the Judeo-Christian framework in which the Hebraic concepts were known and respected"-- is not the secret of his success. His effectiveness was in the fact that he "worked" outside of the "framework" of the ecclesiastic traditions and rules of his day. He did not confine himself to an assigned parish, but declared the whole world as his parish. His greatest faultiness was with the one item that is emphasized the most as the key to the uniqueness of his preaching, perfect love. He knew that he didn't have it and he never did attain it. Theoretically, he was the most informed of all his colleagues about perfect love, but in experience he did not have it, nor know how to advise others how to have it.

And were I to comment further about the speaker, she too is still theoretical in her understanding of "perfect love," and has not reduced it to actual experience in her life, at least to the extent of recognizing it from an intellectual standpoint. She refers to it as a "moral force" which relegates it to the category of the law. Love does not exist in theory or idealism, but only in application. A person does not have love who does not apply love to relation with others. I've made a study of the subject of love for over forty years, and feel that I am far more informed on the subject than many who have some adverse traditionalism on it and others who have partly formulated theories on it.

From my analysis of these addresses, I am quite sure that it was the last one that was the the one that you wanted me to guess was something special. I believe that she has spoken before at a WTS meeting, and had her address published in the WTJ. She was the one exception to respond to the analysis of her address, with a letter in reply about it, to the effect that she was too occupied with academic responsibilities, to enlarge upon her address. If there had been any serious response at all to what I had written, I would probably have continued as a member of the WTS, but just for the honors of belonging and not being involved in any participatory way just does not interest me. Unless the study of Wesleyan traditions leads to new insights and views of life, there is no point of constantly summarizing them. Blind loyalty to a traditionalism is not an evidence of scholarship, nor even of allegiance to the source of that tradition.

Sincerely
Tom Hersey