

T D Hersey, Box 216  
Moravia, Iowa 52571  
July 3, 1979

Dear Brother Wayne,

Since reviewing the Vol 11 issue of the WTJ that you sent, I have not time to send it yet, I've been that busy. But now on the eve of the 4th of July, I have some time for something other than sleeping, so I'll begin the review of the Vol 12 issue. In between times while pre-occupied otherwise, I had time to think about the prospects of preparing a paper on the Theology of Sex. There has been an abundance of publications on the Physiology of Sex, and likewise on the Psychology of Sex, and most of such material inadequate because there has been no basic Theology of Sex to set a standard. And this is especially appropriate a project for those of the Wesleyan tradition, because the central problem of John Wesley was sex, and the doctrine of Original Sin is based on the premise that sexuality is sinful.

*1st ADDRESS*  
The opening "Presidential Address" would direct our attention to "present frontiers". He refers to a book published over 80 years ago, which isn't very contemporary, and which fails to disclose or define the nature of the growth of the national ethos. There were those who felt that American culture was molded by the culture that the emigrants from Europe brought with them. The truth is, that they left their culture behind them, and they effectually severed themselves from their roots. They Americanized their names, and directed their religious interests with their backs to their old religious traditions. But this was not true with the Emigrants from southern Europe. They came to America with the intention of earning a lot of money and returning back to their place of birth. So they did not Americanize themselves, but when they returned to the "old country", they found that they couldn't go back to the life they had formerly known. It wasn't there any more.

The same is true with those of the Wesleyan tradition in America. They can't go back to what Wesley was, as it was not in his written heritage to us. Wesley was an Anglican Catholic all his life, and his "methodism" was intended to vitalize the influence of that Church and he had no enthusiasm for the Reformation Protestantism with its dominant influence in Calvinism. So far removed are Americans of the Wesleyan tradition from the milieu of Wesley's life, that they are actually more opposed to Catholicism, and likewise ignorant of that tradition, than they are against Calvinists. Note how readily they are to associate and align themselves in promoting Billy Graham's type of religious promotion, and how exclusive they have been to the change in Catholicism.

Note also how close the "Doctrinal Position of the WTS" is to Reformation traditionalism than to the Catholic traditionalism of John Wesley. American Methodism has abandoned its heritage from Wesley toward becoming the unofficial Established Church of America, particularly in charge of the culture of local communities where it becomes the pace-setter Church for all activities. In my observation of the trend of holiness churches, they tend to accept that Methodist leadership, in determining the polity of those churches. It is also evident in this address in defining "our contemporary culture" as "secularistic, humanistic, (and) subjectivistic." There are loud-mouthed Methodist theologians who are saying that it is, but the overwhelming success of the Charismatic Movement infiltrating all denominations (except the Holiness denominations of Wesleyan tradition?), repudiates that illusion.

And a reading of the book "Future Shock", by Alvin Toffler, will disclose that the so-called secular-man is hollow with his emptiness. But the speaker to philosophical questions rather than to religious questions, and obviously philosophy has no answers to the questions of life, even as science does not. So he makes the same mistake that Augustine of Hippo made, in his attempt to adapt the religious devotionism of his mother with the philosophical interpretation of life. The consequence has been Calvinism, as well as diverting  
*of his father.*

Catholicism into a traditionalism of being an end in itself. So let us examine this "process theology" as a system that those of the Wesleyan tradition could modify to enhance the elements of that traditionalism. It is true that our bodies completely exchange all the material contents every seven years. That we become aged in our physical make-up, is because it is not a total exchange, and after we have obtained our growth thru youth, there is always a little less than there was before, until there is not enough to maintain efficiency, and we die. But all thru those years of our life, we remain the same person. It is true, that we do not step into identically the same water of a river twice, but the chemical contents of whatever water we step into, does not change. In other words, whatever "process" is taking place, it does not change our essential being. Even when applied to sanctification, the "process" of the development of our sanctified life, is not of a different quality or change of relationship with God, than was experienced at the crisis moment of beginning.

The "second frontier" that is proposed for Wesleyans is another illusion that the speaker does not see for what it is. He assumes that it is defined philosophically as an "affirmation of life in this present world and the essential goodness of the natural world." The illusion is that the "goodness" of the natural world does not come from God. As the song goes: "This is my Father's world, and to my listening ear, all nature sings." But for those who ignore the existence of God, they likewise are not listening to the events of nature. They are likewise not experiencing the expression in the song: "O Lord my God, when I in awesome wonder, consider all the worlds Thy hands have made, I see---", and are primarily cooped up in the artificial buildings made by the hands of men. The speaker "is deeply interested in the subject of ecology as a "science" --- but only from the academic standpoint, and not from the standpoint of actual participation. The basic principle of the philosophy of Ecology is not in science but in humanism. The real interest of those who promote ecology is to escape from the technological cage that modern man has made from himself, and to get back to nature.

And the speaker delineates a third frontier about which he knows but some of the superficial externals. He has assumed that Kant has outlined the interests of the average non-religious man today, and does not see that this third area of what has been designated as existentialism, had its rise theologically in Kierkegaard and Schleiermacher in the last century. He does not see that the quotation that he makes from Roger Shinn is only half true: "There can be in Christian faith no authority that does not arise out of human experience or somehow enter into that experience." The truth is ultimate authority does not arise out of human experience. It does enter into human experience. Christianity has long been under the illusion that authority is in the man-made organization of the institutional Church but Christianity has continued in the world only because the human spirit has constantly broken free from man-made institutions, to follow the leading of God's Spirit in religious movements beyond the control of all denominational organization.

The Holiness Movement is one example, until its fluidity has become "frozen into a solid "hardening of the categories." It is now the Charismatic Movement that is the fluid religious phenomenon of the day, and already it is beginning to congeal as it tends to become respectable. It is true that its "unitarianism" emphasis on the Spirit gives it an imbalance, but the proposed Christological emphasis is merely an imbalance in another direction, and does not correct the problem, for the simple reason that all Christology obscures the ministry and message of Jesus and directs all attention to the Pharisaical theology of the apostle Paul. And until we get back to the ministry and message of Jesus, we do not have the truth that makes us free, as it was in the experience of Jesus.

Let me insert here the basis of why I regard the first address as completely inadequate of serious consideration. In the actual process of our development from infancy to adulthood, we proceed thru three stages in the maturing process. Ideally it should bring us to be complete and normal maturity and command of life, but we do

receive ideal nurture for our development, therefore we do not reach an ideal adulthood. From birth until about the age of six, the main experience of our life is sensate, of receiving information on the phenomena that is around and within us, thru our senses. We can get stalled at this stage in our development, either intellectually or emotionally. There may be an organic or glandular deficiency that is the cause, or it could be because of the kind of nurture that we receive from those that care for us in our infancy. Thus, imbecility, feeble-mindedness, and lack of mental development affect our intellectuality. Emotionally, we may get stalled in what is called from the psychological standpoint, infantilism, and we live on for sensationalism. However, sensate experience can become highly developed, and is the basis of science.

The second stage of development, is from about the years six to twelve, and our main experience is rational, of beginning to classify the information that we receive by our senses and to understand the relationships that there are among the much data that we receive. Many get stalled at this stage of their development, and I would say that it would be the result of the kind of nurture that they receive, altho environmental conditions and cultural conditions may be contributing factors. Those who become stalled at the first stage of development, are to that extent limited in their development in this stage. Those who get stalled at this stage, are characterized by childishness, and live by a logic all their own. But the rational experience can also be highly developed, and is the basis of philosophy.

The third stage of development, is from about the years twelve to eighteen, and the main experience is spiritual, of beginning to evaluate all the information received and classified for attaining the judgment of wisdom for selecting that which is of the highest worth in life. Applied to sensate data, it becomes an appreciation of music, poetry, dance, pleasure, all in that which is harmonious. Applied to rational data, it is expressed primarily thru idealism and a strong criticism of things as they are. But many get stalled at this stage of their development, and they remain adolescent and immature, and fail to become fully responsible and confident in themselves for their course in life. They enter the labor market dependent on others to tell them what to do, rather than becoming independently free to live their own life. But spiritual experience can become highly developed, and is the basis of religion.

Since human life is not on the basis of innate <sup>instinct</sup> ~~experience~~ as it is with animals and other living creatures, a human infant is wholly dependent toward maturity of constant instruction from those who are mature, to reach a normal maturity. An abandoned child who has no contact with adult guidance, attains a subnormal maturity of mind and emotions and is unable to relate with others of his kind. So there are three sources or means by which a person develops his personality to reach complete maturity and command of life of human perfection. The primary source is 1) Traditionalism, and everything true and false in life, he is given indiscriminately. Strong discipline may be enforced on him to conform to traditionalism, with the consequence that he will not attain human perfection. For there is the second means by which a person reaches understanding in life, and that is 2) Theoretical, which is the nature of all philosophy, by which the traditional is examined and questioned.

And the final means is 3) Truth-proving, which means separating the true from the false in traditionalism and from philosophizing. It means unlearning what had once been offered as true. Now this first address is an example of stepping beyond Wesleyan traditionalism, by one who has not adequately examined the logic of the philosophies by which he seeks the theories for the truth beyond and within traditionalism. Those within the Wesleyan tradition, have been so forcefully indoctrinated in religious concerns, that their ability to rationalize is undeveloped so that they are greatly inexperienced in the use of logic. A similar problem affects those who have been over-developed emotionally and under-developed intellectually, or the other way around. In other words, it is a wonder

OR underdeveloped.

that any of <sup>us</sup> reach as much balance in our personality as we do in becoming adults.

*2nd ADDRESS*  
Going on to the next address on "The Baptism with the Holy Spirit", we have another kind of a situation. And I start with the statement in the first sentence that classifies interest in the Holy Spirit as "in the Wesleyan, Keswickian, and Pentecostal sectors of the Church." I think that the third one should be more properly designated Charismatic. And before we rush to the Bible, I think that we should take more time to define the distinctions of the three sectors involved and then look around for other sectors in the Church that interpret the Baptism with the Spirit in a different way of application.

The Wesleyan and Keswickian traditions had their origin in England, with the Wesleyan arising in the Anglican Catholic tradition, and the Keswickian in the Reformation Calvinist tradition. The Charismatic tradition had its origin in America in the Baptist Evangelical tradition. How do the Catholic and Orthodox sectors of the Church interpret the Baptism with the Holy Spirit? When we examine this aspect of the question, we discover factors in our understanding of the subject, that are not based in the Scriptures. And there is a further factor that we need to note when we turn to the Biblical record. And that is, Baptism with the Holy Spirit meant something entirely different to the Jews of Jesus' day than it has come to mean in all Christian tradition, mainly from the Gentile standpoint. The main factor of the difference for the Jews, is that in the land of Palestine, all religious interests were dealt with in the local dialect of the Hebrew, and not in the Greek language in which the New Testament was written.

This means that the careful "Textual Analysis" that was done by the speaker, is largely irrelevant and misleading. This is evident when a comparison is made between the LXX Greek version and the Hebrew version of the OT Scriptures. The minute variations in the Greek version of the Gospels, represents a difference of selecting Greek idioms to express the Hebrew thought patterns. Even in just the one word baptizo in translating it into English, and the question: Does it mean Immerse, Pour, or Sprinkle? When applied to the Holy Spirit, there are the various Scriptures which indicate that the Spirit is "poured on all flesh", which would seem to indicate that all-flesh is not immersed in the Spirit, nor does the baptism with the Spirit eradicate all-flesh (the carnal nature).

So as long as we are making comments on the basis of the Greek text, let us make some good ones. The Matthew account "autos humas baptisei en pneumatihagio kai puri" (yet he baptizes in the Holy Spirit and fire), we have mentioned half of the elements listed in mystical science of that day: 1. Earth, 2. Water, 3. Air, and 4. Fire. It is as tho John had said, I am of the earth and baptise with water; He is of the air and baptises with fire. However, I think that v 12, is the key to the interpretation of v 11. Literally, John is saying, I plant the seed and water it in the earth; He reaps the grain and burns the chaff with fire. Since he is speaking of the seed of truth, then the harvested grain must refer to the revelation of the truth of life. The point is, the text of the Bible is to convey to us a deeper meaning than the mere sense of the words used. (That is why the Amplified Bible is actually worthless, it obscures the meaning in a clutter of distracting synonyms.)

The real question of this address, was on Promise versus Judgment, in the sense that John predicted that the One would come with fire and Jesus predicted that the coming fulfillment would be of promise. However, we must remember that there is also the pre-Christian understanding and use of the terms. John the Baptist was not preaching about salvation of the soul, which is the basic principle in the religion of Christianity, but rather transformation of mind (metanoia). That which changes the mind is the seed-thoughts that John was preaching. The more that Jesus would do would be to so cultivate the planted seed-thoughts, that the truth for a transformed life would result, and that which would be burned with fire would be the seed-thoughts of error that deprive one of life. When we follow this line of thought thru on the occasions when Jesus speaks of

the Holy Spirit, it is for the purpose of leading one "into all truth." But we'll continue to give attention to the contents of the address, to see what the speaker made of the discussion from his standpoint.

And the impression that I get, is that the speaker is giving his attention to what others have written on the subject, from the background of their traditions rather than to the Biblical text itself. There is also another factor in all this that is overlooked. "Baptism" was the chief interest of the apostle Peter and his ministry in the Church. The Gospel of Mark is primarily the testimony of Peter on the ministry of Jesus. The opening words of that Gospel version, are the words of Peter's testimony concerning Jesus when he was asked who Jesus was. It was Peter who was in charge of the group that met on the day of Pentecost. It was Peter who was the chief spokesman to interpret to the multitude the meaning of the joyful enthusiasm that was manifest in the lives of those who came down to the street from their upper room experience. And it was about Peter that we have the first half of the book of Acts, with "baptism" being his main preoccupation for those who accepted the Way of life that he promoted.

But it is notable, that not a thing is mentioned about the Apostle Paul in all this presentation. And when we turn to the record of his ministry in the last half of the book of Acts, and to his epistles, we find that his main thesis was: "I was not sent to baptize, but to preach the Gospel!" In the history of Christianity, it was the Apostle Peter who was emulated in the establishment of the Catholic Church. The main objective of that branch of the Church, was to evangelize for the purpose of baptizing those who submitted themselves to its tenets. From apostolic times, the Church has been divided. It was thru the ministry of the Apostle Paul that we have the term Christian and Christianity. It is thru his ministry that the theological interpretation of the experience of Jesus and His followers has extended the Gospel of Jesus to be for all peoples and not just for those of the Jewish tradition. And his interpretation of the activities of the Holy Spirit, are somewhat different than that of the Petrine emphasis.

It is to be further noted, that all the studies made on the subject of the Holy Spirit, back into the era of the Early Church Fathers, that all were of the Gentile traditions of the Church, trying to understand the Gospel records that were all written from the Jewish standpoint and traditional understanding of the Spirit. One writer was cited who seriously tried to read back from the Greek record of the Gospels to the Aramaic mind-pattern of those with the direct information on the life and message of Jesus. The Gentile concept of "judgment" is of fearful retribution; the Jewish concept of judgment is of glorious vindication. Since John and Jesus were within the Jewish traditionalism, the Gospel that they preached was of present liberation and not some future realization.

3RD ADDRESS  
In the next address, the mind of Paul to Gentile Christians, is disclosed on the subject of sanctification. It is immediately noticeable after the previous address, no mention at all concerning the Holy Spirit. The question of whether the baptism with the Holy Spirit belongs to the Apostolic beginning of the Church, and sanctification belongs to the subsequent history of the Church, can be more easily answered, when we consider that the two concepts are but different interpretations by the Apostles Peter and Paul. Many questions today would be more readily answered, were we to see that there are at least two main traditions, Catholic and Protestant, that provide the standpoint of the interpretations that are made. All books written, are from some traditional standpoint and never from a general standpoint appropriate to all traditions.

In this special study on sanctification in the epistles to the Thessalonians, it may be significant to realize that these epistles are the earliest ones on record that we have by the apostle Paul. They represent the ascending evangelizing ministry of Paul before he began to be faced with the problems of opposition and unsanctified conditions in the older congregations that he had established. Also

this congregation was at a location somewhat removed from those with mixed cultures and competition from competing religious influences. In secular life, it was more a producer community than a commercial community, as was true at Corinth and at Ephesus. Whatever became of it in subsequent history, I do not have information at hand, other than it did not become an ecclesiastical center as was Ephesus.

As for the presentation of the subject of the address, the speaker follows the pattern that Paul set in writing the epistle. The central objective of this particular line of thinking, was the sanctification of these Christians, with two means of emphasis to that end: 1) Paul's prayers, and 2) God's will, and the final outcome to be the preservation of their Christian life to the fulfillment of all things. The extensiveness of the sanctification is emphasized to include every aspect and interest of their life. I wonder whether sanctification is specifically defined. To say Be ye holy as God is holy, is not definitive if one does not have a concept of the holiness of God. The idolatry of paganism does not have a concept of holiness that was cultivated for the Jews in the development of their religion, but which did not penetrate into the character of their lives.

4th ADDRESS The next "address" is really more of a depth analysis in Bible study in search for the meaning of the particular passage under consideration. The speaker, Leo Cox, is one that I have known for over 40 years, as well as his brothers and sisters and parents. The reading of what he presented was a matter of enjoyment because of the thoroughness of his attention to the Scripture being studied. I do feel, however, that his motivation was not quite altogether because of an interest in knowing the truth of the passage. Rather, it was on the matter of a difference with a Calvinist who also misinterpreted it. Both viewed the passage from the standpoint of their respective traditions, rather than setting aside their traditions, and seeking the thoughts that Paul had in mind when he wrote the passage. They might disagree with what he had in mind also.

So the earlier carefulness of search for a meaning in the passage, is not carried thru to the end of the address, and the conclusion of it left a dissatisfaction that the question was left unanswered. The reason is, that the matter of comparison was not between two substances, gold and straw; but three substances on one side compared with three substances on the other side, of which only gold would stand the ultimate test of fire. Gold, silver, and precious stones represent substances of particular value. Wood, hay, and straw represent substances of very little value. So as we read this passage, the question is: Is the building that is erected on the foundation, of these six different types of material after this building is completed, is it to be destroyed by fire down to the foundation, if the materials are destructible?

Of the six substances, gold is the only one that simply melts down by fire. Silver will oxidize into a powder that can be reprocessed to extract the silver metal from it. Precious stones are melted down or fractured by the fire and cannot be restored to their former pristine lustration which made them valuable. Wood, hay, and straw have a decreasing value, and all are destructible by fire. Thus, the loss of straw by fire is less than the loss of wood by fire. Thus, the one whose works are as gold, suffers no loss by fire; and the one whose works are as straw has the least loss by fire. Those that had their works as precious stones, are the ones who lose the most by fire. And this puts an entirely different meaning on the matter that Paul had in mind. We may tend to assume that those whose works are as straw, lose the most when the test by fire comes, but they actually lose the least.

Now the question that comes next, is the application of the "works" to the materials that go into this building that is to be destroyed by fire. The text does not say that the works are to be destroyed, but only tested by the fire. The works of all except those with gold, will be "burned", and all others will

"suffer loss". But the summary in the address, seems to completely miss what the apostle Paul had in mind, and represents only what the speaker had in mind in his partial search for the meaning that Paul had in mind. And I think that there is need for even more investigation into this passage for the meaning that Paul had in mind, before we get the whole truth of what was intended.

For instance, I think that "talents" are involved. The acquisition of these six types of materials besides the using of them in the building, represents the effort of work. Here is a ten talent person who has the ability to be a goldsmith, but he must invest his talents to acquire the gold. He may decide that he will invest only so much of his time in acquiring materials for the building and decide that he can get the most accumulation of materials by investing in straw, and making it into a very colorful wall-paper that makes a great show of his abilities on the walls of the building. But gold is a substance that can be reduced to such thinness, that it too can be spread out to cover the walls just as extensively as the wall-paper went, and be much more impressive. The fire will reduce both from their extensiveness on the walls, the paper to ashes, and the gold to driblets spread thru-out the ashes.

The point is, that we can go in several different directions in seeking the meaning intended in these words of the Apostle Paul. He used a metaphor for the one particular idea that he had in mind, and what he had in mind could be possibly as beside the point, as all the interpretations that have been made of his metaphor from the standpoint of the various traditions that have made their approach to make use of it. The conclusion I am making, is that scholarship will not reach the truth that there is in this passage for us from God, but only the truth which the Holy Spirit brings to the minds of those who are responsive and attentive toward God. Scholarship is one of the works of mankind, and the records of scholarship are printed on the substance of straw, and how much of it really penetrates into transforming the lives of men?

*5th ADDRESS*  
A truly scholarly effort went into the address on "Wesley's Use of the Old Testament." Here was a speaker who did his homework and did not depend on the works of others as the basis of the assignment at hand. Altho Wesley was thoroughly familiar with the English version of the Bible, his acceptance of its contents assumed that the translators were primarily accurate in all details of interpretation and transmission. This was true primarily because the version that he used, was in the same tradition in which he was accustomed in his religious life. This is in contrast to those whose tradition is different from the 1611 version of the Bible, and the need to revise another version in line with their own tradition, until it is almost every denomination with its own version.

Of the three disciplines: sensate, rational, and spiritual, Wesley was the strongest in the second, which was most effective in his ability to use logic and the principle of method by which he established his movement which was to become the Methodist Church. He aspired to spiritual effectiveness but was never sure that he ever attained it, and only outlined what he thought were the ideals of such realisation in life, so that his followers could find that blessed assurance of spiritual experience that he could <sup>NOT</sup> claim as his own. For that reason, he could not grasp the spiritual values in the "intuitions" of his "earlier mentor" because that person could not or did not relate his observations of the spiritual life with the Scriptures in that convincingly logical way that Wesley could do.

In reference to the "Wesleyan quadrilateral"-- altho Wesley may have had the highest regard for the Scripture, he would be unconscious of how permeative tradition influenced his thinking, because he did not live in a multi-culture society which would have exposed him to a number of different traditions. Reason was almost on par with Scripture for him, and experience was largely based on observing what he understood to be the experience of others more than his own experience. Thus, he was persuaded of the reality of spiritual experience in others long before he had his "heart warming experience." His regard for the Scripture was actually a snare to him, to prevent him from realizing spiritual experience as fully

he could have. The Bible gave him the illusion that he had the whole counsel of God, as it was in a form that he could manipulate and control its use, and be ever sure where to find statements on which to base his logic about life. He could thus refuse to use the word "suspended" about "sinful nature", because that word was not used in the Bible. But then, he should not have accepted the use of the word "original sin" on the same basis, as it is not in the Bible either. But it was within the traditionalism of his religious life, so he did accept and try to define in Scriptural terminology of its existence.

It is not surprising that Wesley was so well acquainted with the Scriptures in that he was a strict ritualist in his diligent attendance of daily services at the Anglican Church, with its practice of readings of the Scriptures, and Wesley's habit of giving full attention, and disciplining himself to give such attention to the reading of the text of the Scripture. This is entirely absent in Wesleyan traditionalism, so that there are even few if any ministers who serve congregations, who are familiar with the Bible, and would be incapable of preparing a Scriptural sermon in the manner that Wesley did. But for all his thoro acquaintance of the Bible, he did not preach the content of the message of the Bible, but strictly the traditionalism in which he had been raised.

This is most evident in his thirteen "discourses" on the Sermon on the Mount. Sometime I may try to thoroly analyse just this section of his sermons, to disclose how completely he obscured the message of Jesus. He makes statements that can be shown to be mistaken with Scriptural passages that clearly show otherwise. I have acquired a number of books by different authors that purport to interpret the Sermon on the Mount. Many are by Methodists who have based their interpretations on what Wesley wrote, and none of them clearly disclose the actual message of Jesus. All are based in some traditionalism that veers away from the message of Jesus into some adaptation to the prevailing culture of the time, or denominational tradition of the author.

The edition of Wesley's Sermons that I have, is the 1825 publication, with a Thomas Jackson as the editor. The total number is 141 altho the appended number to the sermons is 140. This edition includes far more than were examined in the address that was given. It is completely indexed on all topics considered but not as to the Scriptural contents of the sermons. Included, are the sermons on Christian Perfection and Original Sin, but not the two appeals, unless they have other titles in these volumes that I have. My possession of these volumes was a heritage which I received from the widow of a cousin of my grandfather. This cousin's father was a Methodist minister who advanced to become presiding elder for Methodism in the early years when it was being established in Wisconsin. I acquired these volumes about 40 years ago while at Miltonvale College.

*6th ADDRESS* Continuing on attention to Wesley, is the next address on the two motivations of his life, law and love. His interest in law was no doubt impressed on him by the strong discipline that was imposed on him thru his childhood, until he came to be dependent on rules as the basis for his living. But this dependency on the law prevented him from learning to be responsive to the Spirit of God, in the same manner as was true with the Pharisees of Jesus' day. The same logic that restricted his life, restricted theirs. I found this address to be quite interesting and informative, of his progress from Anglican Catholicism toward Reformation Protestantism by means of the Moravians. It was thru his reading of books within the traditions of the Church, that he learned of the call to holiness, and it was thru his contact with the Moravians that he was to be misled into an emphasis of happiness, and that both holiness and happiness were attainable thru the exercise of faith.

It should be noted that Wesley began with a strong background of the traditionalism of his life. In putting it to the test by going beyond those of his own culture, to serve in America, he experienced cultural shock that there were ways of living that were unknown to him. This was two-fold, in the experience

with the Moravians in circumstances of crisis, and in his experience with Americans who did not respond to his ministry. This loosened his attachment to his traditions, altho not completely. It led him to venture into the theoretical experimentation and investigation of the way of life of the Moravians. He could go so far with them, but could not break altogether from his traditions, nor discover what was true and what was false in his traditions. But it was thru the Moravians that he learned of the love of God. It will be noted that it was not over a difference of religious views with the Moravians, but a difference of logic and the strength of his rationalism, compared with their weakness of rationalism and the development of their faith, as tho as a substitute for reason. In other words, they could believe where they could not understand, and Wesley felt the need to understand before he could go as far as they did with their faith.

Actually the exercise of his reason was stronger than his adherence to his traditions. The assurance of his faith was based on his conviction that God loved him, and for this reason he could respond and love God. However, his convictions about the law, did not consider it more particularly than a general abstraction. His approach to God was from the rational standpoint and not from the spiritual standpoint. He did not actually come into a consciousness of the presence of God, and to receive the particular law of life directly from God. When a person comes into the experience of a direct consciousness of the presence and reality of God, to the extent of receiving communication from God, What is the first commandment that God speaks to the soul? This would represent the basic law of life.

Most people cannot answer that question, because they too like Wesley draw no closer to God than their rational consideration of what God offers to them as reported thru the Scriptures. They do not penetrate ~~the~~ mystery of mystical experience, so as to be assured from God that they have found him in their conscious awakening in the spiritual aspect of their nature. What does God tell us to do, as the first thing when we meet Him at the crisis point of our spiritual awakening? It is the same thing that God tells us immediately after we die and our spirit of our personality returns into the presence of God, beyond our physical and natural condition in this world. It is the same thing that God tells us at the final judgment when we are in the presence of God for the time of the verdict on our life in this world. It is the whole law in two words: FEAR NOT!

Now, the only way that we can respond to the requirement of that law, is by love, and the cultivation, exercise, and practice of love until it becomes perfect. As we read in John's epistle, "Perfect love casts out fear." The old Testament truth about wisdom was: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," but the New Testament revelation was The love of the Lord is the fulfillment of wisdom! And most people never make that discovery, because they are never fully awakened spiritually to follow on to know the Lord. This seems to have been true in Wesley's life. He was so near the truth about law and about love. His traditionalism had been based on generalities to such an extent that he did not readily get down to particulars, either in the knowledge of the contents of the Bible nor the contents of personal experience as he observed in the lives of others.

He could see that love from God comes by faith, and that faith does not abrogate the law. But he did not see how to participate by faith in the benefits of either the law or of love. Furthermore, if it was true as reported in this address, that he saw the law that it "convinces of sin in the believer," then he did not see clearly what was doing the "Convincing." For it is the Spirit of God and not the law that convinces of sin. The Pharisees of Jesus' day were adepts in their earnestness to know and to observe the law, and Jesus asked them Who of you convinces me of sin? And the second objective that he saw concerning the law, was also incorrect that "the law impels the believer to Christ." Again it is not the law but the Spirit of God that draws the believer to Christ. And the third point of emphasis that he makes about the law, is likewise the work of the Spirit and not the influence of the law.

Now I am making a point of this because of the five facts of life that are basic to any understanding of our condition and purpose in the world. Those 5 facts of life become known to us by the time we reach the age of six, altho they are not directly taught to us. They are: 1) GOD, 2) MAN, 3) SIN, 4) SEX, 5) LAW. Those that deny the existance of the reality of God, or who do not come to an awakened consciousness of God (as Paul calls the "natural man,") they put one of the other four facts of life as the one ultimate over the others. In denying God, they may also deny the fact of <sup>5</sup> sin is that which separates us from God, and if there is no God, then there is no sin that would separate us from nothing. That leaves Man as the ultimate (humanism), and Law (legalism). If there is no God, then sex is not regarded as ultimate, as sex is the means for removing the barrier of sin between us and God.

Wesley's problem in life was that he was not spiritually awakened to a consciousness of God. Therefore for him, the supreme ultimate was the Law. It was the law of discipline that was emphasized on his life in his infancy and childhood, and not the example and practice of love from his parents for himself. They did not disclose the reality of God in anything more than ritual prayers to God for the generalities of life, and no personal prayers for the particulars of life. Wesley's "heart-warming" experience, was not as the result of a prayerful search after God, but an earnest exercise of his reasoning about what he listened to about the significance of faith in what he could expect personally.

His ministry was to the unchurched who were awakened spiritually to his preaching about God's love for them. He sought to bring them into the Church which did not care for them, and it was meaningless to them. So he had to organize them into the class meetings to take care of themselves. It is true that he offered them "the Gospel of God's grace, offered to all men and equal to every human need." I am not sure that they were able to grasp "the moral ideal which this Gospel presents to men", since morality and idealism derive from strong discipline which is not a prominent principle in Wesleyan traditionalism. He instituted a hierarchy of ministers to contain them in some semblance of the Church, and in so doing obscured the Gospel by which they were set free. He failed to reach those who were the Churched, just as Jesus could not persuade the instituted religious hierarchy of His day to accept His message from God for them.

The closing paragraph of this address is very good. But the questions remain. "Wesley's appeal was theocentrically based." But thru-out his life, was he able to positively affirm that he had indeed been made perfect in love? And "righteousness is the work of God thru His love and law with man responding in faith to both." But was this a matter of unanswerable rational logic to him, or a matter of personal and spiritual experience? "Faith in the love of God is the basis for justification." But "justification" implies that the highest ultimate is the Law and not God, and "faith in love" does not go all the way to a direct trust in God beyond the gift of His love. "Faith which works by love establishes the law and is the basis of sanctification." I am not certain in my mind the meaning of this statement, as it seems to bring the law between us and God, and anything that separates us from God tends to be idolatrous and is therefore of sin, and the law was not intended to be a means to sinfulness but a was toward righteousness. The point is that when we get a mind-set in some pattern of traditionalism, we tend to express statements without thinking of the meaning.

"In the development of Christian thought, this may be viewed as a synthesis of the Reformation doctrine of justification and the Catholic doctrine of sanctification." That statement greatly impresses me. The point is that it does not send those of the Wesleyan tradition into an earnest investigation of the Catholic doctrine of sanctification, nor into the Reformation doctrine of justification, but only to the synthesis, (or should we say syncretism?) of Wesley.

7th ADDRESS  
The final address in this series is on Wesley's approach to the Law in the Sermon on the Mount. Had Wesley started with a search to know what Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount, rather than with the premise of the law, we would not be left "with the knotty problem of the role of the law in the life of (a) believer." For the Pharisees of Jesus day had the same problem and likewise did not understand the message of Jesus in His Sermon on the Mount. It will be noted that the twelve different interpretations that have been made of the Sermon on the Mount, as were summarized by the speaker, that none of them actually caught what Jesus was saying!

Note exactly what Jesus said in Matt 5:17, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets." He was not referring to the LAW, per se, but about the Scriptures. "The Law, and the Prophets" -- and the Writings, is the express terminology which the Jews traditionally use when referring to their Scriptures. The whole purpose of His Sermon was specifically intended to demonstrate how "these sayings of Mine", were the fulfillment of the Scriptures and not a repudiation of the Scriptures. What Jesus was offering, was not a new covenant or a new revelation for a new religion, as was done by Mohammed and his Koran, or Joseph Smith and his book of Mormon. Yet Christianity has fallen into exactly that error and misunderstanding of the intention of Jesus, in declaring that the New Testament is a new covenant with God for mankind that abolishes the Scriptures of the "Old Testament" as a revelation from God that no longer applies to life for even the Jews.

Summarizing even further the five interpretations of the Law, per se, they could be classified: 1) The Law is the specific rules of life, 2) The law is a temporary ethic, 3) The Law is a set of ideals, 4) The Law is a Dispensational discipline, and 5) The Law is a challenge to righteousness. It is not certain whether any of these or all of these are directly related to Wesley's understanding of the Law. Of course, none of these actually summarize or define what the Law actually is, whether referring to the Ten Commandments or simply including them in a larger code of ethics. On one occasion during the ministry of Jesus, He was asked about the greatest commandment. It was reported in the 22nd chapter of Matthew, and the 10th chapter of Luke. In both instances, were the specific wording <sup>that</sup> had been as was in the minds of those bringing the question to Jesus, the question would have been stated: "What is the greatest commandment in the Torah?" not of the Law, but of that first section of the Scriptures. The answer of Jesus in Matt 22:40, indicates this fact: "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," ie all the Scriptural requirements in life.

Turning to what Wesley actually said in his "Discourse XXV", (not referred to in this address), he wrote: "All the injunctions and ordinances which related to the old sacrifices and service of the temple, our Lord did indeed come to destroy, to dissolve, and utterly abolish." This premise of Wesley cannot be substantiated by the intention of Jesus, but represent only the opinion of Wesley in his misconstrual of what Jesus said. (It can be noted that Wesley gave the wrong reference of Acts 15:6 for his quotation, and that the speaker did not make a correction, for the actual verse cited is verse 5.) Wesley is making his appeal on the basis of a Christian tradition that had developed long after the ministry of Jesus, and that was not based on the principle of Jesus fulfilling the (Torah).

And Wesley's second point misinterprets the Ten Commandments as tho they were a "moral law," altho he did not exactly say so. For what he actually wrote was: "the moral law contained in the Ten Commandments." This indicates that there is more to the Ten Commandments than just that which Wesley called "the moral law." Morality is a matter of man-made custom, interpretation, tradition, and is always something less than absolute. Divorce, for instance, is a matter of morality. A man can divorce his wife and marry another woman, and not commit adultery. But if a woman divorces herself from her husband and marries another man, that is adultery.

This is a "moral" interpretation of the 7th Commandment, and totally obscures the truth of the 7th Commandment. It is this "moral law" (contained?) in the Ten Commandments, which was exactly the misinterpretation that Jesus came to repudiate, and which He specifically illustrated when he spoke about a man who lusted after a woman. He was not speaking about the lust of an unmarried man for an unmarried woman, but of a married man for another woman than his own wife. There is nothing sinful about an unmarried man lusting for an unmarried woman, as that is the natural characteristic of sex, and sex is not evil nor sexuality sinful. What is sinful, is that covetousness that goes beyond the normal attraction between sexes, to desire to have more than a man has any right to have, and to make a woman to be less than an equal human being to a man.

Going on to the third point that Wesley made, the speaker of the address does not discover that Wesley overlooks what Jesus was saying. He begins to make his point alluding to other interpreters whom he does not name, but from summary of their interpretation we can gather that they are the ones who claim that Jesus came and fulfilled the law by His obedience, therefore they are exempted from giving any further attention to the law. Their claim is based on a misinterpretation and misapplication of the Christian tradition established in Acts 15, and which became a precedent for many further digressions from the intentions in the message of Jesus. Jesus was not speaking about obedience of the Ten Commandments, but that His sayings were the "fulfillment" of the Scriptures (of "the law and the prophets.")

In the second point of Wesley's second division, reference is made to the "First (Great) Commandment" as the speaker of the address refers to it. What he fails to note in his reading of Wesley's discourse, is that this quotation expressed in New Testament language IS a quotation from the book of Deuteronomy with the change of one word that gives a different understanding of the word in Deuteronomy which it replaces. It is possible that somewhere in the transmission of the Scriptures thru translations, that we no longer have the word that was the same both in Deuteronomy and in Jesus' quotation thereof. The two words as we have them are: "serve" and "love". The Deuteromic reading is: "Thou shalt serve the Lord thy God." The New Testament words of Jesus are: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God."

There are two things that are influencing Wesley on this emphasis that he is making concerning the law. First, he is sternly opposing the Reformist theology that Christ's obedience of the law exempts them from the law; and second, the stern tradition of his home discipline is preventing him from seeing what Jesus said. The address on the contents of Wesley's sermon does not deeply analyse the line of thought that he is following, just as he was not turning from his traditionalism and every other traditionalism to analyse exactly what Jesus was saying. It is an obstacle of all of us that we tend to read our traditionalism, whatever it may be into our interpretations of what Jesus said. This was true even of the disciples of Jesus and the people who heard Him, so that we need to separate our minds even from their views, first of all of knowing what their traditions are that would affect their understanding of Jesus.

The speaker correctly observes that Wesley gave "a rather full and generous descriptions of scribes and Pharisees and their kind of righteousness." The only thing that neither Wesley nor the speaker did ~~observe~~, was to define the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees but left it to the hearers or the readers to have their own definition. There was no definition expressed in the words of Jesus likewise, so there is need to raise the question: What was the basis of the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees? Wesley gets close to it in his 11th point, and the speaker overlooks it in quoting the last paragraph of Wesley's discourse. For in that closing paragraph Wesley begins it with the statement: "Above all, let thy righteousness exceed theirs in the purity and spirituality of it." If "spirituality" is the true righteousness, what was the counterfeit in the false righteous-

ness of the Pharisees? The conclusion of the address does give the answer to this question, but more to the point of expressing the "purpose of this paper (was not) to contradict the position of John Wesley on the place of the law in Christian doctrine." The speaker turned to the writings of Paul to clarify the actual position of the law as it was in the Jewish tradition and as related to Christian living. He goes further in referring to "the ethic of Jesus" as emphasized thru-out the Gospel of Matthew, primarily in the point that Jesus made on "doing" these saying of mine, and lastly the "command" of Jesus in the great commission that He made.

The speaker rightly noted that Wesley's use of the sermon was primarily as an opposition to a problem of antinomianism, and that Wesley's usual summation of Christian ethics as: faith working thru love", a principle which "is drowned out with the extreme legalism" expressed in Wesley's sermon. And that was exactly the very same error of the righteousness of the Pharisees. Their basis for righteousness was an attitude of legalism that failed to reach into the spiritual content of the law. Since holiness is the highest spiritual value there is, there have been many attempts to counterfeit holiness with all manner of man-made attempts of attaining self-rigeousness which avoids any reference to God. Legalism was one counterfeit and we could think of many more. Moralism which would exclude the Bible is another. Biblicism which makes use of the Bible and excludes anything not expressly written in the Bible is another. Goodness, Respectability, and many more could be shown to be the counterfeits that many resort to in their reluctance of going all the way in consecrating themselves to God toward receiving the genuine experience of sanctification of their relationship with God and with their fellowmen.

Conformity to the traditions is the particular counterfeit holiness that afflicts most Wesleyans today. Multitudes are living within the illusion that they are sanctified, simply because they went to the altar in search for the second blessing and accepted all the Scriptural teachings and interpretations that such an experience is for them in a crisis event determined entirely by their own act of consecrating themselves to God. That they are not truly sanctified is evident in the fact that they do not love God with all their soul, heart, mind, and strength, and they do not have a loving consideration and understanding of all others of their fellowmen, not just in a profession of love but as defined in Deuteromic language, by their active "service" to God and Man.

For that reason, the Holiness Movement is languishing as are many other religious movements by which Christianity has been kept a living religion in the world. It is the Charismatic Movement that is now the active influence affecting all the Church today. That it will not continue to be such is already becoming evident in the older denominations of that Movement, as they too resort to the counterfeit of conformity to a traditionalism rather than to the truth.

\*\*\*\*\*

This second WTS Journal was more stimulating to my mind than the previous one, and perhaps the third one that you sent could prove to be closer to the approach that I make of examining the traditions, to spearate that which is the truth -- the grain, from that which was either false or may have had temporal usefulness for the time that it was applied to life, -- the chaff. We are to remember or to realise if we are ignorant of agriculture, that there were two substances represented in the "chaff" which the wind driveth away. The chaff included, not only the straw and the husks which were essential for the production of the wheat in the first place, and therefore had "temporal importance", but there was also the "tares" of grasses that did not produce wheat, and were therefore not productive of the essential grain, and so represented "error" in its worthlessness in revealing the "truth".

Sincerely  
Tom Hersey