

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

Wesleyan Theological Journal

Volume 9, Number 1, Spring, 1974

| | |
|--|----|
| Distinguishing the Things That Differ <i>Delbert R. Rose</i> | 5 |
| The Holiness Revival in Nineteenth-Century Europe <i>M. E. Dieter</i> | 15 |
| John Wesley's Concept of the Church <i>J. Duane Beals</i> | 28 |
| Wesleyanism and Genetic Engineering <i>Harold B. Kuhn</i> | 38 |
| Biblical Interpretation and Wesleyan Theology <i>H. Ray Dunning</i> | 47 |
| Academic Orthodoxy and the Arminianizing of American Theology <i>James E. Hamilton</i> | 52 |
| Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology <i>Donald W. Dayton</i> | 60 |

Editor
W. T. Purkiser

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

DISTINGUISHING THE THINGS THAT DIFFER

Delbert R. Rose

Asbury Theological Seminary

“It is always tragic,” writes Rev. John Baker, a British linguist and theologian, “when the blessings which the Lord has provided for His people in Jesus Christ become the occasion of discord and division in His Church. . . . With Luther and Zwingli the issue was over the Lord’s Supper; with the leaders of the 18th Century Revival it was the sovereign grace of God . . . with some today it is the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and often the gifts of the Spirit as well...”²

For several years it has been my concern that we of the historic Wesleyan movement dialogue meaningfully with those of the older “Deeper Life [or ‘Higher Life’] movements” and with those in the younger Pentecostal and/or charismatic movements about “the Spirit-filled life.” But I am aware that this can be done only as representatives of these groups arrive at some basic distinctions which are clearly evident in scripture, and then adhere to these, both in our understanding of the Scriptures as a whole and our labeling of Christian “experiences” which we profess.

This paper is intended to bring into sharper focus a few of these necessary distinctions with the hope that scholars in the various segments of evangelical Christianity may more fully investigate them in the light of all available exegetical, theological especially biblical theology and experiential insights. This paper is more an enunciation of postulates and illustrations of them than it is an exposition of scripture passages, presented with the hope that it may provoke research in depth and fruitful discussions among those vitally concerned.

Guiding Principles

To clear away some of the confusion and consequent conflicts between the various groups stressing “the Spirit-filled life,” I offer the following simple guidelines as a starting point for our investigations biblically and experientially .

First, biblical terms must always be interpreted in context, both in their narrower textual settings, and in their broader literary, historical, and theological settings.³ Trite as it will sound, it is nevertheless necessary to remind ourselves that the same word frequently carries different content and/or meaning in its various contexts. There is no better illustration of this fact than the biblical use of the words *fill*, *filled*, or *full*, and *sanctify*, or

sanctified the very words which are dividing rather than uniting many Christians who use these terms the most frequently in our time.

Second, progressive divine revelation within each of the Testaments, as well as progressive movement from the Older Testament into the New, must be taken very seriously,⁴ and never vitiated in order to bolster a theological system or to marshal support for a series of religious experiences no matter how precious these systems and/or experiences may be to our respective traditions. The biblical use of the term “filled with the Spirit” remarkably illustrates this point.⁵

Third, in the historic process of biblical revelation it is not necessary for God to keep repeating a spiritual truth or principle for it to be very important in the interpretation and application of biblical teaching.⁶ Should we not ask ourselves⁷ How many times does the Lord have to utter a statement of principle for it to be true? Or how many times does a truth need to be repeated before we give it its full weight and significance in the interpretative process? While repetition is one of God’s methods of riveting truth upon our minds,⁷ He may not repeat some truths often which have a controlling position in valid biblical hermeneutics.

One such pronouncement of our Lord concerning the possible candidates for His baptizing them with the Holy Spirit illustrates this point. In John 14:15-17, Jesus plainly declares that “the world” which needs and shall have the Holy Spirit’s ministry of convicting or reproving of sin, righteousness, and judgment (John 16:8-11) cannot receive the Pentecostal baptism with the Holy Spirit. It is reserved for those who already love their Lord and keep such commandments of His as they know.⁸ Should we not keep this principle in view as we exegete the Book of Acts?

Fourth, for Evangelicals, authentic Christian experiences will always corroborate sound biblical interpretation and will also help correct the erroneous interpretations. At no time may religious experiences, as such, be trusted apart from, contrary to, or above the soundly exegeted passages of the written Word.⁹ “To the law and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, it is because they have no dawn” (Isa. 8:20, NASB).

Fifth, as those who are led by the Spirit of God, we will be zealous to honor Him who is called “the Spirit of truth” (John 16:13-15; Rom. 8:14). One of the important ways to do Him honor is to rightly distinguish between truth and error, and to designate as accurately as we know how the spiritual changes He brings into our lives.¹⁰

Sixth, if we take seriously the high view of scripture, namely, that the Holy Spirit is “the Master Mind” behind all scripture as indicated in 2 Pet. 1:20-21 and 2 Tim. 3:16 then we have every right, it would seem, to expect Him to be consistent with himself. That being true, then ought we not to be able to find a consistent and harmonious pneumatology within the Bible? When we have rightly understood the revelatory process as it unfolds through the Law and the Gospels, into the Acts, and on through the Epistles and Revelation, the teachings therein on the Holy Spirit will mesh with support, and illuminate each other.¹¹

Distinctions with a Difference

The following, in my judgment, are some of the necessary distinctions which must be recognized if an interpreter deals faithfully both with the Scriptures and the seemingly authentic experiential claims of multitudes of evangelical believers.

1. The phrase “filled with the Spirit” is a much broader and inclusive concept than the phrase “baptized with the Holy Spirit.” The former phrase is applied to the Spirit’s working under both covenants, whereas the latter phrase is apropos only under the new covenant (Exod. 31:23; 35:31; Acts 1:5; 2:4; 4:8, 31; 11:15-17).

2. The phrase “filled with the Spirit” (i.e., “the Holy Spirit”) does not always denote the same experiential reality within those biblical characters to whom it was applied. There was certainly a difference of inner relationship and reality between the Holy Spirit’s filling Bezalel to work with Moses in building the Tabernacle (Exod. 31:23; 35:30-34) and Jesus’ being filled with the Holy Spirit at His Jordan baptism and wilderness testings (Luke 3:22; 4:1; and Acts 10:37-38). And Bezalel’s and Jesus’ being filled with the Spirit must be distinguished from the experience of the 120 who were “filled” on the Day of Pentecost.

Peter interprets the Acts 2:4 experience as resulting in a heart cleansing (Acts 15:8-9), something which Jesus certainly did not need; and there is no evidence or basis for believing that Bezalel received this heart cleansing in Moses’ day. For the sinless Jesus to be “filled” with the Holy Spirit would be an experience and relationship peculiarly His, especially so in the light of the fullnesses of the Spirit experienced either before, at, or after Pentecost by others.

3. The fullnesses of the Spirit discoverable within the Scriptures, and the New Testament particularly, have been classified by Dr. Daniel Steele as follows: a charismatic fullness, an ecstatic fullness, and an ethical fullness (i.e., a fullness of the fruit of righteousness Matt. 5:6; Phil. 1:11).¹² While these fullnesses need not be mutually exclusive, they are not identical in nature or content, nor are they necessarily experienced simultaneously, or inevitably by all believers.

Without reckoning with such distinctions as these kinds of fullnesses, we will encounter repeated contradictions within the biblical record itself as it was progressively revealed, and between that written Word and the testimonies of some Christians who seemingly have the ring of reality in their witness for Christ and abundant fruit of the Holy Spirit’s fullness of righteousness in their lives (Phil. 1:11; Gal. 5:22-23).

4. Since all men are fallible, we must be ready to admit we may not have given adequate consideration to all pertinent passages of scripture bearing upon valid Christian experience. Therefore we must be ready to reexamine the foundations upon which our professed biblical faith rests.

But equally important for some is that they admit that there may be a discrepancy between what Christians truly experience inwardly (and/or outwardly) in their relation to the Holy Spirit and the names or labels they attach to those experiences. In brief, sincere believers may attribute more or

less to what they have experienced than spiritual reality demands and/or scripture supports. When Christians and their respective communions use the same nomenclature to label religious experience which other Christians use, but with quite differing experiential content, it is inevitable that confusion spreads and clash results among believers interested in “the things of the Spirit.” 13

Kinds of Fullness Examined

It is not without great significance for this generation that the scholar saint Daniel Steele, writing in 1896, distinguished so clearly between three kinds of fullnesses in religious experiences recorded in the New Testament. Several years before the rise of the modern Pentecostal movements and the more recent charismatic movements with their distinctive emphases upon the baptism with and fullness of the Holy Spirit Dr. Steele pointed out these three kinds of fullnesses mentioned earlier in the paper: the charismatic, the ecstatic, and the ethical. 14

According to my findings, one of the mistakes most often made by adherents of the “Spirit-filled life” theology is to regard the scripture phrase “filled with the Holy Spirit (or “the Spirit) as always meaning the same reality. 15

There were fullnesses of the Holy Spirit before the Day of Pentecost, but these were not the Pentecostal baptism with the Holy Spirit; for He was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified (John 7:37-39). It was only after Jesus’ ascension to the Father’s right hand that He obtained for His disciples the long promised Pentecostal gift of the Holy Spirit. Peter declared: “Therefore having been exalted to the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, He has poured forth this which you both see and hear” (Acts 2:33, NASB).

Following the Holy Spirit’s descent on the Day of Pentecost upon the 120, there were subsequent infillings with the Holy Spirit upon those who had been in the Upper Room (Acts 4:8, 31). However, what occurred within Peter’s heart in Acts 2:4 was not identical with what took place in Acts 4:8 and 31. In the Upper Room, Peter’s heart was cleansed as well as his life empowered for service, whereas in Acts 4:8 and 31 a “fresh influx of power” entered the already cleansed heart of the apostle (2:4; 4:8, 31; 15:89). 16

While Professor Robert A. Mattke called the Wesleyan Theological Society’s attention to these distinctions I am here developing, in his 1969 paper on “The Baptism of the Holy Spirit as Related to the Work of Entire Sanctification,” it is my deep conviction that the emphasis needs repeating today. 17

1. The Charismatic Fullness

The first person in New Testament literature to be designated as “filled with the Holy Spirit” was John the Baptist, who was thus filled from birth (Luke 1:15). Then Luke declares that both Elisabeth and Zacharias, John’s parents, were filled with the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:41, 67). Obviously, they were not filled in the Acts 2:4; 10:44-46; and 15:89 sense; for Jesus had not

yet come to perform His earthly work and return to the Father to obtain for the Church the promised Pentecostal gift of the Holy Spirit (John 7:37-39; 14:15-17; Acts 2:33).

The fullness known by Elisabeth, Zacharias, and their son, John, was a charismatic fullness, because they were under the full influence of the gift of prophecy and doubtless of discernment as well. Even Old Testament prophets evidenced this type of fullness of the Spirit from time to time. The charismatic fullness became the experience of the 12 apostles and the 70 disciples whom Christ sent out to heal the sick and cast out demons and for the Twelve to even “cleanse the lepers and “raise the dead” (Luke 10:1, 9, 17; cf. Matt. 10:1, 8).¹⁹

Although John had charismatic fullness from birth, he did not have the baptism with the Holy Spirit which he prophesied only Jesus could bestow (Luke 3:16). John’s own confession to Jesus when the latter came to Jordan to be baptized with water tells us much. Declining at first to baptize Jesus, John said: “I have need to be baptized by You, and do You come to me?” (Matt. 3:14, NASB). If John’s fullness from his birth had been identical with the baptismal fullness that Jesus bestows, John would have recognized he already possessed that spiritual reality and would have rejoiced in it. Instead, he confessed his remaining need of Jesus baptizing work which was to begin on the Day of Pentecost.

From the experiences of several New Testament persons it is evident that a charismatic fullness is not to be equated with or necessarily linked with that fullness of the Holy Spirit which was promised to the waiting disciples in the Upper Room (Acts 1 and 2). It is clearly evident that a charismatic fullness that is, a gift or gifts bestowed by the Holy Spirit can precede the Pentecostal baptism, or it may accompany, or possibly follow that Spirit-baptism bestowed by Christ.

It is clearly evident that being under “the full influence” of any one or more of the gifts of the Spirit is not one and the same reality as the dispensational baptism with the Holy Spirit; nor are the two inseparably linked with each other. No one of the Spirit’s many gifts is unmistakable evidence or proof that a believer has received at Christ’s hands his Pentecost, nor is the absence of any one or more of the gifts a witness against a believer possessing this baptism.

Both within the scriptural account and through the history of the Christian Church men have exercised gifts of the Spirit,” Balaam, for example (Numbers 22:4; 31:8, 16; 2 Pet. 2:15-16), lacked that heart purity which the Holy Spirit creates when He comes upon believers in Pentecostal fullness. Even in His Sermon on the Mount, Jesus cautioned against possessing “gifts of the Spirit” and performing mighty feats in His name, yet lacking the “fruits of righteousness” (Matt. 7:20-23).²⁰

2. *The Ecstatic Fullness*

Dr. Steele defined ecstatic fullness as “a temporary emotional fullness of the Spirit” which in and of itself leaves no permanent moral effect.”²¹ *The Random House Dictionary* defines *ecstatic* as “an overpowering emo-

tion or exaltation; a state of sudden intense feeling (of) rapturous delight.” This ecstatic fullness doubtless accompanied Elisabeth’s charismatic fullness as she responded to the Virgin Mary’s testimony (Luke 1:41-45). Mary herself felt a joyous exaltation as she exclaimed in the Magnificat, “My soul exalts the Lord, and my spirit has rejoiced in God my Savior” (Luke 1:46, NASB) .

John the Baptist also experienced ecstatic fullness, according to his personal testimony to his own disciples. For, said he, “He who has the bride is the bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom, who stands and hears him, rejoices greatly because of the bridegroom’s voice. And so this joy of mine has been made full” (John 3:29, NASB).

Returning from their brief mission, the 70 disciples seem to have experienced this kind of fullness as well. However, Jesus cautioned them not to rejoice over the charismatic power to cast out demons, “but rejoice that your names are recorded in heaven” (Luke 10:20, NASB). Their joyous report also gave Jesus an occasion to feel a similar manifestation of joy within himself. Of that moment Luke declares, “In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth . . .” (Luke 10:21). On a later occasion the Saviour told His disciples to ask of the Father in His name, that they might receive fullness of joy obviously an ecstatic fullness (John 16:24).²²

At His Olivet ascension the glorified Jesus blessed His watching disciples as He was departing from them. Luke says of them that “they returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually in the temple, praising God” (Luke 24:52-53, NASB). So even before they were filled with the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost the disciples were experiencing high moments of ecstasy or periods of exalting joy. Then in Acts 13:52, we read that the Christians of Pisidia “were continually filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit” (NASB). Obviously, persons might have one of these fullnesses without always possessing the others. At Pisidia the Christians were experiencing them simultaneously.

But an ecstatic fullness also accompanied the conversion of the Samaritans under Philip’s ministry (Acts 8:8) before the Holy Spirit fell upon them. This joy has often manifested itself during revival periods throughout church history. It has been known to be recurrent in the lives of many Christians even before they received the baptism with the Holy Spirit in His purifying presence, as well as after that crisis experience.²³

During my years as a student pastor one conversion stands out above all others occurring under my observation then, or ever since. I met a man at the rural church on my twopoint charge in Iowa Methodism who was given by his doctors but two years to live. With a wife and five children dependent upon him and employed by the welfare department of the county, he had little in his future to look forward to, though he was but 38 years of age. By whatever measure you looked at him he was bankrupt physically, financially, morally, and spiritually. He was a social outcast in the eyes of many of his more respectable neighbors and relatives.

But on a cold January night. in his own sparsely furnished home, I saw

that man weep and pray his way into the Saviour's presence. Without either of us asking the Lord for it, the Lord healed that seeking sinner of his basic malady that very night as well as saving his soul. For the next eight months he lived in an ecstasy. The Lord scarcely allowed him to feel the threat of the tempter's darts. And whenever he heard me preach about advanced steps in grace beyond conversion, he would say, "Why, the Lord did all of that for me the night He saved me!"

Without directly discounting my immature brother's testimony, I sought to alert him to the fact that if he should ever discover in some tomorrow that there were as yet spiritual lacks and carnal drives within his soul he should remember that the same Lord who cleaned up his outward life and broke off his evil habits could also cleanse his inner life and give him a holy heart.

After eight months of almost continuous joy over sins forgiven and conscious fellowship with the Lord, my friend came down from those mountaintops of ecstasy and entered the valley of temptation and testing. There, within a few hours or days, the badness in his tempers showed up, and the selfishness in his ambitions, and a basic "proneness to evil" which he had no idea lingered on in his soul during the many months of a "spiritual high." At a Sunday evening altar service, this brother came hurriedly to the front and in less than three minutes on his knees arose to spontaneously witness to the purifying flame of the Spirit that had entered into his spirit.

More than three decades have passed and my lay friend still witnesses with clarity and joy to both his conversion and the spiritual ecstasy that was his for months; but also that, without backsliding, he moved subsequently into the baptism with the Holy Spirit, which was also accompanied with its own special fullness.

Christian biography and histories of revivals corroborate the fact that an ecstatic fullness can precede, accompany, and/or follow the crisis of the Pentecostal baptism. Consequently, overflowing joy or "an emotional high" is neither proof nor necessary ingredient of the baptism with the Holy Spirit. 24

3. The Ethical Fullness

The third kind of fullness, says Steele, may be called "ethical fullness." When Peter stood up in the first general conference of the Early Church recorded in Acts 15 and told of his firsthand participation in the Jerusalem Pentecost for the Jews and in the Caesarean Pentecost for the Gentiles, he as an inspired apostle was giving the official interpretation of the meaning of Acts 2:14 and 10:44-47. What happened in each instance was this: The ascended Christ was baptizing the Jewish believers with the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:5, 8; 2:14) and doing the same for those Gentile believers (Acts 10:44-47; 11:15-17), just as John the Baptist had prophesied Jesus would do (Luke 3: 16-17).

In the Acts, only the risen Jesus and Peter use the phrase "baptized with the Holy Ghost [Spirit]" (Acts 1:5; 11:15-17). While Jesus talked of power connected with that event in the Christian's life, Peter talked of purity of heart (1:5, 8; 15:89). The last time Peter's voice is heard in the Acts he

speaks of an ethical fullness constituting the core of the Pentecostal baptism with the Spirit. And in that official reporting, Peter omits all reference to the charismatic and/or ecstatic manifestations attending the Spirit's advent.²⁵

In a word, to be baptized with the Holy Spirit is a fullness of a specific kind. This experience may or may not be accompanied by "an emotional high," or by some one of the spiritual gifts. Neither "ecstasy" nor any one of the Spirit's "charismata" is essential to, or evidence of, the Saviour's baptizing work.

Time does not permit to show that even though the Corinthians were "not lacking in any spiritual gift" (1 Cor. 1:7, RSV), they were yet spiritual babes, with carnal hearts, still infected with jealousy and strife, and puffed up with "self-importance" (4:18, NEB); and still proud of themselves (5:2, NEB) that they could tolerate the incestuous person in their midst "instead of being overwhelmed with grief at having to expel from . . . [their] number the man who had done this" (5:2, Godspeed).

Whatever the truth is about the baptism spoken of by Paul in 1 Cor. 12:13, namely, "For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free, and we were all made to drink of one Spirit" (NASB), it seems definitely not to have been identical with the baptism with the Holy Spirit (and with fire) which John the Baptist prophesied Jesus would bestow, and which Jesus himself promised to disciples, and which Peter personally possessed and preached. For the Spirit-baptism Jesus administered was heartcleansing and powerbestowing for holy living and serving.²⁶

The Corinthians were still the other side of that relationship with the Spirit, for Paul uses stern reproof and earnest exhortation to move them forward into full cleansing. "Therefore, having these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God" (2 Cor. 7:1, NASB). Although in the body of Christ, these Corinthian Christians lacked that heart purity which the Pentecostal baptism that Jesus bestows brings to believingly obedient disciples (Acts 5:32; 15:89).

With Daniel Steele, the American holiness movement's most oft quoted scholar for several decades of its history, we must conclude that the phrase "filled with the Holy Spirit" is "not a certain proof-text of entire sanctification. Yet there is a kind of fullness of the Spirit which must imply entire sanctification—the permanent gracious presence of the Holy Spirit in the soul in His fullness, not as an extraordinary gift but as a person having the right of way through soul and body, having the keys to even the inmost rooms, illuminating every closet and pervading every crevice of the nature, filling the entire being with holy love. This we may call ethical fullness, or fullness of righteousness, to distinguish it from the ecstatic and the charismatic fullness." ²⁷

This paper is in your hands. Let us hear from you who will accept the challenge to develop an in-depth study on the distinctions herein discussed.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Phil. 1: 10 John Broadus, et al., *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* (ABUV).
2. John Baker, *Baptized in One Spirit: The Meaning of I Corinthians 12:13* (Plainfield, N.J.: Logos Books, 1967), p. 7; John R. W. Stott, *The Baptism and Fullness of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1970), passim; Anthony A. Hoekema, *Holy Spirit Baptism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972), passim; J. Rodman Williams, *The Era of the Spirit* (Plainfield, N.J.: Logos International, 1971), pp. 9-64; Donald L. Gelpi, *Pentecostalism: A Theological Viewpoint* (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), passim.
3. John R. W. Stott, "The Great Commission," *Christianity Today*, Vol. XII, No. 15 (April 26, 1968), p. 5; Robert S. Candlish, *The First Epistle of John* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), see "Preface to First Edition."
4. Thomas Dehany Bernard, *The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament* (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, c. 1867), p. 26.
5. Delbert R. Rose, "Distinctions Which Clarify," *Herald*, Vol. 79, No. 17 (April 10, 1968), pp. 17, 21.
6. Only *twice* in the Old Testament (Gen. 14:18; Ps. 110:4), and not once in the New Testament *outside* the Epistle to the Hebrews, are the name and the office of Melchizedek mentioned; yet the *abiding*, high priestly ministry of Jesus Christ is supremely typified by this unique character contemporary with Abraham.
7. Howard T. Kuist, *These Words upon Thy Heart* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1947), pp. 81-83, 165-67.
8. Charles Ewing Brown, *The Meaning of Sanctification* (Anderson, Ind.: The Warner Press, 1948), pp. 107f.; Richard S. Taylor, *Life in the Spirit* (Kansas City, Mo.: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City, 1966), pp. 76-90.
9. George A. Turner, "John Wesley as an Interpreter of Scripture," *Inspiration and Interpretation*, ed. John F. Walvoord. An Evangelical Theological Society Publication (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), pp. 173-78.
10. Daniel Steele, *The Gospel of the Comforter*, an abridgement by Ross E. Price (Kansas City, Mo.: Beacon Hill Press, 1960), pp. 131-4.
11. F. F. Bruce, *The Message of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972), pp. 12, 112; J. J. Van Oosterzee, *The Theology of the New Testament*, trans. by Maurice J. Evans (New York: Dodd & Mead, Publishers, MDCCCLXXI), pp. 427-37.
12. Daniel Steele, *A Defense of Christian Perfection* (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1896), pp. 108-11.
13. Charles J. Fowler, *Back to Pentecost* (Philadelphia: Christian Standard Co., Ltd., 1900), pp. 91-110. Dr. Fowler was for 25 years president of the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness (now the Christian Holiness Association). In this volume he briefly contrasts the views of R. A. Torrey, the Congregationalist, with those of S. A. Keen, the Methodist. See also: J. Edwin Orr, *Full Surrender* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1955), p. 120.
14. Steele, *A Defense of Christian Perfection*, pp. 108-11.
15. Fowler, *Back to Pentecost*, pp. 111-22; Steele, *The Gospel of the Comforter*, pp. 141ff.
16. Delbert R. Rose, "Luke's History of the Holy Spirit," *Asbury Seminarian*, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (spring-summer, 1954), p. 13.
17. Robert A. Mattke, "The Baptism of the Holy Spirit as Related to the Work of Entire Sanctification," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (spring, 1970), pp. 30-31.

18. Rose, "*Distinctions Which Clarify.*"
19. Steele, *The Gospel of the Comforter*, pp. 143-45.
20. Ibid, pp. 141ff.
21. Steele, *A Defense of Christian Perfection*, pp. 108-11.
22. Rose, "Distinctions Which Clarify."
23. A. B. Earle, *Bringing in Sheaves* (Boston: Published by James H. Earle, 1869), pp. 6280, 36384.
24. Ibid.
25. Rose, "Luke's History of the Holy Spirit," pp. 14-16.
26. Ibid.; Rose, "Distinctions Which Clarify."
27. Steele, *A Defense of Christian Perfection*, pp. 110-11.

FROM VINELAND AND MANHEIM TO BRIGHTON AND BERLIN: THE HOLINESS REVIVAL IN NINETEENTH CENTURY EUROPE

M. E. Dieter
General Secretary of Educational
Institutions of The Wesleyan Church

Introduction

In 1873, Hannah Whitall Smith, author of the religious classic *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*, wrote an account of the recent death of her son Frank, a student at Princeton University. It was a simple story of his witness there to his own profession of the experience of entire sanctification and a revival within the university which accompanied it. ¹ That same year the small book fell into the hands of T. D. Harford-Battersby, minister in the Anglican Church of England and onetime fellow student of Matthew Arnold, Samuel Coleridge, and Archbishop Temple. Later, at the turn of the century, the then Canon Harford-Battersby recalled what influence that work had had upon him in those days when the full impact of the post-Civil War American holiness revivalism first was beginning to make its way into almost every level of English religious consciousness. "It would be impossible to report," he said, "the revolution in my religious thought and life effected by that book.... It spoke with the voice of God to my inmost condition."²

The initial impulses of this holiness revival which was agitating the thinking and emotions of Harford-Battersby and thousands of his fellows had been poignantly identified 37 years earlier in a March issue of the *Zion's Herald*, the official voice of New England Methodism. The *Herald* noted that Charles Grandison Finney, revivalist and professor at Oberlin College, "had recently come out in favor of *Christian Perfection* [italics theirs] as taught by Mr. Wesley."³ This turn by Finney accompanied by a similar espousal of essentially Methodist perfectionism by his colleague Asa Mahan, president of the college, marked a significant turning point for evangelical Christianity. The Oberlin Revival quickly linked up with a new revival of Methodist perfectionism in its own home church under the leadership of Dr. and Mrs. Walter Palmer of New York, sponsors of the Tuesday meetings for the Promotion of Holiness. ⁴

As a result of this joint thrust, neither Finney's "New School" revivalism nor Methodism's Wesleyan perfectionism were ever to be the same again.⁵

The Background of the European Revival

From the revivalism of George Whitefield to that of Billy Graham, there has not been a significant spiritual awakening which has not crossed and sometimes recrossed the Atlantic. The holiness revival of the last century was no exception.

The first impulses of the American holiness revival were carried to England in the 1840s and 1850s by both Methodist and Oberlin evangelists James Caughey among the former and Finney and Mahan among the latter.⁶ All left telling influences on the evangelical churches in Ireland, Scotland, and England.

The fuller impact of the new American revivalism was felt in England through the ministry of Walter and Phoebe Palmer during the Civil War years. Prior to and throughout the revival of 1858, the Palmers went to England and Scotland to take part in the awakenings stirred up there by the American renewal. Although the British Wesleyan Methodist churches had placed an official ban upon their ministry there, reports of their activities seem to indicate that local ministers and congregations were lax in their regard for it.⁷ The Palmers' ministry was so ecumenical in character that many reporters called it an Evangelical Alliance revival. Ten thousand people professed the experience of entire sanctification during their four-year stay, and thousands claimed to be converted.⁸

According to James Orr, this "Second Evangelical Awakening," to which American holiness evangelists contributed a significant part of the "outside forces," affected every county in Ulster, Scotland, Wales, and England. A million members were added to the churches, accomplishing social reformations in the communities involved and spurring the churches to renewed home and foreign missionary enterprise.⁹

In the early seventies, the new impetus given to the American revival by the organization of the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness at Vineland, N.J., in 1867, quickly began to renew the holiness revival which had been born out of the earlier evangelism during the war.¹⁰ From then on, the patterns of holiness evangelism shaped by the Association increasingly appeared in Wesley's homeland. The call for a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the churches came from as diverse sources as Edward Golburn, the dean of Norwich; and William Arthur, an influential minister and later president of the British Wesleyan Methodist Conferences. Books by both of these men, and other British authors, were supplemented by a virtual deluge of holiness literature from the States. "

The Ministry of Pearsall and Hannah Smith

The use of special revival measures in the promotion of holiness aroused the same fears in England that it had in America. Even friends of holiness were reluctant to adopt the new methods.¹² However, the almost chance appearance on the scene of Robert Pearsall Smith and his wife, Hannah Whitall Smith, not only nudged these hesitant friends into total commitment, but swept a host of formerly uninvolved Christian pastors and laymen

into lifelong dedication to various forms of “higher life” ministries. The eminent Princeton scholar, Benjamin Warfield, severe critic of the movement, believed that it represented the full flower of the Wesleyan “Pelagian” heresy. Nevertheless, he stood in awe of Smith’s “whirlwind campaign” of 1873-75. 13

The Smiths were Quakers, both from prominent Philadelphia families. Hannah Smith had been converted in the revival of 1858. But it was not until she and her husband later moved to Millville, N.J., that in a Methodist prayer meeting she claimed to discover what she commonly called the “secret” of a happy Christian life. Robert claimed the “blessing” in “true Methodist fashion” very soon thereafter at the National Association’s first camp meeting at Vineland, N.J., in July of 1867. The Smiths immediately became active lay evangelists in National Association camps. 14

Robert Smith did not go to England to evangelize, but the news of his espousal of the “blessing” and his inability to refrain from testifying to that fact quickly involved him in the tide of incipient revival. 15

By the fall of 1873 the British holiness forces began to coalesce. *The Christian’s Pathway of Power*, published by Smith and William Boardman, carried the news of the revival to non-Methodist readers, and W. G. *Pascoe’s King’s Highway* promoted it among mainly Methodist subscribers. 16 In addition to Boardman, Asa Mahan, now in fulltime evangelism, and Charles Cullis, Episcopalian physician from Boston, joined the Smiths in their revival efforts. Henry Varley, a London Baptist minister who had only recently testified to the “rest of faith,” also joined in the work of the group. 17 These non-Methodist evangelists introduced the movement’s message into circles which otherwise might have summarily rejected it out of the prevailing denominational bias.

Occasionally, outspoken criticism of Smith and his message appeared claiming that the evangelist was a teacher of new doctrine, the possessor of an experience greater than that of the Apostle Paul, and that he must have reached absolute perfection. However, the critics reluctantly admitted that “some of the holiest men of the land have adopted these views which are yet ‘altogether unscriptural and dangerous. ...’” 18

The traditional reserve, which the British Methodist societies had shown earlier to Caughey and the Palmers, began to break down under the expanding interest in spiritual renewal. Smith was soon invited to bring his essentially Wesleyan message clad as it was in its American revivalistic garb back home in meetings with the Methodist ministers of London and vicinity. He urged the Methodists to beware lest they fall behind other churches in the promotion of Christian holiness. 19

The Broadlands and Oxford Conventions for the Promotion of Holiness

The strong support of Lord and Lady Mount Temple and other prominent English Evangelicals counteracted such initial inertia and provided a strong base of operations for the continuing evangelism of the Smiths. From

July 17 to 23, 1874, the Temples' Broadlands estate was the site of a series of meetings for the promotion of holiness, chiefly among students from Cambridge University. At the conclusion of the conference, Sir Arthur Blackwood, Earl of Chichester and president of the Church Missionary Society, suggested that another but more extensive meeting for the promotion of holiness should be held at Oxford during the summer vacation time.²⁰

The list of signatories to the call for the Oxford meeting delineates the broadening patterns of the "higher life" movement. Among leading church men were the Very Reverend Dean of Canterbury; Theodore Monod, son of the prominent French Free church pastor, Fred Monod; Paul Kover, of Switzerland; and from Germany, Otto Stockmayer, Theodor Jellinghaus, and Dr. V. von Niebuhr of Halle.²¹ Approximately 1,500 men and women of all classes and denominations attended the 10day meeting.

At the conclusion of the conference, W. G. Pascoe reported to the *Advocate of Christian Holiness* that the Oxford meetings more nearly approached America's national camp meetings than anything formerly seen in England.²² Rev. Evan H. Hopkins, one of the fathers of the Keswick Conference, said that the Oxford meeting was "the fruit and flower" of camps at Vineland and Manheim. These national camps, he noted, had been "the prototype of Oxford." ²³ *The Zion's Herald* editorialized:

It must have been a suggestive spectacle to see old Oxford, the birthplace of Methodism, the scene of a great convention, composed of hundreds of Church of England clergymen, as well as representatives of other churches, entirely devoted to prayer, meditation, and consultation respecting "Scriptural holiness." . . .²⁴

The Holiness Revival on the Continent

In the late spring of 1875, Robert Pearsall Smith carried his holiness evangelism to France, Germany, and Switzerland. Nowhere on the Continent did Smith receive such an enthusiastic reception as he did in Germany and Switzerland. The doctrine and experience of Christian perfection were already being preached there prior to Smith's coming by a small, but vigorous, German Methodist fellowship, which was celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary in 1875. The writings and ministry of Dr. William Nast, father of German-American Methodism and an active member of the National Association, had fed the holiness cause there.²⁵ The young Methodist movement, however, had not made any great impact upon the established churches of the Reformation tradition, among whom there apparently was very little encouragement toward experiential religion. The old Pietist cells within those churches, moreover, often lay dormant in their prevailing quietism. The country was ripe for a transcendental message such as Smith proclaimed.

Hermann Krummacher, a German representative at the Evangelical Alliance meeting in New York in 1873, observed that the signs of revival which had appeared in Germany in 1864 to 1870 among all classes of the nation had even intensified with the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War

and its attendant nationalistic hopes. With the end of that conflict, however, he continued, the hopes had not been realized, and the German nation had been moving ahead without Christianity.²⁶ August Tholuck, professor of theology at the University of Halle, expressed similarly pessimistic sentiments in a paper read to the same assembly. ²⁷

Pressed by such concerns, prominent German theologians in Berlin, some of whom had attended the Oxford meetings, invited Smith to come to that city. When the “Vereinhaus” built by the Pietists proved to be too small to accommodate the crowds, the meetings moved to the Military Church by permission of the emperor and the court preacher Baur. Four to five thousand people crowded into the meetings daily. An observer reported that on the last Sunday night of the meetings, the crowd stood “spellbound” as Smith made his religious appeal through Dr. F. W. Beadecker, his interpreter.²⁸

Subsequently, the secretary of state’s house was made available to the evangelist for a meeting with 150 of Berlin’s scholars and statesmen Dr. Karl von Hegel, son of the famed philosopher and president of the Brandenburg Consistorium; and Dr. Bushsel, bishop of the German church, among them. Smith personally gave spiritual counsel to Empress Augusta and her daughter, Luise, grand duchess of Boston. The emperor thanked Smith by letter for his ministry in the city. ²⁹

From Berlin, Smith and Methodist Pastor Ernest Gebhardt,³⁰ who was singing for him in the services, moved on to Basel, Stuttgart, Heidelberg, Karlsruhe, and Elberfeld with similar results. In May, 1875, Smith held the closing meeting at Barmen with his sponsors, Pastor Christlieb and Pastor Fabri. More than 60 German pastors followed him to Brighton, England, at the end of the month among them the respected Dr. D. G. Warneck, who with 50 other state church ministers had strongly supported Smith’s ministry in Germany.³¹

The Brighton Convention Triumph and Tragedy

Earnest Christianity, commenting on the European scene in 1875, rejoiced that

Messrs. Pearsal [sic], Mahan, Boardman and others are permitted to behold a work in England such as has hardly been witnessed during the present century; conferences are being held solely that ministers and others may understand the doctrine of holiness more clearly.

The Continent of Europe has caught the flame of spiritual power. A son of the wellknown Fred Monod in France has become an itinerant preacher (T. Monod) and his business now is to travel through France and stir up zeal among the Protestant ranks. Conventions have been held in Germany and Switzerland and great good has been done.³²

Robert Pearsall Smith returned from his triumphant meetings on the Continent to enter immediately into the long anticipated Conventions for the Promotion of Holiness, which met at Brighton, May 29 June 1, 1875. Dwight L. Moody told his own London audiences that the Brighton meeting

was to be “perhaps the most important meeting ever gathered together.” Eight thousand people crowded the three meeting halls utilized for the services. 33

If Oxford was the Vineland of the European movement, Brighton was its Manheim.³⁴ The Smiths were the main speakers. To some, Hannah Whitall Smith was an even more forceful presence than her husband. Her daily Bible readings carried over from a type of service common to the National Camps in America were the chief center of interest. She also conducted special services for the women who were present. Reporters found her to be a “trenchant and often powerful” expositor. 35

The testimony of Dr. Warneck that at Brighton he received the greatest impulses of his spiritual life was repeated again and again by participants in the conference.³⁶ Elizabeth Charles, author of the then popular *Chronicles of the Schoenberg-Cotta Family*, a story about Martin Luther, summed up her view, and apparently that of many others, when she predicted “that the doctrine of sanctification by faith and the blessed experience the doctrine brings are about to occupy the attention of Christians as they never have done before.... Nor can we doubt,” she said, “that time will come when the Conventions of Oxford and Brighton shall be historical as the first great efforts in the development of that movement]....”³⁷

The Significance of the European Holiness Revival of 1873-75

It would be easy to relegate enthusiasm such as Mrs. Charles’s to the usual optimism of a revival atmosphere. However, when one reads the judgment of the scholarly but rather prejudiced Benjamin Warfield, he can put into better perspective the obvious excitement which infused the contemporary accounts. Warfield concluded that there have been “few more dramatic pages in the history of modern Christianity than the record of this ‘Higher Life’ Movement.”³⁸

Many of these participants at Brighton were conscious that they were standing in some kind of enduring Christian tradition. And yet there was a novelty in it all. They testified that it was the truth of “our Saviour and his apostles, believed in by the Godly of all ages.”³⁹ *The Friend’s Quarterly Examiner* reported that “it is making experimental that which we have held doctrinally.... this is the key to the rapid spread of this movement for the promotion of Scriptural holiness....” It was the only explanation the Examiner could propose for a meeting of 8,000 Christians “at which no doctrinal questions were . . . discussed, no resolutions passed, and no fresh church organization attempted....”⁴⁰ Mrs. Charles found an explanation for the freshness with which this came to them in Coleridge’s observation that “to restore a commonplace truth to its first uncommon lustre, you need only to *translate it into action.*”⁴¹

Walter Houghton’s definitive analysis of life in the Victorian age, *The Victorian Frame of Mind*,⁴² provides a composite picture of the dynamics of ideological and sociological forces which were tearing at the minds and lives of men and women in England during the period of the revival. He indicates

that the dominant characteristics of the time were “transition” and “doubt” transition created by “bourgeois industrial society” and resultant doubt “about the nature of man, society, and the universe.”⁴³ Matthew Arnold declared that “amid that breakup of traditional and conventional notions respecting our life, its conduct, its sanctions,” men were looking for “some clear light and some sure stay.”⁴⁴ Such circumstances, then, help to explain why the activistic, optimistic American presentation of an essentially Wesleyan perfectionism burst upon the scene with such freshness. It signified, in short, a revival of hope in the midst of an “age of multiplied doubts and shaken beliefs.”⁴⁵

Houghton says that the common religious mood was marked by the frustrations of “a daily sense of failure” under the hand of a heavy Puritan theology with its sombre Deity. There was an almost universal consensus that the Church was not demonstrating real Christianity.⁴⁶ Bertrand Russell described the mood in society in general as “all the loneliness of humanity amid hostile forces . . . concentrated upon the individual soul.”⁴⁷

Against such a background, one may better interpret the remarks of Rev. J. B. Figgis about the holiness revival in the *Evangelical Magazine* for September, 1875. “There is ‘no small stir about this [Higher Life] way,’” he said,

and this implies a certain amount of novelty and (probably) of truth. Some friends of the movement have been a little too ready to disclaim the former.... *But they are new to many*, perhaps new to most, new certainly to us; and glorious newsthey are “good news,” a very “Gospel,” only a Gospel not merely for sinners, but for the saved . . . and life is a continual triumph.⁴⁸

The Victorians who heard Smith apparently felt that they had been freed from the heavy hand of a stern God. They professed a new joy in a relationship in which it was “possible to walk with God, and to . . . ‘please Him.’”⁴⁹

It was part of a “new era of American Pietism” whose beginnings Perry Miller has identified with the rise of holiness literature such as Boardman’s *Higher Christian Life* just prior to the Civil War. The extent to which it was received by people of every class and creed, in both European and American Protestantism in the troubled 1870s, serves as a strong reminder that, in spite of Miller’s fear that it represented “the ultimate reaches of the Revival’s long efforts to elude the trammels of metaphysics,” it did speak to the day and the heart. ⁵⁰ The certainty and the immediateness of the holiness message apparently represented a path to new purpose. ⁵¹

After Brighton, Smith and his followers were exuberant; all Europe seemed to be at their feet. However, the continuing reports of the English revival in the *Advocate of Christian Holiness* brought the announcement in September, 1875, that Smith had to return to his Philadelphia home because of “failing health.” The editor hoped for an early return to his ministry.⁵² Smith and his wife, who had been scheduled to speak at the first Keswick Convention, held in July of 1875 following the Brighton Convention, never did attend.

More than “*failing health*” was involved. His sponsoring committee had summarily dismissed him from his work for what they considered to be doctrinal and moral indiscretions. For nearly 90 years the rumors and questions concerning Smith’s “fall” persisted without any additional explanation. When further facts were ultimately discovered, it appeared that Smith’s “indiscretions” were of such a nature that it might have been better for all concerned if the committee had not been as evasive as they were. In any case, the editor’s hopes for a continued ministry for the Smiths were never realized

53

The Institutionalization of the Revival

England and the Keswick Convention

The holiness movement in Europe was shaken by the dissension over Smith but not finally daunted. The revival recovered, grew, and eventually produced new holiness institutions. Jack Ford lists Wesleyan-oriented English groups which sprang up as a result of the revival. In addition to his own Church of the Nazarene, he mentions Cliff College (1884), the Southport Convention (1885), the Faith Mission (1886), the Star Hall (1889), the Pentecostal League (1891), the Salvation Army (1878), the Holiness Church (ca. 1880), and the Independent Holiness Movement (1907).⁵⁴

W. Webb-Peploelater—prebendary—was called upon to take Smith’s place in the first Keswick Convention where Smith was to have spoken. He with men like Rev. Evan H. Hopkins; Robert Wilson, a Quaker; Canon HarfordBattersby, vicar of St. Johns in Keswick; and Handley Moule, principal of Ridley Hall and later Bishop of Durham, determined the early course of the convention.

The ongoing history of Keswick represents the most enduring form of what might properly be called the Calvinistically or the less Methodistically oriented results of the holiness revival. Annual meetings “for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness” have been held there to the present time. Their structure and purpose, in many ways, faithfully reflect their holinessmovement parentage. The influence of Keswick in all of Protestant evangelicalism has been substantial.⁵⁵

The Holiness Movement and German Pietism

Equally important consequences for evangelicalism grew out of the impact of Smith’s preaching upon the old Pietist areas of southern Germany. Students of the German *Gemeinschaftsbewegung* maintain that this modern German Pietist movement sprang from a combination of the staid strain of old German Pietism and the vigorous activistic strain of the American-English holiness movements.⁵⁶ Conditioned by the waves of evangelism which swept Germany at the beginning and the middle of the nineteenth century, traditional Pietism was ready to hear a message which called for practical, positive, Christian holiness. The impact of the new Fellowship Movement upon the German churches was so significant that it is impossible to read the

history of the German evangelical church from that time to this without understanding these origins of the movement.⁵⁷

The German holiness movement took a different turn from that found in the ongoing American and English movements. Its converts formed conventicles within the established or state church in the old Pietistic tradition of smallgroup fellowships or churches within the church. These German groups had three main emphases: fellowship, which gave them their name *Gemeinschaftsbewegung*, evangelization of the masses, and the promotion of the doctrine of entire sanctification. The national movement finally centered around the famous Gnadau Conference, which first met in 1888. Jasper V. Oertzen, who had been strongly influenced by Johann Wichern, the father of German Inner Missions; Theodore Christlieb, one of Smith's sponsors and professor of practical theology at Bonn; and Theodor Jellinghaus, the theologian of the movement, became the most prominent leaders. The latter's *Complete Salvation in the Present* outlined the movement's theology of Christian holiness.⁵⁸

Christian Endeavor Societies, the Young Men's Christian Associations, and the university Christian movements in Germany got almost all of their strength from the new Pietist movement.⁵⁹

The movement in Germany was severely divided in the early decades of the twentieth century when the Pentecostal movement began to promote its particular emphases on the baptism of the Holy Ghost as evidenced by speaking in tongues. Varying positions on the question were taken by powerful leaders in the movement. More than doctrine and experience were at issue; the strong separationist tendencies of the incipient Pentecostal movement gradually led to a breakdown of the prevailing Pietist concept of a church within the church and produced a church organization of distinct Pentecostal bodies much in the same pattern as the holiness and Pentecostal movements in the United States.⁶⁰

Summary

This brief review indicates that a more thorough study of the European revival would be helpful to the interpretation of the American holiness movement. Its value lies in the fact that it gives us a view of the response to American holiness revivalism in a non-American context far removed from the American frontier, from all other distinctly American sociological factors, and just as important, largely removed from the close involvement with American Methodism. The latter involvement frequently has tended to make identification of the issues in American perfectionist revivalism difficult to define, interlaced as they were in so complex a denominational context.

What was true of the revivalism in England was also true of its acceptance and influence in Germany and other European countries. In Germany, in particular, it proved the breadth of its appeal by reviving the old pietistic cells, while at the same time attracting to itself men from all levels of society as well as established churchmen.

The European story is important because of the numerous movements

which sprang from Smith's evangelism and that of others who continued his work; the basically pietistic impulses, strongly energized by the American movement's optimism and activism, shaped a new concept of the Christian life, not only for many in the Free Churches of England and Europe, but also for many in the evangelical elements of the established Protestant churches as well. New institutions, especially dedicated to the revival's holiness doctrines, came into being in England and Europe as they did in America. In the Germany and Switzerland of that day, the revival took up the Inner Mission movement and gave it a new dynamic, as an influential force within the state churches.

The study is also important to all who may wish to do further work in the theology of the movement; it appears that in numerous German works both within and without the movement more important work was done on the theological and biblical questions raised by the holiness movement than has ever been done in America. Competent translations of this work would greatly enhance future studies in this area; they have been neglected too long.

Finally, a very practical point. The breadth of the message's appeal to all classes of questing Christians who are seeking the celebration of hope and victory in daily Christian living is demonstrated in the European revival story. The fact that learned German doctors and the lords and ladies of England could rejoice in the holiness message in common with the farmer, the frontiersman, and the "disinherited" of the American cities, should give new impetus and hope to anyone who will proclaim the gospel of the fullness of life in Christ by the power of the Spirit today. He still moves where and when and with whom He will; and where He is, there will His servants also be.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Hannah Whitall Smith, *Frank he Record of a Happy Life* (Philadelphia: Printed for Private Collection, 1973).
2. Charles F. Harford, ed., *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, Its Method, and Its Men* (London: Marshall Brothers, 1907), p. 124.
3. *Zion's Herald* 8 (March 15, 1837): 42.
4. *Guide to Christian Perfection* 1 (July, 1839): 13, quoted Mahan; and D. S. King, publisher of the *Guide*, published Mahan's *Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection* (Boston: 1839) in the same year he began the journal.
5. *Guide*, loc cit.
6. See Caughey's accounts in his *Methodism in Earnest: Being the History of a Great Revival in Great Britain . . .*, e's. R. W. Allen and Daniel Wise (Boston: C. H. Pierce, 1850).
7. *Earnest Christian* 4 (December, 1862): 185.
8. *Walter and Phoebe Palmer, Four Years in the Old World: Comprising the Travels, Incidents and Evangelistic Labors of Dr. and Mrs. Palmer in England, Ire land, Scotland and Wales* (New York: Foster and Palmer, Jr., 1867), gives the

Palmer's account; also see James E. Orr, *The Second Evangelical Awakening* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1955), pp. 6277 et passim.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 81, 125.

10. See Wm. McDonald and John E. Searles, *The Life of Rev. John S. Inskip, President of the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness* (Chicago: The Christian Witness Co., 1885), pp. 19495; Henry B. Ridgeway, *The Life of Rev. Alfred Cookman: With Some Account of His Father, the Rev. George Chrimston Cookman* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1873), pp. 31718; Delbert Rose, *A Theology of Christian Experience* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Bethany Fellowship, 1965), pp. 4467.

11. Edward Golburn, *The Pursuit of Holiness* (London: Rivington, 1870); Wm. Arthur, *The Tongue of Fire: Or the True Power of Christianity* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1880 [originally published in 1856lh])

12. *Advocate of Christian Holiness* 3 (March, 1873); *ibid.*, 4 (June, 1873): 281.

13. Benjamin B. Warfield, *Perfectionism* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 223, 266, 324.

14. Fuller accounts of the Smiths' lives and work are given in Hannah Whitall Smith, *The Unselfishness of God, and How I Discovered It: A Spiritual Autobiography* (New York: Fleming H. Resell Co., 1903), and Logan Pearsall Smith (ed.), *Philadelphia Quaker: The Letters of Hannah Whitall Smith* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950); Warfield, *Perfectionism*, pp. 247307. Also see H. Smith, *The Unselfishness of God*, pp. 16995, 24189, "Believing, Resting, Abiding," *Guide* 52 (July, 1867): 21 23; Olin S. Garrison, *Forty Witnesses, Covering the Whole Range of Christian Experience* (Freeport, Pa.: The Fountain Press, 1955 [reprint of the 1888 edition]), PP 11930; *Guide* 60 (July, 1871): 27.

15. *Christian Standard* 8 (No. 42): 333; John Charles Pollock, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1964), pp. 1819; A. T. Pierson, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1905), pp. 24ff.

16. *Advocate of Christian Holiness* 5 (November, 1874): 108.

17. *Ibid.* 4 (September, 1873): 65; *ibid.* (July, 1873), p. 15; Mrs. William Earl Boardman, *Life and Labors of the Rev. W. E. Boardman* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1887), pp. 156-59.

18. *Advocate of Christian Holiness* 4 (January, 1874): 159. Also see Pollock *Keswick Story*, p. 33.

19. *Advocate of Christian Holiness* 4 (May, 1874): 262. *Christian Standard and Home Journal* 8 (December 19, 1874): 45.

20. Harford, *Keswick Convention*, pp. 25-26.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 18. *Webster's Biographical Dictionary* (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1943), p. 1100.

22. *Advocate of Christian Holiness* 5 (November, 1874): 113.

23. Evan Hopkins, "Preliminary Stages," Harford, *Keswick Convention*, p. 30. For a full account of the Oxford Convention see *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874* (Chicago: Fleming H. Resell, 1875).

24. *Zion's Herald*, n.s. 24 (February, 1876): 54. *Christian Standard* 8 (December 19, 1874): 405.

25. Methodist membership in Germany in 1874 was 7,022. See Paul F. Douglass, *The Story of German Methodism: Biography of an Immigrant Soul* (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1939), p. 127. This biography of Nast fails to recognize his deep involvement as an active member of the National Association for the Promotion of

Holiness 26. "Christian Life in Germany," Philip Schiff and S. Airiness Prime, ed}, History, Essays, Orations, and Other Documents of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance Held in New York, October 212, 1873 (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1874), pp. 78-84.

27. "Evangelical Theology in Germany," *ibid.*, pp. 85-89.

28. *Earnest Christianity* 1 (July, 1875): 444, quoting "a Berlin paper." For summaries of Smith's German ministry see D. Paul Fleisch, *Die Moderne Gemeinschaftsbewegung in Deutschland: ein Versuch dieselbe nach Ihren Ursprung darzustellen und zu würdigen* (Leipzig: H. G. Walkman, 1903); Fr. Winkler, "Robert Pearsall Smith und der Perfectionismus," Friedrich D. Kropatscheck, *Biblische Zeit = und Streitfragen zur Aufklärung der Gebildeten*, Series ix (BerlinLichterfelde: Edwin Runge, 1914), pp. 40122.

29. Paulus Scharpff, *The History of Evangelism: Three Hundred Years of Evangelism in Germany, Great Britain and the United States of America*, trans. Helga Bender Henry (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 215-22.

30. *Ibid.*, pp. 22022.

31. *Advocate of Christian Holiness* 6 (June, 1875): 1819. Winkler, "Smith und der Perfectionismus." p. 415.

32. *Earnest Christianity*, n.s. 1 (June, 1875): 28283.

33. *Record of the Conuention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton*, May 29—June 7, 1875 (Brighton: W. S. Smith, N.D.), pp. 47, 319 (hereafter cited as *Brighton Record*).

34. *Advocate of Christian Holiness* 6 (August, 1875): 37.

35. *Sunday School Times* 17 (June 26, 1875): 413, quoting an unidentified English newspaper.

36. Winkler, "Smith und der Perfectionismus," p. 415.

37. *Brighton Record*, p. 416.

38. Warfield, *Perfectionism*, pp. 324, 267.

39. *Brighton Record*, p. 415.

40. *Ibid.*

41. *Ibid.*, pp. 42425. Italics hers.

42. Walter Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind: 183()1870* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957).

43. *Ibid.*, pp. xvi, 21-22.

44. As quoted by *ibid.*, p. 9, from Matthew Arnold, *Last Essays on Church and Religion* (1877), p. 287.

45. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind*, p. 10.

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 62, 228ff.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 87, n. 112.

48. As quoted in *Brighton Record*, p. 422. Italics his.

49. *Ibid.*

50. Perry Miller, *The Life of the Mind in America from the Revolution to the Civil War* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1965), p. 93.

51. See *Account of the Union Meeting . . . at Oxford*, pp. Ivii.

52. *Advocate of Christian Holiness* 6 (September, 1875): 70.

53. Pollock, *Keswick Story*, pp. 3437. Winkler, "Smith und der Perfectionis-

mus,” p. 416. Warfield, *Perfectionism*, pp. 258-61. Logan Pearsall Smith, *Unforgotten Years* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1939), pp. 60-64.

54. Jack Ford, *In the Steps of John Wesley: The Church of the Nazarene in Britain* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1968), pp. 2930.

55. For general histories of Keswick see Pollock, *Keswick Story*; Harford, *Keswick Convention*.

56. Abdel Wentz’s excellent monograph, *Germany’s Modern Pietistic Movement* (n.p., n.n., N.D.), develops this theme; see pp. 24.

57. *Ibid.*, p. 2; Winkler, “Smith und der Perfectionismus,” p. 402.

58. Wentz, *Germany’s Modern Pietistic Movement*, pp. 45; Scharpff, *History of Evangelism*, pp. 202, 208, 219, 22426, 23233. For an article typical of Reformed theologians’ polemics against the theology of the new German holiness movement see D. Gennrich, *Wiedergeburt und Heiligung mit Bezug auf die gegenwartigen Stromungen des religiosen Lebens* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1908).

59. Wentz, *Germany’s Modern Pietistic Movement*, p. 8; Scharpff, *History of Evangelism*, pp. 228-29

60. See D. Paul Fleisch, *Die Pfingstbewegung in Deutschland: Ihr Wesen und ihre Geschichte in funfzig Jahren* (Hannover: Heinr. Feesche Verlag, 1957), pp.24-186.

JOHN WESLEY'S CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH

J. Duane Beals

Fort Wayne Bible College

I. Introduction

One can scarcely read any commentary on Wesley's life or thought without finding the author lamenting that Wesley was unsystematic in his presentation of the topic under discussion. It is no different when the topic is the Church.

If one searches through Wesley's works for a treatise on the Church, he will find a sermon entitled "Of the Church" ¹ along with similar sermons and many references to the Church in the whole of his writings. To properly understand Wesley's concept of the Church, it is necessary to consider his background in the established church, his conversion and the changing ideas which flowed from it, his view of the ministry, and his interpretation of the sacraments. That is what this paper will attempt to do with the hope that, while not being exhaustive, it will at least be an adequate introduction to one Phase of the thought of the man who had the world for his Parish.

II. The Church

John Wesley was born of parents who, as far back as can be traced, had Puritans for their ancestors.² John's father, Rev. Samuel Wesley, rector at Epworth, had gone over to the established church during his student days.³ It was thus that John was born in an Anglican manse.

The Methodist Society at Oxford was established in High Church mold with frequent observance of the Lord's Supper and reading of prayers. But nowhere in pre-Aldersgate days did Wesley carry his High Church zeal so far as when he was in the American colonies. Rigg writes:

He refused the Lord's Supper to all who had not been baptized by a minister episcopally ordained . . . and he refused to bury all who had not received episcopalian baptism.⁴

He even refused Communion to John Martin Bolzius, an exemplary Christian of the colony, because he was not baptized by a minister episcopally ordained. Later, in 1749, he received a warm letter from Bolzius and entered it in his journal, lamenting his actions in Savannah. Wesley comments, "Can any one carry High Church zeal higher than this? And how well have I been since beaten with my own staff!"⁵

His own experience at Oxford was evident when in Georgia he “advised the serious part of the congregation to form themselves into sort of a little society” for mutual edification.⁵ This may have been a forerunner to his later societies, but being pre-Aldersgate, it was of a different order.

Much later in life, in 1775, writing to Lord North, Wesley describes himself as “a High Churchman, and the son of a High Churchman.”⁷ Telford argues that this refers to Wesley’s political attitude and not to his doctrinal position.⁸ Rigg feels that Wesley’s “inner and essential ultra-High-Churchmanship” belongs to the period preceding his conversion.⁹ To be sure, Wesley’s “evangelical experience” on May 24, 1738, was to cause many changes, and Wesley’s concept of the Church would be no exception.

Wesley returned from the colonies to England and preached in many churches, but pulpits were gradually refused him, especially after his conversion. The well-known act of preaching from his father’s tombstone came about because he was refused the use of the parish church in his own hometown of Epworth.¹⁰ He was a prophet without honor in his own country. As more pulpits were denied, he went to the streets and fields, but he wrote in his *A Short History of the People Called Methodists*:

It was still my desire to preach in a church, rather than in any other place; but many obstructions were now laid in the way. Some Clergymen objected to this “new doctrine,” salvation by faith; but the far more common (and indeed more plausible) objection was, “The people crowd so, and they block up the church, and leave no room for the rest of the parish.”¹¹

Wesley began to look at the established church in a new way, and along with other things, to interpret the Church as a man with a “strangely warmed” heart. He believed in both the invisible and the visible Church. ¹² In his sermon “Of the Church,” he asks, “What is the Church?” and answers, “The Catholic or universal Church is, all the persons in the universe whom God hath called out of the world.”¹³ He comments on Jude 19, “It should be observed that by the Church is meant a body of living Christians, who are a habitation of God through the Spirit.”¹⁴

The Church is the company of saints, the holy persons, whether of one city, a nation, or the whole earth.¹⁵ Outler gives record of the minutes of the Fourth Annual Conference, Wednesday, June 17, 1746, which state that church in the New Testament always meant a single congregation. ¹⁶ Apparently Wesley held both views, but it would seem he was speaking of the Church Universal when he said:

The Church is called “holy” because it is holy; because every member thereof is holy, though in different degrees, as he that called them is holy. How clear is this! If the Church, as to the very essence of it, is a body of believers, no man that is not a Christian believer can be a member of it.¹⁷

One particular publication, Lord King’s *Account of the Primitive Church*, had great influence upon Wesley, as he records in a 1746 Journal entry. Having read it, he writes:

I was ready to believe that this was a fair and impartial draft; but if so, it would follow that Bishops and Presbyters are (essentially) of one order; and that originally every Christian congregation was a Church independent of all others! 18

The statement about the essential oneness of bishops and presbyters would greatly influence Wesley's actions, as will be seen later in this paper. The next year, the 1747 Conference Minutes record that the divine right of episcopacy was first asserted in England about the middle of Queen Elizabeth's reign.¹⁹ Telford says that Wesley never withdrew from the position taken in 1746 and 1747.²⁰

That Wesley thought the Church to be holy has already been stated. He also maintained that this holiness was a practical holiness and laid down rules for the band societies shortly after his conversion, adding supplemental directions later.²¹ On various occasions he would visit the societies with an end to preaching righteous living and speaking with those who were out of step, sometimes putting them out of the society if they did not promise to mend their ways.²² Cannon says that it was such practices and ethics which gave the Wesleyan movement its sectarian character-the social teaching that society is rectified by the rectification of individuals who are genuinely converted and pursue the moral life.²³ It seems clear that the societies had a strong moral character which stemmed from Wesley's concept of a holy Church .

Some of Wesley's commentators seem to feel that he had the idea that the Methodist societies would serve the Church of England, analogous to the Orders of Rome. Rigg mentions Wesley's respect for Ignatius Loyola,²⁴ and Outler, making the same point, adds:

He understood his own mission primarily as that of a minister extraordinary, called forth by God to help remedy the insufficiencies of the ordinary ministry of the established church. This made him something rather like the superior-general of an evangelical order within a regional division of the church catholic.²⁵

That this is a probable interpretation seems supported by the respect which was given him by the societies and preachers. He was recognized as the living head of Methodism. As long as he lived, Wesley was the president of every conference.²⁶ Writing to Asbury in 1790, he says, "You are the elder brother of the American Methodists: I am, under God, the father of the whole family. 27

Whether or not Wesley had the concept of "an Order within the Established Church," he wanted the Methodists to remain in the church. He wrote to Charles in 1786, "Indeed, I love the Church as sincerely as ever I did; and I tell our societies everywhere, 'The Methodists will not leave the Church, at least not while I live.'"²⁸ Yet as early as 1755, commenting on legalism in the Church of England, he had written, "Those who separate from her have a far stronger plea than I was ever sensible of."²⁹

Wesley loved his national church, and wanted his societies to contribute spiritual vitality to her existence. But there were forces at work over which he had no control. Under the Toleration Act, if the Methodist societies were

to be afforded protection and benefits, they had to register their chapels and meetinghouses as “Protestant Dissenting” places of worship. The Methodists were forced, against their own will and the will of their founder, to become, before the law, Protestant dissenters.³⁰ Wesley wrote to an unnamed bishop in 1790, less than a year before his death:

Do you ask, Who drives them out of the Church? Your lordship does, and that in the most cruel manner, yea, the most disingenuous manner. They desire a license to worship God after their own conscience. Your lordship refuses it, and then punishes them for not having a license! So your lordship leaves them only this alternative, “Leave the Church or starve.” And it is a Christian, yea, a Protestant Bishop that so persecutes his own flock.³¹

Wesley must have anticipated at least the possibility of forced separation, for as early as 1744 he writes:

We are persuaded the body of our hearers will even after our death remain in the Church, unless they be thrust out. We believe notwithstanding, either that they will be thrust out, or that they will leaven the whole Church.³² Telford says that Wesley’s death removed the last barrier to full independence of the Methodists.³³

But the Methodists were not found wanting when the time came for full separation. Over the period of years Wesley and his followers had built up a self-sufficient organization with treasurers and trustees. Except for the sacraments, the Methodists had been functionally separate all along. Whether the organization had been built up from necessity or in preparation for the feared separation is not important. In probability it was both. What is more important are the steps which led toward and resulted in a separate church.

Rigg writes that Wesley’s organization of religious societies in 1739 and the building of a meetinghouse in 1740 were the first and second steps toward a separate communion.³⁴ Rigg also thinks that Wesleyan Methodism really began when Wesley separated from the Moravians and organized his own society at the Foundry, Moorfields.³⁵

Wesley himself observes that the first step in the rise of Methodism was in November, 1729, when four persons met at Oxford. The second step was in 1736 when a society met at his house in Savannah. The next was in London in 1738.³⁶ About seven years before he died, after a serious illness, Wesley executed his Deed of Declaration providing for oversight of the chapels and giving other men, and eventually the conference, the right to appoint preachers.³⁷ The legal constitution for the continuance of the Methodists, with or without separation from the established church, was complete. Although Wesley’s concept of the church seemed to be that of a national body with Spirit-filled subgroups sounding the clarion of holiness and righteousness, the very organizational steps which he took facilitated eventual separation. It was not his goal, but his own work made it easier.

Wesley had defined the Church as a believing people “among whom the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered.”³⁸

We turn our attention now to the ministry and to the sacraments, to see they shed on Wesley's concept of the Church.

III. The Ministry

In 1741, Wesley called out lay preachers. He argued that the men of the Reformation were largely unordained, Calvin among them.³⁹ He held that lay preachers were so important to the movement that separation was preferable to silencing them? He even maintained that, while it was expedient for preachers to have an outward as well as an inward call, it was not absolutely necessary?

Many of the established church ministers were corrupt and the members of the societies preferred not to attend the regular services, choosing rather the chapels and meetinghouses. Wesley himself allowed that this might be the case; but whether the minister was good or bad, he went to church, and he advised his followers so to do.⁴² It was an original rule that all members of the society would attend the church and sacraments? In his sermon "On Attending the Church Service" Wesley argues that the character of the clergy does not profane the sacrament nor give one an excuse to abstain from attendance.⁴⁴ But writing to Charles in 1786, he says:

The last time I was at Scarborough I earnestly exhorted our people to go to church and I went myself. But the wretched minister preached such a sermon that I could not in conscience advise them to hear him any more.⁴⁵

Yet in his *Reasons Against a Separation from the Church of England* he says, "It would be well for every Methodist preacher, who has no scruples *concerning* it, to attend the service of the Church as often as he conveniently can."⁴⁶ Clearly he respected the individual consciences of his preachers.

It has already been mentioned that King's tract on the Primitive Church had much influence on Wesley. He had sent men out to preach and visit the societies, but had not ordained them, leaving that to the established church. But the societies grew and the demands grew. Not only were there members who were not of the established church, but eventually even lay preachers who had other connections than the Church of England. Simpson says that this led to a mutual desire to administer and receive the sacraments. The societies wanted pastors who could carry on full pastoral duties.⁴⁷

Wesley was faced with a problem and didn't know what to do. He seems to fluctuate to avoid making a decision for as long as possible. In a Journal entry of December, 1745, a letter to a Mr. Hall, Wesley upholds the doctrines of apostolic succession and the threefold order of ministry. But a month later he records reading Lord King's *Account of the Primitive Church* and being ready to believe that bishops and presbyters were essentially one.⁴⁸ Rigg says that Wesley was convinced from the reading of *The Account*.⁴⁹ But this is perhaps too strong, for in the Conference Minutes of 1747, the threefold order of ministry is affirmed? It seems rather that Wesley was only beginning to think in a direction other than that taught by the Church of England.

It came to light at the Leeds Conference of 1755 that some of the lay

preachers had begun administering the sacraments on their own accord. The point was argued, but Wesley's view prevailed whether it was lawful or not, it was not expedient, for it might lead to separation.⁵¹ It should be noted that the decision was made more for expediency than for support of ecclesiastical opinion.

Rigg suggests that Wesley contemplated the possibility that some of his chief ministers would be ordained clergymen in the Church of England under whom lay evangelists might continue the work of the societies. He gives Fletcher of Madelay as a case in point.⁵² But if this was Wesley's hope, it did not materialize. Fletcher's early death, the Toleration Act, and other events were to turn the tide in a different direction.

Methodism was growing in the States. by leaps and bounds. Many of the English clergymen had returned home or ceased to officiate because of the war. Wesley wrote to Dr. Lowth, bishop of London, in 1780, and pleaded the American cause, but to no avail. Lowth replied, "There were three ministers in that country already."⁵³ In 1784, Wesley and Rev. James Creighton ordained Coke as "superintendent" for America. The next day, September 2, three more were ordained.⁵⁴ Telford says:

Wesley had now taken a decisive step. He was fully convinced in his own mind that he was a Scriptural *episcopos*, but only the most pressing necessity drove him to exercise the power of ordination.⁵⁵

The act of ordination troubled Charles, and John wrote to him in 1785:

I firmly believe I am a Scriptural *episcopos* as much as any man in England or in Europe; for the uninterrupted succession I know to be "fable which no man ever did or can prove."⁵⁶

Whether Wesley thought of himself as a bishop in the scriptural sense as early as 1746, we cannot know. However, it seems fair to conclude that, as with the rest of his decisions, the decision to ordain was made deliberately. If he thought of himself as a bishop, he never called himself such, nor allowed others to so address him. In 1788 he wrote a letter to Asbury reprimanding him for allowing some of the Americans to call him bishop.⁵⁷

The ordination of preachers, with attending right to administer the sacraments, answered the needs of the American Methodists, and eventually of English Methodists as well. The Church, ministry, and sacraments are, by definition, linked together. We turn our attention now to the sacraments as they related to Wesley's concept of the Church.

IV. The Sacraments

Telford says the country Methodists particularly fared badly. They often had to receive Communion from a minister who either persecuted them or lived unworthily.⁵⁸ As has been pointed out, they began adopting Puritan practices of infrequent Communion.

As early as 1744, in the directions given to the Band Societies, Wesley pointed out the goal of weekly Communion⁵⁹ Rigg says that even though Wesley encouraged "constant" Communion, it is doubtful whether he held

really high doctrine as to the Lord's Supper.⁶⁰ This may be true in regard to the question of Christ's presence, but it does appear that Wesley believed forgiveness of sin was attendant with the bread and cup. In his sermon "The Duty of Constant Communion," published in 1788, he makes the following statement:

Now, when we are convinced of having sinned against God, what surer way have we of procuring pardon from him, than the "showing forth the Lord's death"; and beseeching him, for the sake of his Son's sufferings, to blot out all our sins?⁶¹

This sermon is prefaced with the statement that, although written over 55 years earlier, he had seen no reason to alter his sentiments "in any point which is therein delivered."⁶²

Here we see Wesley, shortly before his death, reaffirming a position taken on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper during his pre-Aldersgate, High Church period. The ramifications of this have been dealt with elsewhere.⁶³ Suffice it to say, without taking time for further illustrations, the important point is not whether there was or was not inconsistency in Wesley's concept of Communion. What is important for our study is that Wesley linked the Lord's Supper with the ministration of grace and forgiveness, and that most of his life he would not allow the cup and bread to be administered outside the Established Church by other than an episcopally ordained clergyman.

Regarding baptism, Wesley held it to be a sacrament initiating the recipient into covenant with God.⁶⁴ As the Jews were admitted into the Church by circumcision, so are Christians by baptism.⁶⁵ In "A Treatise on Baptism" he holds that, "in the ordinary way, there is no other means of entering into the Church or into heaven."⁶⁶ Wesley accepted infant baptism, saying in his sermon on "The New Birth":

There may sometimes be the outward sign where there is not the inward grace. I do not now speak with regard to infants: it is certain our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole Office for the Baptism of Infants proceeds upon this supposition. Nor is it an objection of any weight against this, that we cannot comprehend how this work can be wrought in infants. For neither can we comprehend how it is wrought in a person of riper years.⁶⁷

Elsewhere Wesley says that the Church does not just ascribe outward washing but inward grace to baptism, which when added makes it a sacrament.⁶⁸ He seems to make baptism concomitant with the new birth at times, as in the statement just given; but in "The New Birth" he says, "Baptism is not the new birth: they are not one and the same thing."⁶⁹ Cannon tries to reconcile Wesley's apparent inconsistency by saying that Wesley accepts the efficacy of infant baptism as a teaching of the Church and nothing more.⁷⁰ John Cho, in a carefully worked out study of Wesley's concept of baptism, says, "The idea of incorporation in the Church in baptism appeared in some sense to the fore in his teaching of baptism. Nevertheless, he never thoroughly worked it out."⁷¹

What was earlier said of Communion may be said again about baptism.

Wesley linked it to the Church and had serious difficulty with those who would dismiss it. It was initiatory and it was grace-oriented; and he, for most of his life, felt that it could be administered only in the established church by an episcopally ordained clergyman.

V. Conclusion

The man who saw himself the father of the Methodists remained to some degree a son of the Church of England. Rigg writes:

John Wesley, till his death, considered himself as belonging to the Church of which he was ordained a minister, and wished and urged his people, as far as possible to attend her services and take part in her communion.⁷⁷

Outler concludes:

It was his plain intention that his followers should depend on the Church, not only for the sacraments themselves but also for their doctrinal interpretation.⁷³

I would suggest the following summary statements about John Wesley's concept of the Church:

- 1) His concept of the Church grew out of his Aldersgate experience. He eventually came to believe that every ecclesiastical obligation was subservient to the salvation of souls.
- 2) He believed in the universal and invisible Church, which was called by a holy God to be holy in nature.
- 3) He loved the Church of England to his death, and this accounts for a large part of any seeming inconsistency of thought or interpretation.
- 4) Even though he may possibly have believed otherwise, he put off as long as possible the ordination of clergymen and administration of the sacraments, fearing more than anything the lack of charity in schism.
- 5) He held the sacraments to be inseparably linked to the Church as means of grace to all who would receive.

I close with John Wesley's statement about his church:

I look upon all the world as my parish; thus far I mean, that in whatever part of it I am I judge it meet, right, and my bounden duty to declare, unto all that are willing to hear, the glad tidings of salvation. This is the work which I know God has called me to; and sure I am that His blessing attends it.⁷⁴

REFERENCE NOTES

1. *The Works of John Wesley*, 14 vols., reprint edition (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, n.d.), 6:392-401. (Hereafter referred to as Works.)

2. James H. Rigg, *The Churchmanship of John Wesley, and the Relations of Wesleyan Methodism to the Church of England* (London: Wesleyan Conference Office, n.d.), p. 19.

3. *John Wesley the Methodist* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1903), p. 14
4. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 29.
5. Works, 2:150.
6. Ibid., 13:305. 7. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 72
8. John Telford, *The Life of John Wesley*, reprint edition (London: The Epworth Press, 1947), p. 308. 9. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 52
10. Works, 1:377.
11. Ibid., 13:307.
12. Ibid., 8:31.
13. Ibid., 6:395-96.
14. John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament* (New York: G. Lane and P. P. Sanford, 1844), p. 649.
15. Works, 6:394.
16. Albert C. Outler, ed., *John Wesley* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 173.
17. Works, 6:400.
18. Ibid., 2:6-7.
19. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 67. Rigg here reproduces portions of the 1747 Conference Minutes.
20. Telford, *The Life of John Wesley*, p. 305.
21. Works, 8:272-74.
22. Ibid., 2:413. See also Telford, *The Life of John Wesley*, pp. 150-51.
23. William R. Cannon, *The Theology of John Wesley* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946), p. 237. Cannon refers to Ernst Troeltsch's distinction between two types of Christian society.
24. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 83.
25. Outler, *John Wesley*, p. 306.
26. *John Wesley the Methodist*, p. 189.
27. Works, 13:74
28. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, pp. 93-94.
29. Works, 13:185-86.
30. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 96.
31. Ibid., p. 95.
32. Works, 8:281.
33. Telford, *The Life of John Wesley*, p. 311.
34. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, pp. 83-84.
35. Ibid., p. 56.
36. Works, 13:307. This is in "A Short History of the People Called Methodists."
37. Ibid., 4:503. For comment on the Deed, see Telford, *The Life of John Wesley*, p. 299; and also Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 84.
38. Works, 8:30.
39. Ibid., 8:222.
40. Ibid., 13:196.

41. Ibid., 5:488.
42. Letter to James Rea, July 21, 1766, in John Telford, ed., *The Letters of the Reverend John Wesley*, 8 vols. (London: The Epworth Press), 5:23.
43. Works, 7:175.
44. Ibid., 7:174-86.
45. Ibid., 12:155.
46. Telford, *The Life of John Wesley*, p. 306.
47. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *John Wesley and the Church of England* (London: S.P.C.K., 1934), p. 20.
48. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 65.
49. Ibid., pp. 60-61.
50. Ibid., pp. 66-67. Rigg here reproduces a portion of the 1747 Conference Minutes.
51. *John Wesley the Methodist*, pp. 187-88.
52. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 82.
53. Telford, *The Life of John Wesley*, p. 296.
54. Works, 4:288.
55. Telford, *The Life of John Wesley*, p. 297.
56. Ibid., p. 307.
57. Works, 13:75.
58. Telford, *The Life of John Wesley*, p. 309.
59. Works, 8:274.
60. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 44.
61. Works, 7:148.
62. Ibid., p. 147.
63. Irwin Reist, "John Wesley's View of the Sacraments: A Study in the Historical Development of a Doctrine," in *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 6, no. 1 (spring, 1971):
64. Works, 10:188.
65. Ibid., p. 191.
66. Ibid., p. 192.
67. Ibid., 6:74.
68. Cannon, *The Theology of John Wesley*, p. 128.
69. Works, 6:73.
70. Cannon, *The Theology of John Wesley*, p. 129.
71. John Chongnam Cho, "John Wesley's View on Baptism," in *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 7, no. 1 (spring, 1972):73. For further comment on the apparent inconsistency in Wesley, see George A. Turner, "Infant Baptism in Biblical and Historical Context," in *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 5, no. 1 (spring, 1970):11-21.
72. Rigg, *Churchmanship*, p. 16.
73. Outler, *John Wesley*, p. 332.
74. Letter to James Hervey, in John Telford, ed., *The Letters of the Reverend John Wesley*, 1:286. This does not come from the original source, but from R. W. Burtner and R. E. Chiles, *A Compend of Wesley's Theology* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 261.

WESLEYANISM AND GENETIC ENGINEERING

By **Harold B. Kuhn**

Asbury Theological Seminary

Unprecedented advances in the field of the biomedical sciences have brought it into the range of possibility for man to modify and even radically alter the human genetic endowment. This capability has clashed with formerly accepted attitudes with respect to the inviolable nature of the human reproductive system. The gap between society and science is not only exposed but also raw-edged. Unless reasonable assurances are soon given that there will not be a misuse of techniques of genetic engineering, there may well be a social response conditioned by fear. It seems imperative to this writer that the issues raised by the biomedical sciences be exposed to public scrutiny-and more important still, to the scrutiny of the Christian conscience.

The most important areas within which genetic tailoring is being attempted are the following: mass genetic screening, *in vitro* (test tube) fertilization, monogenic gene therapy, polygenic gene therapy, and cloning. To this list may be added *in utero* or prenatal surgery, which would quite possibly be facilitated by *in vitro* development of fetuses. The argument most frequently advanced in support of the employment of one or more of these technological means for genetic control is that the total number of possible genetic defects carried by the race is increasing, and that the race's genetic load is becoming dangerously heavy.

Several reasons are adduced as causative for this. The mutation rate in human reproduction is being vastly increased by population increase. Contributory to this is the fact that medical science is able to maintain alive into reproductive age many potential bearers of genetic defects (e.g., diabetics). It is estimated that the proportion of children now being born with visible genetic defects is 1 in 20; the percentage is said to be growing.

Before we proceed further, something needs to be said at the point of the relation of today's genetic engineering to the classic or conventional science of eugenics-a science which in the broad sense deals with the improvement of the human race through the isolation and control of hereditary factors.

It is standard today to speak of negative and positive eugenics. The former is concerned primarily with the treatment of individuals and individual ailments, whether monogenic or polygenic, without regard to the wider genetic situation. That is to say, negative genetics makes no conscious effort

to modify the overall condition of the genetic pool, but rather it seeks to eliminate hereditary defects which have already occurred in persons.

Techniques in this connection center in genetic counseling, possible genetic screening. Objectives include possible limitation of repeated births to parents bearing genetic defects, possible dissuasion of probable bearers of defective offspring with respect to such matters as institutionalizing of the hopelessly handicapped in the light of other family needs.¹

Positive eugenics, on the other hand, attempts to modify the actual condition of the genetic pool. Feeling that the elimination of present defects means attacking the problem too late, positive eugenics seeks to deal with the problem in advance by applying therapeutic measures to human genes, and to utilize the information and the genetic results thus gained for the improvement of the race, or at least for the elimination of those elements which produce the most readily visible forms of racial deterioration.²

This seemingly long introduction is intended to provide the background for a consideration of the several areas within which genetic surgery is presently undertaken. After a discussion of these, it will remain to discuss the challenge which they present to the evangelical Christian, with special reference to those of us of a specifically Wesleyan orientation.

I

A. In mass genetic screening, the size of the project is a major factor which distinguishes it from the so-called negative eugenics. The focus becomes, not the individual couple, but entire groups of persons, in order to determine the possible presence of genetic disease—in the form of carriers or in actual appearance of the disorder. Screening programs include those for the detection of the sickle-cell trait, with its consequent sickle-cell form of anemia, and of Tay-Sachs disease, which occurs chiefly among Jews of Eastern Europe and Asia.³

The goals of such programs are detailed in an article by Marc Lappe, James F. Gustafson, and Richard Roblin, entitled “Ethical and Social Issues in Screening for Genetic Disease.” These goals are, in part, as follows: to “contribute to improving the health of persons who suffer from genetic disorders, or allow carriers of a given variant gene to make informed choices regarding reproduction, or move toward alleviating the anxieties of families and communities faced with the prospect of serious genetic disease.”⁴

These objectives are laudable in themselves, since the large majority in any group thus tested are neither carriers nor themselves afflicted. Thus they can be given meaningful mental and emotional reassurance.

The problems which seem implicit in screening programs are chiefly two: first, the inadequacy of present testing procedures; and second, the matter of the voluntary and confidential nature of the programs themselves. In some cases, false positive reactions have been registered, to the distress of those involved. As for the extent of the programs, there is serious concern that they may be made compulsory within a given ethnic group, and thus exert a dehumanizing influence upon their members. Also, the question of confi-

dentiality enters: Should insurance companies have access, even on demand, to such information? Thus, false diagnoses and accessible public records constitute genuine problems at this point.

B. *In vitro* fertilization and related experimentation is coming under increasing scrutiny today. So-called test-tube fertilization has been contemplated for several decades. A landmark in the progress of this technique occurred in the early 1960s, when an Italian researcher, Dr. Danielle Petrucci, with the assistance of his colleagues Dr. Laura de Pauli and Raffale Bernaboo, fertilized a human ovum in a test tube and kept it alive for 29 days, until it attained the size of a small garden pea. A later conceptus lived for 59 days. The destruction of both of these triggered papal opposition, causing Dr. Petrucci to stop his researches.⁵

A wide range of experiments, actual or projected, cluster about *in vitro* sperm-and-ovum operations, each raising possible problems and perils. Along with fertilizations aimed at demonstrating the length of period in which a test-tube conceptus can be kept alive and providing observable specimens of early embryonic development, *in vitro* experiments are being utilized for the purpose of developing artificial uteruses and especially artificial placentas. The ultimate goal here is, of course, the development of a full-term fetus without the presence of a maternal body.

Another sought-for objective is that of artificial ino-vulation, in which an ovum may be transferred to the test-tube, artificially fertilized, and transplanted into the fallopian tube or uterus of a foster mother. This would be designed for employment by two classes of women: those who want “their own” children but due to professional plans or other personal reasons wish to avoid personal experience of pregnancy; and as well, those who for medical reasons find contraindications for pregnancy. In either case, presently developed techniques do not, many qualified persons fear, offer sufficient safeguards against damage or even death to the transferred embryo.⁶

The presence of an embryo *in vitro* offers opportunity for a wide range of possible experiments upon it. It is difficult to sort out those experiments which are within the probable range of feasibility from those which are merely dreams in the minds of genetic engineers. But several are at present the subject of serious and active discussion. Among them are: the excision and addition of genes, the repair or modification of genes, and the injection of various modifying substances into the developing embryo designed to effect genetic changes within it. None of these is without the element of risk to *human* material, and raises the question of the *rights* of a fertilized ovum or zygote at time of c6nception, and of the developing embryo.

C. Gene therapy, both monogenic and polygenic, seems uppermost in the minds of many biomedical specialists. It gbes without saying that traits or qualities produced monogenetically (that is, by a single gene or by one gene of a allelic [allelomorphic] pair) are vastly more simple than those produced by a number of genes. Thus genetic surgery which confines itself to monogenic traits or qualities would carry fewer hazards than that dealing

with complex traits of polygenic origin. Such traits as skin and hair color or bodily shapes are polygenic traits whose mode of inheritance is far from clear.⁷ No less than nine genes are found to be involved in the fertility or sterility of one type of *Drosophila* or fruit fly.⁸

It follows that even the simpler forms of genetic surgery require a fantastically detailed internal analysis of the cell's genetic data. Nevertheless, genetic surgery is definitely "with us," for those who project its use have already developed the art of microsurgery to a point at which the basic building-blocks in human genetics are capable of being treated by means of it. Nor is microsurgery the only technique by which genetic surgery is to be effected. It is projected to affect basic genetic materials-and ultimately the gene pool of the race-by means of enzymes or of viruses.⁹

This latter-genetic alteration by means of viruses-at first thought impresses us as contradictory, since we usually regard viruses as our enemies. Present investigation of the viruses indicates that they are quasi-living things, having a coating of protein and a core of nucleic acid. They have no mechanism for ingestion and metabolism of food, nor for reproduction. It is the understanding of this writer that we do not yet fully understand the ways in which viruses invade cells and preempt their metabolic and reproductive processes. But cells seem to obey the virus, which always demands the production of more viruses.

AlQng with this, viruses effect significant changes on the cell's nucleus, through the working of its own DNA. Now, some viruses have the ability to move with ease in and out of human cells, doing little or no damage. Two of these are the so-called Shope virus and the 5V40 type. Such a viral transduction may, it is believed, serve to modify the genetic code; those working to develop this form of genetic transformation envision the alteration and resynthesizing of the inner structure of human genes.¹⁰

Genetic surgery thus promises to combine microsurgery and chemical and viral infusions. Dr. Edward L. Tatum, Nobel Prize winner, forecasts the use of laser beams for the erasing of unwanted genes, and the replication of destroyed genetic materials by the use of enzymes. Some go further and suggest the genetic redesigning of the entire human body. Should this prove to be possible, the sky would become the limit for human experimentation.

D. Cloning represents another area where the exercise of genetic tailoring is envisioned. Briefly stated, cloning is a process by which an ovum is denucleated, by microsurgery or by laser beam, and its nucleus replaced by a somatic cell, often from intestinal tissue, of a donor. This body cell switches on the denucleated ovum in much the same way that the male reproductive cell would in normal fertilization. The "clone" which results has the same chromosome number as the engrafted cell, and is of the same gender as the donor-iji reality, it is an identical twin, a generation later. Thus far, clones have been produced in fruit flies, frogs, and salamanders; it is projected, however, that cloning of mammals will shortly be effected, since the technical difficulties seem surmountable.¹¹

Will this technique be applied to humans? Some predict that it will be done so with success yet in this decade. The problems will be many: What

will be the adjustments needed if two (or more) of the same genotype occur but a generation apart? Will clones be sterile? (This seems to be the case with cloned salamanders and frogs.) What will be the effect upon the human gene pool if clones prove to be fertile? More important still, does cloning call up the spectres of Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *1984*? It is in any case possible that cloned individuals would lack the adaptability to changing environments which seem to be linked to the genetic process of bisexual reproduction. And if clones returned to normal reproduction with members of the opposite sex, what would be the potential for an accumulation of negative genes and mutations to be fed back into the gene pool?

It follows that the various projected and anticipated forms of genetic engineering bristle with unanswered questions and bear within themselves major hazards, not to mention grave moral questions. It is to these latter that we now turn.

II

The broad spectrum of techniques for genetic engineering does, of course, pose a variety of problems and raise a large number of issues. These may be divided into four types: the legal, the medical, the ethical, and the religious or spiritual.

This is scarcely the place or time to undertake a survey of the legal issues which will inevitably be raised as biomedical research is pursued in the areas under discussion. It should be observed that legal safeguards seem inadequate at the moment, and there is little reason to suppose that these will be raised until spectacular breakthroughs make it imperative for legislators to step into the situation. Some feel that any such effort will prove to be "too little and too late."

A. Objections to *avant-garde* experimentation with human reproduction and human inheritance are raised from time to time upon medical grounds. The most telling set of warnings from the medical point of view with which this writer is acquainted is found in published form in an article in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* 220, no.10 (June 5, 1972): 1346-359. In this carefully drawn essay, Paul Ramsey, the Harrington Spear Paine Professor of Religion in Princeton University, details a series of issues which evidence that "this artificial mimicry of nature . . . in the matter of fertilization" (i.e., *in vitro* fertilization and the forms of experimentation which grow out of it) contravenes the historic purpose(s) of the medical profession, which is to prevent injury to human life, and in case of injury, to save life. It would extend this paper beyond tolerable limits to survey the steps by which he demonstrated, conclusively we think, that such experimentation serves, not to conserve life, but to create, beyond permissible limits, hazards to life.

B. The ethical questions raised by the several forms of genetic manipulation are numerous; they center around issues which serve to relate them rather intimately to religious/spiritual questions. It is helpful, however, to try to isolate some purely ethical issues before proceeding to see the religious involvement of them.

There arises, perhaps first of all, the ethical question which springs from the complicated nature of inheritance and the consequent factor of artificially created *risk*. The nature of today's genetic "load" (i.e., "the array of mutant genes found within the gene pools of populations")¹² rests of course upon the almost infinite intricacy of genetic inheritance. Over several millennia of human history, there has developed a complex of what Pierre Teilhard de Chardin calls "fragments of the world." Our Maker has built into the mechanisms of human inheritance sequential safeguards by which even the perversity of the race—at times its sexual perversity—does not succeed in breaking down the continuum of human life. But these techniques *are* built in; and it may be questioned whether even scientific man knows sufficiently much of the complexities of the genetic structure of the race to undertake such radical modifications of it.

The ethical issue appears most visibly in the possibility of the interruption or subversion of the normal streams of inheritance. This would, in the long run, be more damaging than the production, evidently quite possible, of monsters and chimerical specimens. The treatment or possible destruction of these would certainly have a strong ethical involvement. But how much more serious might be the "surprise" effect of the immediate contamination of the genetic stream—say by means of a return to bisexual forms of reproduction by cloned individuals.

Ethical problems likewise emerge when genetic experimentation leads—as it quite probably will—to institutionalized control of human reproduction. Such problems as: the right to privacy, the right to marry, the right to procreate—these may well be raised in critical form in our own lifetimes. Such rights will be increasingly called into question if gene therapy for disease be extended to similar therapy for the modification of socially undesirable or disruptive behavior. Moreover, it seems clear, as Paul Ramsey suggests, that there will be cumulative "successes" in genetic experimentation, leading step by step to policies of "immense disvalue for the human community"¹³

The objection is sometimes raised that there is really little reason to suppose that the more drastic forms of genetic engineering (e.g., actual gene surgery or cloning) will actually be undertaken by biomedical scientists. This represents, we think, an inadequate reading of history. Such things will be undertaken for precisely the same reason that the climbing of Mount Everest is repeatedly attempted—because it is there. Thus, the "wedge argument" or the "camel's nose in the tent" objections become genuine ethical issues. And those who undertake to guide mankind into *Brave New World* will quite probably exercise their scientific activities at a tempo which stops nowhere short of the limit which society will tolerate. The ethical implications of this are, we believe, unacceptable to the ethically sensitive.

C. The religious and spiritual implications represent a refinement and a specialization of the ethical objections to the more radical forms of genetic experimentation. At this point, it needs to be said that some forms of the spiritual life respond more directly than others to peril—challenges made by novel types of social engineering. In general, liberal forms of Christianity are

more inclined to be pragmatic and “open”—and to accept with greater eagerness new advances, particularly in the social sciences and in the areas of the modification of human behavior. These forms are, of course, less disturbed by the materialistic orientation of genetic engineers than are Evangelicals.¹⁴

Forms of spiritual life which retain the major features of historic Christianity are more likely to view such matters with reserve. This is due in part—but not entirely—to the conservatism which is part of the accompanying tradition. But we venture to suggest that part, at least, of this reserve stems from valid insights and a Spirit-given sense of threat to the deeper values of humanhood as bearing, even if now in wounded form, the image of God. Evangelicals who concern themselves with such matters are concerned with what may happen to the *human* dimension as the basic elements involved in the ongoing of the race are made matters of experimentation at their deepest level.¹⁵

The assignment of topics for this Ninth Annual Meeting of the Wesleyan Theological Society included, in the case of this paper, the element of the specifically Wesleyan implications for the subject, or more precisely, the implications of the subject for the Wesleyan understanding of things. It goes without saying that our theological tradition contains no direct mandate, affirmative or negative, for manipulation or control of the human reproductive process. We will need, therefore, to content ourselves in these closing minutes with suggestions concerning the possible bearing of the major thrust of our tradition upon the issues in hand.

It is suggested that, as we are a part of the broader evangelical movement of our time, we will have much in common in our social outlook and social critique with evangelical groups within Lutheranism, within modified Calvinism, and within the charismatic movements. We share, for example, with other Evangelicals in the rejection of the view, so common in our time, that the legal is the moral. Our society does pressure us in this direction; but it belongs to our genius as part of the body of Christ to insist that *the right* rests upon higher ground than legality.

We are in agreement, too, with the general evangelical understanding of the dignity of man—a dignity which has survived the Fall. Thus, whatever calls into question that dignity and whatever tends to cause human worth to be judged by some “index of performance rather than by man’s high ancestry, must be and is repudiated by us. Again, we refuse to set up criteria for human worth upon the shallow basis of physical perfection or even human symmetry. Thus, we would, in agreement with other heirs of historic Christianity, reject the proposal that a fetus which was shown by amniocentesis to be less than fully “normal” (e.g., in full possession of a normal complement of limbs) should be aborted.

In common with other Evangelicals, Wesleyans will agree with Paul Ramsey that “men ought not to play God before they learn to be men, and after they have learned to be men they will not play God.”¹⁶ It is possible that we as Wesleyans will place an overall higher estimate upon man as *man* because of our conviction that the unlimited dignity of our Lord’s self-offering at Golgotha renders *all* human persons salvable. Without wishing to

assign less lofty motives for the recognition of the dignity of the individual person to those accepting, explicitly or implicitly, a view of a limited atonement, we do believe that the view of Christ's atonement as adequate for all who will meet its terms has valuable theological significance.

Again, the Wesleyan understanding of the role of the human will has implications for the concepts of its thoughtful adherents for sexual reproduction, and for the wider purposes of sexuality for humans which ought to be broader than those drawn from more limited conceptions of the role of human volition. These implications need, it seems to this writer, to be thought out and articulated far more fully than they have been to date.

Finally, the Wesleyan understanding of perfection (i.e., in the "evangelical" sense as opposed to its quantitative and absolute usages) has a direct bearing upon the question in hand. The objective of the genetic engineers seems to be, not merely the production of novelty, nor the correction of human imperfection(s), but the ultimate production of "perfect" humans. The spelling out of this quest usually includes the achievement of individuals with large physical and mental prowess. Seldom do the engineers raise questions concerning moral and spiritual excellence as a genetic idea. The understanding of things human in our tradition stands as a perpetual challenge to the ideology which seems to inform the engineers of humanity.

The Wesleyan view of man understands perfection in dimensions radically different from every view which omits the element of man's high ancestry (the *imago dei*) and which excludes the reality of a historical calamity (the Fall) in which the first human pair involved the race. In the light of the biblical view of man, perfection inheres, not in the attainment (by whatever means) of physical or mental enlargement. It consists rather in moral and spiritual renovation-renovation which lies wholly outside either the vision or the techniques of human engineers, and which is available to man solely on the basis of supernatural intervention, from beyond man.

The expectation of the perfection of man in terms of modification of the genetic elements contributory to his empirical presence in the world is, in this light, an impossible one. The Wesleyan understanding of perfection calls into question, not only as futile but as presumption, the technological mimicry of the work of the Creator, who endowed our first ancestors with dimensions which place him essentially beyond the reach of technological manipulation. For man's perfection transcends in superlative measure his physical and mental endowment.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. For a carefully written discussion of negative forms of eugenic techniques, including a section entitled "Clinical Genetics and Counseling," see Kurt Hirschhorn, "Human Genetics," in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* for April 30, 1973.

2. James B. Nelson, *Human Medicine*, pp .99 f.

3. *Ibid.*, p.106.
4. In the *New England Journal of Medicine*, issue of May 25, 1972, p.1129.
5. David Rorvik, *Brave New Baby*, pp.79 f.
6. *Ibid.*, pp.113-16.
7. Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Genetics of the Evolutionary Process*, p.289.
8. *Ibid.*, p.362.
9. Rorvik, *Brave New Baby*, pp.96 if. Leroy Augenstein, *Come, Let Us Play God*, pp. 20ff.
10. Paul Ramsey, *Fabricated Man*, pp. 44f., 101 f., 11Sf.
11. Rorvik, *Brave New Baby*, Chapter III, especially pp.108-li. Ramsey, *Fabricated Man*, pp.73 f.
12. H. J. Muller, "Our Load of Mutations," in Bruce Wallace, *Topics in Population Genetics*, p.169.
13. In *Journal of the American Medical Association* 220, no.11: 1481.
14. Ramsey, *Fabricated Man*, pp. 92ff.
15. Nelson, *Human Medicine*, pp. 25ff.
16. Ramsey, *Fabricated Man*, p.138.

BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION AND WESLEYAN THEOLOGY

H. Ray Dunning

Trevecca Nazarene College

One of the strangest theological anachronisms of our time is the close relationship between dispensationalism and Wesleyanism. It is almost a universal phenomenon among ministers of my acquaintance. But if, in fact, a wedding has been consummated, it is an illegitimate marriage because the two partners are theologically incompatible. Few people seem to recognize this fact.

It is extremely difficult to point to the theological norm of dispensationalism but, among other presuppositions, it certainly rests on a particular hermeneutic. The special aspect of the hermeneutic with which this paper is concerned has to do with the so-called prophecies of the Old Testament. Dispensationalism demands a literal fulfillment of these prophecies, especially those referring to the supremacy of Israel. It therefore produces an elaborate scheme of eschatology as a theological necessity stemming from this hermeneutical presupposition. Incidentally, a Wesleyan preoccupied with eschatological speculation is also a strange phenomenon.

The most serious indictment of dispensationalism, however, is that it sets itself against the basic premise of the New Testament kerygma. As C. H. Dodd has isolated it, one of the essential elements of the kerygma of the Early Church is that all those occurrences surrounding the Christevent were “according to the scriptures”; i.e., the New Testament itself claims these prophecies to have been fulfilled by Jesus of Nazareth.

As Dodd also points out, if we can discover the hermeneutical principles which guide the New Testament writers in this claim, “we shall be on the way to understanding the concept of ‘fulfillment,’ which appears to govern the early Christian interpretation of the Gospel events as proclaimed in the kerygma.”¹

Thus we are seeking to focus, not on the problem of predictive prophecy in general, but on the specific problem of the New Testament writers’ use of Old Testament scripture to substantiate their aforementioned claim. This is a problem because of the logically odd way in which they do it. Passages are said to be “fulfilled” which in their original setting have an obviously different reference. Our modern historical understanding of the biblical writings has led us to see that they arose out of definite historical settings, a fact which intensifies the problem.

In earlier times, the so-called argument from prophecy played a prominent role in Christian apologetics. In a word, it involved “the demonstration

of the validity of the witness of the Old Testament to the truth of Christ,” and laid “great stress upon the literal fulfillment of detailed prediction.”² This particular approach operated on the basis of a special view of prophecy so well described by Gurdon Oxtoby as representing “future history to be like a motion picture film, where the entire plot is already photographed and edited, so that the present represents the frame passing the lens at a particular moment, and the future will inevitably unfold in like fashion at a predetermined time.”³ Oxtoby denies that this is the nature of Hebrew prophecy and with this we must concur.

Such an approach to biblical hermeneutics raised problems even before the celebrated “rise of biblical criticism,” and was vigorously discussed in the eighteenth century during Wesley’s lifetime. It may be helpful to remember that the second and eighteenth centuries are considered the great apologetic centuries of Christian theology. In 1722, William Whiston (whom you probably know as the editor of Josephus’ works) published a work entitled *An Essay Toward Restoring the True Text of the Old Testament, and for Vindicating the Citations Made Thence in the New Testament*. It was Whiston’s contention that the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy constituted the principal proof of Jesus’ messiahship; and of the divine origin of Christianity. But he recognized the problem to which we have referred, namely, the “occasional” lack of correspondence between prophecy and alleged fulfillment. The purpose of his work was to remedy the difficulty by restoring the true text of the Old Testament, which he claimed had been intentionally corrupted by the Jews.

In 1724, Anthony Collins published an ambiguous response to Whiston’s work which he titled *A Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*. He placed the whole case for Christianity on the grounds of prophecy and then declared that the lack of correspondence between prophecy and fulfillment which Whiston had noticed in some cases is true of every case, when the prophecies are literally interpreted. Thus Whiston’s reconstruction of the text does not adequately meet the difficulty. Collins then proposed a familiar solution, namely, interpreting the prophecies allegorically. I speak of this reply as ambiguous because it appeared to be an attempt to undermine it, since, as A. C. McGiffert puts it, “the allegorical method could not be taken seriously, and was not meant to be.”⁴

Three years later, Collins published a second book entitled *The Scheme of Literal Prophecy Considered*, in which he abandoned the whole approach of dependence on prophecy. There was evidently a massive discussion of the issue during this time. The question continued to stimulate interest, and in 1889 an ingenious solution was suggested that the early Christians made use of manuals containing collections of texts. “With this suggestion by E. Hatch there began a theory which gained wide acceptance by the turn of the century and by 1920 was virtually unanimously approved.”⁵ This theory was developed most thoroughly by J. Rendel Harris in a work called *Testimonies*, in which he argued that the Church used books of testimonies compiled from the Old Testament for use by those who had to argue from the Old Testament

against the Jews. This document was earlier than the canonical New Testament writings.

Although this theory fell into disrepute in later times, support for it has arisen out of the Qumran discoveries, which demonstrated conclusively that the Jews used such collections in the exposition of scripture. J. M. Allegro says:

There can be little doubt that we have in this document a group of testimonia of the type not long ago proposed by Burkitt, Rendel Harris, and others to have existed in the early Church. Our collection has the added interest of including two testimonies used by the early Christians concerning Jesus. Furthermore, the first testimony quoted has a particular importance in that it demonstrates the type of composite quotation well represented in the New Testament.⁶

Now this seems to us to merely push the problem one step further back without coming to terms with it. It may explain how the Christian apologists came to use certain passages, but the hermeneutical principle which must justify such use is still to be uncovered. It is this question to which C. H. Dodd addressed himself in his modification of the testimonia theory. He proposed the hypothesis that there were some larger parts of scripture which were early recognized as appropriate sources from which testimonia might be drawn, rather than a collection of isolated proof texts. The principle of selection will be referred to later.

This leads us to propose certain considerations which should be taken into account while seeking our “hermeneutical principle” for interpreting the concept of “fulfillment.”

First, I would suggest that we must take seriously the findings of modern biblical scholarship, namely, that biblical passages arise in particular settings. Gurdon Oxtoby puts this point clearly:

The historical study of the Bible has emphasized the fact that those who wrote it did so in response to actual situation. The older idea, that men of old were divinely inspired to speak words whose content was in reality a mystery to them, has been discredited. Of course they often dealt with principles and concepts whose depths they could not fathom, and they may on occasion have spoken words that would someday be seen to have significance far beyond their own realization. But we must not imagine that they spoke or wrote what was to them unintelligible.

Absence of historical perspective is what has tended to make the Scripture unreal for many in our time. ⁷

As a corollary, it also seems to me that we cannot resort to an uncontrolled “allegorical hermeneutic,” especially when allegory is defined as the “reading into a biblical passage of a meaning which its author did not intend and could not have understood.”⁸ While Richardson says that allegory is a veritable necessity for those who are committed to a literalist interpretation of the Bible, he evidently had not heard of dispensationalism or else considered it beneath reference. I would agree with Richardson that allegory (or an analogy of faith as he called allegory under the control of a hermeneutical

norm) “may be useful for pedagogic and hortatory purposes, but it is useless for the establishment either of the historical meaning of particular biblical passages or of theological truth.”⁹

I believe that we must also assume a position which adequately takes account of the understanding of biblical prophecy as chiefly forthtelling. Furthermore, as modern scholars have indicated, it seems reasonable to take seriously the understanding of revelation so widespread, namely, that revelation is primarily attached in some organic way to historical events. It has been inferred from this that “the fulfillment of prophecy is thus seen to involve more than the fulfillment of words and predictions; it involves the fulfillment of history, the validation of the prophetic understanding of history in the events which the New Testament records and interprets for us.”¹⁰ This kind of approach has considerable support among solid scholars and we may further elucidate it from the words of C. H. Dodd:

The New Testament writers “interpret and apply the prophecies of the Old Testament upon the basis of a certain understanding of history, which is substantially that of the prophets themselves.... Taking up this view of history the earliest thinkers of Christianity declared that in the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ” the act of judgment and redemption toward which the prophets pointed “had taken place.... In general then, the writers of the New Testament, in making use of passages from the Old Testament, remain true to the main intention of their writers. Yet the actual meaning discovered in a given passage will seldom, in the nature of things, coincide precisely with that which it had in its original context.”¹¹

In the teaching of Old Testament literature, students often ask the question, “Does this passage predict Christ?” I have suggested that it is more accurate to say that Christ is the Fulfillment of this passage. I understand that to be the intent of the “fulfillment of history” approach. This is precisely what Oxtoby means in his statement that “the emphasis . . . must be put upon the idea of fulfillment, not on prediction. To regard the Old Testament as primarily a foretelling of the New is to present the matter in reverse.”¹²

It came to me with considerable relief to find support for this way of coming at the question from John Wesley himself, who offers a “hermeneutical principle” which evidently is far beyond his day. In his note on Matt. 2:17 dealing with the Evangelist’s quote from Jeremiah which obviously refers to something else, he says: “A passage of Scripture, whether prophetic, historical, or poetical, is in the language of the New Testament fulfilled when an event happens to which it may with great propriety be accommodated. “

Systematically, this issue has implications for several theological areas, including the questions of inspiration and ecclesiology as well as eschatology. If the Wesleyan must reject dispensationalism theologically, he must also reject its literalist hermeneutic, for the two are Siamese twins. Thus he must project his own hermeneutic and Wesley has, fortunately, already pointed the direction.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scripture* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 27.
2. Alan Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*, p. 177.
3. Gurdon Oxtoby, *Prediction and Fulfillment in the Bible* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), p. 85.
4. A. C. McGiffert, *Protestant Thought Before Kant* (London: Duckworth and Co., 1919), p. 217.
5. E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), p. 98.
6. E. F. Osborn, *Word and History* (Melbourne: Jonker Printy Pty., Ltd., 1971), p. 8.
7. Oxtoby, *Prediction*, p. 162.
8. Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*, p. 180.
9. Ibid., p. 186.
10. Ibid., p. 188.
11. Dodd, *According to the Scripture*, pp. 128-30.
12. Oxtoby, *Prediction*, p. 66.

ACADEMIC ORTHODOXY AND THE ARMINIANIZING OF AMERICAN THEOLOGY

James E. Hamilton

Asbury College

During the decades immediately before and after 1800 a massive shift began to take place in American theology. The dominant Calvinistic framework gave way and was succeeded by a prevailing Arminianism. So fundamental were the issues of this intellectual revolution and so profound were their implications that the Protestant Reformation has been called by comparison “a negligible theological performance.”¹

Calvinism had hit a low ebb before the days of the American Revolution. The basically deterministic formulations of Jonathan Edwards and his followers were increasingly looked upon as both theologically indefensible and morally repugnant. The attempt to maintain a form of determinism and yet to extricate from God responsibility for sin was straining the ingenuity of Edwards’ most capable followers. The idea that God would arbitrarily elect some to salvation and allow others to remain forever in their degraded and sinful condition was repugnant to the keen sense of fair play of American frontiersmen. A number of reactions appeared. Among the best known were the Enlightenment, Unitarianism, and that reaction to the Unitarian reaction, transcendentalism. None of these, however, were genuinely popular movements.

What did make headway with the general public was freewill, revivalistic, pietistic, Trinitarian Evangelicalism spearheaded by a group of academic leaders who have come to be known collectively as the “academic orthodoxy.” It will be our purpose in this study to characterize Evangelicalism during this period, to point out some of the reasons for its success, to identify academic orthodoxy, and to discuss the role of the orthodoxy in effecting the demise of Calvinistic supremacy.

We shall also focus attention upon the man who was perhaps the most complete single representative of this movement, Asa Mahan. The relevance of our discussion to the specific interests of the Wesleyan Theological Society is to be found in the fact that although this movement emerged phoenixlike out of Calvinism, it ran parallel to and mingled increasingly with Methodism, and, finally, with Methodism it gave rise to the holiness movement of the latter half of the century. This study will thus also provide a backdrop and context for Professor Dayton’s paper, “Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology.”

In his analysis of the nature of the evangelical movement during the last century, William McLoughlin says,

The history of Evangelicalism in America must be told on three levels: first as philosophy, second as theology, and third as social history. As philosophy it is the story of the permeation of nineteenth-century thought with the ideas and system of the Scottish Common Sense School. As theology it is the story of the decline of Calvinism, the Protestant Counter Reformation against deism, and the emergence of a new theological consensus on Arminian principles which prevailed between the Second Great Awakening and the rise of Modernism. As social history it is the story of the final triumph of voluntarism over establishmentarianism and the rise of a new revivalistic religion which was as interdenominational in its pattern as the moral reform crusades and benevolent associations which it spawned to purify the nation and redeem the world. 2

This is the movement which from the beginning of the nineteenth century took America by storm. So influential was it that McLoughlin again writes,

The story of Evangelicalism is the story of America itself in the years 1800 to 1900, for it was Evangelical religion which made Americans the most religious people in the world, molded them into a unified, pietistic-perfectionist nation, and spurred them on to those heights of social reform, missionary endeavor, and imperialistic expansionism which constitute the moving forces of our history in that century. 3

One reason for the success of Evangelicalism was that it was intellectually respectable. These men cultivated the vigor and integrity of their rational powers. Is it not significant that the chief revivalist of the era could be accused by Princeton theologians of being a cold logician.⁴ and that *his Lectures on Revivals of Religion* can be characterized today as “a major work in the history of the mind in America”?⁵ The Evangelicals interpreted Christian experience itself as a matter of fidelity of the will to reason rather than to feeling. As we shall see, these men produced convincing philosophical arguments in defense of the will’s freedom and against the universal determinism of Edwards.

Their influence was keenly felt in academia also. D. H. Meyer points out that

the American system of higher education in the nineteenth century has been aptly described as “Protestant Scholasticism” because of its ambitious effort “to organize all knowledge, including knowledge of the cosmos, of men, and of society, into a consistent and intelligible whole,” establishing a correspondence between secular knowledge and basic Christian principles.⁵

Hand in glove with the intellectual defense of freedom was the revivalistic emphasis of the Evangelicals. Of course the Calvinist Edwards was responsible for much of the religious impetus giving rise to the nineteenth-century revivals. The irony of this, however, is that if a revival is a mystery-

ous, unexpected, inexplicable visitation from God, as Edwards held that it is, then whatever a person might say or do to produce one is irrelevant. Whatever is determined to be will be.

The Evangelicals maintained a different position. In their view the atonement had been provided and the grace of God was as a great reservoir waiting to be drawn upon. It was up to the individual to meet God's conditions, to appropriate God's grace, to choose to allow God to do something for him, to accept Jesus Christ as one's Saviour. Revivals took work. People needed to be persuaded that what they did made a difference. Thus it was that people began to speak of revivalism, of the promotion of revivals, of the anxious seat, and of camp meetings; so Perry Miller can say in retrospect that "the dominant theme in America from 1800 to 1860 is the invincible persistence of the revival technique [*italics mine*], coming to its resplendent triumph in the Third Awakening of 1857-58."⁷

The popular character of Evangelicalism is most clearly seen in this revivalistic emphasis. "Generally considered," says Perry Miller, "the period following 1800 was, for about forty years, one of massive revivals."⁸ Though often treated as peripheral, revivals may have been the decisive element in determining the character of our nation. As Miller says, "They gave a special tone to the epoch; through them the youthful society sought for solidarity, for a discovery of its meaning."⁹ He further says,

Indeed one can almost say that the steady burning of the Revival, sometimes smoldering, now blazing into flame, never quite extinguished (even in Boston) until the Civil War had been fought, was a central mode of this culture's search for national identity. ¹⁰

In Miller's view it was not Thomas Jefferson, or Madison, or Monroe who led America out of the eighteenth century, but Charles Grandison Finney, the man who "incarnated the aspiration and the philosophy of the revival."¹²

Evangelicalism was particularly congenial with the democratic sense of the new republic. The Evangelicals tended to be democratic theologically, temperamentally, and institutionally. Jacksonian democracy was a curious blend of individualism and community awareness and aspiration. The model and chief inspiration of this democratic spirit was in fact the revival. In every revival men were held strictly responsible for their own actions. They were called as individuals to make peace with their Maker. Yet the revival was by its very nature a communal enterprise. Its methods were brought to bear upon whole towns, villages, and even cities. Individuals were summoned, as Miller points out, in order that "all might participate in the mystery of communion, even to self-abasement before the eyes of the fellowship."¹³ The proof of a genuine revival was that a community now acted as a community.

We are now prepared for an identification of the academic orthodoxy and for a discussion of its role in accomplishing the transition from Calvinism to Arminianism in American theology. In order to meet the rising demand for ministers, many new colleges were founded during the first 40 years of the century. In most cases these colleges represented the new school, or freewill brand of Protestantism, and produced ministers of the non-Calvinistic, liberal type. The term *academic orthodoxy* is usually applied to the philo-

sophical academicians in most of the older colleges, except Princeton and a few others, and to the teachers in the burgeoning new colleges. Concerning these men, E. H. Madden says:

The members of the “orthodoxy” generally exhibited the syndrome of minister-philosopher-college president.¹⁴ In addition to Wayland, Mahan, Finney, and Fairchild, the following names, at least, would have to be included in any representative roster: Jeremiah Day (Yale), Henry P. Tappan (New York University), Laurens Perseus Hickok (Union), Thomas C. Upham (Bowdoin), Noah Porter (Yale), Francis Bowen (Harvard), James McCosh (Princeton), Mark Hopkins (Williams), Andrew Preston Peabody (Harvard), Taylor Lewis (New York University), and Leicester A. Sawyer (Central College, Ohio) . 15

The academic orthodoxy not only emphasized a non-Calvinistic, freewill, evangelical brand of Christianity; it defended its views within the context of the Scottish realistic philosophy of Thomas Reid and his followers. Thomas Reid (1710-96) was a Presbyterian clergyman who left the ministry to devote his intellectual talents to the development of a philosophical system which would both undermine and replace the skepticism of David Hume. It is, of course, an irony of history that Reid was inadvertently to undermine Presbyterian Calvinism in America. According to Baruch Brody:

Reid was convinced that Humean scepticism was the logical conclusion of the whole of philosophy since Descartes and Locke and not merely the product of an ingenious and sophistic mind, and he saw his own psychological theories as the basis for the only approach that could avoid this devastating scepticism. 16

According to Reid, skeptical conclusions are the logical outcome of a faulty methodology. Instead of starting out with hypotheses and analogies drawn from the physical world, the mental philosopher should begin with the data of introspection, the dictates of common sense. Admittedly, the task of the philosopher in defending common sense is restricted. He can argue against objections and proposed alternatives to common sense intuition, but he cannot prove these data by deduction from more evident premises. Since they are first principles, the dictates of common sense are held to be self-evident and incapable of derivation from more ultimate truths. They are imposed upon us by the very constitution of our own nature, and the best way to defend them is simply to draw attention to their authority. Thus, careful reflection upon the operations of one’s own mind is the only proper method for the mental philosopher.

Reid was not unaware of the subjectivity of his methodology and proposed, as Brody points out,

that it should be supplemented by (a) a consideration of common distinctions drawn in all languages which usually reflect real distinctions in the world that mankind, in its ordinary activities, has had occasion to notice and (b) a consideration of the behaviour that is the effect of the mental activity and that can shed light on it. 17

The idea is that certain bedrock convictions of the generality of men are

unavoidably implicit in our actions, and these same convictions have helped mold the structure of all language. Thus, by providing two external check points Reid was able to deliver his methodology from the charge of sheer subjectivity .

For more than 50 years Reid's philosophy, in Miller's words, "constituted what must be called the official metaphysic of America." 18 More important for our purposes though was the fact that Reid's work provided Asa Mahan and other members of the orthodoxy with the tool for rejecting Edwardsian determinism. Following Reid, Mahan held that "the mind has but one eye by which it can see itself, and that is the eye of consciousness." 19 When the human mind is confronted with a choice, it is directly conscious that, under the same set of circumstances, two or more acts of will are equally possible. When a choice has been made, a person is similarly conscious that in the identical situation he could have chosen differently.

This consciousness of liberty constitutes higher and more certain evidence that the will is free than any amount of rational argumentation to the contrary. The fundamental error of Edwards' determinism was the total neglect of this testimony of consciousness. Because of this error Edwards neglected to make the basic distinction between sensation and the will. Man is conscious, claimed Mahan, of a distinction between volition and even the strongest desire. This experiential distinction requires us to distinguish conceptually between the faculty of will as the sphere of choice and decision and the faculty of sensation as the sphere of passive impression. Determinism belongs to the realm of sensation, from which the will is exempt. Unless it can be shown that a necessary connection exists between sensation and the will, which cannot be shown, the testimony of the consciousness that the will is free must be accepted. Such, in brief, was the type of argument put forth by Mahan .

Mahan was not the first to use this slingshot against the giant Edwards. As early as 1793, Rev. Samuel West in his *Essays on Liberty and Necessity* emphasized the importance of introspection in ascertaining the independence of the will from extrinsic causation. Although Jonathan Edwards, Jr., sought to defend his father's arguments from this novel criterion of evidence, his battle was a losing one. As Herbert W. Schneider points out, "The appeal to consciousness itself had now been made forcefully, and this appeal became the dominant note of philosophizing in the nineteenth century."20 When Mahan attacked Edwards in 1845 for constructing his whole system on the will without an appeal to consciousness, he was merely "repeating what had by now become a commonplace."21

It is important to notice that Scottish realism was useful in various camps. It was just as useful to the Unitarian in his opposition to Calvinism as it was to the Evangelical. Thus, it is not sufficient to identify academic orthodoxy solely in terms of Scottish realism in this country. Rather, it is the union of Scottish philosophy with freewill, revivalistic Evangelicalism in the abovedesignated old and new institutions in this country that all the academic orthodoxy had in common.

The individual who most clearly exemplifies the leading characteristics

of academic orthodoxy is Asa Mahan. Both at Oberlin and later at Adrian College, Mahan was president and professor of mental and moral philosophy, thus manifesting the syndrome of minister-philosopher-college president. Like many of the orthodoxy, Mahan authored several books on both philosophical and theological subjects; but unlike some of the orthodoxy, his books were filled with aggressive reasoning and were neither dry nor pedantic. Like Finney, Mahan was actively engaged in promoting revivals from the time of his conversion. A. M. Hills tells us, in fact, that “revivals followed all his labors.”²² Although religious revivals were not his sole concern, as with Finney, they were nevertheless a central and abiding interest throughout his life.

Above all, however, Mahan embodied the shift from Calvinism to Arminianism. By his own testimony, Mahan passed during his life from the strictest sect of Calvinism, in which he was reared, to “the antipodes of all the peculiarities of that faith.”²³ The two pivotal areas of doctrine upon which this transition turned were the freedom of the will and entire sanctification. Fundamental to the first was his conversion to Christ at the age of 17, and basic to the second was his entrance into the “higher life” 18 years later.

Mahan’s early training was exclusively a rigid Calvinism. Not long after he had learned to read, he had committed the *Longer and Shorter Catechisms* to memory. He confesses that under the influence of the doctrines of divine decrees, imputation, election, effectual calling, regeneration, and reprobation, which were then taught in a modified Edwardsian form, there was within him “an utter and absolute exclusion of all real ideas of duty, obligation, merit or demerit of good or ill, from the entire sphere of Christian truth, thought, and action.”²⁴ These latter ideas became intuitively clear to Mahan in immediate connection with his spiritual conversion. Although he was not at that time aware of the doctrinal implications of these ideas, he soon became convinced that moral obligation as he now conceived it was inconsistent with the Calvinistic determinism of Jonathan Edwards.

It was not long before Mahan’s adherence to strict Calvinism gave way before the intuitive convictions of his moral consciousness. In his *Doctrine of the Will*, written in 1845, Mahan, as we have seen, bases his defense of freedom and his rejection of Edwardsian determinism upon an appeal to consciousness. It should be made clear at this point that Mahan’s conception of human freedom was always set in the context of the freely offered and undeserved grace of God. God offers man salvation. Man may accept or reject this salvation, but he can neither earn it nor can he live righteously apart from it.

In time Mahan came to understand Christian perfection as logically implied by his view of freedom. The very suggestion that a state of moral and spiritual perfection might be open to a man was staggering to the imagination of a Calvinist. But Mahan, along with Finney, argued that Jesus Christ *enjoins* men to be perfect, and nothing in the Bible would be enjoined if it were impossible. If you *ought* to do something, then you can do it; and if you do not do it, you should not look for excuses elsewhere.

The Arminianizing of American theology was a major accomplishment.

Basic to this transition were Scottish philosophy and revivalism. It may seem incongruous in our day that the philosophical and the spiritual should have been thus associated. One is reminded of a remark made by G. K. Chesterton in a comparison of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Francis of Assisi:

The great fact of medieval history is that these two great men were doing the same great work; one in the study and one in the street. They were not bringing something new into Christianity, in the sense of something heathen or heretical into Christianity; on the contrary. they were bringing Christianity into Christendom.²⁵

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Joseph Haroutunian, *Piety Versus Moralism* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1970), p. xxv.
2. William G. McLoughlin's introduction to *The American Evangelicals, 1800 1900* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968), pp. 12.
3. Ibid., p. 1.
4. Perry Miller, *The Life of the Mind in America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965), p. 32.
5. Ibid., p. 9.
6. D. H. Meyer, *The Instructed Conscience* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), p. 4.
7. Miller, *Life of the Mind*, p. 7.
8. Ibid., p. 14.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., pp. 56.
11. Ibid., p. 24.
12. Ibid., p. 9.
13. Ibid., pp. 3435.
14. Frances Wayland was president of Brown, while Mahan, Finney, and Fairchild were the first three presidents of Oberlin.
15. Edward H. Madden, *Civil Disobedience and Moral Law in Nineteenth Century America* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1968), p. 5. 16. Baruch Brody's introduction to the M.I.T. Edition of Thomas Reid's *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man* (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1969) .
17. Ibid., p. xi.
18. Quoted in Terence Martin, *The Instructed Vision* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1961), p. vii.
19. Asa Mahan, *Doctrine of the Will* (New York: Mark H. Newman, 1845), p. 11.
20. Herbert W. Schneider, *A History of American Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946), pp. 21112.
21. Ibid., p. 207.
22. A. M. Hills, *Life of Charles G. Finney* (Cincinnati: God's Revivalist, 1902), p. 231.

23. Asa Mahan, *Autobiography: Intellectual, Moral and Spiritual* (London: J. Woolner, 1882), p. 320.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
25. G. K. Chesterton, *Saint Thomas Aquinas* (Garden City, N.Y.: Image Books, 1956), p. 29.

ASA MAHAN AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN HOLINESS THEOLOGY

Donald W. Dayton

North Park Theological Seminary

A recent Christianity Today editorial devoted to Asa Mahan was entitled “A Man Worth Examining.”¹ One cannot but concur in this judgment. Mahan was successively president of Oberlin College, Cleveland University, and Adrian College, and then retired to an active life in Britain as editor and writer. Intensely committed to Charles Finney’s “new measure” revivalism, he participated in the “Arminianizing” of Calvinist theology and became the major architect of the controversial “Oberlin perfectionism.”

“ Philosophically Mahan was a major figure in the “academic orthodoxy” that vied with transcendentalism for dominance in preCivil War America and had major impact on the development of the evangelical traditions and, consequently, on much of American culture. In his commitment to abolitionism, women’s rights, temperance, the peace movement, and other reform movements, Mahan illustrates the close conjunction of revivalism and social reform during this period. But these facets of Mahan’s career are already beginning to receive attention.²

I wish to argue that Mahan can also be used to illustrate major shifts that took place during the nineteenth century in the thinking of perfectionist and holiness groups and to make clearer the interrelationships of Oberlin perfectionism, Methodistic holiness groups, and the Keswick movement, as well as shed a great deal of light on the origins of Pentecostalism.

Interpreters within the Methodistic holiness movement have tended to emphasize the distinctions between the Wesleyan and Oberlin doctrines of Christian perfection. Though at one point I took this position myself,³ I am now convinced that these distinctions have been overdrawn. This becomes clearer when one concentrates on Mahan rather than Finney as the determinative force behind Oberlin perfectionism. The Oberlin teaching was developed in part under the influence of Wesley, and its earlier period was designated by B. B. Warfield as its “Wesleyan period.”⁴

Mahan’s *Christian Perfection* was the major expression of this period, and upon its publication George Peck, then editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, was “satisfied that the thing which we mean by *Christian Perfection* is truly set forth in that work.”⁵ It was primarily with the introduction of the doctrine of the “simplicity of moral action” that major cleavages began to appear in the Oberlin teaching.⁶ Finney and his colleagues began to move more

in a Pelagian direction while “Mahan moved closer to Wesleyan theology as he grew older.”⁷

This theological movement was reflected as well in Mahan’s institutional alignments. He spent most of the 1860s as president of Adrian College, which had been founded by the abolitionist Wesleyan Methodists, and just before his retirement transferred his church membership to the local Wesleyan Methodist church in Adrian.³ One may also trace the impact of Mahan on the circles associated with Phoebe Palmer and her “Tuesday Meeting” for the promotion of holiness.⁹

The significance of Mahan for the development of holiness thought in the nineteenth century is best seen in a close comparison of his two most popular books: *The Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection* (1839)¹⁰ and *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost* (1870).¹¹ Both of these books were originally published under Methodistic holiness auspices. The first was published by D. S. King, who shortly thereafter became publisher and then editor of the *Guide to Christian Perfection*, while the second was published by the Palmers after Phoebe Palmer had become editor of the same journal, now renamed the *Guide to Holiness*.

The first of Mahan’s books is fairly typical of the development given to holiness theology until about the time of the Civil War, while the second book indicates a new theological development of the doctrine that gained acceptance in the years after the Civil War and by the turn of the century had become widely accepted not only in holiness circles but to a certain extent beyond them. The new element is the use of the term “baptism of the Holy Ghost” and the model of Pentecost in Acts 2 in explicating the meaning of “entire sanctification.”

Some interpreters have assumed that this language can be traced back to Wesley,¹² but a recent study by Herbert McGonigle¹³ strongly calls this assumption into question. McGonigle argues that Wesley rarely uses the expression “baptism of the Holy Ghost” and that his major statements of Christian perfection are developed in a Christological vein that relies little on the development of a doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer. By and large the same is true of other early British Methodists, though the language does begin to appear in Joseph Benson and John Fletcher.

When one turns to the renewed emphasis on Christian perfection in America, whether in the *Guide*, in Phoebe Palmer’s circles, or in early Oberlin perfectionism, the development is along classical Wesleyan lines. One occasionally finds references to a “baptism of the Holy Ghost” but not as a developed doctrine and not usually applied to the “second blessing.” The first hints of this teaching seem to occur in Oberlin perfectionism, but the exact development is difficult to trace.

Some have made a great deal of Finney’s use of the term in his memoirs,¹⁴ but there the reference is to his conversion, and the volume was not published until 1876, when this language was relatively common. The “baptism of the Holy Ghost” plays little role in his *Views of Sanctification* (1840) and no part in his systematic theology (the relevant section was published

in 1847). A similar situation seems to obtain with Mahan. The “baptism of the Holy Ghost” dominates the Autobiography (1882) and the more strictly “spiritual” account *Out of Darkness into Light* (1877). Mahan refers to those “two great doctrines which have been the theme of my life during the past fortysix years,”¹⁵ but the early literature does not bear him out. The new language does not appear in *Christian Perfection* or his other early writings.

The first real development of this new language appears to have taken place among the two minor figures of Oberlin perfectionism. In his *Holiness of Christians in the Present Life* (1840), Henry Cowles gives greater attention to the Holy Spirit as the Agent of sanctification, but he does not refer to a “baptism of the Holy Ghost.” Shortly thereafter, however, in two sermons on the “Baptism of the Holy Ghost,” Cowles concludes that “the plan of salvation contemplates as its prime object, the sanctification of the Church; and relies on the baptism of the Holy Spirit as the great efficient power for accomplishing the work.”¹⁶

But it was John Morgan who first gave this teaching extended development in an essay entitled “The Gift of the Holy Spirit,” where he argues that “the baptism of the Holy Ghost, then, in its Pentecostal fullness, was not to be confined to the Primitive Church; but is the common privilege of all believers.”¹⁷ But this essay seems not to have had major impact. I do not find it cited until after Mahan’s book in 1870 served as the definitive explication of this Oberlin teaching.

It is difficult to determine exactly when Mahan turned to this doctrine. He left Oberlin in 1850, and a lecture published in 1851 argues in line with his *Christian Perfection* that “the mission of the Spirit is wholly subsidiary to that of Christ, and is coextensive with it in design and actual influence.”¹⁸ On the other hand, we know from his correspondence with Phoebe Palmer about the publication of *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*,¹⁹ that the book consists of lectures developed at Adrian College six to eight years earlier. These facts indicate that Mahan began to use this language during the decade of the 1850s or in the early 1860s.

Other currents converge on this same period. One may trace a rising interest in this doctrine in the *Guide to Holiness* during the 1850s.²⁰ William Arthur’s book *The Tongue of Fire*, from Britain, was published in New York in 1856 and called for a “new Pentecost.”²¹ Much of the literature associated with the revival of 1857⁵⁸ spoke of “Pentecost” and the “baptism of the Holy Ghost” without identifying either with the experience of entire sanctification,²² though it should be noticed that the spread of “higher Christian life” teachings was closely associated with this period of revival.

It was in 1859 that Phoebe Palmer published *The Promise of the Father* that argued from the quotation of Joel in Acts 2 the right of women to preach.²³ But it is especially her letters published in the *Guide* from her revival campaigns in the British Isles during the Civil War that reveal the extent to which she had adopted the new language. Her report from New castle indicates that she preached “the endowment of power, the full baptism of the Holy Ghost, as the indispensable, ay, *absolute* necessity of all the

disciples of Jesus.”²⁴ She comments as well that the importance of this way of describing the experience had just recently been impressed upon her.

That Phoebe Palmer was using Pentecost now as the model of this experience and that it was to be explicitly identified with “holiness” is made clear in another report from Newcastle: “At our afternoon meetings, ‘Holiness unto the Lord,’ or, in other words, the full baptism of the Holy Spirit, as received by the one hundred and twenty disciples on the day of Pentecost, is set forth as the absolute necessity of all believers of every name.”²⁵

In spite of these developments Phoebe Palmer was still reluctant to publish Mahan’s book in 1870, arguing that it was too controversial. But Mahan replied that widespread discussion of the doctrine indicated that the churches were ready for his book in which “the doctrine of entire sanctification is presented in a form old and yet new.”²⁶

Phoebe Palmer finally capitulated and the book immediately had major impact through several editions. Less than a dozen years later Mahan could report that “it has been very extensively circulated in America, in Great Britain and in all missionary lands; and has been translated into the German and Dutch languages.”²⁷

After 1870 one can trace an increasing crescendo of “Pentecostal” and “baptism of the Holy Ghost” language. In 1871, Oberlin was finally reconciled with orthodox Congregationalism, and Finney addressed the Oberlin Council of Congregationalism on the “baptism of the Holy Ghost.” It was the same year that two Free Methodist ladies told D. L. Moody that his preaching lacked power and launched his spiritual quest for the experience. The teaching became a major theme of Moody and his successors.

In the early 1870s, Mahan retired to England, where he played a major role in the Oxford and Brighton meetings for the “promotion of scriptural holiness” out of which the Keswick movement grew. The report of the earlier meeting indicates that, of all the “conversational meetings” at Oxford, “none was of more interest than that in the Town Hall, in which the baptism of the Holy Spirit was the special subject” under the guidance of Asa Mahan.²⁸ At the Brighton Convention (of which he was one of the conveners), Mahan directed a series of sectional meetings at which “the Baptism of the Holy Ghost was the theme of exposition and prayer. Each afternoon the room was crowded to overflowing.”²⁹ Other evidence could be provided.

But Mahan’s book and its new terminology also had major impact within Methodism, especially within the growing holiness movement. The *Buffalo Christian Advocate* observed that “the author has hit upon just the right time for his work. The church is awakening to the importance of the baptism of powerhungering for a dainty meal, abundantly provided, but which few enjoy.” *The Methodist Recorder* found the theme “central in the current of all New Testament teaching.”³⁰ And in 1874, Daniel Steele, then of Syracuse but later of Boston University, described his own experience in terms of a “baptism of the Spirit” and advised his brethren “to cease to discuss the subtleties and endless questions arising from entire sanctification or Christian Perfection, and all cry mightily to God for the baptism of the Holy Spirit.”³¹

One can note in the *Guide to Holiness* an increasing tendency to use “Pentecostal” language. This climaxed in 1897 when the latter part of the title was changed from “and Revival Miscellany” (dating from Phoebe Palmer’s days) to “and Pentecostal Life” in response to the “signs of the times, which indicate inquiry, research and ardent pursuit of the gifts, graces, and power of the Holy Spirit. ‘The Pentecostal idea’ is pervading Christian thought and aspiration more than ever before.”³²

The same issue announced inside the front cover a new edition of that “Great Pentecostal Gift” the *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, “this truly magnificent work of Dr. Mahan on the Great Theme of the Period.”

By the turn of the century everything had become “Pentecostal.” Sermons are published in the column “Pentecostal Pulpit”; women’s reports are entitled “Pentecostal Womanhood”; testimonies are “Pentecostal Testimonies”; and devotions are held in the “Pentecostal closet.” This is but an extreme illustration of what had become generally true in most strands of the holiness movement by 1900.

This adoption of “Pentecostal” and “baptism of the Holy Ghost” language by holiness and related traditions involved much more than a mere shift in terminology. When “Christian perfection” becomes “baptism of the Holy Ghost,” there is a major theological transformation. The significance of this shift can best be seen in a close comparison of the two books by Mahan. By this procedure we can focus the study and, by examining the development in a single mind, see in greater relief what is taking place.

1. There is, first of all, a shift from Christocentrism to an emphasis on the Holy Spirit that is really quite radical in character. Christian Perfection, like Wesley’s *Plain Account*, is basically oriented to Christ for the work of sanctification. Where Mahan does speak of the Holy Spirit, it is as the “Divine Teacher” who “sustains to Christ the same relation that a teacher does to the particular science which he teaches. His object is not to present himself to the pupil, but the science. So the Spirit shows not himself, but Christ to our minds.”³³ In this book Mahan will give no autonomy to the Spirit in guidance and suggests that a man should resist any undefined impressions to speak or undertake any particular course of action unless he can advance clear, rational reasons for such activity.

In the *Baptism of the Holy Ghost* the fundamental question has now become “Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?” Instead of anchoring the work of the Spirit in Christ, Mahan now argues that Christ himself was “dependent upon the indwelling, and influence, and baptism of the Holy Spirit, the same in all essential particulars as in us.”³⁴ And though Mahan is cautious, this shift involves a movement toward giving the Spirit autonomy in guidance and the enabling to “prophecy.”

2. This shift in emphasis is underlined by another shift in terminology. In *Christian Perfection*, salvation history is divided into “covenants,” the old covenant of the moral law and the new covenant of grace, of which Christ is the Mediator. The pivotal point between the two is Christ, especially His atoning death. In *Baptism of the Holy Ghost* salvation history is divided into dispensations. It is the Spirit who is “the crowning glory and promise of the

New Dispensation”³⁵ and it is Pentecost that is the pivotal point between the dispensations. This shift adds a third division to salvation history and prepares the way for easier coalescence with dispensational theology.

3. This shift in terminology involves as well a radical shift in exegetical foundations on which the doctrine of sanctification is built. In *Christian Perfection*, Mahan relies on a selection of texts that is similar, but not identical, to the set of texts used by Wesley. Both Mahan and Wesley hardly ever refer to the Book of Acts, and then not to texts that become important in Mahan’s later book.

In the *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, however, almost all the key texts are taken from the Book of Acts. Basic, of course, is the account of Pentecost, but other accounts of the receiving of the Spirit come into focus. Other passages from the New Testament that speak of the Holy Spirit play a role, as well as such prophetic passages as Joel 2:28 (quoted, of course, in Acts 2). There are very few texts that appear in both books.

This fact points to an ambiguity that plagued efforts to synthesize these two doctrines from the days of John Morgan and Henry Cowles. A study of the biblical doctrine of “perfection” does not naturally lead to the account of Pentecost, and vice versa. This constitutional instability of the synthesis may help to explain why the concern for sanctification tended to drop out of the Pentecostal movement.

4. This shift in exegetical foundations tends to bring into view a new set of contexts and related biblical ideas. Among these are (a) a new emphasis on power (cf. Acts 1:8). We have seen above how this element moved to the fore when Phoebe Palmer adopted “Pentecostal” terminology. Mahan notes that at Pentecost “*power* was one of the most striking characteristics of this baptism”³⁶ and the idea permeates the whole of his second book. (b) 1 Corinthians 12 with its list of the gifts of the Spirit becomes more determinative. Mahan tries, as have other holiness writers, to emphasize the fruit of the Spirit over the gifts of the Spirit and not “the miraculous, but common influence of the Spirit.”³⁷ But in *Baptism of the Holy Ghost* this concern is necessarily weakened. Making Pentecost normative for all believers cannot but raise the question of the place of the more “miraculous gifts” like healing, and one can trace after 1870 especially a rising interest in faith healing in holiness and related traditions. (c) A heavy emphasis falls on “prophecy” which Mahan understands as “the power of utterance for the edification of the church and the conviction of sinners.” But this gift now becomes “the common privilege of all believers” and contributes to a concern for “testimony” and “speaking as the Spirit giveth utterance.”³⁸

5. There is also an intensification of the use of prophecy in the predictive sense. This is manifested in several ways.

(a) A development of the Christian life in terms of living in the Pentecostal reality makes more difficult the direct appropriation of Old Testament models. The Old Testament is read more in terms of its looking forward to the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit in a promise-fulfillment pattern. One of the most determinative of the new expressions is the phrase “the promise of the Father.”

(b) There is also an intensification of the expectation of the ushering in of the millennium. Mahan felt that the contemporary interest in the Holy Spirit was a sign that the millennium was dawning and assigned to Methodism a special place in the last days:

The central article of her creed is the great central Truth of the Gospel. If she will be true to her calling, she will not only enable “the fountain to be opened” in her own midst, but also in other communions. When this takes place, “then is the millennium near, even at the door.”³⁹

(C) New emphasis falls on problems of the interpretation of prophecy. In the later book Mahan devoted several pages⁴⁰ to determining the meaning of the phrases “in that day” or “in those days” that occur in the prophecies that he is now utilizing. He concluded that these expressions referred not primarily to Pentecost but to those final days of spiritual blessing just before the advent of the millennium. In this discussion one may see the beginning of the distinction between the “earlier” and “latter” rains of spiritual blessing that became so prominent in later holiness and Pentecostal thought.

All of these developments take place, of course, within Mahan’s postmillennial framework. But the lectures behind the *Baptism of the Holy Ghost* were first given in the 1860s. The prophecy conferences that signaled the rise of premillennialism did not take place until the late 1870s. And it was not until 1882, for example, that A. T. Pierson, prominent in the Keswick movement, capitulated to premillennialism.⁴¹ But we can see that once attention is shifted to the “baptism of the Holy Ghost,” as Mahan developed it, the ground is already well prepared for the growth of premillennialism.

6. In the shift from “Christian perfection” to “baptism of the Holy Ghost” there is also a shift from emphasis on the goal and nature of the “holy” life to an event in which this change takes place. In the earlier book this goal is expressed in highly ethical and moral terms. For Mahan “perfection in holiness implies a full and perfect discharge of our entire duty, of all existing obligations in respect to God and all other beings. It is perfect obedience to the moral law.”⁴² It is clear how such a position easily correlates with the mood of social reform that dominated pre-Civil War America. The later book has a greater emphasis on personal “cleansing” and “purity” and concentrates on God’s *method* for achieving this. Explicating this in terms of the baptism of the Holy Ghost cannot but emphasize the “eventness” of the experience of holiness, perhaps to the ultimate detriment of ethical concerns, especially those of social ethics.

7. There is finally in the later book a much stronger emphasis on the assurance that the Pentecostal baptism brings.⁴³ “Where the Holy Ghost is received, such a change is wrought in the subject that he himself will become distinctly conscious of the change . . . a change observable also to others around.”⁴⁴ One can trace after 1870 ⁴⁵ a concern for a “conscious” baptism of the Spirit. It is easy to see how these sorts of concern could raise the question of a “physical evidence” of this baptism and how the experience of “speaking in tongues” could provide an answer to this concern. Indeed, there seem to be

several instances of this experience in holiness circles between 1870 and the outbreak of Pentecostalism in 1900.⁴⁶

These comparisons between these two books by Mahan delineate a major theological reorientation that took place in nineteenth-century American holiness circles. Two basic patterns for the development of holiness theology have been explored. By concentrating on Asa Mahan, who embodies within himself so much of this theological transition, we have also seen more clearly the close interrelationships between the major holiness currents in the nineteenth century: Oberlin perfectionism, the Methodistic holiness movement, and the Keswick movement. Many details of the story need filling out, but the main outline is clear.

But this study also illuminates the backgrounds of Pentecostalism. It is possible to trace the rise of “Pentecostal” language through the whole last half of the nineteenth century. It is not surprising that modern Pentecostalism should sprout in this well-prepared ground. It was therefore a *holiness* evangelist who founded Bethel Bible School near Topeka, Kans., where the doctrine that the evidence of the Pentecostal baptism of the Holy Spirit is the gift of speaking in tongues was first expounded. And in 1906 it was a black *holiness* evangelist who came to speak in a Nazarene mission and saw the launching of the Azusa Street Revival from which the rise of modern Pentecostalism is usually dated.⁴⁷

REFERENCE NOTES

1. *Christianity Today*, June 22, 1973, p 23.
2. Early in this century Mahan was studied by Paul Fleisch in his uncompleted *Zur Geschichte der Heiligungsbewegung. Erstes Heft: Die Heiligungsbewegung von Wesley bis Boardman* (Leipzig: Wallmann, 1910); and by Benjamin B. Warfield in articles in the *Princeton Theological Review* (1921), later gathered into Vol. 2 of *Perfectionism* (New York: Oxford U.P., 1931) and reprinted in an abridged edition by the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1958. The period of Mahan’s presidency of Oberlin College is treated in detail in Robert S. Fletcher’s two-volume *History of Oberlin College* (Oberlin: Oberlin College, 1943), though with insufficient attention to Mahan’s religious and theological development. Mahan is considered to some extent in Edward H. Madden, *Civil Disobedience and Moral Law in Nineteenth Century American Philosophy* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1968); and D. H. Meyer, *The Instructed Conscience: The Shaping of the American National Ethic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972); but in more detail in Barbara Zikmund, “Asa Mahan and Oberlin Perfectionism” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1969) and James Hamilton, “A Comparison of the Moral Theories of Charles Finney and Asa Mahan” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1972). A recent symposium at Asbury College (April 23-24, 1973) on “Asa Mahan and the Academic Orthodoxy” included papers by Harold B. Kuhn, Edward Madden, Barbara Zikmund, and Timothy Smith.
3. Cf. Donald W. Dayton, *The American Holiness Movement: a Bibliographic Introduction* (Wilmore, Ky.: B. L. Fisher Library, Asbury Theological Seminary, 1971), pp. 19-20. This essay is also available in the 1971 *Proceedings* of the American Theological Library Association.

4. *Perfectionism* (1958 abridgment), p. 66.
5. *Methodist Quarterly Review* 23 (April, 1841): 3078.
6. Cf. James H. Fairchild, "The Doctrine of Sanctification at Oberlin," *Congregational Quarterly* 18 (April, 1876), though Warfield is a better guide to the development than Fairchild for our purposes.
7. Barbara Zikmund, "Asa Mahan and Oberlin Perfectionism," p. 241.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 221, but based on a notice in the *Hamilton Literary Monthly* 6 (May, 1872): 355.
9. In a review of Phoebe Palmer's *Present to My Christian Friend*, Mahan found her writings "among the most profitable that can be placed in the hands of enquirers after holiness," *Oberlin Evangelist* 7 (1845):86. Phoebe Palmer, in turn, put Mahan's testimony first in her anthology *Pioneer Experiences* (New York: W. C. Palmer, Jr., 1872), and the second edition of her *Way of Holiness* (New York: Lane & Scott, 1851) contains a commendatory preface by Mahan. Mahan was quoted and published in the *Guide*, often in the midst of lists of Methodist writers. Cf. *Guide to Holiness* 10 (1850):4. Other evidence could be cited.
10. I am using the second edition published by D. S. King of Boston, 1839. There were 10 editions within the first 10 years, as well as a number of later reprints, including a twentieth-century edition by the Free Methodist Publishing House.
11. I am using primarily the first edition (New York: W. C. Palmer, Jr., 1870). More common is a British edition (London: Elliot Stock, n.d.) with an appendix containing Charles Finney's "Enduement of Power." There have been a number of other editions, including a very recent paperback reprint distributed by Edwin Newby, Noblesville, Ind.
12. W. J. Hollenweger comments, for example, that "John Wesley . . . had already made a distinction between the sanctified, or those who had been baptized in the Spirit, and ordinary Christians," *The Pentecostals* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), p. 21.
13. "Pneumatological Nomenclature in Early Methodism," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 8 (spring, 1973): 64.
14. Cf., for example, Frederick Dale Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1970), pp. 4042, 33235, etc.
15. *Autobiography, Intellectual, Moral and Spiritual* (London: T. Woolmer 1882), p. 321.
16. *Oberlin Evangelist* 2 (1840):93.
17. *Oberlin Quarterly Review* 1 (August, 1845):115. This essay was also published serially in the *Oberlin Evangelist* and later as a pamphlet with an introduction by Finney (Oberlin: E. J. Goodrich, 1875), in which form it had major impact on A. J. Gordon, identified by Frederick Dale Bruner as a major figure on the way to Pentecostalism .
18. *Lectures on the Ninth of Romans; Election, and the Influence of the Holy Spirit* (Boston: Charles Pierce, 1851), p. 173.
19. These letters are among the Phoebe Palmer papers in the Drew University Library.
20. Cf. J. D., "Entire Sanctification and the Fullness of the Spirit" (arguing they are not the same), *Guide to Holiness* 29 (April, 1856):9798, and A. A. Phelps, "An Important Distinction Between the 'Witness' and the 'Baptism' of the Spirit; Saving Faith," *Guide to Holiness* 33 (May, 1858):129-31.
21. (New York: Harper, 1856), still in print with Light and Life Press.
22. Cf. reports in Warren Chandler, *Great Revivals and the Great Republic* (Nashville: Publishing House of the M. E. Church, 1924) and such reports as *Pente-*

cost, or the Work of God in Philadelphia, by William McClure, sent from Ireland to investigate the revival.

23. (Boston: Henry V. Degen, 1859).

24. These letters were later collected into *Four Years in the Old World* (New York: W. C. Palmer, Jr., 1870) This reference is from a letter dated September 16, 1859, p. 96.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 107 (letter dated October 12, 1859).

26. Letter of Asa Mahan to Phoebe Palmer, dated May 4 (perhaps 7 or 9), 1870, Drew University Library. This account is also confirmed by Mahan in his *Autobiography*, pp. 413-4.

27. *Autobiography*, p. 414.

28. *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Oxford*, Aug. 29 to Sept. 7, 1874 (various publishers, n.d.), p. 141.

29 *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29 to June 7, 1875* (Brighton, England: W. J. Smith, n.d.), p. 383.

30. *Press reports, Guide to Holiness*, Vol. 14 (June, 1871), inside front cover.

31. "Baptism of the Spirit," *Guide to Holiness* 20 (February, 1874):1.

32. "Pentecost What Is It?" *Guide to Holiness* 66 (January, 1897) :37.

33. *Christian Perfection*, pp. 164-5.

34. *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, p. 21.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 50.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 78.

37. *Christian Perfection*, p. 166. Cf. *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, p. 113.

38. *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, p. 47.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

40. *Ibid.*, pp. 138-43.

41. *D. L. Moody at Home* (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1886), p. 168.

42. *Christian Perfection*, p. 7, apparently Mahan's basic definition.

43. Cf., for example, *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, p. 199.

44. *Ibid.*, p. 39.

45. Cf. the papers of Hannah Whitall Smith in Ray Strachey, *Religious Fanaticism* (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1928), *passim*.

46. Cf. the summary of evidence collected by Stanley Frodsham in *With Signs Following* in William Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God* (Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 293-3. An additional report may be found in A. M. Kiergan, *Historical Sketches of the Revival of True Holiness and Local Church Polity from 1865-1916* (Fort Scott, Kans.: Board of Publication of the Church Advocate and Good Way, 1971), p. 31.

47. For further development of this thesis cf. H. Vinson Synan, *The Pentecostal Holiness Movement in the United States* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971) and Donald W. Dayton, "From 'Christian Perfection' to the 'Baptism of the Holy Ghost': A Study in the Origins of Pentecostalism," in H. Vinson Synan, *Aspects of Pentecostal Origins* (Plainfield, N.J.: Logos, 1974). In progress is a further major statement of this thesis by the present writer.