

*The Work
of the
Holy Spirit*



**REPORT OF
THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
THE WORK OF THE
HOLY SPIRIT**

TO THE 182nd GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
510 Witherspoon Building
Philadelphia, Pa, 19107

SEVENTY-FIVE CENTS PER COPY

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

COPYRIGHT © 1970 BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The committee was appointed by the 180th General Assembly (1968) with instructions to study *Overtures 14, 15, 16, and 17*, and to report to the 181st General Assembly (1969). These overtures requested study of the work of the Holy Spirit with special reference to glossolalia and other charismatic gifts within the fellowship of the United Presbyterian Church.

The committee made a preliminary report in 1969 and recommended that it be continued with a view to completing its mandate and reporting to the 182nd General Assembly (1970).

Report to the 181st General Assembly (1969)

Your committee has been impressed by the fact that of all branches of Christianity that of Pentecostalism is one branch currently experiencing rapid growth in membership. This is especially true in that part of the Church to be found in Latin America and in Africa. We note, also, the fact that within the mainstream of Christianity in the United States, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, there is a small but growing movement of what has been called the "charismatic renewal" or "Neo-Pentecostalism." The real impetus of this development began about a decade ago and continues to this day. This is the second period of rapid growth by Pentecostalism within less than one hundred years.

The committee is grateful to observe the rapid breaking down of barriers that have separated Protestant denominations from our brethren in the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Churches. Similarly, we are glad to note the beginning of a breakdown of the barriers that have deprived us of fellowship with Pentecostal denominations. Believing that both of these are the result of the work of the Holy Spirit, we call on United Presbyterians to be sensitive and responsive to the insights and experiences of fellow Christians within all traditions. And the end is not yet, "... no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him,..." (I Cor. 2:9 RSV)

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

In the United Presbyterian Church the number of clergy and laity involved in charismatic experiences is comparatively small, although your committee finds that in some areas these numbers are growing significantly. This involvement in such experiences has sometimes

led to dissension within our Church. Occasionally where pastors have been involved, the pastoral relationship has been terminated. As a result, many have found it necessary to seek an "independent ministry-evangelism," and some to demit the ministry of the United Presbyterian Church.

There is also something of a pattern in connection with the laity. When laymen have become involved in charismatic experiences, they have often felt alienated from both their pastors and fellow church members. As a result, they have sought other fellowship. Pastors have sometimes failed to show understanding of the laymen's experience and have been unable to counsel adequately with them. On the other hand, some laymen have not always been receptive to the pastor's guidance.

In a future report your committee hopes to make specific recommendations by which the Church may more adequately minister in these situations. Until then, guided by the Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter XX, we plead for that tolerance, good will, and Christ-centered love which is at the heart of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. We remind ministers, sessions, and presbyteries of their respective pastoral responsibilities toward those whose spiritual experience may differ from their own. We believe that these situations provide immediate opportunity for the application of the theme of reconciliation which is paramount in the Confession of 1967. Therefore, we say to the whole Church in the words of the Apostle Paul: "So, my brethren, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues: but all things should be done decently and in order." (I Cor. 14: 39-40 RSV)

Overture 14, On The Freedom of the Ministry and Other Matters, from the Presbytery of Phoenix was referred to this committee by the 180th General Assembly (1968). The committee requested the counsel of the Stated Clerk among others in arriving at the following statement.

The committee would refer you to the Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter XX, "Of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience" in its entirety. It is evident to your committee that the silence of the Book of Confessions on any matters of faith or practice does not prohibit the introduction of such beliefs and practice into the life of a congregation so long as such beliefs and practice are not destructive to the external peace and order which Christ has established in the Church. When a member of a local congregation is concerned, the local session is charged with making a determination as to whether or not censures are necessary; when a congregation or its pastor are concerned, then the presbytery is charged with making a determination; when a presbytery, the synod; and when the synod, the General Assembly.

We would remind you that all of the confessions of the Church are subservient to the Holy Scripture.

Report to the 182nd General Assembly (1970)

Members of the committee are: Rev. John H. Strock, *Chairman*; Rev. Joseph Bishop; Rev. Jack M. Chisholm; Mr. James D. Copeland; Rev. David E. Dilworth; Dr. Thomas Foster; Mr. Phil W. Jordan; Dr. Charles H. Meisgeier; Rev. Bruce M. Metzger; Chap-lain T. David Parham; and Rev. David H. C. Read.

Since the last General Assembly the committee has met for extended study and discussion on October 2 and 3, December 11 and 12, February 12 and 13, at St. Louis, Mo., and has considered the reports of its sub-committees on exegesis, theology, psychology, and healing, as well as ecumenical correspondence. On two occasions there has been close contact with the permanent sub-committee on theology of The Presbyterian Church in the United States. We have also followed the practice of hearing personally from those with both positive and negative experience of charismatic phenomena both within and outside the United Presbyterian Church. Our discussions were marked by openness and vigor, and a wide diversity of view and experience has been disclosed within the charismatic dimensions of love, joy, and peace. We are convinced that "the work of the Holy Spirit" is not only a vaster topic than can be addressed by one committee of the Church, but points to a neglected area in our thinking and practice. It is very possible that the Holy Spirit is preparing a renewal of the Church in our time that may come in surprising ways and through unexpected channels. We are therefore conscious that, in addressing our-selves to the question of glossolalia and other unusual manifestations, we are dealing with only one small segment of a vast theme that has enormous potential for the Church.

Vocabulary

In this report with its supporting documents we shall be using certain words and phrases that require preliminary definition.

By PENTECOSTALISM we refer to the movement, dating from the turn of the century, which arose out of various "holiness" sects that were expressing a reaction against rationalism and secularism in the institutional churches. Pentecostal churches emerged, laying stress on an experience called "the baptism in the Spirit" as a second stage (after conversion) in the life of holiness. This experience was believed to be attested by the gift of "tongues," although this was seen as only one manifestation of the fullness of life in the Spirit. In recent years

Pentecostalism has been represented by denominations and groupings of churches that go by many different names, of which the "Assemblies of God" is now probably the best known and most structurally developed. The Pentecostal churches can no longer be viewed as minor sects on the fringe of organized Christianity. The movement is now worldwide and is recognized by ecumenical authorities to be one of the most dynamic and fastest-growing sectors of the church in the modern world.

By NEO-PENTECOSTALISM we mean the phenomenon of "Pentecostal" experiences within the traditional Churches. It is now fairly well-known that clergy and laymen within the Roman Catholic Church and all of the main Protestant denominations have claimed to have received a "baptism in the Spirit" with attendant manifestations, such as speaking in tongues, powers of healing, exorcism, and other practices not normally associated with our style of congregational life. "Neo-Pentecostalism" is thus a movement *within* the established churches, and its exponents would regard it as a legitimate instrument of revival with strong scriptural justification. It is notable that "Neo-Pentecostalism" has come now to stress the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit more than some of the historic Pentecostal churches.

By GLOSSOLALIA (a word which is not used in the New Testament) we mean the utterance in prayer and worship of sounds that give the impression of being either ecstatic or a language hitherto unknown to the speaker. The scriptural references to this phenomenon in the early church are to be found exclusively in the Book of Acts and Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (if we except the concluding section of the Gospel of Mark which is of disputed authenticity). The word has been recently accepted in popular speech and writing as the description of a psychological phenomenon without prejudice as to its religious validity.

CHARISMATIC GIFTS is a phrase properly used to describe *all* the endowments with which the Holy Spirit enriches the Church, but has come to refer especially to those that modern man regards as abnormal—such as tongues, healings, discernment, and exorcism. Since "charisma" is another theological word that has infiltrated our popular speech "charismatic gifts" will be readily understood to refer to unusual and non-rational facets of human personality.

PROPHECYING in the early church was not so much the predicting of future events (though this sometimes occurred, e.g., Agabus in Acts 11:27), but was chiefly the gift of understanding and expressing through teaching or preaching what the will of God was for a given situation, resulting in "upbuilding and encouragement and consolation" (I. Cor. 14:3).

The committee has used the word "ecstasy" in relation to glossolalia rarely and with hesitation because it may convey a wrong impression about the experience. In this report "ecstasy" implies only that one may feel emotionally lifted, inspired by God's Spirit, not that one behaves in an irrational or trance-like manner.

Exegesis

The committee felt it essential to examine the scriptural references to the Holy Spirit in general and the passages on the "gifts of the Spirit" in some detail. (See the supporting document in the Appendix prepared by a sub-committee).

The Old Testament speaks of the Spirit as the source of physical, intellectual, and moral life, and refers on occasion to exceptional gifts of the Spirit bestowed on individuals for special service. It points forward to a Messianic Age in which God will "pour out his Spirit on all flesh."

In the New Testament the doctrine is greatly developed. The synoptic Gospels emphasize the work of the Spirit in the conception, baptism, mission, and message of Jesus, and speak of his gift of the Spirit to the disciples. In the Fourth Gospel much is said of the future work of the Spirit as the one who will lead and empower the followers of Christ. The Book of the Acts sees again the work of the Spirit in the birth, empowering, mission, and message of the Church. We find in its pages continual reference to the prompting and power of the Spirit in specific situations.

It was the Apostle Paul who developed the doctrine of the Spirit as the sustaining power of the Christian life. Using a variety of titles Paul sets forth the possession of the Spirit as the means of overcoming the power of sin and as a pledge of complete redemption to come. It is Paul who elaborates the thought of special manifestations and gifts of the Spirit and certain passages in his epistles—particularly Chapters 12, 13 and 14 of I Corinthians—have formed the main exegetical basis of the committee's work.

A study of the lists Paul gives of spiritual gifts (Romans 12:6-8; I Corinthians 12:8-10; 12:28-31; Ephesians 4:11) shows rather considerable differences in the terms used and the types of gifts mentioned. It is only in the letter to Corinth that the more miraculous functions such as healing, miracles, and glossolalia are mentioned. Moreover, the apostle's estimate of the relative value of glossolalia is made clear by (1) the fact that, whenever speaking with tongues is listed it comes at the end; and (2) by his express statement he would rather "speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others, than ten thousands words in a tongue." (I Cor. 14:18, 19.)

The charismatic gifts as a whole are defined as endowments necessary for the edification and service of the church, bestowed by the Spirit on its members whereby they are enabled to employ their natural faculties in a heightened degree, or to be endowed with new abilities and powers for this purpose.

The very limited reference in the New Testament to the gift of speaking with tongues we feel to be significant in view of the current stress laid on this phenomenon in Neo-Pentecostal circles.

The chief exegetical difficulty we find in the relevant passages is to determine whether the "tongues" were actual foreign languages or dialects not previously known by the speaker, or were a kind of rhapsody of sounds, unintelligible to others as well as to the speaker. Our conclusion, based on a study of the language and analogies used by Paul, is that in I Corinthians he is speaking of a peculiar kind of utterance attained in prayer in which praise and adoration overflow in ways that transcend ordinary speech.

The Book of Acts offers three passages referring to glossolalia: Peter's experience with the Roman centurion at Caesarea, where Gentiles were heard, after receiving the gift of the Spirit, "speaking in tongues and extolling God" (Acts 10:46); Paul's experience at Ephesus where the Holy Spirit came on a group after they had received baptism in the name of Christ, and "they spoke with tongues and prophesied;" and the description of the day of Pentecost. In the former two references there is no hint of a need to speak in foreign languages, so that most commentators have seen here an utterance of unknown sounds in ecstatic speech.

The Pentecost passage has given rise to the most diverse interpretations. Many see the plain meaning of the passage to be that the Holy Spirit miraculously enabled the believers to speak in various foreign tongues so as to be understood by the different nationalities present. Others claim that the narrative suggests that this was primarily an ecstatic act of worship, and point out that there was no need for a miracle of languages since all present would know either Aramaic or Greek. It is also noted that the accusation of drunkenness suggests "strange noises" much more than actual languages. Again it is pointed out that the writer of Acts does not affirm that the disciples actually *spoke* foreign languages, but only that the hearers so interpreted their utterances. Thus the miracle would be one of hearing rather than of speaking. We find it impossible to be dogmatic in our interpretation of this passage. It appears that either Luke was using two different accounts of the event, or else he himself introduced into an original account of ecstatic, tongues certain features suggesting the use of actual languages in order to interpret to the reader the significance of the coming of the Spirit as

the answer to the confusion of tongues at Babel.

Our conclusions from the exegetical study may be summarized thus:

1. The Church, according to the New Testament, is a super-natural fellowship in which the talents and services of the members are a continuation of the life and work of Christ himself, mediated by the Spirit.

2. Of all the spiritual gifts, that of speaking in tongues was open to certain dangers and abuses. But Paul did not forbid the exercise of this gift in private; he nevertheless restricted its exercise in public, demanding that the tongues be always interpreted.

3. For the apostle speaking in tongues is good, but prophesying is better, and love for God and men is best of all.

4. From the silence of the gospels and of the great majority of the epistles on the subject of the gift of speaking in tongues we conclude that it occupied a subordinate place in the life of Christians in the apostolic age.

5. In the light of current claims that glossolalia is a proof of having received the so-called "baptism of the Spirit," it is necessary to note that, while the verb "to baptize" is used by scripture in connection with the Spirit, the noun "baptize" is never used in the form "baptism of the Spirit." The elaboration of the doctrine concerning this "baptism of the Spirit" seems to be a sectarian over-interpretation, and to contrast it to baptism with water is contrary to the apostolic teaching that there is but one baptism. Since "by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body" it is unwarranted to teach that speaking in tongues is an indispensable sign of having received the Spirit.

6. We believe that the correct method of ascertaining the revelation of the purpose of God in scripture is to give *primary* attention to its didactic, rather than its historical parts. Hence we should look for guidance in such matters to the teaching of Jesus and the sermons and epistles of his apostles, rather than to the narratives of the Book of Acts. We must, however, keep in mind that the pattern of empowering by the Spirit revealed in these narratives is both a stimulus for the church today and a help in the understanding of Neo-Pentecostal experience among us.

7. We cannot, however, follow the view of some theologians that the purely supernatural gifts ceased with the death of the apostles. There seems no exegetical warrant for this assumption. Rather are we to "test the spirits to see whether they are of God," since each one of the

charismatic gifts had its counterfeits and frauds.

8. We therefore conclude, on the basis of Scripture, that the practice of glossolalia should be neither despised nor forbidden; on the other hand it should not be emphasized nor made normative for the Christian experience. Generally the experience should be private, and those who have experienced a genuine renewal of their faith in this way should be on their guard against divisiveness within the congregation. At the same time those who have received no unusual experiences of the Holy Spirit should be alert to the possibility of a deeper understanding of the gospel and a fuller participation in the gifts of the Spirit—of which love is the greatest. (For further implications of these principles, see section entitled "Guidelines.")

Some Theological Considerations

A survey of the theological field from the Fathers to the present day reveals that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has received less attention than one would expect from the emphasis of Scripture. There is not much guidance, for instance, in the writings of Calvin and other Reformed theologians in the matters we have under consideration, and the confessions have little to say about the gifts of the Spirit.

Positive statements concerning the Spirit's relation to Christ, the Church, the forgiveness of sin, the Scriptures, reconciliation, sacraments are set forth, but there is no elaboration on the manifestations of the Spirit in the believer's life.

We find that today few theologians seem to have as yet reflected systematically on the data of recent experience in the churches. Dr. Hendrikus Berkhof affirmed that "the many new insights in the field of Biblical theology with regard to the Holy Spirit have not yet found their way to systematic theology, let alone to the pulpit and life of the Church. The efforts of many theologians are needed to fill what is more or less a vacuum in the dogmatics of the contemporary churches." He suggests that one reason for this may be that the Spirit is self-effacing (John 14:26), and "hides himself in Christ, in the operations of the Church, and the lives of individuals."

We note too that the Church has always been confronted with "enthusiasts" who have claimed the guidance of the Spirit for all kinds of excesses. Theologians of the traditional Churches have, therefore, been sensitive to any loosening of the ties between the Spirit and the

¹The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, p. 10

historical Christ or between the Spirit and institutional church life. In modern times a certain kind of theological liberalism has been rejected because it seemed a mere extension of the human spirit and lacked a Christocentric foundation.

Three theologians of our times have drawn attention to the need for greater openness to the potential of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church.

Dr. Karl Barth warns the contemporary Church against identifying the Holy Spirit with the Church. "As a foolish Church presupposes His presence and action in its own existence, in its offices and sacraments, ordinations, consecrations, and absolutions, so a foolish theology presupposes the Holy Spirit...Only where the Spirit is sighed, cried, and prayed for does he become present and newly active."² Dr. Barth also alerted the Church to the need for its being a creative community of the Spirit. "The Christian community can and must be the scene of many human activities which are new and supremely astonishing to many of its own members as well as to the world around because they rest on an endowment with extraordinary capacities." The outpouring of the Spirit bestows upon Christians "gifts and lights and powers." Dr. Barth continues: "Where these are lacking, there is reason to ask whether in pride or sloth the community as such has perhaps evaded this endowment, thus falsifying its relationship to its Lord, making it a dead because a nominal and not a real relationship."³

Dr. Emil Brunner has written that "the operation of the Holy Spirit is not confined to bearing witness to us of Christ. Rather is He borne witness to by the Apostles as creative power, that produces new life, new will, new feelings, new spiritual, psychological, and even physical power."⁴ He also states that "we ought to face the New Testament witness with sufficient candour to admit that in this pneuma which the Ecclesia was conscious of possessing, there lie forces of an extra-rational kind mostly lacking among us Christians today." He adds that theology is ill-equipped to deal with this realm of the dynamic and supralogical, for "theology has to do with the logos and therefore is only qualified to deal with matters that are in some way logical, not with the dynamic in its a-logical characteristics. Therefore, the Holy Ghost has always been more or less the stepchild of theology and the dynamism of the Spirit a bug-bear for theologians; on the other hand, theology through its unconscious intellectualism has often proved a significant restrictive influence, stifling the operations of the Holy Ghost, or at least their full

²*Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, p. 58

³*Church Dogmatics*, Vol. IV, Part 2, p. 828

⁴*Dogmatics*, Vol. III, p. 15

creative manifestations."⁵ Dr. Brunner concludes that "The miracle of Pentecost, and all that is included under the concept of the charismata—the gift of the Spirit—must not be soft-pedaled from motives of a theological Puritanism."⁶

We believe that the Holy Spirit is witnessing to the Church that it should be "praying and sighing" for his ministry and manifestations, but too often the charismatic dimension is being reduced to the level of psychological dynamics and dismissed as an emotional aberration.

Dr. Paul Tillich, reflecting on the "Spirit-movement" says that "Spirit-movements find it difficult to defend themselves against this alliance of ecclesiastical and psychological critics." He goes on:

"This whole part of the present system is a defense of the ecstatic manifestations of the Spiritual Presence against its ecclesiastical critics; in this defense, the whole New Testament is the most powerful weapon. Yet, this weapon can be used legitimately only if the other partner in the alliance—the psychological critics—is also rejected or at least put into proper perspective."⁷ Dr. Tillich is calling for an openness on the part of the Church to let God speak anew, but he also has a warning for those who overindulge in such activities. "At the same time, Paul resists any tendency that would permit ecstasy to disrupt structure. The classical expression of this is given in the first letter to the Corinthians where Paul speaks of the gifts of the Spirit and rejects ecstatic speaking in tongues if it produces chaos and disrupts the community, the emphasis on personal ecstatic experiences if they produce *hubris* (pride), and the other charismata (gifts of the Spirit) if they are not subjected to *agape* (love)."⁸

From theological comments such as these we learn that historically the Church has been in danger of swinging to one of two extremes when it finds itself baffled by contemporary problems. Some who are conscious of the lack of spiritual power will seek a kind of ecstasy through the excitement of charismatic experience, through experiments with psychic research, and through various counterfeit "spiritual" movements, even as others are seeking an instant mysticism through drugs. On the other hand some become less and less tolerant of any spiritual reality and place increasing emphasis on the secular which absorbs all their gifts and energies. We are aware of these tendencies in the life of the Church today.

The committee would, therefore, call on the Church to undertake a new and creative theological exploration concerning the person and work of the Holy Spirit.

⁵ *The Misunderstanding of the Church*, pp. 48, 49

⁶ *Dogmatics*, Vol. III, p. 16

⁷ *Systematic Theology*, p. 18

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 117

Psychological Dimensions

In view of the particular relevance of psychology to the phenomena under consideration the committee offers the report of the Subcommittee on the Psychological Dimensions with editorial abridgement.

To avoid unnecessary footnotes bibliographical references are printed immediately following "A More Detailed Study of Relevant Psychological Literature" in the Appendix.

A Summary

The task of making a critical examination and evaluation of the charismatic movement in the Presbyterian Church is bewildering, for psychological and sociological theories are in conflict as to its origin, the reasons people participate, and the nature and origin of the charismatic gifts themselves.

Most of the so-called scientific studies and evaluations are based upon psychological models which either (a) assume at the outset that such states are pathological, or (b) have been prepared subjectively without following normally accepted controls; so as to make them almost meaningless from a research standpoint. For this reason, only theories supported or refuted by research data have been considered in this report. One of the more comprehensive studies reviewed by the subcommittee was conducted by Gerlach and Hine (1967, 1968). In a well-designed and controlled study they found that there is no empirical evidence to support theories that such a movement occurs because of the (a) social dis-organization, (b) economic deprivation, or (c) psychological mal-adjustments or personality characteristics that predispose an individual to join a movement. Older psychological explanations of glossolalia as a concomitant of schizophrenia or hysteria have been found to be no longer defensible or acceptable in the light of recent socio-cultural and psychological data.

Many opinions and judgments have been rendered about the charismatic experience by persons with only superficial knowledge of the phenomena.

From its investigation of the psychological character and dimensions of the charismatic movement, the subcommittee has reached conclusions that are similar to those of many other observers and scholars who have engaged in first-hand evaluation. The first conclusion affirms that Pentecostals generally, whether they are from the classic Pentecostal denominations or the historic mainline Protestant denominations, are essentially well-adjusted and productive members of society. There is a paucity of empirical research relative to the charismatic gifts as they

relate to the movement, however, the most current evidence available indicates no justification for making a sweeping generalization that participants in the movement are maladjusted individuals, emotionally unstable, or emotionally deprived.

The assumption has been made that suggestibility plays an important role in the practice of glossolalia. A popular opinion, reiterated by several individuals giving testimony before the committee, is that group hypnosis plays an important role in the movement, and that those who are involved tend to be submissive and suggestible. Exactly the contrary has been documented by Gerlach and Hine(1967) who report that twenty-three percent of the participants in their study experienced the infilling of the Holy Spirit and spoke with tongues for the first time when they were alone. Individual committee members heard the testimony of several persons who had the experience of infilling with speaking in tongues long before they had contacted a charismatic group, attended a Pentecostal meeting, or associated with participants in the movement. Further contradictory evidence has been developed by Vivier (1960) a South African psychiatrist who has completed one of the most extensive studies of Pentecostal Glossolalia to date.

The opinion of some that participants in the movement exhibit a higher level of neuroticism, un-adaptive anxiety reactions, a higher degree of susceptibility to suggestion or hysteria, or that charismatic meetings foster such behavior, has not been documented.⁹ The data indicate that participants in the movement are emotionally and psychologically quite similar to the normal church population and to their occupational identity group.

One of the most noteworthy aspects of the charismatic movement is the keen interest directed toward its psychological dimensions, particularly from non-participants. It might even be said in this regard that since the charismatic dimension is considered by some to be no longer of theological or religious import, it may be discussed only as a psychological phenomenon.

Cognitive and Affective Relationships

Longtime conflicts have existed between the domains of cognitive and affective religious experience. An interesting history and documentation of this conflict as it relates to the Pentecostal movement is to be

⁹See Appendix "A Summary of Relevant Psychological Literature."

found in the writings of Father Kilian Mc-Donnell, O.S.B.¹⁰

McDonnell, after years of direct observation and study, has concluded, "It should be stated unambiguously that the essential Pentecostal reality has nothing to do with emotional elevation." (McDonnell, 1970, p. 39.)

Father Edward O'Connor, a trained theologian with extensive experience among Catholic Pentecostals, has stated that, "The experience is not produced by emotion, it does not consist in emotion, and its chief and characteristic effects are not emotional." (McDonnell, 1970, p. 39)

The committee has found, as have other such investigative groups in many other denominations, that it is extremely difficult to evaluate objectively the movement because of the negative public image of Pentecostalism. This negative image is projected through clergy and laymen alike and from those of the behavioral professions as well. Commenting on this problem in the Roman Catholic Church, Father McDonnell has stated, "... there are vast areas of the Pentecostal world where the public image is not reflective of the Pentecostal realities ... for vast areas of the Pentecostal world there is a basic falsity about the public image ..." (McDonnell, 1970, p. 37.) However, for the general American public such behavior as speaking in tongues, prophesying, and interpretation are socially unacceptable ways of behaving, regardless of how authentic the manifestations might be.

The Fear of Religious Experience

The fear of religious experience further clouds the evaluation of the movement. "The majority of Christians in the mainline churches feel threatened by the kind of religious experience typified by Pentecostalism. And to judge while under the stress of fear is to almost preclude an objective judgment." (McDonnell, 1970, p. 37.)

Commenting that a healthy skepticism of religious experience is in order, Father McDonnell goes on to say, "But a deep fear of religious experience, with the consequent complete rejection of religious experience as hysteria, can lead to another kind of religious superficiality.

¹⁰Father Kilian McDonnell is Director of the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research, Collegeville, Minnesota. He was a member of a team of anthropologists who conducted a comprehensive in-depth study of the Pentecostal movement as a researcher and theologian. He has not received what classical Pentecostals call baptism in the Holy Spirit and does not speak in tongues. Quotations used by permission of Father McDonnell.

And the alternative to an experience-oriented faith need not be its complete rejection, but an integration of the experiential into the total religious approach, with the experiential taking a subordinate role. But as long as an exaggerated fear of religious experience typifies one's outlook an objective evaluation of Pentecostalism is not possible." (McDonnell, 1970, p. 38.)

A Major Misconception

The Committee has noted the attention and preoccupation with "speaking in tongues." Tongues obviously play an important role in the movement. However, it appears from the committee's study that this preoccupation is a gross misconception of the real issue. Indeed, the main issue may not be the matter of certain charismatic gifts or experiences but the experience of God's power and presence in the life of the individual through the *gift* of the Spirit. McDonnell clarifies the issue in his statement, "Catholic and Protestant neo-Pentecostals do not come together specifically to pray in tongues. They are disturbed by neither the presence nor absence of tongues in a given prayer meeting. The issue in Pentecostalism is not tongues, but fullness of life in the Holy Spirit, openness to the power of the Spirit, and the exercise of all gifts of the Spirit." (McDonnell, 1970, p. 39.)

Keven Ranaghan, instructor in theology of the faculty of St. Mary's College, has articulated the experience in another way: "As each of us learned of what the other was doing, we rejoiced to see that in each case our testimony was not about tongues; not even primarily about the Holy Spirit. But wherever we went our talk was about Jesus Christ and the Power of his saving love to transform men and men's world." (McDonnell, 1970, p. 44.)

McDonnell identifies a major issue in his statement that:

"The very nature of the gifts of the Spirit, whether tongues, prophesy, interpretation or discernment of spirits, makes it difficult to arrive at an objective judgment. One can study the gifts of the Spirit from a psychological, sociological, economic point of view. All these approaches will tell one something about the gifts and the person who exercises them. However, the ultimate spiritual reality eludes all of these avenues of investigation. The gifts are spiritual gifts and, in their ultimate significance, they can only be understood spiritually. St. Paul said quite clearly that the things of the Spirit would not be understood, and because they would not be understood, would not be received. 'The unspiritual man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, for they are folly to him and he is not able to understand them because they are spiritually discerned.' (1 Cor. 2:14) The unspiritual man who does not receive the things of the Spirit is not, in Paul's mind, the pagan. St. Paul is talking about the believer, who judges according to the flesh. So

there will be good men, men of conscience, who will oppose the things of the Spirit and not receive them because they judge them according to the flesh. This makes it difficult to arrive at any kind of public consensus on Pentecostalism which is both objective and capable of sustaining a theological scrutiny." (McDonnell, 1970, p. 40.)

The sub-committee warns that it will be a dark and tragic day in the life of Christianity if psychological norms are to become the criteria by which the truth or the untruth of religious experience is judged. Psychological insight has enriched, deepened, and humbled our knowledge of ourselves beyond measure; but, when it is asked for a decisive answer to the question of whether a man has or has not experienced the living Christ it is an aborted and inappropriate use of the science. To ask it for its own dimension of understanding is valid; to use it as one instrument, among others, to lighten the darkness is appropriate; but to ask it to assume the role of arbiter and judge in the sphere of religion is to ask it to do something which is an affront to psychology as a science and a scandal to religion.

Mental Health and the Holy Spirit

The Holy Spirit is the dimension in the life of the believer that makes the concepts of traditional Christian theology operational. It is difficult for the psychological precepts in the Scripture to be personally activated without the Holy Spirit in the life of the individual. It is commonly assumed that the Christian experience is an integrating experience; however, the process of regeneration does not necessarily eliminate any personality difficulty an individual has. A disoriented life is not magically brought into focus when a man becomes a Christian. Nor does the infilling of the Holy Spirit necessarily bring such change. Such experience does not necessarily change a disoriented neurotic into a well-integrated extrovert. It seems that important data are being ignored if persons are being told that after either becoming a Christian or being filled with the Holy Spirit they now have a foolproof technique to pull themselves together.

There are many Christians in every congregation who are scarcely models of a healthy personality. This is likewise true of those who have had a dynamic infilling of the Holy Spirit. A major step has been accomplished however with the so-called empowering of the individual through the infilling of the Holy Spirit. Whether or not the potential power available through the Holy Spirit is actualized depends upon several human factors. Cooperation is necessary. After a profound experience with the Holy Spirit, a new life does not unfold automatically or spontaneously. It is a life that must be cultivated by teaching, by fellowship, by discipline, and this is what fosters good mental health.

A Christian has the mental health resources not available to the non-believer. In summary, the potential for psychic integration is provided by regeneration and infilling of the Holy Spirit, but that potential must be utilized by the individual himself or no significant personality change is likely to occur.

It must be recognized that individuals with neurotic personalities are frequently drawn to the more dramatic religious movements. In a charismatic prayer meeting one may observe a disturbed individual and may note bizarre manifestations or statements coming from such an individual. Disturbed individuals also participate in the regular organized activities of the Church. Therefore, it is suggested that the group and the movement not be evaluated on the basis of the problems of a few of its members who come seeking help and advice. This would be akin to criticizing the hospital or the psychiatrist for the problem brought by the patient. Although disturbed individuals occasionally may be attracted to the charismatic movement, there is no evidence that they exist in greater proportion in the movement under question than in the organized church. If a psychologically sick individual experiences a charismatic gift, it neither validates nor invalidates the gift. A person may be emotionally disturbed: this however does not prove his religious experience to be imaginary. If one sought to determine the validity of religious insight negatively or positively on the basis of a neurotic grasp of the situation, the task would be a hopeless one. It is better by far to admit freely that unbalanced persons are often among us in religious quests and to learn to live with them humbly and as lovingly as possible, recognizing that in all of us there are layers of unhealth which were perhaps prevented from becoming burdens to us through no merits of our own, but because of some good fortune in our genes or in the environment into which we were born.

Overview of Psychological Findings

The committee reviewed and examined data from various sources. Many of the findings and conclusions were subsequently found to be most ably summarized by McDonnell, who stated:

"Some scholars take a dim view of the psychological make-up of glossolalics. The standard treatise on tongue-speaking is by George Cutten who contended (in 1927) that glossolalia is related to schizophrenia and hysteria. Lapsley and Simpson (in 1964), while denying that glossolalics can be considered mentally ill in any clinical sense, still consider them 'uncommonly disturbed.' In their judgment, tongues fill the psychic function of reducing conflict brought on by a "developmental 'fixation' at an early age in their relationship with parental figures" and is a 'dissociative expression of truncated personality

development.' William W. Wood (in 1965) came to the conclusion that 'Pentecostalism attracts uncertain, threatened, inadequately organized persons with strong motivation to reach a state of satisfactory interpersonal relatedness and personal integrity.' In an unpublished paper, Andrew D. Lester noted that glossolalic groups he studied manifested childish megalomania, had weak egos, confused identities, high levels of anxiety, and were generally unstable personalities. In a survey of the pertinent literature (in 1968) George J. Jennings came to the conclusion that 'most scholars and observers maintain that glossolalists are usually characterized with some personality deficiency.'"

"Many researchers would not only reject these negative judgments, but also would reject the assertion that any such consensus as Jennings postulates exists. Taking up the conclusions of Cutten that glossolalia tends to be related to schizophrenia and hysteria, Alexander Alland (in 1961) countered that the socio-cultural data no longer supports such a view. The members of the Negro Pentecostal church that Alland studied were well adjusted to their social environment and, by the norms of socially acceptable behavior, normal in every respect except for speaking in tongues. In 1939 Anton Boisen wrote that: 'the rapid growth of eccentric religious cults in recent years may be regarded as a direct result of the shared strain due to the economic depression,' but he found no mental illness among the people he studied. Indeed he found several disturbed individuals who found the Pentecostal experience psychologically beneficial. E. Mandell Pattison (in 1964) rejected the position that economic deprivation is a necessary factor in explaining growth. Pattison also found that glossolalics are neither contentious nor emotionally maladjusted. In an early study Lincoln Vivier (in 1960) showed that Pentecostals scale lower on suggestibility than non-Pentecostals; in a later study (1968) he asserted that 'glossolalia, as practiced in its religious context, is manifested in normal, non-neurotic persons.' Vivier found that glossolalia brings a change in the ego complex which 'tends toward the more mature and tends, furthermore, to add quality and enrichment of feeling and depth of meaningfulness.' Speaking of Pentecostals within the historic churches, A. W. Sadler (in 1964) contended that the psychic force of glossolalics may not be neurotic but rather the unconscious expressing itself positively in a creative way."

"Anxiety and tension, Vivier says, are obliquely associated with glossolalia, that is, not with the practice but with the frequency of tongues. One of the most interesting studies is that of the Jewish sociologist, Nathan Gerrard (1966, 1968), who observed a snake-handling Pentecostal church, using a conventional denomination as a control group.

He concluded that there is very little difference between the two groups with regard to mental health, 'but what-ever differences there are seem to indicate the serpent-handlers are a little more 'normal' than members of the conventional denomination.' The list of studies finding good the psychological health among Pentecostals could be extended. These studies and yet unpublished material show that to argue the dubious character of the Pentecostal experience or persons on the basis of psychological data is to argue from very shaky premises." (McDonnell, 1968, p.201-202.)

Healing, Exorcism, and Occult Practices

Healing

A ministry of healing is validated on three grounds: it is scriptural; it reflects the reality that personality is composed of an inter-relatedness of mind, body, and spirit; it affirms the reality of the Living God in human affairs.

Even a casual review of the gospels brings undeniable evidence of the central importance of healing in the life of the Savior. Few images of Jesus are as poignant and unforgettable as that one in which he stands before Peter's house in the dusk, welcoming all manner of sickness to his healing touch. "That evening, at sundown, they brought to him all who were sick or possessed with demons And he healed many who were sick with various diseases, and cast out many demons." (Mark 1:32, 34) The apostles later went forth to heal the sick.

In our age of psychological awareness, we have rediscovered the delicate balance between body and spirit. We now know that man must be seen as a totality, not as though he consists of separate compartments. The best practice of medicine today no longer treats our bodies as though they were mechanical entities unrelated to what we feel or believe or dream. Most thoughtful people among us now fully recognize the profound interconnections which exist between illness and one's total life experience. This inter-dependence of the varying dimensions of life is at the base of our newly-found appreciation of the power of the spirit to effect positively the physical and emotional aspects of our experience.

The active presence of God in Christ is clearly apparent to those who have found that by prayer they are healed. Many who have participated with a new seriousness in an intercessory prayer group and seen the results of their prayers in various forms of guidance, comfort, and actual healings, are brought to a new realization of God's living reality; for they know that it is only he who heals and guides.

As we have recovered our confidence in the relevance of the spiritual life to our sickness, 'it is natural that we should find among us individuals from the laity, as well as the clergy, who feel themselves called to a special ministry of healing. Sometimes these persons pray for others with the laying on of hands and the anointing of oil, as did the apostles and elders of the first century, and sometimes they do not. Invariably, however, they are people who find by experience that remarkable influences of healing flow through them toward the sick. The rate of recovery is accelerated. The efficacy of medicine is increased. The disappearance of symptoms is observed; and most importantly, the faith of all who are involved in this process of healing intercession is strengthened.

Many questions are raised. Why does God endow some persons with this healing power more richly than others? Is there not a danger of an elitism of the spirit, promoting a divisive self-righteousness? Does not the practice of the laying on of hands engender a certain magical expectation that it is the intercessor who heals? What about the prayers for healing which are seemingly answered in the negative?

There are always dangers of misuse and misrepresentation in the gifts of the spirit. Fraud in such matters is an ever present possibility. Where it is evident, however, that in fact by prayer and faith an individual has been undeniably assisted toward health and wholeness of life, one can only conclude that there is a valid basis for the healing ministry which has blessed that person. If one keeps the focus of prayer on the Healing Christ and offers oneself to his spirit for the blessing .of others in whatever way he chooses to do, the likelihood of misuse is surely minimized.

In these matters there are always questions we cannot answer and mysteries we cannot fathom. Our task as Christians is not to know but to obey.

We would wish to make it perfectly clear that in commending an active ministry of intercession to the Church, welcoming God's gift of healing to whomsoever he gives it in love and humility, we are not suggesting the healing ministry as a substitute for medicine.

Medical science represents one of God's greatest gifts to mankind. It is an evidence of his providential care for us that we have been led by dedicated men and women in medicine to alleviate the burden of pain and misery so dramatically in this century of appalling violence, and we would affirm God's healing power in all the channels of his grace, including that abundant vessel we call medicine.

Exorcism

Another dimension in the discussion of the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church today is found in the phenomenon known as exorcism, that ancient rite by which satanic forces called demons, including Satan himself on occasion, are called forth from their possessive clutch upon an individual life.

There are three accounts of special significance in the life of Jesus when he encounters this demonic force. The accounts are particularly memorable because the Gospels record them in some detail.

One is that dreadful experience of testing which Jesus underwent in the Judean wilderness. He must have told the experience to his followers in vivid terms because they remembered it so well. They had no other way in which they could have learned of it because he was alone. There was no one else present to witness the occasion. Jesus clearly thought of it as a crucial turning point in his time of trials, for the nature of his testing reflects a basic questioning of his destiny, his vocation, and his identity.

The other two occasions which are especially noteworthy are the times when Jesus meets an epileptic boy brought to him by the father of the child, and the unforgettably vivid encounter between Jesus and the madman from the tombs of the Gadarene country.

The Gospels tell us about "unclean spirits," the disciples are sent forth to "cast out demons," among other commissions given to them. John's Gospel tells us that the devil is "the Father of Lies," and that he entered into Judas.

How are we to interpret these evidences in the life of Jesus of his recognition of demonic spirits? Shall we dismiss the problem by saying it is only a question of terminology? Or, shall we allegorize the occasions of demonic possession? Or, shall we conclude that the accounts represent a cultural limitation, reflecting the limited knowledge of the period? Or, shall we say flatly that what the New Testament calls demon possession we would probably call neuroses or psychotic states of being? And in the wilderness, shall we say that the adversary whom Jesus met in the story is a personification of evil?

Each of these conclusions is possible, and each represents a facet of the many-sided problem of demon possession; but what no amount of demythologizing can do is to discount the possibility that Jesus saw a dark reality which we often miss in our devotion to rationality, important as reason clearly is for any mature understanding of the Christian faith.

Is it not conceivable that beyond the testing of his nature and the uses of his powers, Jesus saw something more? Can we not assume that

beneath the outward appearance of illness and psychoses, Jesus sometimes perceived a malignant force at work whose purpose was ever to bring sickness where there was health, division where there was wholeness, and death where there was life? Does it not seem likely that the one in whom truth and life were united in an unprecedented singleness of will should be extraordinarily perceptive about that which is the enemy of truth and life? Might it not be true that Jesus saw illness as clearly and accurately as we see it, both emotional and physical, but that he saw something else in some instances, a shadow behind the divisiveness, an adversary, an anti-Christ?

If the implication of these questions be true, it is of great importance that we observe the calm, unquestioned authority with which Jesus meets that malignant presence. There is never any sign of struggle in which there is a doubt about who the victor will be. With assurance, Jesus commands, "Get thee behind me, Satan," and with utter simplicity, he restores the Gadarene man to his rightful mind, and heals the demonic boy. It is never a question of dualistic division between the forces of darkness and the legions of light. Jesus is the Lord and wherever he meets that which is contrary to his love and Truth, he quietly overcomes it, as do his disciples. "Lord," they said on their return, "even the demons were subject to us." And since that time, there have been others among us who, by the power of the Holy Spirit, have also claimed to have the power of the Holy Spirit to cast out demons.

However, there are grave dangers in such practices. The history of the church is filled with those who have used Satan as a convenient escape from responsibility. To attribute angry and hostile feelings to the devil is to be freed from having to face the truth within oneself about where those feelings come from and what one must do to overcome them. To blame the adversary for the blight and burden of poverty, militarism, and racism is to cut the nerve of reformation and progress.

Moreover, to be looking for the devil in every situation of life is to commit oneself to an unhealthy quagmire of blame and judgment in personal relationships which presently alienates one from the human family, with the result that the devil has only served the devil, "and the last state is worse than the first."

These dangers are so real and prevalent that there appears to be little usefulness served in encouraging any practice which would excuse human faults by blaming a personal devil. The belief, though representative of a reality in the experience of contemporary man, as well as the men of the New Testament, is so subject to distortion and misuse that wisdom would seem to encourage the most careful approach. There is ample explanation in the complexities and conflicts in all of us for the evil we do. Yet no man who has looked long and hard at the intractable,

abysmal depth of human iniquity can deny that there is at least a shadow of an evil reality beyond human life.

Perhaps the only practical criterion we can follow is that of hard and constant day-labor against evil in all its multiplicity, personal and social, leaving the matter of its origin and nature to the mind of God.

Occult Practices

There are many phenomena of the occult today in which our people are engaged with varying degrees of commitment, among them being spiritualism, psychic communication between the living and the dead, astrology, horoscopes, and the like. It is not fair to lump all these phenomena under one heading. Psychic research is often a creditable, dignified pursuit, conducted by persons of integrity and responsibility. However, our purpose is simply to mention these areas as illustrative of the quest among us today for the reality of the spiritual order, and to observe that it can frequently become misdirected and possessive.

The only foundation on which we can judge such matters is on a practical basis of what fruits appear to issue from the activities involved, and what ground is in Scripture for the Christian's interest or participation in them.

Finally, it needs to be observed that the very fact of the rise of increasing interest in the occult today is a revelation of a spiritual vacuum in the Church which has given rise to occultist practices.

Guidelines

We believe the Church needs to pray for a sensitivity to see the manifestations of the Holy Spirit in our world today. We are not unmindful that the problems of discrimination between the true and the fraudulent are considerable, but we must not allow the problems to paralyze our awareness to his presence, nor should we permit our fear of the unknown and the unfamiliar to close our minds against being surprised by grace. We know the misuse of mystical experience is an ever-present possibility, but that is no reason to preclude its appropriate use. We believe that those who are newly endowed with gifts and perceptions of the Spirit have an enthusiasm and joy to give and we also believe that those who rejoice in our traditions of having all things done in "decency and order" have a sobering depth to give. We therefore plead for a mutuality of respect and affection.

In facing the issues raised by Neo-Pentecostal experiences, we plead for a spirit of openness and love. We commend to the attention of the Church the disciplines of I Corinthians 13, as well as the 20th Chapter of The Westminster Confession on Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience. The emphasis of The Confession of 1967 on Reconciliation is central to the attitude we seek for all parties to these problems in the Church. Without an active, calm, objective and loving understanding of our brother's religious experience, however different from one's own, reconciliation is impossible. Therefore we urge the reading of The Confession of 1967 on the theme of Reconciliation.

The criteria by which we judge the validity of another's religious experience must ever be its compatibility with the mind and spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, as we know them in the New Testament. If the consequence and quality of a reported encounter of the Holy Spirit be manifestly conducive to division, self-righteousness, hostility, exaggerated claims of knowledge and power, then the experience is subject to serious question. However, when the experience clearly results in new dimensions of faith, joy, and blessings to others, we must conclude that this is "what the Lord hath done" and offer him our praise.

Guidelines for All

1. Be tolerant and accepting of those whose Christian experiences differ from your own.
2. Continually undergird and envelop all discussions, conferences, meetings, and persons in prayer.
3. Be open to new ways in which God by his Spirit may be speaking to the Church.
4. Recognize that even though spiritual gifts may be abused, this does not mean that they should be prohibited.
5. Remember that like other new movements in church history, Neo-Pentecostalism may have a valid contribution to make to the ecumenical Church.

For Ministers Who Have Had Neo-Pentecostal Experiences

1. Combine with your Neo-Pentecostalism a thorough knowledge of, and adherence to, United Presbyterian polity and tradition. Remember your charismatic influence will, in large part, be earned by your loving and disciplined use of the charismatic, and by your conduct as a pastor to *all* your congregation, as well as by your participation as a responsible presbyter.

2. Seek a deepening and continued friendship with your clergy colleagues within and without the Neo-Pentecostal experience.

3. Remember your ordination vows, particularly the vow to "approve the government and discipline of the United Presbyterian Church" and your promise to be "A friend among your comrades in ministry, working with them, subject to the ordering of God's word and Spirit."¹¹

4. Avoid the temptation to force your personal views and experiences on your brethren. Seek to understand those whose spiritual experiences differ from your own.

5. Seek to grow in your skills as a Biblical exegete, a systematic theologian, and as a preacher in *all* the fullness of the gospel.

For Ministers Who Have Not Had Neo-Pentecostal Experiences

1. Remember the lessons of church history when God's people rediscover old truths; that the process is often disquieting, that it usually involves upheaval, change, and a degree of suffering, misunderstanding, and sometimes even persecution.

2. Seek first-hand knowledge of what Neo-Pentecostalism means to those who have experienced it. Avoid a judgment until this first-hand knowledge is obtained (i.e., by attending and evaluating their prayer meetings, etc.). Then evaluate the observations as a Christian, a United Presbyterian minister, and as a sympathetic, conscientious pastor. Keep an openness to Scriptural teaching regarding the charismatic gifts.

3. When speaking in tongues occurs, seek to know what it means to the speaker in his private devotional life, what it means when used for intercessory prayer, especially in group worship. We should be aware that speaking in tongues is a minor "gift of the Spirit" for many of those who have had Neo-Pentecostal experiences.

4. Seek to know the meaning of the other "gifts of the Spirit" in the Neo-Pentecostal experience, such as the utterance of wisdom, of knowledge; the gift of faith, of healing, of working of miracles, of prophesying.

5. Keep in mind that Neo-Pentecostals may be prone to neglect formal exegesis, systematic theology, and adherence to tradition and polity of our denomination. They may, at times, tend toward a new form of legalism, and may consequently be in need of loving guidance from their

¹¹From *Overture F (1969)* amending ordination questions.

peers, or from their pastor, or from their session. Like many of the laity within our fellowship, they too frequently need to understand the place and authority of their session. They may also, at times, tend to be over-enthusiastic concerning their experiences, to believe that their experiences should be duplicated by every sincere Christian, to limit their fellowship in the church to those who have had similar experiences so that pastoral guidance is sometimes needed to bring their prayer meetings under the authority of the session and open to all interested members of their congregation.

For Laity Who Have Had Neo-Pentecostal Experiences

1. Remember to combine with your Neo-Pentecostal enthusiasm a thorough knowledge of and adherence to the United Presbyterian form of church government. Neo-Pentecostalism is new in our tradition. Consult with your minister (or ministers) and if he (they) has not also had your experience, help him to know what it is, what it means to you, what it does for you. Urge him to attend your group meetings.

2. Pray that the Spirit brings understanding, and that he may help you to maintain empathy with your colleagues and all your fellow United Presbyterians. Remember that all members of any United Presbyterian congregation are under the authority of the session, welcome any opportunity granted you to interpret your experience to the elders, or to the session itself.

3. Strive for a scholarly knowledge of Scriptural content in combination with your spiritual experiences. Strive to integrate your experiences with the theological traditions of our Church.

4. Avoid undisciplined and undiplomatic enthusiasm in your eagerness to share your experiences with others. Resist the temptation to pose as an authority on spiritual experiences. Failure in this area often causes your fellow United Presbyterians to accuse you of spiritual pride.

5. Strive to keep your prayer meetings, etc., open to all members of your congregation. When non-Neo-Pentecostals do attend, discuss with them the content of the meeting with an interpretation of the significance of the content to Neo-Pentecostals.

6. Seek attendance at your meetings by your ministers and members of your session.

7. Remember that there are many types of Christian experiences, which lead to spiritual growth. Neo-Pentecostal experience is only one of these.

8. Accept every valid opportunity to become personally involved in the work and mission of your own congregation. Let the results of Neo-Pentecostal experience be seen in the outstanding quality of your church membership. Be an obvious and enthusiastic supporter of your congregation, its pastor and session; of your Presbytery, your synod, the General Assembly, and the mission of each. This may well be the most effective witness you can offer to the validity and vitality of your Neo-Pentecostal experience. Strive to integrate your experience with the theological traditions of our Church.

9. It is not necessary to carry all the Pentecostal baggage.

10. Keep your Neo-Pentecostal experience in perspective. No doubt it has caused you to feel that you are a better Christian. Remember that this does not mean that you are better than other Christians, but that you are, perhaps, a better Christian than you were before.

For Laity Who Have Not Had Neo-Pentecostal Experiences

1. In our Reformed tradition, we believe God is constantly seeking to reform and renew his Church, including the United Presbyterian Church. The advent of Neo-Pentecostalism into our denomination may be one aspect of reformation and renewal. In any case, pray that God may make known to you your own place in the process of reformation and renewal.

2. Should some fellow members of your congregation be brought into Neo-Pentecostalism, accept this development matter-of-factly. Should it happen to edify, thank God.

3. Be aware of the tendency to condemn the Pentecostals and Neo-Pentecostalism. If such is your reaction, restrain the tendency and seek to observe personally the Neo-Pentecostals in their prayer meetings, in your congregation, and in the mission of your church. Examine scriptural teaching about this. Pray about it. Discuss your concern with your minister. Remember that all members of any United Presbyterian congregation are under the authority of the session.

4. Do not be disturbed if this experience has not been given to you. This does not mean that you are an inferior Christian. Your function in the work and mission of your congregation may call for other gifts. Each Christian is a unique member of the body of Christ.

5. Should your minister be a Neo-Pentecostal, accept the fact calmly and affectionately. Discuss the matter with him. Help him to be mindful of the spiritual needs of *all* his congregation, to be a pastor and teacher

to all, and encourage him in his preaching to present the fullness of all aspects of the gospel. Remember that your minister is the moderator of your session and that it is the elders on the session who have the responsibility to consult formally with your minister but that he is a member of, and under the authority of, the presbytery.

For Presbyteries

1. Refer prayerfully and thoughtfully to the other sections of these Guidelines.

2. Remember the pastoral responsibilities of the presbytery toward ministers, sessions, and congregations within the presbytery, particularly toward those whose spiritual experience may involve Neo-Pentecostalism.

3. While the General Assembly, in accepting the report of this Committee, takes the position of "openness" regarding the Neo-Pentecostal movement within our denomination, the presbytery must decide whether any given instance involving a minister or a congregation is for the edification and the purity of its area of the Church.

4. If there is divisiveness involved in a particular Neo-Pentecostal situation, make as careful an evaluation as possible, remembering that there are other kinds of issues which also divide our fellowships. Sometimes tensions and conflicts may result in the edification and greater purity of the Church, and need therefore to be wisely handled by the judicatories of the United Presbyterian Church.

5. When a Presbytery must assume its responsibility with regard to Neo-Pentecostalism, and deal with it administratively, we urge Presbyteries so involved to gather not only factual but *inter-pretative* data. This should include first-hand evidence about Neo-Pentecostalism; its meaning for those involved in it; and its significance for the mission of the particular congregation.

6. Where a minister is following some Neo-Pentecostal practices, he should be counseled, if need be, to preach the fullness of the gospel (not only his Neo-Pentecostal interpretation of it), to minister to the needs of all his congregation, and as a presbyter to grow in understanding of our polity in the mission of the particular presbytery. Often ministers in difficulties, growing out of the Neo-Pentecostal experience, are newly ordained and are therefore in special need of the guidance and friendship of older presbyters.

7. Presbyteries may also be faced with a situation where there is a Neo-Pentecostal group within a congregation whose minister, or whose session, or both, may be hostile to or ignorant of Neo-Pentecostalism

Here we believe the presbytery has a pastoral responsibility to teach, mediate, and to guide in reconciliation.

8. Pray continuously for sensitivity to the will of, and the leading of, the Spirit.

For Sessions

1. Remember that in the United Presbyterian Church, the session is "charged with maintaining the spiritual government of the congregation, for which purpose it has power to inquire into the knowledge and Christian conduct of the members of the church to concert the best measures for promoting the spiritual interests of the congregation" (Form of Government, Chapter XI, Section 6 (41.06)). Thus it is the session which must decide whether or not Neo-Pentecostal practices are appropriate for the particular congregation. It is important that the session members be knowledgeable concerning Neo-Pentecostalism in regard to both its dangers and its potential contributions for the congregation's spiritual life and mission. The fact that Neo-Pentecostalism may be new and different is not in itself adequate reason for repression.

2. When members of a particular congregation are involved in Neo-Pentecostal experiences, the session of such congregation needs to gain, on the part of the elders belonging to that session, a first-hand understanding of the meaning of the experience not only to those involved in it but also for members of the congregation outside Pentecostal experiences. This may be an excellent opportunity again to implement the spirit of reconciliation emphasized in our Confession of 1967.

3. If the minister is a Neo-Pentecostal, the elders should seek full understanding of what the experience means to him, their pastor. The elders should counsel with the pastor to maintain a balanced ministry to all members of the congregation.

4. Session members are reminded of the responsibility to maintain oversight of all groups within their own congregation.

Recommendations

1. That the report and appendices, which have received the unanimous approval of the committee, be received, that the guidelines be adopted, and that the entire report and appendices be printed in pamphlet form for distribution to local congregations, ministerial relations committees of judicatories, stated clerks, and judicatory executives.

2. That since the questions in the overtures have been given full consideration by the committee, the committee requests that it be discharged.

APPENDIX A

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The general topic assigned to this committee by the General Assembly is "The Work of the Holy Spirit." Our sub-committee was given the assignment to prepare an exegetical paper relating to the work of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. Since this subject is very extensive (the Holy Spirit is mentioned—sometimes many times—in every book of the New Testament except 2 and 3 John), we have thought it best to concentrate our attention upon the following three themes: "The So-Called Baptism with the Holy Spirit," "Gifts of the Spirit," and "Speaking in Tongues."

We begin the paper with a brief overview, summarizing the role of the Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testaments. Then we present analyses of passages, chiefly from the Gospels and Acts, relating to the Holy Spirit in the life and ministry of Christ, with special attention being given to the prediction of John the Baptist that the Messiah would baptize with the Holy Spirit. This section is followed by a discussion of the teaching of Paul and the descriptive accounts in the Acts of the Apostles concerning the "Gifts of the Spirit," and "Speaking in Tongues." A concluding summary sets forth some of the main teachings related to our subject which we believe are most significant.

DAVID E. DILWORTH

BRUCE M. METZGER

1. The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament

Both the Old and the New Testaments speak of the reality and activity of God's Spirit. In the Old Testament, the Spirit is described as the source of physical, intellectual, and moral life (Gen. 1:2; Job 32:8; 33:4; 34:14 f.; Ps. 104:30; 139:7). Besides passages that describe special gifts of the Spirit that were bestowed upon individuals—such as manual skill (Ex. 31:3), wisdom (Num. 27:18), strength (Judg. 3:10; I Sam. 11:6; I Chron. 12:18) and prophetic frenzy (Num. 11:24-29; I Sam. 10:10; 19:23-24)—it is foretold that in the Messianic age God would pour out his Spirit upon his people (Isa. 44:3; Ezek. 36:27). In fact, the promise is given that God would pour out his Spirit on all flesh (Joel 2:28 f.).

2. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament

In the New Testament the doctrine of the Spirit is greatly developed, particularly in connection with the person and work of Jesus. Besides referring to the miraculous conception of Jesus by the Holy Spirit (Matt. 1:18-20) and the descent of the Spirit upon him at his baptism (Matt. 3:16; Mk. 1:10; Jn. 1:32), the Gospel writers imply that Jesus'

work is the work of the Spirit (Matt. 12:28; Mk. 3-29) and that Isaiah's prophecy (61:1) concerning the empowering of the Spirit finds its fulfillment in the mission and message of Jesus (Lk. 4:18). In his teaching, Jesus promises the Spirit to his disciples when they are persecuted (Matt. 10:20; Mk. 13:11; Lk. 12:12). According to the Fourth Gospel, the Holy Spirit, as Counselor or Advocate, is to be sent by the Father to teach and to guide Jesus' followers (Jn. 14:26; 15:13).

Particularly in the Acts of the Apostles is frequent reference made to the Spirit—so much so that more than one expositor has suggested that a more appropriate title for the book might well be "The Acts of the Holy Spirit." The author stresses that the Church had its origin in the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, in fulfillment of the oracle in the book of Joel (Acts 2:1-13; Joel 2:28 f.). Those who carry on Jesus' work of preaching and healing are described as being "filled with the Spirit" (Acts 6:3, 5; 8; 7:55; 11:24). By the prompting of the Spirit, new areas of evangelistic work are opened; thus Philip (8:29, 39), Peter (10:19-20), Barnabas and Paul (13:2), and Paul and his companions (16:6-10) are guided by the Spirit to new areas of more extended service.

Whereas the book of Acts describes a variety of situations in which members of the early church felt and responded to the leading of the Spirit, it was the Apostle Paul who developed the doctrine of the Spirit. His special contribution is the recognition of the Spirit as the *characteristic sustaining, permanent power of the Christian life*. Paul uses a variety of expressions, referring interchangeably to the Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of the Lord, the Spirit of Jesus, and the Spirit of him who raised Jesus; also of being in Christ, being in the Spirit, having Christ in you, and having the Spirit. For Paul the possession of the Spirit is both the means of overcoming the power of sin in the flesh (Rom. 8:1-5, 10-13) and a pledge or guarantee of complete redemption here-after (2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5).

The So-Called Baptism with the Holy Spirit

It should be observed that the expression, "baptism with the Holy Spirit," does not occur in the New Testament. The noun "baptism" is never so used. A few times the verb "baptize" is used in this connection with the Greek preposition *en*, which is translated in the R.S.V. "with" (Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; Acts 1:5; and Acts 11:16). All of these refer to the same saying attributed to John the Baptist that the coming Messiah would "baptize with the Holy Spirit." The one other occurrence of the phrase is in I Cor. 12:13, where it is stated that "by (Greek *en*,) one spirit we were all baptized into one body" (that is, the church).

In order to set in proper perspective the popular yet non-Biblical expression "baptism with (or, in) the Holy Spirit," it is necessary to examine passages in the New Testament that relate to the work of the Holy Spirit. We begin with the Synoptic Gospels.

A. *The Synoptic Gospels*

The majority of references to the Holy Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels relate the Spirit to the life and ministry of Jesus Christ. These include:

1. His conception in Mary by the Holy Spirit (Matt. 1:18,20; Luke 1:35).
2. His being blessed in the temple by Simeon who is inspired by the Holy Spirit.
3. The promise by John the Baptizer that Jesus would baptize with the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16). The emphasis is on the superiority of Jesus' Spirit-baptism to the water-baptism of John. In Matthew and Luke the phrase "and with fire" is added; the probable reference is to the judgment-character of Jesus' ministry (cf. Luke 3:9,17).
4. His Baptism and Temptation. The Spirit comes upon Jesus (Matt. 3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22), drives (Mark 1:12) or leads (Matt. 4:1, Luke 4:1) him into the wilderness. Following the temptation experience returns "full of the Holy Spirit" (Luke 4:1).
5. His Ministry. Jesus ministered in the power of the Holy Spirit, particularly in casting out demons. He warned those who attribute the power to any other force (Luke 4:14, Matt. 12:28-32, Mark 3:29, Luke 12:10).
6. His role as the Suffering Servant, anointed with the Spirit (Matt. 12:18—quoting Isaiah 42:1,4).
7. There are two promises made by Jesus Christ to the disciples related to the Holy Spirit: (a) in the time of testing the Holy Spirit will guide them as to what to say (Matt. 10:20, Mark 13:11, Luke 12:11-12); and (b) the Heavenly Father gives the Holy Spirit to the disciples more readily than an earthly father gives gifts to his children (Luke 11:13).
8. The few remaining references to the Holy Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels are: (a) the inspiration given David in the Psalms (Mark 12:36); (b) the Holy Spirit's relationship to John the Baptizer and his parents—(1) it is predicted by the angel to Zechariah that John will be "filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb" (Luke 1:15), (2) Elizabeth is filled with the Spirit (Luke 1:41), (3) Zechariah is filled

with the spirit (Luke 1:67); (c) Jesus' final commission to his disciples: to "make disciples" and baptize in the name of the Trinity (probably the Evangelist's formulation) (Matt. 28:19).

COMMENTS

1. It is quite amazing that the gospels, written from thirty to sixty years after the death and resurrection of Christ, should have so few sayings relating the Holy Spirit to *the disciples*. There is no mention of the gifts of the Spirit to them, of "tongues" as a sign of the Spirit, or of their seeking the fullness of the Spirit as something beyond their obedient faith in Jesus Christ. (One passage, Luke 24:49, does use "power" as a probable synonym for Holy Spirit, but the reception of the Spirit does not depend upon the disciples' seeking the Spirit, but upon God's promise, fulfilled at Pentecost.)

2. The Synoptic Evangelists explain the person and ministry of Jesus Christ primarily by reference to the Holy Spirit. It is by the Spirit that he is conceived, given power at baptism, and is able to perform miracles. His greatest gift to his followers is the Holy Spirit. It is not difficult to see how natural it was, therefore, for Luke in the Acts and Paul in his letters to develop the theme that the same Holy Spirit creates, guides, and empowers the Church, the body of Christ.

3. In each of the Synoptic Gospels it is stated (Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16) that the Messiah will baptize with the Holy Spirit. The implied effect of this baptism is an abiding transformation for which John's baptism to repentance was only a dim temporary preparation. There is "no hint that this would be an experience for only a privileged few of the disciples.

B. *John's Gospel and Epistles*

INTRODUCTION: There are frequent references to the Holy Spirit in the Gospel of John, many more than in the Synoptics, particularly in the accounts of the Last Supper. The fact that John, in all probability, was written later than the Synoptics, provides a basis for seeing in it the later understanding and experience of the Christian Church. When considering the Johannine teaching concerning the Holy Spirit, the following passages are important:

1. John 1:29-34:

"The next day he saw Jesus coming toward him, and said, 'Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said, "After me comes a man who ranks before me, for he was before me." I myself did not know him; but for this I came baptizing with water, that he might be revealed to Israel.' And John bore witness, 'I saw the Spirit descend as a dove from heaven, and it remained on him.

I myself did not know him; but he who sent me to baptize with water said to me, "He on whom you see the Spirit descend and remain, this is he who baptizes with the Holy Spirit." And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God."

(a) The baptism of Jesus is not described in John's Gospel.

(b) However, Jesus' baptism is alluded to in the Baptizer's words, "I saw the Spirit descend as a dove from heaven, and it remained on him." (Note the emphasis on the *abiding* experience of the Spirit for Jesus.)

(c) Jesus is designated as the one who "baptizes with the Holy Spirit," in contrast to John's baptizing with water.

2. John 3:5:

"Truly, truly I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

Three points are significant:

(a) Water is linked with Spirit as both being necessary for entrance into God's kingdom. There are several possible interpretations: (1) "Water" refers to John's baptism and "the Spirit" to Jesus' baptism, cf. John 1:31,33 (C. H. Dodd). (2) Water refers to ritual baptism and Spirit to inner regeneration. (3) "Water" and "Spirit" are used metaphorically, representing baptism and Pentecost. (*The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 8, p. 439.)

(b) Both water and Spirit are associated with the idea of birth. In John's Gospel one enters the family of God by divine birth (John 1:13). Water and Spirit are therefore designated as the agents by which this birth occurs.

(c) When one is *born* of God he then "enters the Kingdom of God."

3. John 3:34. In this passage it is noted that: "God gives the Spirit without reserve," probably meaning to the Son (cf. Jerusalem Bible, John, p. 152-153).

4. John 7:39. "Now this he said about the Spirit, which those who believed in him were to receive; for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." In this passage, the following should be noted:

(a) The Holy Spirit was not "given" to others than Christ until after his death and resurrection.

(b) The Spirit is associated with water in two aspects: (1) it will satisfy inner thirst; and (2) it will be in the believer's life the spring out of which blessing will flow to others.

(c) Believing in Jesus Christ results in the reception of the Spirit.

5. John chapters 13-17:

The references to the Holy Spirit in these chapters describe the Spirit as being given by Christ (16:7), by the Father in Christ's name (14:26), and in response to the prayers of Christ (14:16). Also the activities of the Spirit, both in believers and in the world, are described (16:7-14, et al.).

6. John 20:21-23:

(a) In this passage the Holy Spirit is "breathed" on the disciples in what is apparently John's interpretation of the Pentecost experience.

(b) Associated with the giving of the Spirit is the Christ-like mission, "as the Father has sent me, even so I send you" (20:21), and the authority to pronounce the forgiveness of sins.

7. The Letters of John

In these letters, the references to the Spirit reinforce the Upper Room discussions, stressing the abiding of Christ in his people through the agency of the Spirit which "he has given" to them (I John 3:24). An important summary is given in I John 5:6-8:

"This is he who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ, not with the water only but with the water and the blood. (7) And the Spirit is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth. (8) There are three witnesses, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree."

(a) Jesus Christ coming "by water and blood" is probably symbolic of his baptism by John and his crucifixion (his "baptism" of suffering). "With water and blood" means providing the benefits of baptism (the gift of the Spirit) and the benefits of the Lord's Supper.

(b) The three witnesses signify: (1) *The Spirit*: Pentecost, the living presence of Christ in the disciples; (2) *The Water*: the baptism and its benefits; and (3) *The blood*: the death of Christ as represented in the Communion meal.

COMMENTS:

John's Gospel and Epistles contain the following teaching regarding the Baptism with the Spirit:

1. The primary meaning of Jesus' baptism was the receiving of the Spirit in full and permanent measure.

2. Jesus Christ bestows the Spirit on his disciples, committing them to the same mission which he has followed.

3. "New birth," "participation in the Spirit," "reception of the Holy Spirit," are all descriptions of essentially the same experience.

4. John's writings make no mention of "tongues-speaking" or "gifts of the Spirit," though there are many references to the Spirit and his ministry in the disciples.

C. *The Acts of the Apostles*

As was mentioned earlier, the book of Acts makes such frequent reference to the Holy Spirit that it has often been suggested that a more appropriate title of the book might well be "The Acts of the Holy Spirit." After the initial pouring out of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the quality of life of the early church at Jerusalem is described in terms of boldness in witnessing, accompanied by joy and gladness in the common life (Acts 2:42-47). The recurring expressions in the following account are "full of the Holy Spirit" and "filled with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 4:8; 6:3, 5, 8; 7:55; 9:17; 11:24; 13:9).

Not only are the lives of individual believers described as being strengthened and empowered by the Holy Spirit, but Luke is also concerned to show how the Spirit was the guiding and controlling factor in the early Christian mission. By the inspiration of the Spirit, Philip is instructed to speak to the Ethiopian treasurer (Acts 8:29,39), and when his task is completed, Philip is removed to other spheres of activity by the same Spirit (ver. 39). Likewise Peter is directed by the Spirit to go to the home of the Gentile Cornelius, a centurion at Caesarea (10:19; 11:12). Later the Spirit directs the Church at Antioch to send out Barnabas and Saul as missionaries to Asia Minor (13:2-4). Subsequently Paul and his companions are guided by the Spirit into new areas of more extended service (16:6-10).

Luke does not tell us how this guidance was mediated; but we should probably infer that it was through prophetic insight, in the manner in which the Hebrew prophets had discerned the divine command to go to particular places and to carry out particular tasks. In this connection we should not overlook the presence in the early church of a special group who are called prophets. Mentioned along side of apostles and teachers, this group of prophetically sensitive persons (Acts 13:1; compare I Cor. 12:28-29; Eph. 2:20; 4:11) probably exercised a double function of proclamation and prediction. By the Holy Spirit a prophet named Agabus foresaw an impending famine and issued spiritual guidance to the church (Acts 11:27-29). On another occasion the Holy Spirit prompted Agabus to predict the persecutions that lay in store for the apostle Paul (21:10-11).

Throughout all these references in the book of Acts to different aspects of the work and activity of the Holy Spirit, it is significant that speaking in tongues is mentioned on only three occasions; namely, at Pentecost (though the account is susceptible of different interpretations), at the conversion of Cornelius, and at the establishment of the church at Ephesus. A fuller discussion of these passages is reserved for the following section; it will be enough here to draw attention (a) to the paucity of such incidents of speaking in tongues recorded in Acts, and (b) to the obscurity that attaches to the question of how Luke conceived of the Spirit to have been received by the ordinary members of the Christian society.

Concerning the latter problem, it has often been observed that, on the one hand, Luke reports that at Pentecost Peter proclaimed that the gift of the Spirit is now available to all who repent and are baptized in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38)—a teaching that is in harmony with explicit statements in Paul's Epistles and with the general implications of the New Testament as a whole. On the other hand, in the case of Cornelius and his household the Spirit "fell on" the converts immediately, prior to their being baptized (10:44-48). There is also the case of the Samaritan converts who were baptized by Philip but whose reception of the Spirit was delayed until Peter and John had come from Jerusalem and had laid their hands on the new believers (8:12-17). In these two cases the distinctive features of the narratives may be due to the special circumstances that were involved, namely, in each case Luke's account has reached a turning point in the church's mission, as it moves first from Judea into Samaria, and later into what can be called Gentile territory.

Somewhat similar to the last mentioned incident is the status of certain disciples whom Paul met at Ephesus (Acts 19:2-6) and who had been baptized with only "John's baptism." They accordingly had not received the Holy Spirit when they had believed (i.e., had been converted; the rendering of the King James version, "since ye believed," is erroneous). These persons were then baptized by Paul "in the name of the Lord Jesus," and "when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came upon them; and they spoke with tongues and prophesied" (19:6).

COMMENTS

1. The predominant testimony of the book of Acts concerning the Holy Spirit concentrates on the outpouring, the gift, the reception, the falling of the Holy Spirit upon Christian believers. The prediction made earlier by John the Baptist that Jesus the Messiah would baptize his followers with the Holy Spirit is mentioned twice (1:5 and 11:16), but nowhere is reference made to "the baptism in (or, with) the Spirit."

2. The notorious difficulty of ascertaining any single, consistent pattern in Acts of the sequence of conversion, reception of the Holy Spirit, and water-baptism, suggests that the correct hermeneutic in ascertaining God's will for the Church is to give primary attention to *the didactic* rather than the *historical* parts of the Scripture. As John R. W. Stott puts it: "We should look for it [i.e., the revelation of the purpose of God] in the teaching of Jesus, and in the sermons and writings of the apostles, and not in the purely narrative portions of the Acts. What is *described* in Scripture as having happened to others is not necessarily intended for us, whereas what is *promised* to us we are to appropriate, and what is *commanded* us we are to obey" (*The Baptism and the Fullness of the Holy Spirit*, Chicago, 1964, p. 4).

The Gifts of the Spirit

"Spiritual gifts" is a comprehensive designation for all those extraordinary and sometimes directly miraculous powers which were possessed by many Christians in the Apostolic age. These gifts, or *charismata*, had their origin in the gracious (Greek *charis*, "grace") operation of the Holy Spirit, and were bestowed in order "to equip God's people for work in his service" (Eph. 4:12 New English Bible).

The primary section in the New Testament that deals with spiritual gifts is chapters 12, 13, and 14 of I Corinthians. Here the apostle provides three lists of such gifts (12:8-10, 28, and 29-30). It is instructive to compare the lists, beginning with verse 28 where Paul enumerates the first three gifts in a definite sequence ("first ... second ... third"). I Cor. 12:28: (1) apostles, (2) prophets, (3) teachers, (4) workers of miracles, (5) healers, (6) helpers, (7) administrators, and (8) speakers in various kinds of tongues.

Somewhat similar is the sequence of gifts in the statements found in I Cor. 12:8-10 and 29-30. (In the following lists the gifts are enumerated in the order in which they stand in the scripture text, while the numerals in parentheses correspond to the numerals in the list cited above.) I Cor. 12:8-10: (1) a word of wisdom, (3) a word of knowledge, (5) gifts of healing, (4) working of miracles, (2) prophecy, ability to distinguish between spirits, (8) various kinds of tongues, and (9) interpretation of tongues.

I Cor. 12:29-30: (1) apostles, (2) prophets, (3) teachers, (4) miracles, (5) gifts of healing, (8) speaking with tongues, and (9) interpreting (tongues).

Elsewhere in the New Testament other lists of spiritual gifts include the following: Rom. 12:6-8: (2) prophecy, service, (3) teaching, exhortation, contributing, giving aid, and doing acts of mercy.

Eph. 4:11: (1) apostles, (2) prophets, evangelists, pastors, and (3) teachers.

One or two other lists occur, but these differ somewhat from the specific charismata enumerated above. Thus, in Gal. 5:22-23 the apostle enumerates the nine-fold fruit of the Spirit characteristic of the full Christian life, and in I Pet. 4:10-11 the writer restricts himself to two typical Christian charismata, namely speaking the oracles of God (i.e. teaching) and rendering service.

Before making a comparison of items among the several lists of gifts of the Spirit, it will be useful to define several of the less familiar terms used in the lists. In I Cor. 12:8-10, "a word of wisdom" and "a word of knowledge" appear to refer to discourses or briefer utterances that either expound Christian truths and their relations to one another, or that set forth ethical instruction and practical exhortation. "Faith" in this list cannot mean the saving faith possessed by every sincere Christian believer, but must refer to some exceptional kind or degree of potent faith that can work miracles (cf. I Cor. 13:2). "Prophecy" in the early Church was not so much the predicting of future events (though this sometimes occurred; e.g. Agabus in Acts 11:27), but was chiefly the gift of understanding and expressing through teaching or preaching what the will of God was for a given situation, resulting in "upbuilding and encouragement and consolation" (I Cor. 14:3). The "ability to distinguish between spirits" refers to a deep and intuitive power that enabled its possessor to discriminate between true and false prophets and to judge whether what they taught came from God or was an illusion (cf. I Jn. 4:1). Except for the nature of the gift of "speaking in tongues" (which will be discussed later), the characteristics of the other gifts in the lists are no doubt sufficiently clear and do not require further comment.

A comparison of the four primary lists reveals certain instructive features. Each of the lists contains two or more gifts that are not mentioned in the other lists. It must not be assumed, however, that in all cases the difference in name means a difference of gift or function; for example, "service" in one list (Rom. 12:6) and "helpers" in another list (I Cor. 12:28) are probably to be identified. In any case, it is clear that in general the gifts may be divided into the apparently miraculous and the non-miraculous. Included among the former are workers of miracles and healers, whereas among the latter are certain gifts of character and mental and spiritual endowments, such as exhortation, contributing, giving aid, and administering. That is, the items in the latter group appear to be what are commonly called natural powers or talents which have been raised to a pitch that is not attainable apart from a special endowment of the Spirit. Paul's estimate of the relative value in public

worship of the several gifts of the Spirit is made unmistakably clear by (1) the fact that whenever he mentions in a list of spiritual gifts the speaking in tongues, with the interpretation of tongues, he does so at the end of the list; and (2) his express statement, "I thank God that I speak in tongues more than you all; nevertheless, in church I would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (I Cor. 14:18-19—the proportion being one to two thousand!).

By way of summary, charismata may be defined as endowments and capacities necessary for the edification and service of the Church, bestowed by the Holy Spirit upon its members, in virtue of which they are enabled to employ their natural faculties in the service of the Church, or are endowed with new abilities and powers for this purpose.

Speaking in Tongues

Explicit references in the New Testament to the gift of speaking in tongues are confined to three books, namely Mark, Acts, and I Corinthians. The terminology used in these books to describe speaking in tongues varies slightly. The predominant text of the concluding section of Mark, a section of disputed authenticity (see below for further discussion of this matter), refers to speaking in *new tongues* (16:17); in Acts 2:4 reference is made to *other tongues*; and mention is made in I Cor. 12:28 of *various kinds of tongues*. Usually, however, Acts and I Corinthians refer simply to *tongues* or (singular) *tongue*. The verb "to speak" is commonly used with both the singular and the plural noun (Acts 2:4; 10:46; 19:6; I Cor. 14:2, 4, 13, 14, 19, 27); once Paul uses the phrase to "pray in a tongue" as distinct from praying with the mind (I Cor. 14:14-15). The following sections contain a more or less detailed examination of these passages, beginning with those in I Corinthians, which is the earliest written account in the New Testament that mentions speaking in tongues.

A. I Corinthians

The meaning of the word "tongue" (Greek *glossa*) in I Cor. 12-14 has been differently explained. The primary use of the word in Greek is to designate the physical organ that lies on the floor of the mouth. This, however, is obviously not the meaning here, because in that primary sense everyone speaks with his tongue and because the plural "tongues" is used of a single individual (I Cor. 14:5, 18). Some scholars have thought that the charismatic gift in the church at Corinth was the miraculous speaking of existing foreign languages and dialects not previously learnt by the speakers. In support of this interpretation it has been urged that the seven occurrences in I Cor. 12 and 14 of the verb *hermeneuein* must mean to interpret or translate a foreign language.

This argument, however, is not water-tight, for the verb can also be used in the giving of an explanation of a statement or a passage of scripture (Lk. 24:32).

Furthermore, the opinion that it was foreign languages which the Corinthians spoke seems to be inconsistent with two comments that Paul makes in the context. For one thing, speaking in foreign languages, even though they were unknown to the hearer, would scarcely lead him to judge that the speakers were out of their mind (I Cor. 14:23). Likewise, Paul uses the analogy of musical instruments (I Cor. 14:7-8) and says that if they "do not give distinct notes, how will anyone know what is played?" It is altogether unlikely that the apostle is identifying speaking in tongues with speaking in foreign languages because in that case he would not have suggested that there was no distinction between the sounds—for in every language there must be such a distinction.

Apparently therefore the expression "tongues" in I Corinthians has the sense of a peculiar kind of speech which a person may attain in prayer, pouring forth his glowing spiritual experience in a rhapsody of sounds, unintelligible to others as well as to himself. In this connection the apostle directs that "he who speaks in a tongue should pray for the power to interpret" (I Cor. 14:13). If, however, there is no one present to interpret, the speaker shall "keep silence in church and speak to himself and to God" (I Cor. 14:28).

In light of the special usage of the Greek word for "tongue" it would be useful to have in English a corresponding special term to designate the gift of speaking in tongues. In older as well as in several more recent translations of the Bible (but not the Revised Standard Version, which gives a strictly literal translation of the expression), various paraphrastic renderings have been utilized in the interest of greater clarity. The Geneva Bible of 1560 used throughout I Corinthians, Chapter 14 the expression "strange tongues," and the King James or so-called Authorized Version of 1611 used the expression "unknown tongues." In both cases the qualifying word was printed in italics to indicate that it is an interpretative addition. In more modern times the New English Bible (1961-1970) employs the renderings "ecstatic speech," "the language of ecstasy," "the tongues of ecstasy," and "ecstatic utterance"; and the Today's English Version issued by the American Bible Society (1966) translates with the phrase "speaks with strange sounds." It may also be mentioned that during the past century the technical term *glossalalia* (a term that does not occur in the Bible) has often been used in referring to the Corinthian experience.

B. *The Book of Acts*

In the book of Acts three passages refer to the speaking in tongues. Perhaps it will be best to deal first with the two passages about which there is little or no dispute concerning their meaning. In the account of the conversion of Cornelius, the Roman centurion at Caesarea, we are told that while Peter was preaching the gospel to him and his kinsmen and close friends who had gathered together in his home, "the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the word. And the believers from among the circumcized [i.e. the Jewish Christians] who came with Peter were amazed, because the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out even on the Gentiles [i.e. on Cornelius and those with him]. For they heard them speaking in tongues and extolling God" (Acts 10:44-46).

In another account in Acts (19:1 ff.) reference is made to certain disciples at Ephesus who had previously been baptized in accordance with John the Baptist's teaching concerning the need of repentance, and who had not yet received the Holy Spirit. After Paul had given them further instruction, they received Christian baptism and, when he "had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them; and they spoke with tongues and prophesied" (Acts 19:6).

In the context of neither of these two passages is there any hint of the need of speaking in foreign languages. Accordingly almost all commentators regard the reference to "tongues" to be similar to the experience of believers at Corinth, namely the utterance of unknown words or sounds as a consequence of the exuberance of a newly acquired faith in Jesus Christ.

The remaining reference in Acts to speaking in tongues (2:4) involves a number of problems of interpretation, concerning which there is no general agreement among scholars. On the one hand, some commentators urge that the *prima facie* meaning of the account in Acts 2 is that the Holy Spirit enabled the one hundred twenty believers, who had been assembled in the upper room at Jerusalem, to speak in various foreign languages (Acts 2:6 and 8), which were understood by people of many nationalities (fifteen lands are mentioned in the list of hearers in 2:9-11).

On the other hand, a number of features in the narrative seem to other scholars to suggest that the speaking in "other tongues" (verse 4) was not the use of existing foreign languages but was essentially the same as the Corinthian tongues-speaking, namely an act of worship involving the giving of thanksgiving and praise for "the mighty works of God" (Acts 2:11). In support of this interpretation, these scholars point to the following facts. First, the Pentecostal speaking in other tongues began before the spectators had arrived (compare verses 4 and 6), and

was followed by the missionary discourse of Peter in plain, ordinary language. Secondly, a miracle of speaking in so many foreign languages to the multitude at Pentecost would have been superfluous, for Jews born abroad normally spoke a dialect of Aramaic, or the common Greek, or sometimes both. There was, therefore, no need for the apostles and their companions to speak in a wide variety of foreign languages. Thirdly, some of the multitude ridiculed the speakers as "filled with new wine" (2:13). Such is not the reaction of bystanders who hear others speak in real languages; it agrees, however, with the impression that outsiders received of speakers in tongues at Corinth ("When the whole church assembles and all speak in tongues, and outsiders or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are mad?" I Cor. 14:23). Fourthly, on another occasion Peter compared what happened to Cornelius and his companions with what had happened at Pentecost (Acts 11:15). Since the tongues in which Cornelius spoke were in all probability an act of worship, not of teaching (in existing foreign languages), Peter's comparison implies that the same kind of speaking took place at Pentecost. Fifthly, strict attention given to the account in Acts 2 discloses that, whereas the utterances of the apostles and their companions sounded in the ears of the excited crowd as the words of their mother tongues (2:6 ff.), the writer of Acts himself does not really affirm that the speakers spoke the foreign languages of the several nationalities which made up the group, but only that the hearers so interpreted their utterances ("each one hearswe hear"). Thus the miracle would have been one of hearing rather than one of speaking. According to this interpretation of the account in Acts 2, the phenomenon at Pentecost involved a kind of spiritual intoxication, a rhapsodic telling of "the mighty works of God" (Acts 2:11). The import of the "tongues" was interpreted and applied by the Holy Spirit himself to those hearers who believed and were converted, to each in his own vernacular dialect. The difference between the experience at Pentecost and that at Corinth was that in the former case the "tongues" were immediately understood by some of the multitude, while at Corinth a special gift of interpretation was necessary.

The upshot of this rather lengthy discussion of the meaning of Acts 2 may be expressed more briefly as follows. It appears that either (a) Luke (who, so far as we know, had not himself been present in Jerusalem at Pentecost) had found two reports of the event, one of which told of speaking in foreign languages and the other of which told of a charismatic speaking in unknown tongues, and he combined in Acts 2 features of both reports; or (b) Luke himself introduced into the original report of ecstatic tongues certain features suggesting the speaking of foreign languages in order to interpret to the reader of Acts the profound significance of the coming of the Holy Spirit, whose gracious work of illumination transcended all national boundaries and linguistic barriers.

C. *The Gospel of Mark*

The remaining explicit reference in the New Testament to speaking in tongues is found in the appendix to the Gospel according to Mark (16:17). Since the last twelve verses (9 to 20) of the Second Gospel are absent from the earliest and best manuscripts of the New Testament, and since the style and vocabulary of these verses differ from the rest of Mark's Gospel, it is almost universally held by scholars that, after the original ending of the Gospel had been accidentally torn off and lost at a very early date, the verses now widely current were added early in the second century by someone who wished thereby to provide a more satisfactory ending than the very abrupt close of the Gospel at 16:8, "for they [the women] were afraid."

Among the manuscripts that contain Mark 16:17, most read "they will speak in new tongues"; the adjective "new," however, is absent from several early manuscripts. It is difficult to decide whether the word "new" was accidentally omitted by early scribes, or whether it was added in order to differentiate the sign promised to believers from the gift of speaking in tongues. In either case, it is altogether probable that the addition of the last twelve verses was made at a time prior to the canonization of the Gospel of Mark; that is, when the Second Gospel came to be acknowledged as authoritative scripture, the traditional ending was already attached.

Summary of New Testament Evidence

This section will serve to pull together the different strands of New Testament teaching which have been indicated in the analyses given above.

1. Any study of the so-called "baptism with the Holy Spirit" must begin with John's baptism which was of "repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (Luke 3:3). It was a preparatory experience designed to make the hearts of people ready for the "Coming One." John's testimony concerning the coming Messiah was that the latter was so far greater than the Baptist that John was not worthy to be even his slave. The primary mark of the "Coming One" was that he would baptize with the Holy Spirit. (The experience of Apollos and the disciples at Ephesus, Acts 18:24-19:7, reinforces the idea of the superiority of Jesus' baptism compared with that which John administered. It should be noted that though both Apollos and the unnamed disciples "knew only the baptism of John," the former was not rebaptized, but was only taught "the way of God" more accurately, while the latter "were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.")

2. All of the Gospels see the coming of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus as the central feature of his experience of baptism at the hands of John (cf. Luke 3:22 and parallels; Acts 10:38).

3. The reception of the Spirit by the first disciples and later believers is regarded as the fulfillment of the promise that Jesus would baptize with the Holy Spirit (Acts 11:16; Acts 1:5; John 20:21-22).

4. Baptism with the Spirit means incorporation into the body of Christ, the Church (Acts 2:37-42; Acts 10:44-48; Rom. 6:1 ff; I Cor. 12:13; Col. 2:12). The only condition for receiving this baptism is repentance and faith toward Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38; Acts 10:44-45; Ga. 2:26-27; Rom. 8:9-11; etc.?)

5. Regarding visible evidences of reception of the Spirit, the following may be noted: Some speak in tongues (Acts 2:4, 10-44, 19:6); others give no visible sign (Acts 2:41, 4:4, 8:17). In I Cor. 12:13 Paul says that *all* were baptized by the Spirit, but only some have the gift of "various kinds of tongues" (I Cor. 12:10); others have other gifts.

6. The phrase, "baptism in or with the Holy Spirit," is central in pentecostal theology. One writer summarizes thus:

"The basic dogma of pentecostalism, the one that distinguishes it from other branches of Christianity, is the dogma of 'the Baptism in the Holy Spirit.' Sometimes it is called 'the Baptism *of* the Holy Spirit.' Whatever preposition is used, this term refers to a decisive, usually for the Christian, a second encounter with God. This encounter empowers the Christian for service to the Lord, it is claimed, and in a way that nothing else can. Without this a Christian is 'only saved.' With it, he is an effective servant of Christ" (Peter Doyle, *The Theology of Episcopalian Pentecostalism*, p. 2).

We do not, however, find warrant in the New Testament for a doctrine of *two* Spirit-baptisms as normal for the Christian life. Those who speak of one baptism to "make us new creatures, spiritually," and another baptism by which "the Holy Spirit comes to dwell in us" (*The ministries of the Holy Spirit in the Church*, Blessed Trinity Society, 1962, p. 6), are making a division which is not found in the New Testament. In the New Testament, baptism with water, when practiced or taught, is a ritual related to the reception of the Spirit, and may come before (Acts 19:5-6), at the same time (Acts 2:38), or after (Acts 2:38) one has been baptized with the Holy Spirit.

Furthermore, it should be noted that though several biblical writers use the verb "to baptize" in connection with the Spirit (Matt. 3:11; Mk. 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16); nowhere do the Scriptures use the noun "baptism" in the expression "the baptism of the Spirit." The modern elaboration of a doctrine concerning a special event called "the baptism of the Spirit," different in kind from any other operation of the Holy Spirit, is a sectarian over-interpretation. Furthermore, not only have certain persons today invented a non-scriptural phrase, but they contrast this so-called baptism of the Spirit with baptism with water, contrary to the apostolic teaching that there is but *one* baptism (Eph.4:5).

7. Of all the spiritual gifts, that of speaking in tongues was open to certain dangers and abuses, which at Corinth had led to loveless pride and chaotic confusion. Notwithstanding its liability to misuse, however, Paul did not forbid the exercise of this gift in private, which he recognized as an operation of the Spirit (I Cor. 14:39). But he restricted its exercise within the assembled congregation and demanded that it be interpreted (I Cor. 14:27). Whenever Paul makes a list of spiritual gifts, he always ranks speaking in tongues and their interpretation last in such lists (I Cor. 12:10,28,30).

8. The general impression made by Paul's discussion in I Corinthians, chapters 12, 13, and 14, is that speaking in tongues can be good, but prophesying in intelligible speech for the edification of the congregation is better (I Cor. 14:5), and love for God and men is best of all (I Cor. 12:31; 13:13). According to Paul, without love the greatest tongue-speaker imaginable is a mere noise-maker ("If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal," I Cor. 13:1).

9. Although Paul has much to teach in his major Epistles about the Holy Spirit and about the Spirit's gifts to the Church, it is only in one Epistle (I Corinthians) that he discusses (and regulates) the speaking in tongues. Tongues are not mentioned in the General Epistles or in the book of Revelation. And although the Acts of the Apostles makes a great many references to the activity of the Holy Spirit in the early Church, it is only on three separate occasions that explicit reference is made to speaking in tongues (2:4; 10:46; 19:6). Even though some have found allusions to tongues in a few other passages in the New Testament (e.g., in Acts 8:17; Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6; and I Thess. 5:19), it is plain that this gift occupied a subordinate place in the life of Christian believers in the apostolic age.

10. There is not the slightest hint in the Gospels that Jesus Christ, to whom the Father gave the Spirit without measure (John 3:34), ever spoke in tongues. Nor do we find in his teaching concerning the coming of the Spirit as Counselor or Advocate any word of a miraculous gift of tongues. In fact, there is, as has been pointed out above, only one reference to "new tongues" in the four Gospels, and that is not in connection with the Spirit but as one of the five signs which should accompany those who believe, a reference to saving faith in general (Mark 16:17-18).

11. To insist that speaking in tongues is a necessary proof that one has been baptized by the Spirit is to overlook the clear statement of the apostle in I Cor. 12:13, "For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body [the Church]." Since only some of the Corinthian believers spoke in tongues (I Cor. 12:8-10), yet all of them (as Paul here specifically declares) had been baptized by one Spirit, it is unwarranted to teach that speaking in tongues is an indispensable sign of having received the Spirit.

12. Of all the many individuals and groups mentioned in the Acts who received the Spirit, in only three instances is speaking in tongues mentioned. There are many other references in the same book to the fullness of the Spirit or to receiving the Spirit in context where there is no allusion to speaking in tongues (Acts 1:5,8; 4:8,31; 5:32; 6:3,5; 8:15, 17-19; 9:17; 11:15-16; 24; 13:9, 52; 15:8). In the face of such evidence it is entirely arbitrary to assert, as some do, that speaking in tongues always follows the reception of the Spirit. The authentic apostolic teaching, instead of referring to the baptism of the Spirit, exhorts believers to be filled with the Spirit (Eph. 5:18). The New Testament makes it clear that fullness of the Spirit is an expression referring to the Christian's dependence on the Holy Spirit, a dependence that must be renewed from time to time. Just as forgiveness is to be sought daily, so also a renewed sense of dependence on the enabling power of the Holy Spirit is to be sought for each task to which we put our hands.

13. With reference to modern instances of the bestowal of spiritual gifts similar to those at Corinth, Calvin confesses that "it is difficult to make up one's mind about gifts...., of which the Church has been deprived for so long, except for mere traces or shades of them, which are still to be found" (*Commentary* on I Cor. 12:28-31). Although some theologians have held that the purely super-naturalistic gifts ceased with the death of the apostles and their companions, it is difficult to validate this view either exegetically or historically. In accord with the apostolic exhortation to "test the spirits to see whether they are of God" (I John 4:1), it appears that each of the authentic gifts of the Spirit has had its counterfeits and frauds. There are also instances, even within the circle of Orthodox Christendom, when "divine healing" has

been shamefully exploited. Such cases cannot but bring reproach to the cause of Christ and his Church.

14. By way of conclusion, the practice of speaking in tongues, when inspired by the Holy Spirit, should neither be despised nor forbidden. At the same time, tongues should not be overemphasized; normally they belong to private worship. Christians who have experienced, through speaking in tongues, a revitalizing of their faith should be on guard against forming divisive cliques within the congregation. On the other hand, those who have received no unusual experiences of the Holy Spirit should be alert to the possibilities of a deeper understanding of the gospel of Christ and a fuller participation in the gifts and fruit of the Spirit—of which love is the greatest (I Cor. 13:13).

APPENDIX B

A MORE DETAILED SUMMARY OF RELEVANT PSYCHOLOGICAL LITERATURE

1. *Objectivity.* There are several major obstacles to an objective evaluation of the charismatic type religious experience. According to McDonnell (1968, 1970) it is difficult for Pentecostals to receive a fair hearing because of: (a) negative public images relating to emotionalism, fanaticism, illiteracy, credulity, etc.; (b) fear of religious experience as opposed to more abstract, cognitive, theological, and other considerations; (c) norms of socially accepted behavior such as manifestations of speaking in tongues, prophesying, giving interpretations, are generally thought in American society to be unacceptable ways of behaving however authentic they might be; and (d) a fear on the part of the organized church dealing with a dimension that knows no jurisdictional boundaries which cannot be regulated by decree or pre-programmed.

Although the church generally encourages effective religious experience, there seems to be a natural fear of religious experience and when it assumes or approaches amazing proportions, the church becomes uneasy and watchful.

NOTE: The committee after study and review of much relevant psychological data discovered a similar comprehensive review by Dr. Luther P. Gerlach and Virginia Hine. The committee is indebted to Dr. Gerlach for his generosity in making available this comprehensive summary of relevant psychological literature. This section of the committee's report contains extensive quotes from this review by Dr. Gerlach, Virginia Hine, and the team that was involved in their project. For a more comprehensive treatment of this subject the reader is referred to a forthcoming book by Dr. Luther P. Gerlach and Virginia Hine entitled *People, Power, Change*, Bobbs Merrill, tentative publication date: June 1970.

Charismatic experiences in general are usually thought to involve an altered mental state. In Western culture and society such states are viewed with a great deal of suspicion and managed with a good deal of confusion. Pentecostal glossolalia appears to have fallen heir to both the confusion and the suspicion. (Gerlach and Hine, 1967.)

Analysis of altered mental states is frequently based upon psychological models which assume at the outset that the state is pathological or abnormal.

Altered mental states are usually treated as a loss of reality-orientation, interruption of normal associations or direction of behavior, unconnected with consciousness. (Gerlach and Hine, 1967.)

2. Alexander Alland (1961) studied a Negro Pentecostal Church and found that members who spoke in tongues were well adjusted to their social environment and behaved in a normally accepted manner. According to Alland, earlier psychological explanations relating to glossolalia and schizophrenia are no longer acceptable.

3. The testimony of spokesmen of the charismatic movement emphasizes that charismatic experiences, including speaking in tongues are not related in any way to ecstatic or trance states. With few exceptions participants are totally aware of the environment around them and exercise the "gift" of tongues at will.

4. Gerlach and Hine (1967, 1968) described three basic models used by social scientists to study religious phenomenon in related movements. They indicate that such movements can occur (a) if there is social disorganization, (b) among the economically or socially deprived classes or (c) when individuals involved are defective in some way, a theory that assumes psychological maladjustments or personality characteristics that predispose an individual to join a movement. According to these authors, there is no empirical evidence to support these theories as applicable to the modern charismatic movement.

5. George B. Cutten's *Speaking in Tongues*, written in 1927, illustrates an often quoted but inaccurate analysis of the movement. The account describes more dramatic instances of tongue speaking, and Cutten makes extravagant statements about tongues being received only by non-verbal individuals of low mental ability. Quoted and re-quoted through the years, his impressions "have taken on an aura of fact among laymen and churchmen critical of the movement. His assumptions that glossolalia is related to schizophrenia and hysteria have not been supported by any conclusive empirical studies." (Gerlach and Hine, 1967)

6. *Suggestibility*. Joiners of the charismatic movement have been labeled highly-suggestible by laymen and professionals from many disciplines. Empirical studies do not support this opinion. For example, Gerlach and Hine (1967) reported that twenty-three percent of respondents in their study spoke in tongues for the first time when they were alone. Many others have reported spontaneous experiences after considerable prayer and searching, un-related to any religious meetings or involvement of other individuals. Several individuals have reported a lapse of many months before they came in contact with those in the movement and determined that the phenomenon they were experiencing was "speaking in tongues." Vivier (1960) found further evidence of this kind and reported that those who spoke in tongues were no different from his control groups with respect to suggestibility.

7. In seven studies conducted by psychologists or psychiatrists (reported by Gerlach and Hine, 1967) Pentecostal glossolalia could not be related to mental illness. Speaking in tongues was not considered an indicator of neurosis or psychosis. Data indicates that although disturbed individuals may be attracted to the movement there is no evidence that they exist in greater proportion within this movement than within the organized church. It is quite possible that the disturbed may be attracted because of their great need for help. They may do or say bizarre things as a manifestation of their illness—not as a result of the dynamics of the movement.

8. Anton Boisen (1939) having studied members of a "holy roller" church and certain types of mental patients, found no evidence of illness in the cases he studied in the church. He found in several cases of mentally disordered individuals that the experience of the "baptism of the Holy Spirit" and tongues within the church context played for the most part a constructive role.

9. Dr. Stanley Flog, using the California Psychological Inventory with a group of Neo-Pentecostals of California, reported that "those who entered into the tongues experience were very responsible and normally well-controlled individuals." (Gerlach and Hine, 1967.)

Mansel Pattison (1968), Department of Psychiatry, University of Washington, rejects the theory that glossolalics are malcontent, socio-economically deprived, or emotionally disturbed. Pattison advances the thesis that glossolalia is a psychological accompaniment of an intense and meaningful spiritual experience for normal devoutly religious people but that it must be seen as incidental to the attainment of spiritual goals and that it can be achieved as an end itself. His emphasis is on the natural speech mechanism which produces glossolalia, which he defines

as a stereotyped pattern of unconsciously controlled vocal behavior. He feels that such an experience is available to any normal person under the right conditions, such as group-setting, appropriate motivation, and example.

10. Gerlach and Hine (1967) concluded from their interviews and interaction with members of the movement that Pentecostals are generally normally adjusted and productive members of society, and indicated that the notion that such persons were maladjusted, emotionally unstable, or emotionally deprived is contradicted by their field data.

11. L. N. Van Eetvelt Vivier (1960), a South African psychiatrist, has conducted one of the most comprehensive studies of pentecostals. He reports empirical findings that "tongue speakers scored *low* on three factors of the Cattell Personality test associated with conversion hysteria." Vivier reported no significant differences between the test and control groups on the Willoughby test for general level of neuroticism. Vivier found "no more evidence of persistent unadaptive anxiety reactions in tongue speakers or Pentecostals who have not yet spoken in tongues than in non-Pentecostals except for factors of desurgence and shrewdness-naivete on the Cattell inventory. On the desurgence factor Vivier reported that the glossolalics "although not far from the median appeared to be more 'long-circuiting' and renunciative in their habits than the control groups." They were "less realistic and practical, more concerned with feelings and thought actions and more human in their interests." (Gerlach and Hine, 1967.)

Vivier found that his test group scored lower than the control group on suggestibility and challenged the popular notion that tongue speakers are highly susceptible to suggestion. He characterized tongue speakers as "generally more sensitive, less bound by traditional orthodox thought processes, less depressed, having less generalized fear but more need for emotional catharsis." Vivier found no substantiation of "theories of dissociation as a result of an inherent weakness in neural organization, Freudian repression, or of suggestibility." For an explanation Vivier referred to Jungian concepts of the collective unconscious and what he called a "dynamic system acting on the organism." (Gerlach and Hine, 1967; McDonnell, 1970.)

"Even the most critical analysts of the movement who espouse the defective individual theory are forced to admit that glossolalics cannot be regarded as mentally ill." (McDonnell, 1970.)

Lapsely and Simpson (1964a, 1964b) have suggested that speaking in tongues resembles clinical hysteria and that the psychodynamics involved were similar to those in a person with hysterical systems. They

point out however that this does not mean that all or even most who speak in tongues could be called hysterical in a clinical setting. "Like most writers who quote Vivier, they include Vivier's findings that most of the glossolalics in his test group had poor beginnings in life and that therefore one should expect disturbed ego development, difficulty in emotional control and disturbed interpersonal relationships. Most of these writers ... do not include Vivier's companion statement that the glossolalics he tested showed marital adjustments similar to that of the control group, that is, non-tongue speaking Pentecostals and non-Pentecostals, and that their capacity for marital adjustment did not reflect higher childhood insecurity as might have been expected." (Gerlach and Hine, 1967.)

12. Nathan Gerrard (1966) of the Department of Sociology of Morris-Harvey University has conducted one of the more conclusive and interesting sociological-anthropological studies. Members of a serpent handlers cult in West Virginia, although independent of the Pentecostal movement as it is generally described, practiced glossolalia. Although not related to the present charismatic movement, from the psychological point of view this group was on the fringe, readily identifiable and constituted an excellent group for psychological study and testing.

Gerrard compared the church cult group with other church groups in the community and developed the hypothesis that the snake handlers were not psychologically disturbed individuals. He tested this hypothesis by administering the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory to the group and to members of the conventional church of a major protestant denomination in the same area. The 96 Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory's were analyzed in the Department of Psychology at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Gerrard found that both groups were essentially within the "normal limits" established by wide use of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory.

He found no evidence of systematic differences between the two groups with respect to dimension of thought disorder (psychoticism). He found with respect to neuroticism an insignificantly higher incidence within the conventional denomination than among the snake handlers. One of the psychologists who analyzed the data, Dr. Auke Tellegan, indicated that the conventional denomination presented a "somewhat more repressive and dysphoric picture." He also found them "more likely to present more symptoms of distress than were the snake handlers." What differences there were in the direction of the serpent handlers being more normal than the conventional denomination." (Gerrard and Gerrard, 1966.)

Three separate clinicians were given the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory profiles and were told that one of the groups were snake handlers. "They were asked to categorize the profiles diagnostically and then to sort out the profiles they thought belonged to the snake handlers." The clinicians' degree of bias was remarkably revealed in the results reported by Dr. Gerrard. The most abnormal profiles were assigned by the clinicians to the serpent handlers and the most normal profiles to the conventional denomination. The actual distribution indicated that the reverse was true.

"Dr. Gerrard concluded that while clinical psychologists are aware that standards of normalcy vary cross-culturally, they are less sensitive to sub-cultural differences and they are also subject to stereotyped judgments concerning the pathology of sub-cultures that are defined as deviant by the larger society." (Gerrard and Gerrard, 1966; Gerlach and Hine, 1967; McDonnell, 1970.)

13. Psychiatrists Jerome Frank (1951) and William Sargent (1949) analyzed the function of dissociation from the point of view of psychological changes of an individual. Lapsely and Simpson (1964) and Nouwen (1967) indicated that glossolalic dissociation produces only temporary conflict reduction and therefore no lasting change. "In comparing the nature of revivalistic religious experience with the process *"if* psychotherapy, Frank disagreed and reported that conversion experience of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit was a mechanism through which attitudes toward God, the self, and those in significant relationships shift in such a way as to lead to permanent attitudes and behavior changes. According to Frank these stem from the reorganization of the assumptive system or world view that is possible during such experience. Similar results can be obtained through the process of successful psychotherapy. Sargent offers the thesis that experiences such as revivalistic conversions, snake handling, glossolalia can produce an effect similar to that of electro-shock therapy. Temporary cortical inhibition breaks up previous mental and emotional patterns and frees the individual to form new ones."

Both Sargent and Frank stress the fact that the dynamics of revivalism and conversion involving dissociational experiences are such that predisposing personality characteristics or emotional maladjustments are not required as an explanation of participation. They feel that the common denominator in processes of religious conversion, some methods of psychotherapy, thought reform, and brainwashing is not a psychological state but a physiological state which can be brought about in any individual." (Gerlach and Hine, 1967)

Sargent's emphasis on the physiological mechanisms of cognitive reorganization is based on his observations of the most extreme forms of these phenomenon. Gerlach and Hine point out the difficulty in finding any evidence for physiological breakdown of the type which Sargent has observed in brainwashing and war neurosis. (Gerlach and Hine, 1967.)

14. William Wood (1965) used the Rorshach technique in an attempt "... to test the hypothesis that personality types participating in highly emotional religions will vary in some regular way from types participating in more sedate religions Unfortunately, the only significant differences between the Pentecostal and non-Pentecostal Rorshach results were in the area of shading which is the 'chief area of dispute' among Rorshach authorities concerning scoring the responses There are apparent inconsistencies in his conclusions.... Until we have more data on this aspect, all evidence concerning psychological characteristics that predispose individuals to glossolalia or to participation in the movement must be considered inconclusive." (Gerlach and Hine, 1967.)

15. Gerlach and Hine (1968) found five factors which they felt were responsible for the growth of the movement. They reported these as: (1) reticulate organization, (2) fervent and convincing recruitment, (3) commitment after experience, (4) change oriented and action motivated ideology, and (5) the perception of real or imagined opposition.

16. A section of a report of the Diocese of California Episcopal Church study commission on glossolalia. May 2, 1963, is relevant to this investigation. The report indicated that the psychiatrists on the committee generally reacted in the affirmative to the concept that speaking in tongues provided a new language which helped to overcome inadequacy. They pointed out that "our deepest feelings and convictions with the roots in the sub-conscious seldom can be adequately articulated by the conscious." The report stated "without judging whether glossolalia be of God or not, our psychiatrists sense that it could be for some, a healthy outlet freeing and enlarging religious life. Again, the scientists' research cannot determine whether it is the Holy Spirit that provides the language of the glossolalists or not, but it can affirm that the need for expression beyond normal verbalization is a wholesome part of a normal person's life. To satisfy it is to enrich life, so long as the means itself is not self-destructive." (Diocese of California, 1963.)

17. Pattison (1968) has indicated that "many adherents of the glossolalia movement assert that the experience has made a change in their lives, has improved their style and quality of personality and life. Clinicians have been hesitant to accept such testimonials. Yet a careful study

of non-pathological mystical experiences, such as the work of Deckman, Underbill, Sedman, and Saizman have illustrated that mystical experience, often in a religious context can be an integrative emotional experience that results in an altered life style with subsequent improvement in life adaptation."

18. *A Definition.* Charisma can be defined as "a spiritual gift or talent regarded as divinely granted to a person as a token of grace or favor and exemplified in early Christianity by the power of healing, gift of tongues, or prophesying." This then is a proper label, but the term is not reserved only to the religious but has other references and many times is used in non-religious contexts. By further definition, charisma is "supernatural power or virtue attributed especially to person or office, regarded as set apart from the ordinary by reason of a special relationship or, that which is considered value and is endowed with the capacity of eliciting enthusiastic popular support and leadership, symbolic unification, or direction of human affairs."

Subcommittee Procedures

In reviewing the psychological dimensions of the charismatic movement, the sub-committee listened to the testimony of clergy, both in support of the movement and against the movement. The committee met with biblical scholars, theologians, and seminarians of this and other denominations. An exhaustive review was conducted of the relevant literature, including reports of other denominations, pamphlets, journals, articles, research reports, tapes, books, etc.

Members of the subcommittee visited numerous kinds and varieties of charismatic meetings, and the entire subcommittee visited a large Episcopalian church in one of the major cities of this country to meet with the members of the church, official boards, and the minister. Approximately 80 percent of this congregation were involved participants in the charismatic dimension of the Christian experience. Members of the subcommittee interviewed approximately forty members of the congregation in groups and individually, including children, teenagers, representatives of official boards, persons from all walks of life, educational backgrounds and social classes, those who participated and were involved in the movement who had the charismatic infilling of the Holy Spirit and those who did not. Extensive interviews were held with the rector. Observations were made of a regular Friday evening charismatic meeting attended by approximately 250 persons. Individually, members of the subcommittee discussed the movement extensively with representatives of the various scientific disciplines and clergy from many denominations including the Roman Catholic Church.

The subcommittee found no evidence of pathology in the movement. The movement was found to be dynamic, growing, and involving persons from practically every denomination, walk and station in life. Varied educational backgrounds and personality patterns are present and the socio-economic status ranges from the uneducated through those in high executive positions carrying great responsibility in major corporations, in federal government and in the space effort. Physicians, psychologists, psychiatrists, scientists, professors of every description, clergy of every denomination including the hierarchy, and professors of religion and philosophy are to be found in the movement.

This portion of the report prepared by Thomas Foster, M.D., and Charles H. Meisgeier, Ed.D.

References

- Adorno, T. W., E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. Levinson, R. M. Sanford. 1950 *The Authoritarian Personality*. Harper. New York.
- Alland, Alexander. 1961 Possession in a Revivalist Negro Church. *Jnl. for the Scientific Study of Relig.* Vol. 1., No. 2
- Boisen, Anton. 1939 Economic Distress and Religious Experience: A Study of the Holy Rollers. *Psychiatry* 2: 185-194.
- Cutten, O. B. 1927 *Speaking With Tongues*. Yale Univ. Press, New Haven.
- Frank, Jerome D. 1961 *Persuasion and Healing: A Comparative Study of Psycho-therapy*. John Hopkins Press, Baltimore.
- Gerlach, L. P. and V. H. Hine. 1967 *Non-Pathological Pentecostal Glossolalia: A Summary of Relevant Psychological Literature. A Report Prepared for Director of the Pentecostal Movement Research Committee*.
- Gerlach, L. P. and V. H. Hine. 1968 Five Factors Crucial to the Growth and Spread of a Modern Religious Movement. *Jnl. for the Sci. Study of Relig.* VII: 23-40.
- Gerrard, Nathan L. and Louise B. 1966 *Scrabble Creek Folk: Mental Health Part II*. Unpublished Report, Dept. of Sociology, Morris Harvey College, Charleston, West Virginia.
- Lapsley, J. N. and J. M. Simpson.
1964 a Speaking in Tongues: Token of Group Acceptance and Divine Approval. *Pastoral Psychology*. May: 48-55.
1964 b Speaking in Tongues: Infantile Babble or Song of the Self. *Pastoral Psychology*. Sept.: 16-24.
- McDonnell, Kilian.
1968 Holy Spirit and Pentecostalism. *Commonweal*. Vol. 89, No. 6. November 1968;
1970 Catholic Problems in Evaluation Pentecostalism. *Dialog*. Winter 1970.

Pattison, E. M.

- 1964 Speaking in Tongues and About Tongues. *Christian Standard*, Feb. 15, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- 1965 The Effects of a Religious Culture's Values on Personality Psychodynamics. Read to Section H, Anthropology, Amer. Assn. for the Advancement of Science. December 1965.
- 1968 Behavioral Science Research on the Nature of Glossolalia. *Jnl. of the American Scientific Affiliation*. September 1968.

Sargant, William

- 1949 Some Cultural Group Abreductive Techniques and their Relation to Modern Treatments. *Pro. Royal Soc. of Medicine*. 42: 367 ff.
- 1957 *Battle for the Mind*. New York.

Vivier, Lincoln M. V. E. 1960 *Glossolalia*. Unpublished thesis. University of Wisconsin Dept. of Psychiatry. Microfilm available University of Chicago Union Theological Seminary.

Wood, William W. 1965 *Culture and Personality Aspects of the Pentecostal Holiness Religion*. Mouton, Paris.

Diocese of California, The Episcopal Church, Division of Pastoral Services, *Preliminary Report, Study Commission on Glossolalia*, May, 1963.