

or to God. Whatever the self is seeking, it cannot help taking certain attitudes, forming certain judgments, and this in an immediate, intrinsic, spontaneous way, toward what Lynch calls 'the images of limitation' it experiences. Lynch calls these attitudes 'theological', using the word deliberately in its broadest sense, to indicate that there is more in ourselves and in our images, myths, and dreams than meets the eye. These attitudes permeate the images, myths, and dreams so that they are always mutually forming, creating, sometimes even distorting each other.

There is no dream without wish, no Blue Mountain or Belle Rêve without human longing, and no dream-telling, myth-making, *Glass Menagerie* or *Streetcar*, without owning up to one's wish. There is a dream of paradise at the very centre of everyman which works its way out in that tissue of symbols that is myth, expressing through images of limitation the reality of every individual's life-story, personal drama, or 'myth'.

Paul's Reluctance to Baptise

by Josephine Massyngberde Ford

It has often caused the present writer some *admiratio* that in 1 Cor 1: 14-17 Paul appears to show such reluctance to baptise¹ but upon reading Kildahl's *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues*² an insight into the situation was suggested to her.

In 1 Cor 1: 14-15 Paul declares:

I am thankful (or I thank God) that I baptised none of you except Crispus and Gaius; lest any one should say that you were baptised in my name.

Such a statement is not found elsewhere either in the Pauline Corpus or the rest of the New Testament, or to my knowledge in Christian writings: this would suggest that a special situation in Corinth warranted such reluctance. One main peculiarity of the Corinthian Church was its overenthusiasm and its stress on the gift of tongues.³ The Acts of the Apostles demonstrates that on extraordinary occasions

¹Not arising as Barrett suggests from lack of appreciation for the sacrament, C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Corinthians*, Harper & Row, N.Y. 1968, p. 48.

²John P. Kildahl, *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues*, Harper and Row, 1972.

³This is the only epistle where tongues are explicitly mentioned although one might conjecture that the gift was used at Ephesus because of the reference to it in Acts 19: 1-7.

the baptism of candidates was either preceded or followed by glossolalia.⁴ That 'tongues' might have accompanied baptism in Corinth also is suggested by the fact that Paul, after listing the spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12: 4ff), emphasises the unity of the Body, which is the Church, by using a phrase occurring only once outside the Gospels and Acts⁵ 'in one Spirit were we all *baptised* into one body' (1 Cor 12:13). Then Paul embarks on a lengthy discussion of the Church as the body of Christ, the lists of the varying ministries (1 Cor 12: 27-31) his eulogy of love and then the long discussion on tongues. In other words, Paul seems to indicate that baptism was accompanied by the spiritual gifts but the one upon which he spends the most time is tongues because this was a divisive element in the Church at Corinth.⁶

One may ask, therefore, whether 'tongues' were a determining factor in the grounds or divisions mentioned in 1 Cor 1: 10-17.⁷ In his book cited above Kildahl examines the characteristics of tongues—speakers, although, as the present writer has stated in her review,⁸ he has failed to distinguish between the genuine gift of tongues, which produces unity within the person and the community, and induced tongues, which—unknown to the leader—appears to be hypnotically produced and does not yield the fruits of the Spirit.

In this research Kildahl discovered that tongue-speakers were 'more submissive, suggestible and dependent in the presence of authority figures than non-tongue-speakers'.⁹ He observes:

it was often difficult to distinguish whether glossolalists were talking about their leader or about Jesus. The leaders were regarded with a special quality of adoration, in such a way that it was difficult for an observer to know where the influence of the leader stopped and that of Jesus began. An intimate, prayerful

⁴But as F. D. Bruner (influenced by Dibelius) explains the gift of tongues in Acts:

... on the three occasions where tongues occur, they come to an entire group at once, with prophecy, bringing complete Christian initiation, and occur, in all three cases, apart from recorded effort on the part of the recipients. Speaking in tongues in Acts is on all three occasions a corporate, church-founding, group-conversion phenomenon, and never the subsequent Spirit—experience of an individual.

(*A Theology of the Holy Spirit*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1970, p. 192.) This is quite different from the understanding of tongues at Corinth, which is seen as an individual gift for private devotion or, if there is an interpreter, in the prayer meeting.

⁵Anthony A. Hoekema, *Holy Spirit Baptism*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1972, pp. 17-20.

⁶See the excellent article by J. P. M. Sweet, 'A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia', *N.T.S.* 13 no. 3 (April, 1967), pp. 173-179. Especially interesting are Sweet's seven 'Pauline points' for guidance with reference to the contemporary Pentecostal phenomena.

⁷Sweet (*ibid.*) thinks that it was the Palestinian Petrine party who overstressed glossolalia (p. 247).

⁸*Spiritual Life*, December, 1972.

⁹Kildahl, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

address was used in approaching both Jesus and the tongue-leaders.¹⁰

In the light of this it is interesting to note that at Corinth people were grouped around what appear to be *authority figures*,¹¹ not according to differing doctrinal tenets. In general elsewhere in the New Testament opponents, expositors of false doctrines, factious people or members of the circumcision party are not actually named.¹² Here the men are specified and the people's adherence to them is clearly associated with baptism.¹³ What appears to be attracting the Corinthians is the prowess of the individuals themselves, not any particular facet of their teaching. Further, in reply to the Corinthians, the apostle does not discuss doctrine but attempts to lessen the Corinthian allegiance to the leaders by commenting on the slogans, 'I belong to Paul . . . I belong to Apollos', etc., in order to show that their true allegiance should be returned to Jesus (cf Kildahl's observation above p. 2). Paul seeks to lessen the importance of the leaders by speaking of them as 'servants through whom you believed' and by insisting that only God 'can give the increase' and that all the workers are equal (1 Cor 3:8). Further he says that they have countless guides in Christ but only one Father (1 Cor 4:15).

Some of the other characteristics of induced glossolalia listed by Kildahl are divisiveness, projection of anger, group camaraderie, histrionic display, rectogression of the ego and pre-occupation with glossolalia. Some of these are quite prominent at Corinth. Dissensions (*schismata*) and quarrelling (*erides*) are mentioned in 1:10-11 as also in 11:18 (the Eucharistic assembly).¹⁴ What, however, is more characteristic of the Corinthian Church is the element of arrogance or self-confidence. In fact the word *phusioo* (be conceited or puffed up) occurs mainly in the Corinthian epistles (1 Cor 4:6 'puffed up in favour of one another'; 4:18-19; 5:2; 8:1 and 13:4) and once in Col 2:18. Paul sums up this attitude with the almost sarcastic statement:

Already you are filled! Already you have become rich! Without us you have become kings! And would that you did reign, so that we might share the rule with you! (1 Cor 4:8).

This sense of confidence, almost superiority, is observed by Kildahl. He found that glossolalists were less depressed than other people, they

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹¹Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 66-75.

¹²E.g. 1 Thess 3:6-13; Rom 16:17-20; 1 Tim 1:3-7, the opponents in Galatians and Romans and in the captivity Epistles. Contrast, however, 1 Tim. 1:20.

¹³Nowadays one frequently hears Neo-Pentecostals of various denominations saying, 'I received the Spirit from N.N.' or 'I was baptised (meaning the release of the Spirit) by N.N.'

¹⁴But Cf. Rom 1:29; 13:13; 2 Cor 12:20; Gal 5:20; Phl 1:15; 1 Tim 6:4 and Tit 3:9.

experienced a sense of well-being, a definite assurance that God loved and approved them, in short, he avers:

Confident that his cupboard will be full again tomorrow, he can afford to be generous today. Whereas depression is characterised by the feeling of inner emptiness, the glossolalist is '*filled*' (italics mine) by the Spirit. . . . Each time he speaks in tongues, he performs a physical act which he surrounds with a set of beliefs reconfirming that he is a special person, especially blessed.¹⁵

Whereas there is, naturally, a great deal of good in this, Kildahl found that the tongue-speakers did set themselves apart¹⁶ and 'exhibited a subtle disrespect for non-tongue-speakers and towards those who showed no interest in joining their numbers'.¹⁷ If this occurred at Corinth, then it is understandable why Paul devoted so many words to true and false wisdom (1 Cor 1: 18-31; 2: 1-16; 3: 18-23) and why *kauchaomai* (be confident) *kauchema* (boast) and *kauchesis* (boast) occurs with high frequency in the Corinthian correspondence in contrast to the rest of the New Testament.¹⁸ Paul was also obliged to remind them of their lack of sensitivity towards others, especially the 'weaker' brethren.¹⁹

One might also note an implicit reference to retrogression of the ego in 1 Cor 3: 1-4 where Paul speaks of the Corinthians as babes, and also to histrionic display in Paul's underestimation of the importance of visionary and ecstatic experience in 2 Cor 12: 1-10. Pre-occupation with glossolalia is surmised from the disproportionate space given to this subject in 1 Corinthians and in no other book in the New Testament.

In summary, the present writer would suggest that the divisions in Corinth were caused by submission to the authority figures through whom the people believed that they had received the gift of tongues. As tongues may in many cases have been 'induced tongues', not the genuine gift, this led to other undesirable characteristics associated with induced glossolalia. The Corinthian problems have their root here rather than in gnosticism. It must, however, be noted that Paul does not condemn the genuine gift of tongues but supports it by listing it among the ministries of the Spirit and giving advice concerning its proper use in private and in public worship. However, 'induced tongues' associated with baptism may have led him to refrain from administering the sacrament himself and caused him to include 'one baptism' among the seven facets of union in Eph 4: 4-6.

¹⁵Kildahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-47.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 66-68.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 69.

¹⁸*Kauchaomai* occurs 21 times in 1 and 2 Corinthians against 11 times in the rest of the New Testament; *kauchema* 6 times against 5 and *kauchesis* 7 times against 4.

¹⁹Cf. D. Daube, 'Re-creation and Beyond' in *Jesus and Man's Hope*, vol. II, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1971, pp. 223-245.