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Foreword
This edition of JEPTA includes a collection of articles relating to theological, biblical and historical issues that are of particular interest to Pentecostal and Charismatic Christians. Increasingly, students of Pentecostal phenomena are providing a variety of contributions concerning topics, some of which have only being commented on in depth in recent years. At the same time, questions are being asked concerning the pilgrimage, direction and beliefs and praxis of Pentecostals in a context of stimulating objectivity and encouragement. It is to be hoped that this spirit of co-operation and maturity will develop, itself the result of the motivating work of the Spirit.

Walter Hollenweger, from the standpoint of a life of study and association with Pentecostalism, asks some searching questions concerning reconciliation. This theme is developed in the context of a study of Acts by Matthias Wenk. Keith Warrington examines aspects of importance to healing within the context of British Pentecostalism, offering some comments for the refining of such beliefs. Writing within the context of being the senior minister of the largest Pentecostal church in Britain, Colin Dye revisits the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, calling for a return to the distinctives of Pentecostalism in the local church.

Valdis Teraudkalns reveals the contribution made by William Fetler to the development of Pentecostalism in Latvia while Peter Kay examines the significance of the gift of speaking in tongues to the missionary activity of the Pentecostal Missionary Union.

I am pleased to draw your attention to the Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies. This journal, recently launched, has already produced several articles of note to those interested in Pentecostal topics. I am pleased to be able therefore to recommend it to you for your perusal. You may subscribe or receive a sample copy by writing to Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies, PO Box 377, Baguio City 2600, Philippines; email to apts@xc.org. The subscription rates including surface mail are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>1 year</th>
<th>2 years</th>
<th>3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>P200.00</td>
<td>P400.00</td>
<td>P500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>US$10.00</td>
<td>US$20.00</td>
<td>US$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>US$15.00</td>
<td>US$20.00</td>
<td>US$40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keith Warrington
The Challenge of Reconciliation

Walter J. Hollenweger

The fact that the EPTA conference invites me to Erzhausen is in itself a reconciliatory act, so is the recent decision by the Society for Pentecostal Studies to give me a "Life Time Achievement Award" in recognition of my scholarly contributions to the Charismatic/Pentecostal tradition (Evangel University, Springfield, MO., 12th March 1999). I know I have written and said many things that did not especially amuse Pentecostals. But in the meantime many Pentecostals realized that I did not want to harm Pentecostalism, that I think on the contrary that there is considerable potential in this movement in particular amongst the younger academically trained Pentecostal leaders. I even expect from them an impetus for our sleeping theological faculties and the ecumenical movement which is at present in a crisis. Perhaps some Pentecostals have discovered that what I have done—although they did not always like it—has put Pentecostalism squarely and fairly on the academic and ecclesiastical agenda. No longer can one theologically ignore the Pentecostal revival with a haughty and superior smile. A number of academic teachers and church leaders realize that these issues are not the hobby-horse of some sectarians but questions of life and death of our whole church.

CHALLENGING MEMORIES

It is well known that many pioneers of Pentecostalism were women. In all countries I know, women did much of the pioneering evangelism. In Seymour's Azusa Street Revival, women were prominent in the leadership of the church. It is also well known that Seymour tried to build bridges between the classes, nations, the social, cultural, denominational divides, thus concentrating on a reconciliatory ministry. The tools of this ministry were not theological propositions but prayer, African music, a healing ministry and testimonies. He did therefore not include in his confession of faith adult baptism, nor did he have a paragraph on the inspiration of Scripture, or even "verbal" inspiration. He also did not formulate the doctrine of "initial evidence". On the other hand, baptism of believers was practised, speaking in tongues was prominent and of course everybody believed in the reliability of Scripture.

Today, many teach a doctrine of inspiration. But what does it mean for our church policy, our witness in the world and our personal spirituality? We have a doctrine of "initial evidence", but only 35% of our people speak in tongues. In fact, one can generally observe that when experience fades, doctrine gets harder. One may notice a parallel development in the Roman Catholic Church. The less Catholic priests live a celibate life, the more the pope speaks about celibacy. The more female pastoral assistants take over the leadership of catholic parishes, the
more the curia opposes female ministry. The result is that in many places the
catholic church can only survive by being openly disobedient to the pope. Is there
a similar process going on in Pentecostalism?

Let’s take another example of a challenging memory, namely the founder of
German Pentecostalism, Jonathan Paul. He baptised children because he thought
that something special had happened at his own baptism as a baby. He remained a
reconciler all his life although he was cruelly persecuted and vilified by the
evangelicals of his time - not by the official churches. These were not interested
in him - to their own disadvantage. Paul and his followers said that “verbal
inspiration” of Scripture was an unchristian doctrine. He had a high respect of
theological scholarship and did his final examination at the University of
Greifswald with an essay in Latin on the Holy Spirit. He did not condemn
smoking but gave up smoking himself so that he could give the money thus
emptised to the mission. He was one of the first Pentecostal ecumenists. It is
no accident that one of his followers, Christian Krust, was the first Pentecostal to
address a Full Assembly of the WCC.4

The American Assemblies of God have also a challenging history of
reconciliation. They had, up to the late sixties, an office at the very seat of
Babylon, namely at 475 Riverside Drive, New York, at the headquarters of the
NCCC and the American branch of the WCC. They worked prominently and
regularly in the committees of these bodies.5 This reconciliation ministry was
suddenly destroyed. Women were put in their place. A doctrine of inspiration
of Scripture, foreign to Pentecostalism, was invented. Relationships with
ecumenical bodies and other churches were frozen. Racism and sectarianism
replaced the earlier spirit of reconciliation. All this happened in order to please
their former arch-enemies, the evangelicals. The Assemblies of God were given
the presidency of the American Association of Evangelicals, but at what a price!
We could tell similar stories from other countries: an ecumenical, reconciliatory
movement was destroyed and turned into sectarianism which was camouflaged as
newly discovered faithfulness to Scripture. How little do we know our own
history!

The Pentecostal Movement is in itself a striking example of reconciliation.
Catholic elements, Holiness and evangelical elements, black oral elements,
critical and ecumenical elements have been blended together and reconciled in a
way which is extremely promising. This shows also in a number of outstanding
ecumenical personalities, such as David De Plessis, Donald Gee, politique Dalliere,
Gerrit Roelof Polman, Killian McDonnell, Peter Hocken, Wolfgang Failing,
Jerry Sandige, Daniel Brandt-Bessiere, Jean-Daniel Pluess, Veli-Matti
Karkkainen, David Cole, Cecil M. Robeck and many others. We find in the
Pentecostal academic associations Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist-Holiness,
Lutheran and many other scholars. They all try to bring together the insights of
their own tradition with the experience of Pentecost. One could tell fascinating
stories on each one of them. Perhaps some of the most important (but least
known) reconcilers are those who open our eyes to the African Diaspora in

Europe. These Africans work in Holland, Germany, Switzerland, France, Italy,
Great Britain and many other countries. They actively seek reconciliation with
the mainstream churches and the ecumenical organisations. These immigrant
churches are probably more important evangelists and reconcilers than most of
us.6 So both the challenge and the facticity of reconciliation is here, right before
our doorsteps. However, intellectual understanding and theological interpretation
of these reconciling events have still to be developed.

CHALLENGING PRESENCE

The present time is characterised by a communication revolution. We can today
simultaneously be present almost everywhere in the world. Through television we
take part in what happens worldwide. Through internet we can communicate with
the whole world at a mouse-click.

Pentecostals are very eager in using these media, for instance by communicating
with their Third World sister churches.7 That is an important development,
although it is not without problems. These electronic media may further
understanding and reconciliation. They may also be another means of
colonisation and indoctrination. They may destroy local Pentecostal cultures and
replace them by a kind of imported media-Pentecostalism.

The electronic tools have drastically changed the political, economic, theological
and social scene of the world. Examples: Only that which is reported on
television, has really happened. That which happens and is not reported on
television is disregarded - a serious change of perception. That is also the reason
why - at least in Europe - the most important revival movement of our century is
practically unknown to the public at large. Or another example: A politician is no
longer measured by his political competence but by his ability to communicate on
television. Democracy means today not an ongoing dialogue amongst the
politically articulate citizens but it means to convince the electorate with a few
snappy statements on the media. Internet and computers make it possible to win
or lose billions in just a few seconds.

In the world of business not the better manager is promoted, but the faster.
Everything has to happen immediately. The one who can organise a merger faster
is considered the better manager. The quality of work is no longer of any interest,
only the speed. For instance, in order to judge the viability of a big merger, one
would need at least three to five years. Only then can one say whether the merger
in question is in the interest of the company or even of society at large. But this
time is not available. After five years the director responsible for the merger has
moved on to another company and the original company has already merged with
other companies.

Very few people can understand the computer-programmes at the stock
exchange. That’s why they sometimes produce their own economy, not to speak of
the risks of computerised nuclear technology with its unsolved problem of
waste. I have experienced myself that a salesman told me: The computer says it,
even if this was the most idiotic statement and I could calculate in my head that the computer was wrong. The computer says it! Fullstop. That sounds like: The pope said it. There is no time for critical reflection. Everything happens fast: Fast food, fast learning, fast reading, instant coffee, instant religion, instant sanctification, instant conversion, even instant love!

The official opinion makers say, with these tools we can win time. The contrary is true. We have less time. Everything is accelerated and we have less and less time. There are a number of economists and sociologists who ask themselves: Why is that so? And one of them, Professor Gross from the University of St. Gallen, comes to the following conclusion: We have cancelled Heaven. That's why we must compress everything into a lifespan of 70 years or less. And within this lifetime we must go through education, build up a career, found a family and build up a relationship with a partner. And all this in the shortest possible time. No wonder, we have no time. But if there was a Heaven, we would not be in such a hurry. We would have all eternity at our disposal. An interesting thought by a secular scholar!

Are Pentecostals different and do they have time? Do they have something to offer to reconcile these different trends? Do they really believe in Heaven and do they therefore not have to say: Nevermind whether it is true or not, good or bad, the main thing is that it works. That is - as we know - the temptation of Pentecostals.

Let me give a story, which one of my doctoral students, John Davis, told me. Davis reported how thirty Californian businessmen came to Thailand, where Davis was the director of a Bible College. They arrived by jumbo jet and distributed tracts on which John 3:16 was printed in Thai. Now, every Thai will gladly accept what a foreigner gives him. He is far too polite to refuse. And if the foreigner asks him, "Do you want to give your life to the Lord Jesus Christ?" he will of course say, "Yes". One does not say "no" to a foreign guest. After their two week evangelistic campaign, the Americans held a great farewell meeting at which they said that they had converted more people in two weeks than the missionaries in ten years.

That hurt my doctoral student greatly, for he was a conscientious missionary. So he told his fellow researchers in the doctoral seminar what a Buddhist Thai understands when he reads John 3:16 in Thai. First there is the question of God. Whether there is a god or no god, who can know that? But anyhow foreigners believe in a god, so let it be conceded. But a God who loves, furthermore a God who loves the world, and a God who has a son, that is either great nonsense or even a blasphemy. And a God who promises life eternal - no thank you! That would be like a Protestant offering a Catholic eternal purgatory if he converted to Protestantism. Life eternal is the last thing a Buddhist wants. He wants to get out of this continuous circle of reincarnations; he wants to be freed from the power of karma. So, in this context salvation means not "life eternal" but the end, the breaking out of this eternal circle. The American businessmen were - in their own terms - fast and efficient. But their work was of no value because they refused to think!

When I started my studies, my church in Zurich said: You cannot afford to study. Time is short. There is no time to study, to find out what is true and what is not true. We must work. That is an argument, as if there was no Heaven. I have met many Pentecostals who said: We have no time for finding out what people understand if we give them a biblical text, say John 3:16. No time to find out whether what we do is wrong or right. The main thing is to do at least something. Even if we do not know in which direction to go, at least let us go!

In the face of the European historical churches, this attitude is understandable because sometimes one has the impression that - instead of doing something - they always say: Zuerst muss die Grundsatzfrage geklart werden. First, we must clarify the principle. And so they clarify the principle until they die.

That is of course not what I advocate. But the opposite is equally dangerous. If the question is no longer "Is it true? And is it understandable?" but only "Does it work? Can we sell it?" why are we Christians at all? What I advocate is an intellectual discipline which is based on the model of "Reflection Upon Action", that means: If I have an idea - let's say a different approach to European evangelism by involving non-Christians in the production of the Bonhoeffer-Requiem or another play - I do it. But then I have to stop, to stand back, look at it, ask other people what they think about it, and try again - this time hopefully better."

For these and other reasons there are people who refuse to use internet, computers, television and fax. They realise that these things are not only tools but media that change our whole outlook on life and theology. They steal not only our time, they steal Heaven. The medium is the message. I must confess that I myself have no television, no fax, no computer and no internet, but not for theological reasons but for reasons of personal discipline. I leave these things to others. At the age of 70, I do not think it necessary to invest in these media. It takes too much time for me which I better use for thinking, for talking to people and for prayer. Others might come to a different conclusion. If I were younger I would probably try to discipline myself in order to use these media in the interest of the kingdom of God.

**CHALLENGING SCRIPTURE**

In another field, however, in a media in which Pentecostals are very reluctant to invest much, I have invested many years of my life. It is the modern tool of historical-critical interpretation of the bible. Let me say right from the beginning, it seems that this too is going to change in Pentecostalism. If Pentecostals want to communicate in the academic world, they will have to learn to use this media. It has its advantages and disadvantages. We owe it to the historical-critical method that we have a reliable biblical text and that we have now a more precise biblical tradition than the reformers had. Luther, for instance, translated Philippians 3:20: "Unser Wandel ist im Himmel" (Our walk is in heaven). Likewise the Authorised
If we do not find it, we might face the same problems as the mainline churches. It is well known that during the Reformation, Protestants and Catholics disagreed. I always thought that we could find a way to combine intellectual honesty with pastoral concern. Let us pray that Pentecostals could do better than the Presbyterians, Lutherans, Methodists, Baptists and Catholics. Unfortunately, that is probably also true. It is a dilemma which we share with all of those who are different from those of the world. We also owe it to critical exegesis that we now know that there was among the apostles at least one female apostle, the famous Iounia.\(^1\)

Furthermore, the results of critical exegesis are vital for a sound interpretation of Scripture. It is not true that without intellectual work everybody can understand Scripture so that they may preach in public. Scripture has not been written for us but for the addressees indicated in the biblical texts, namely the Gospel of Luke for Thelphilus, the Gospel of Matthew for the narrative community of Matthew, the Gospel of John for the Johannine community which was in a severe dispute with the Jewish synagogue. Therefore the synagogue excommunicated the Christians from the synagogue (John 16:2). That had grave repercussions because it meant that they lost their status as religio licita, as protected religion. And the Jews knew very well that this action would deliver the Christians to the Roman police, to prison, torture and perhaps even capital punishment. Understandably, but historically not correct, John describes the trial of Jesus as a kind of lynching-justice, where a howling and shouting mob of Jews demanded from Pilate the crucifixion of Jesus even if that meant the freedom of the murderer Barrabas. John even puts such words into the mouth of Jesus: "The father of the Jews is the devil" (John 8:44), something which is unthinkable for the historical Jesus. It has had far-reaching consequences for the relations between Jews and Christians. It is one thing that a small persecuted Christian community sees in the trial of Jesus the dark machinations of a Jewish mob. It is quite another thing if a mighty Christian church repeats this statement of John and persecutes and harasses a small Jewish community.

A prominent leader of the EPTA conference at Erzhausen told me after my lecture: What you say about the Gospel of John is, of course, true. On this issue there is no disagreement. However, if you say such things in a Pentecostal congregation, you will disqualify yourself as a bona fide bible-expositor. Unfortunately, that is probably also true. It is a dilemma which we share with all those churches which have university-trained theologians. However, I always thought, we Pentecostals could do better than the Presbyterians, Lutherans, Methodists, Baptists and Catholics. I always thought - and still think - we could find a way to combine intellectual honesty with pastoral concern. Let us pray so that we find a way out of this dilemma.

If we do not find it, we might face the same problems as the mainline churches. It is well known that during the Reformation, Protestants and Catholics disagreed on almost everything. But on one thing they were united, namely, that Jews and Anabaptists had to be harassed, persecuted, burned and drowned. The attack on the "irregular people" is an old tradition in Christianity. One of the latest examples is the ill-famed Berlin declaration of 1909 which says that Pentecostalism is from below. What is the reason for such a statement? The stated reasons are (1) that Pentecostals did not have a reformation theology; they had a holiness theology; (2) they behaved strangely, "irregularly" by falling to the ground, weeping and laughing and speaking in tongues; and (3) its cradle is in Los Angeles, a meeting point of spiritists; some of its manifestations are clearly demonic.

However, points (1) and (2) are not new in German church history. We find similar features in all German revivals. None of these revivals was qualified as "from below" or "demonic". What then is the reason for this extraordinary judgement? The reason lies in the general cultural climate of Germany at that time. Not only was it the time of beginning anti-Semitism, it was also the time, when everything unGerman was considered inferior, in particular that which came from black people, Jazz and Spirituals. In these things leading Germans saw a "danger for Europe". This cultural "bolshevism", this revolutionary attack on all which the German elites held dead, this unseemly behaviour which was unworthy of the German academic and cultural elite filtered through into German evangelicalism and made them see in Pentecostalism not only cultural bolshevism and expressions of subhuman Negroes but a black import into white Germany from the dark side of humanity. That had to be stopped.

Most astonishing is that German (and other) Pentecostals for a long time did not see in Anti-Judaism a danger for the Gospel. I know only of one Pentecostal who took sides with the Jews. And that was the French Reformed pastor and charismatic leader, Louis Dalliere. Pentecostals only discovered their love for the Jews when the state of Israel was organised. So much on John's Gospel and its uncritical adaptation.

I want to end this overview of the tool of critical interpretations with a look on the role which John's Revelation has played in Pentecostalism. Also, Revelation has not been written for us despite of all which Pentecostals have discovered in it from the Union to the World Council of Churches and the Vatican. None of this is in the book of Revelation. That book was written for the seven churches in Asia Minor, a persecuted and small minority which struggled against an almighty Roman economic, political and religious power. In recent years, serious misgivings of this fanciful interpretation have been voiced among Pentecostals.\(^{3}\) One begins to see, that this book too has to be interpreted in his historical context. That does not exclude that it has an important message for us today. That message for us today is called rightly by the churches "the inspiration of Scripture". Listen for instance to the following passage:

John, the prophet, prophesied about the business of this earth. He did not differentiate between the Full Gospel Business Men, the half Gospel Business Men and the secular business men. That is what he said: And the
business men of the earth weep and mourn, since no-one buys their cargo any more - and now comes a complete list of the Chicago Commodity Exchange: cargo of gold, silver, jewels and pearls, fine linen, purple, silk and scarlet, all articles of costly wood, bronze, iron and marble, cinnamon, spice, incense, myrrh, frankincense, wine, oil, dairy products, fine flour and wheat, cattle and sheep, horses and cars, and slaves, even human souls are a commodity for them. The business men, who gained wealth from their trade, will stand far off, in fear of torment, weeping and mourning aloud. And all the shipmasters and seafaring men, sailors and board directors of the tourism industry, stand far off and cry, for in one hour all this wealth has been laid waste. The business men who deceived the whole world with their sorcery (in Greek: pharmakeia which also means the pharmaceutical and chemical industry) cry and weep. For in one hour this whole wealth was destroyed. (Apk. 18).30

This text is not from the Communist Manifesto. It is in the Bible and it describes more than a stock exchange crash. It is the crash of the whole system. There are many secular analysts today who think this to be a realistic scenario. It does not come about because of a miraculous collapse. It is purely man-made. What about Pentecostal theology vis-a-vis this scenario? It seems to me that the future of Pentecostal theology lies in a clear option for spiritual and intellectual priorities. What do we say to the syncretism between capitalism and Christianity with its devastating effects for our world?

What I want to say with these examples is this: Historical-critical interpretation is not only a medium, but a tool which also changes our perception of the biblical content. That does not mean that we have to follow every fashion of modern interpretation. But we have to use this medium as we use other modern media. The result will be that we discover a plurality of theologies, spiritualities, moralities and liturgies in the biblical tradition, just as there is a tremendous variety of Pentecostal traditions in Pentecostalism, in particular if we consider the ever-growing Third World Pentecostal churches.

The unity of the Christian church was never rooted in a uniform doctrine, neither in New Testament time nor in church history. It is true that the churches always tried to structure a uniform doctrine. Where this was successful (mostly it was not) it led to separate church bodies or to a sterile church. Unity of the church is based on prayer, on fellowship with those who disagree with us (see the fact that Paul made a collection for his theological enemies), in a common celebration of the eucharist (not a common sacramental theology), in the conviction that all theology must be centred in Christ (but not in a common Christology), in the experience that no-one can be a Christian on his own and no church can be the church in isolation. It seems to me that this is an ecumenical ministry of reconciliation which should appeal to Pentecostals.

Where I live, in the Bernese Oberland, there is a mountain, called the Stockhorn. Seen from the viewpoint of Thun it looks like a trapezoid. If you climb another mountain, let’s say the Gammelalpstock, the Stockhorn appears like a triangle. If you take the cable-train and go on top of the Stockhorn, you see a restaurant and it smells of chips, steak and beer. If you take a plane and look at the Stockhorn, it looks like a cone. And if you drive a shaft into the Stockhorn you discover its geological strata. And yet it is always the same Stockhorn. It looks very different depending from where, from which viewpoint you observe it. The whole Stockhorn, the Stockhorn in its entirety is not simultaneously observable by a human being. That is the principle of all scholarship, including mathematics and physics. We do not know what is, we know only how it appears to us. There is no objective truth for humans. That is reserved to God.

If we are scholars we will indicate from which viewpoint a phenomenon appears to us in a specific way. It is the same with Christ. We have the different viewpoints of the Gospels, the synoptic Gospels with their view of Christ as the eschatological son of man, the Gospel of John with its view that Christ is the way, the truth and the life, Paul with his view that Christ is kyrios, pròtòma and sótèr. All of them are right - from their viewpoint. Of course, it is possible to systematise and combine all these statements. But by doing this we will not come to an objective view of Christ. We come only to another viewpoint on him. Therefore, the time is over when one tradition - the Pentecostal, the Catholic, the Protestant - can say: We know Christ objectively. They know him from their point of view. And that is why we need each other. Each view is provisional ("ek merous", I Cor. 13:9). The complete view of Christ is reserved for the beyond. Amen. “Then we shall understand fully, even as we have been fully understood” (I Cor. 13:27). That is why it is dangerous for humanity and for theology to cancel heaven. Heaven reminds us of our provisional knowledge.

CHALLENGING PRAXIS

I have asked myself many times what moral right do Pentecostals have to ask Blacks and Whites in America, Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda, Muslims and Christians in Switzerland, Albanians and Serbs in ex-Yugoslavia to live peacefully in the same place, in the same schools, in the same offices? What right do we have if Pentecostals of different types and convictions fight each other? What moral right do we have, if the slightest deviation from the party-line is punished by the loss of livelihood in Pentecostalism, by severe sanctions and the calling off of a lifelong fellowship? Please forgive me that I do not give specific examples, although I could do so easily.

When I was a young Pentecostal pastor, my ministry was questioned because my wife used nail-varnish and wore a wooden necklace. My ministry was put at risk because I refused to criticise young female converts who wore short hairstyles, such as the lady who gave us a very uplifting prophecy during the eucharistical service of the EPTA conference. A prophecy by a woman, who had even put rouge on her lips would have been outright rejected in the Swiss Pentecostal movement in the fifties. We may laugh nowadays at such childish prohibitions. At that time it was a dead-serious affair. It was the topic of night-long theological
debates amongst the Swiss Pentecostal pastors. One of the main exegetical proof-
texts was Samson, who lost his spiritual power when his hair was cut. Nobody
seemed to notice that Samson was a man and not a woman. Taking the hairstyle
of Samson as a criterion for spirituality, the hippies and freaks who congregated
around our meeting-place would have looked much more spiritual than any of the
Pentecostals pastors. It is clear now that this controversy was simply a tool to
make Pentecostalism a male-chauvinistic sect.

Perhaps in ten years time we will also laugh at some hotly debated controversies
of today, let us say on cohabitation, 23 on compulsory re-baptism, 24 on the
definition of Spirit baptism or on our understanding of Scripture. Laughing these
things off is not a way of reconciliation. It is, however, a way of reconciliation to
recognise these differences and rejoice in the fact that we can be Pentecostals in
many different ways. Pentecostal spirituality could become a school of tolerance
and an example to the world.

Many think they can take refuge in Augustine who said: In principal things, unity
- in secondary things, diversity - in everything, love. That would be a good way
out if we could agree on what are the principal things. In the fifties, women's
attire was a principal thing in the Swiss Pentecostal Mission. Just as that, which
we hold dear now, is always a matter of principle.

Things are changing very fast. At the EPTA conference in Erzhausen, we were
told that in a Dutch congregation half of the members were heavy smokers and
that the smokers were better soul-winners than the non-smokers. Such changes in
attitude will produce conflicts as they did in New Testament times. These early
Christians were confronted with two existing but mutually exclusive interpretations of the divine will. 25 Just to say, "times are different now" is a
cheap excuse. We have to communicate to our churches that any text is
codetermined by its context.

One may ask: Is there no heresy? Does that mean that everything goes? No, of
course not. But the borderlines are shifting just as they were shifted in New
Testament times and during the short history of Pentecostalism. The biggest
heresy is to take my view of the Stockhorn for the only one or perhaps just for the
best one. That is a gross overstatement of my intellectual capacities. That is also
true for my paper! Furthermore, the touchstone of any theology is Christ. If a
theology loses sight of the centrality of Christ, the decisiveness of his person,
work and message and replaces this by my experience, my church or by a general
principle - that might still be a good thing but it ceases to be Christian theology.
And furthermore, it is always a good sign if we continually learn from the biblical
authors how our provisional view might be helpful in a specific situation.

From this point of view, reconciliation does not only appear easy but it appears as
the most normal Christian behaviour. We can be glad that there are people who
think otherwise. We can be glad that there are Pentecostals who are Pentecostal in
different way from ours. So, let me end with a question: What is our
contribution to the fulfilment of Christ's prayer that "all should be one", knowing
full well that so-called "spiritual unity" is a cheap excuse for doing nothing? How
do we publicly (or even institutionally) express our mutual respect, our
dependence on each other, in a visible way? And what instruments do we develop
so that our ministry of reconciliation becomes visible in church and society?

Endnotes
1 In order not to overload this paper with footnotes I refer here in general to my
Pentecostalism, Origins and Developments Worldwide (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997), where
one finds the documentation to the statements. In German: Charismatische pfingstesliches
Christentum. Herkunft. Situation. okumetische Chance (Gottigen: Vanden boeck &
Ruprecht, 1997).
2 David Barrett, "Statistics. Global", in Stanley M. Burgess and others (eds.), Dictionary of
Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements. (Grand Rapids, 1988), 810-830, quote, 820.
3 Christian Krust, Was wir glauben, lehren und bekennen (Aldorf/11bg: Missionsbuchhandlung
und Verlag, 1963) 117, 120. C.O. Vogel, Pfingstsgschaft (1921). 20ff (quoted in Krust,
Fünzig Jahre deutsche Pfingstbewegung Mithrener Richtung (Aldorf/11bg: Missionsbuchhandlung
und Verlag, 1963), 237ff. P. Gercke, Christliche Vollkommenheit
und Geisteserlebnisse (Rietema/Wutb.: Gercke, 1950), 16.
4 Krust, "The Pentecostal Churches and the Ecumenical Movement", in the Uppsala Report
(1968), Official Report of the Fourth Assembly of the WCC. Uppsala July 4-20, 1968, ed. N.
5 Cecil M. Boebeck, "The Assembly of God and Ecumenical Co-operation" in Wonsuk Ma
Menzies (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 107-150.
6 See The Pentecostals (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988 3), 208-216; R.M. Ross, Donald Gee: In
Search of a Church, A sectarian in Transition, Th.D. dissertation, Knox College, Toronto,
94-103.
7 See his many publications in my Pentecostalism, 430-31.
8 W.E. Failing "Neue charismatische Bewegung in den Landeskirchen", in Hollenweger (ed.),
Die Pfingstkirchen. Selbstdarstellungen. Dokumente. Kommunen (Die Kirchen der Welt VII;
9 Daniel Brand-Beissir. Aux sources de la spiritualité pentecôtiste (Geneva: Labor et Fides,
1986).
10 Jean-Daniel Pluess. Theoretische and Prophetische Narratives in Worship. A Hermeneutic Study
of Testimonies and Visions. Their Potential Significance for Christian Worship and Social
More on Pluess in my Pentecostalism (index).
11 Veli-Matti Karkkainen, Spiritus abi vult spirat. Pneumatology in Roman Catholic -
Pentecostal Dialogue (1972-1989) (Schriften der Luther-Aricola Gesellschaft 42; Helsinki;
Luther Agricola Society, 1998). See also his "Habituationsschrift" on a very controversial
topic: Ad Utinam Terrae. Evangelization, Priselyism, and Common Witness in the Roman
Frankfurt: Lang, 1999).
12 David Cole, Pentecostal Koinonia: An Emerging Ecumenical Ecclesiology Among
Will be published in the "Studies for Intercultural History of Christianity", Frankfurt: Lang,
1999. Detailed on Karkkainen and Cole see Hollenweger, "Roman Catholics and Pentecostals
Community Forming Power: Reconciliation and the Spirit in Acts

Matthias Wenk

INTRODUCTION

Throughout Luke-Acts, the restoration of the people of God is characterised by a twofold reconciliation between God and his people and among his people (cf. Lk. 1:17 and John's subsequent ministry in 3:1-18). Thereby, salvation comprises a this-worldly dimension (cf. Lk. 4:16-30). In Luke-Acts, it is precisely this community which represents this side of salvation. It will be inquired how Luke relates in Acts (with the exception of the Pentecost account) this soteriological concept to his pneumatology. Can the restoration of inter-personal relationships be traced back to the work of the Spirit? To answer this question, it needs to be demonstrated how the Spirit and charismatic manifestations became instrumental in redefining and constituting the people of God and her ethos. Based on the analysis of the community as the this-worldly dimension of salvation, it will be argued that the Spirit is instrumental in effecting salvation. It will further be suggested that any redefinition of a community's existing character represents a crisis moment and a conflict between continuity and discontinuity with the community's past, and becomes an ethico-religious issue ('a change within the community's symbolic universe'). At the centre of this conflict is the self-identity of the community and the question: 'Who are we?'

This study will (1) look at the community as the this-worldly dimension of salvation as well as at Luke's attitude to schisms and conflicts in the church as presented in Acts in general, (2) establish a pattern for conflict-resolving as outlined in the Agabus incident (Acts 20:36-21:16) and elucidate the role of the Spirit in it, and (3) apply this pattern to some of the 'crisis moments' of the early church in Acts. It will also be argued that the Spirit is in some conflicts instrumental in the preservation of the community's unity and thus exercises an ethical influence on the church's life. Thereby it will be suggested that the restoration of the people of God, characterised by an interpersonal reconciliation, is related to the Spirit. It will also be proposed that the Spirit was instrumental in redefining the 'restored Israel'; the new liberated community is the result of the Spirit's intervention throughout Acts. Those passages in which the Spirit is clearly the source of bold witness (i.e. Acts 4:23-31) will not be considered, nor will all the initial Spirit-experiences be discussed. This study will rather focus on the Spirit's role in the preservation of the community's unity in times of transition and conflict.
COMMUNITY AS THE THIS-WORLDLY DIMENSION OF SALVATION AND THE THREAT OF SCHISM IN THE EARLY (LUCAN) CHURCH


The assessment that belonging to God's people is part of Lukan soteriology not only concurs with the evidence found in Luke-Acts but also with Jewish hopes both in the Old Testament and in intertestamental Judaism. Following Hanson, Turner argues that throughout Jewish writings one finds the belief that God created the universe in harmony. But it was also the Jewish understanding that humanity's rebellion against God caused the rise of competing claims within the creation; division became part of this world-order. 'By contrast with the present state of affairs, the day of the Lord was to be seen as the day when God subjects all competing powers to himself and thus restores the universe to harmony', best called a cosmic reconciliation (cf. Zech. 14:9; Isa. 95; 11:1-9; 16:8/9; 20:1; 73:1; Tobit 14:6-9; Syb. Or. 3:796-808; Jud. 4:26).

This (ecclesiological) dimension of Lukan soteriology becomes critical in any discussion of conflicts and the threat of schism in Acts. Since 'to be saved' and 'to be in community' are essentially identical, divisions or the exclusion from community may reflect a certain disorder in the realisation of this-worldly dimension of salvation.

Before the role of the Spirit can be discussed in the realisation and restoration of community and unity as well as in the resolution of conflicts (preservation from schism) in Acts, these situations must be identified. The focus is on specific conflict situations and times of transition in the church and the role of the Spirit in it or in bringing people into the community so that they have a share in salvation. This basic definition will be adopted that a conflict is the simultaneous existence, or competition, or incompatibility of mutually exclusive or opposite desires, ideas, interests and wills. Our position regarding the conflicts in Acts is that Luke's emphasis may be on the conflict resolution and not so much on the absence of conflicts in the earliest church. The reason for 'downplaying' or 'ignoring' some of the discord is not merely his concern to present an 'idealised' picture of the church. He is concerned to present a model to a community threatened by schism to preserve her unity.

There are several turning points and conflicts of the church indicated in Acts. Each influx of new people and groups of people into the community was at the same time a crisis moment, characterised by the struggle between continuity and discontinuity with the community's previous character:

- the mass conversions at the day of Pentecost (2:41)
- the inclusion of Gentiles into the community (10:1-11:18)
- the conflict between Paul and Barnabas (15:36-41)
- the conflict between the church in Tyre and Paul (21:1-15)
- the controversy around Paul's ministry (21:1-15)
- the conflict in Acts 6 between the Hellenistic and Hebraic group in the church
- the inclusion of the Samaritans into the community (8:4-25)
- the apprehension of the Jerusalem church concerning accepting Paul (9:26-31)
- the inclusion of Gentiles into the community (10:1-11:18)
- the conflict with the Judaizers and the council (15:1-35)
- the conflict between Paul and Barnabas (15:36-41)
- the church's relationship to the disciples of John the Baptist (19:1-7)
- the church's relationship to the disciples of John the Baptist (19:1-7)
- the conflict in Acts 6 between the Hellenistic and Hebraic group in the church

Paul's speech in Miletus (20:28-31) makes it also clear that the community will be (is?) threatened by false teaching and schism, originating both from within and from outside. The fact that this is Paul's only speech to fellow Christians as well as its decisive place in the overall structure of Acts, demands that it is given due weight in any consideration on the purpose of Acts. It seems that the community to which the 'testament' was handed down was threatened by schism. Hence, it may be argued, Luke's concern was not simply to present an idealised picture of the earliest church, but most probably also to provide a model for resolving conflicts and preserving her unity in times of transitions and other contentions.


It is now that the role of Spirit in the preservation of unity among the church in Acts (the Lukan church) must be addressed. The first incident to be discussed follows immediately from the Miletus speech and is partly rooted within it. The passage is of significance because the conflict and the threat of schism centres around conflicting claims to the Spirit (20:22-21:16). At the same time, a pattern for the role of the Spirit in the conflict-resolution process, as presented by Luke, may be established.

Of the several church internal conflicts identified in Acts, none is more perplexing than the one between Paul and the believers in 21:1-16. In Paul's farewell discourse, it is explicitly stated that his journey to Jerusalem is under the command of the Spirit (20:22); Paul is bound by the Spirit to go to Jerusalem. More than likely the reference to the pneuma is to the divine Spirit. On the way, Paul meets several churches and at Tyre the believers urge him 'through the Spirit not to go to Jerusalem (21:4). If Luke was so concerned to downplay the discord in the early church, why did he not smooth out this obvious dissonance? In some of the other conflicts the readers
were led by various literary devices to agree with the 'proper' viewpoint: In Acts 10-11 with Peter, who had, based on his visionary experience and the leading of the Spirit, table-fellowship with the Gentile Cornelius (11:12); in the Jerusalem council, the reader is led to agree with Paul, Peter, James and the whole community because they resolved the tension in accord with the Spirit (15:28); and in the conflict around Paul's ministry as indicated in 21:17-26 with Paul, because the reader knows that the apostle was commissioned by a vision and filled with the Spirit for his ministry among the Gentiles (9:15-18). But this time, the reader is left uncertain with whom to side; both parties are portrayed as under the influence of the Spirit. It would have been easy for Luke to diminish the dilemma simply by omitting the reference to the Spirit in 21:4. What would be left would be the 'normal' pattern: a conflict between two parties in which the author has determined the proper viewpoint and thereby leads the reader to accept the author's viewpoint, in this case in favour of Paul. Since Luke did not do so, he did not downplay the conflict. Typical for many is Rachi's handling of the passage when he states: 'Obviously it is not the Holy Spirit who tries to keep back Paul but rather it is the church, informed by the Spirit.' If Luke wanted his readers to perceive a contrast between the revelation by the Spirit and the church's 'application' thereof, he was not very successful in doing so.

A convincing approach to resolve this conflict is suggested by Bovon. In a first step he compares the passage of 20:36-21:16 with farewell situations in Greek and early Christian literature and detects a common pattern: tears, the plea to the hero not to leave, and the hero's decision to go. In contrast to these stories, Luke presents both sides as under the influence of the divine. Bovon comes then to his first observation: since both parties were under the leading of the Spirit, the Spirit does not promote superiority of the one in contrast to the other. Yet as Bovon properly realises, the communication between the two is apparently trapped in a cul de sac. Bovon finds the solution in a paradigm for communication introduced by Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson. Wherever a dialogue becomes locked, a new element that lies outside the system must be introduced to bring about the change needed. This new element must help the parties involved to obtain some distance for themselves and enable them to reflect on their communication-process. Bovon identifies this element with the prophetic ministry of Agabus who is introduced into the narrative in 21:10. The same Spirit that urges Paul to go to Jerusalem and influences the disciples to caution Paul, now speaks through Agabus. Hence, the Spirit leads the discussion out of the dead end and opens a new platform for Paul and the church to dialogue. Bovon concludes that the Spirit does not reveal himself without the community's dialogue and never in such a way that it leads to the superiority of anyone or the breakdown of communication within the community. The church surrenders to the leading of God (and not to Paul's will - it was noted above that a conflict includes also a clash of opposing wills), yet at the same time Paul did not know the will of God completely either. He will not die a martyr's death in Jerusalem. At the end, both parties claimed the Spirit as the source of their action/words but neither of the two knew God's will completely and it was the prophetic ministry of Agabus that provided a way out of a boxed-in communication situation, without providing any 'new' insight as such.

The implications are suggestive. The Spirit is given a socio-ethical dimension and is instrumental in resolving the conflict between Paul and the church in Tyre. The existence of mutually exclusive interests and incompatible claims to the divine will within the church are at least for the reader overcome. At the end of the story, the reader knows that all characters in the story knew in part. Luke now concludes his story with the remark that 'After this we got ready and went up to Jerusalem. Some of the disciples from Caesarea accompanied us to the home of Mnason ... When we arrived in Jerusalem, the brothers received us warmly' (21:15-17).

Based on the analysis of the Agabus narrative, Shuyler Brown's conclusion on Paul's farewell discourse for Lukan ecclesiology needs to be more nuanced. Brown derives from Paul's speech that (a) the Lukan community was threatened by heresy, and (b) that he therefore emphasised dependence on the apostolic authority which guarantees the Spirit rather than on the individual's possession of the Spirit. The first part of Brown's analysis requires no further discussion. His second conclusion, however, must be qualified. While Brown's conjecture is true for situations in which 'wolves will come in among the community, or rise from within' (20:29-30), Luke knows of other conflict-situations that threaten the unity of the church. Such a conflict is the one between Paul and the church as presented in 21:1-16. In this case, the conflicting claims were not between apostolic authority and an individual's Spirit possession, but between conflicting claims to the Spirit. In such a situation, the solution is not presented as an individual's subjection under apostolic authority, but as the submission of all under the 'prophetic process' within the community. Therefore, Lukan ecclesiology does not emphasise in an unqualified way dependence on the apostolic authority over against the individual's possession of the Spirit. Rather, Luke can affirm the claim that 'all the Lord's people were prophets and that the Lord would (did) put his Spirit on them' (Num. 11:29).

In a next step, it must be analysed whether the thesis that the Spirit, or prophetic ministry, fosters community and dialogue also applies to some of the other conflict-situations in Acts, particularly to those in which the unity of the church was preserved and the conflict was resolved.

THE SPIRIT AND THE REALISATION OF SALVATION: A GROWING COMMUNITY'S STRUGGLE FOR CONTINUITY AND DISCONTINUITY WITH HER IDENTITY

The passages in which the Spirit is the agent who brings people into community and to participate in the this-worldly dimension of salvation will be addressed now. In Acts 8:1-11:18, four conversion stories are told: The Samaritans, the Ethiopian eunuch, Paul, and Cornelius. In its own way, each conversion story impacted the community make-up and identity and as noted above, each new
Two arguments may support the suggestion that the primary issue at stake in the 'delay' of the Spirit-manifestation is due to ecclesiological reasons: the period between the Samaritans' acceptance of the word and the Spirit-manifestation among them is more difficult to explain.

The first conversion story in the bloc of Acts 8:1-18 is the Samaritan episode: the disciples had begun to experience 'salvation' through the Spirit between his ascension and Pentecost. The question thus arises as to why the Spirit was not manifested to the Samaritans before this time. Turner observes that this passage presents an interchange between angelic and pneumatic speech-acts, similar to the Cornelius story and the infancy narratives. Similar to the Cornelius narrative there is no reference in this story to a Spirit-filled or prompted speech.

The Conflict between the Hebraic and the Hellenistic Group (Acts 6:1-7)

In Acts 6:3, a passage telling about a major conflict in the church, the nexus between a person's 'walk with the Lord' and the Spirit is made (cf. Acts 9:31). It is difficult to agree with Haya-Prats and Menzies that the reference to 'plerēis pneumatōs' refers to Stephen's speech in Acts 7. Because two questions remain: (1) do they not violate to some extent the rule of sequential reading? and (2) although Stephen is in Acts 6:5 singled out specifically as full of the Spirit, do they not apply a statement made of a group ('full of the Spirit' in Acts 6:3 is a prerequisite for all of the seven) only to one, to Stephen - or in the best case to two, to Philip, who later preached to the Ethiopian (Acts 8:26-40)?

Thus, it seems that 'being full of the Spirit and of wisdom' was a prerequisite to resolve the conflict in Acts 6:1-7 and this gives the Spirit a fundamental role in the preservation of the church's unity, most likely evidenced in the wisdom of the seven.

The Mission in Samaria (Acts 8:4-25)

The first conversion story in the bloc of Acts 8:1-11:18 is the one of the Samaritans, resulting from Philip's mission. Turner observes that this passage represents a clear break with the 'norm' we might expect from Acts 2:38-39.

After analysing the six commonly held views on the Samaritan episode, Turner concludes ad interim that Acts 8:17 presents an exception to the rule established in Acts 2:38 and that the Spirit had not yet been manifested among the Samaritans. He refers to the disciples' situation that was not completely unlike the Samaritan episode: the disciples had begun to experience 'salvation' through Jesus' Spirit-empowered ministry before his resurrection, but Luke knows of a period of forty days between Jesus' resurrection, ascension, and the Spirit-manifestation as well as the ten days between his ascension and Pentecost. The question why there is a period between the Samaritans' acceptance of the word and the Spirit-manifestation among them is more difficult to explain.

Two arguments may support the suggestion that the primary issue at stake in the 'delay' of the Spirit-manifestation is due to ecclesiological reasons:

1. Although Acts 8 does not depict any conflict between Jerusalem and Samaria, Luke, and with him the reader, knows of such elsewhere. In Luke 9:51-56, the evangelist introduces the travel narrative: Jesus is on his way to Jerusalem. This large section is opened with the Lukan story of the Samaritan opposition to Jesus 'because he was heading to Jerusalem' (Lk. 9:53) and James and John's proposal to call down fire from heaven upon them (9:54). Luke is concerned in other places to present the relationship between Jesus and Samaritans in a positive light (Lk. 10:33; 17:16). In the incident of Jesus' travel to Jerusalem, the Samaritan opposition is not depicted as directed against Jesus; the enmity is focused rather on Jerusalem (9:51, 53) and evokes the anger of James and John. Thus, Luke knows of a conflict between Jerusalem and Samaria. Acts 8:14-17 may tell the story of the reconciliation between Jerusalem and Samaria (the heart of the father has been turned to the son) because this time Peter and John come from Jerusalem and pray for the Samaritans. Luke does not explicitly capitalise on this reconciliation theme.

This last statement leads to the second suggestion.

2. It is explicitly stated in Acts 8:5 that Philip went down to a city in Samaria (and in 8:8 too one particular city is in view [en tē polei ekeínei]). It is only after the Spirit-manifestation and the implicit bonding between Jerusalem and Samaria that Peter and John preached the gospel in many Samaritan villages (8:25; pollas tē kómas twn samarītwn). This may in turn suggest that the Spirit-manifestation was not simply for the 'empowerment' for the mission of the church (we read of no missionary activity of the Samaritan believers; the mission of Samaria was accomplished by Peter and John) but the identity marker for a community that has isa factō come to comprise both Jews and Samaritans. The same concept will be found again, and even more explicitly, in the Cornelius episode.

The Ethiopian Eunuch and the People of God (Acts 8:26-40)

Beginning with the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch, each story concerning the admission of new social groups reports of a divine intervention that leads to the conversion and subsequent baptism of the person(s). The story of the eunuch presents an interchange between angelic and pneumatic speech-acts, similar to the Cornelius story and the infancy narratives. Similar to the Cornelius narrative there is no reference in this story to a Spirit-filled or prompted speech by the evangelist. The explicit role of the Spirit is more in directing Philip in his missionary activity rather than 'empowering' him for such. An additional parallel to the Cornelius narrative is that both Philip and Peter were left with some uncertainty as to what to do or say to the people they were to meet. In both instances, the specific situation of the moment prompted the following proclamation. Thus far, the Spirit's role is still within the horizon of the church's mission; with the emphasis on directing rather than empowering it.

The eunuch's baptism may not only have a missiological, but also a social
dimension. The latter may be reflected in the eunuch's quest to be baptised (8:36). The normal pattern throughout Acts is that the proclamation of the good news leads naturally to baptism (2:38; 8:12; 9:18; 10:48), but Acts 8:36 makes it clear that the eunuch is only baptised upon his own initiative. This may be request, thus perhaps indicating some reluctance on Philip's part. The reader is even given the impression that the apostle did not fully understand the Spirit-prompted vision (10:13-16). At the centre of the narrative is Peter's conflicting understanding of the divine will in regard to the Jewish-Gentile fellowship that is resolved by the charismatic manifestations evidenced among the Gentiles: 'So then, God has even granted the Gentiles repentance unto life' (11:18). This concluding statement provides the reader with the basic parameters along which the episode has to be understood.

However, the Jewish-Gentile relationship continued to be an issue, at least in Acts, until the council in Jerusalem. At that time, conflicting ideas existed concerning the community's identity marker, centring around the question of circumcision. Without the Spirit manifestation, what was at stake was the community's identity. The conclusion of the whole debate as well as Peter's statement in 10:47 make it clear that circumcision no longer is the distinctive identity marker of those belonging to God's people; its place has been taken by the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the Spirit not only 'witnesses' to the Gentile's inclusion into God's people; the Spirit-manifestation becomes the very principle upon which this inclusion is approbated by the community. The outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles testified of God's acceptance of them into the restored Israel and thereby redefined the community at the same time. The charismatic Spirit-manifestation was a transforming experience that led to the table-fellowship between Jews and the Gentiles. From that moment on, the community was no longer the same. The Spirit-manifestation, witnessing to God's gracious acceptance of the Gentiles, became normative for the Jewish believers of the earliest (and Lukan?) church in their relation to Gentiles.

Thus, the Spirit is the source for the community's life in a very direct sense. Without the Spirit manifestation, the community would not be defined in the same way and would have a different symbolic universe. Although the conflict of the community's identity marker is still present in Acts 15, the charismatic manifestation, exemplifying God's salvific intervention among Gentiles, was to become normative for the church's (and the readers') ethos in regard to Jewish-Gentile table-fellowship. The same conclusion is reached by approaching the passage not from its end, but from its beginning. In 10:19, the Spirit is not pictured as empowering but rather as commissioning Peter; the apostle is not primarily speaking 'filled with the Spirit' but as one 'sent by the Spirit'. As a speech act, 10:19 is an exercitive (asserting an influence and exercising power).

**The Spirit and Jewish-Gentile Table Fellowship**

There is hardly any doubt concerning the pivotal significance the Cornelius episode has in the book of Acts. Cornelius' vision is narrated four times throughout the book of Acts, and Peter's twice. Within the whole narrative the Holy Spirit plays a key role. There are eight references to the Spirit in the course of the story alone: 10:19, 38, 44, 45, 47; 11:12, 15, 16. Peter's vision represents a conflict of a different sort. It confronts the apostle with two co-existing but mutually exclusive interpretations of the divine will. On the one hand, the divine will is represented by the food regulations of the mosaic law that are binding for Peter. On the other hand, is the divine vision and command to eat what is taboo (10:13-16). At the centre of the narrative is Peter's conflicting understanding of the divine desir in regard to the Jewish-Gentile fellowship that is resolved by the charismatic manifestations evidenced among the Gentiles: 'So then, God has even granted the Gentiles repentance unto life' (11:18). This concluding statement provides the reader with the basic parameters along which the episode has to be understood.

However, the Jewish-Gentile relationship continued to be an issue, at least in Acts, until the council in Jerusalem. At that time, conflicting ideas existed concerning the community's identity marker, centring around the question of circumcision. Without the Spirit manifestation, what was at stake was the community's identity. The conclusion of the whole debate as well as Peter's statement in 10:47 make it clear that circumcision no longer is the distinctive identity marker of those belonging to God's people; its place has been taken by the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the Spirit not only 'witnesses' to the Gentile's inclusion into God's people; the Spirit-manifestation becomes the very principle upon which this inclusion is approbated by the community. The outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles testified of God's acceptance of them into the restored Israel and thereby redefined the community at the same time. The charismatic Spirit-manifestation was a transforming experience that led to the table-fellowship between Jews and the Gentiles. From that moment on, the community was no longer the same. The Spirit-manifestation, witnessing to God's gracious acceptance of the Gentiles, became normative for the Jewish believers of the earliest (and Lukan?) church in their relation to Gentiles.

Thus, the Spirit is the source for the community's life in a very direct sense. Without the Spirit manifestation, the community would not be defined in the same way and would have a different symbolic universe. Although the conflict of the community's identity marker is still present in Acts 15, the charismatic manifestation, exemplifying God's salvific intervention among Gentiles, was to become normative for the church's (and the readers') ethos in regard to Jewish-Gentile table-fellowship. The same conclusion is reached by approaching the passage not from its end, but from its beginning. In 10:19, the Spirit is not pictured as empowering but rather as commissioning Peter; the apostle is not primarily speaking 'filled with the Spirit' but as one 'sent by the Spirit'. As a speech act, 10:19 is an exercitive (asserting an influence and exercising power).

In his defence at Jerusalem, Peter made it clear that he did not act out of his own impulse but that he was urged by the Spirit to go to Cornelius (11:12). Peter was under the divine command; the Spirit gave the vision. The reader is even given the impression that the apostle did not fully understand the Spirit-prompted vision
until after arrival in Cornelius' house and the subsequent Spirit-manifestation
(10:29,34,47-48). Peter's interpretation of the vision and Cornelius' request
prompted the apostle's speech that followed the basic kerygma.

While in Acts 21 the prophetic ministry through the Spirit re-established an
interrupted communication process, at least from the reader's perspective, the
Spirit in Acts 10-11 opened a communication process that otherwise would never
have begun, just as in the pericope of the Ethiopian eunuch. This newly initiated
communication was first prompted by conflicting claims to the divine will, and
resolved with the manifestation of the same Spirit among the Gentiles. It radically
transformed the community and forced her to redefine herself. The verdictive
(exercising of judgement) in 10:47 is the interpretation of the pneumatic
experience/definition: 'Can anyone keep these people from being baptised with
water? They have received the Holy Spirit just as we have'. Since the Gentiles
manifest the same identity marker as the Jews, they too must be part of God's
eschatological and restored people; they have a share in salvation because they
are part of the liberated community. This suggests that the Spirit was the primary
agency in initiating the Jewish-Gentile relationship in its beginning and
consequent inclusion into the community. The Jewish-Gentile table-fellowship
was both under the Spirit's debut and approval. As a result, the two groups
enjoyed table-fellowship as the celebration of their salvation. God's salvific
intervention has become normative for the community's ethos.

The Council in Jerusalem: Reflecting on the Spirit as the Community's
Identity Marker

Peter's defence before the Jerusalem church (11:1-18) did not resolve the issue on
the Jewish-Gentile relationship once and for all. With Paul's and Barnabas'
motion among the Gentiles the discussion became vigorous and led to the
council in Jerusalem (15:1-35). The question at Jerusalem did not centre around
whether or not Gentiles were to be welcomed in the church, but rather on the
conditions for them to be admitted or continuing in God's people. Thus, the Gentiles
manifest the same identity marker as the Jews, they too must be part of God's
eschatological and restored people; they have a share in salvation because they
are part of the liberated community. This suggests that the Spirit was the primary
agency in initiating the Jewish-Gentile relationship in its beginning and
consequent inclusion into the community. The Jewish-Gentile table-fellowship
was both under the Spirit's debut and approval. As a result, the two groups
enjoyed table-fellowship as the celebration of their salvation. God's salvific
intervention has become normative for the community's ethos.

It was already noted above that the Cornelius incident with its charismatic
manifestations became normative for the Jewish-Gentile relationships in the
church; 15:7-11 echoes 10:1-11:18. The emphasis will therefore mainly be with
15:28 where the outcome of the council was communicated with the Gentile
churches: 'It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to not to burden you'.

Two observations need to be made: (1) Luke does not give us any explicit
indication that the wording of 15:28 is based on special revelation. It rather seems
that the reference to the Holy Spirit is the community's interpretation of the role
of the Spirit in Cornelius' house, and (2) the issue at stake was not the mission of
the church but rather the prerequisites for entering or continuing in God's people:
'Unless you are circumcised according to the custom taught by Moses, you cannot
be saved' (15:1b). This is further evident in the whole discussion. Peter's speech
concludes with the words '... we are saved just as they are' (15:11) and James'
speech too is concerned only with the requirements for the Gentiles who are

turning to God (15:19). The statement 'it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to
us' appears not to be the result of a 'joint' decision at the council between the
apostles and the Holy Spirit. The decision has already been made when God sent
his Spirit upon Cornelius in the same way as he did on the believers at the day of
Pentecost. Therefore 'it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us'.

Thus, charismatic manifestations not only empowered the church for her mission
but also defined it and reshaped her symbolic universe. Acts 15:28 represents the
same dynamic as Peter's quote of Joel 3:1-5: the Spirit of prophecy not only leads
to prophetic speech, but leads the church to cross social and ethnic barriers and
thereby redefines the relationships among God's people. Charismatic
manifestations cannot be separated from their socio-ethical implications. The
effects of the outpouring of the Spirit are not either charismatic or ethical, they
are both.

That the Spirit shaped the community's life in 15:1-35 can also be approached
from a different perspective. It is suggestive that the apostles' decision that is in
agreement with the work of the Holy Spirit is in direct contrast to 15:10 where
Peter cautions those present 'why do you try to test (peirazō) God?' The
interchangeable references to God and the Spirit are not new for Luke. In 5:1-11,
Ananias and Sapphira are said to have lied to the Spirit (5:3) and to God (5:4).
And in 5:9, Sapphira is asked 'How could you agree to test (peirazō) the Spirit of the
Lord?' In both cases, 5:9 and 15:10, to test God, or to resist the Spirit of the
Lord, means to oppose the course God, or the Spirit, is taking with his
community. Other passages in Acts bring up the idea of opposing the direction
God, or the Spirit, is taking with his people: 5:32; 7:51; 28:25-28. All three of
these passages are in the context of obedience towards God in an ethical sense,
and not in a 'missionary' one. While the couple in Acts 5 put God to the test by
deceiving the community, the people in Acts 15 would do so in placing an
unnecessary requirement upon the Gentiles for being part of God's restored
people. Thus, the basic argument of Acts 15:10 and 28 runs as follows: to place
an additional burden upon the Gentiles, which means to redefine the community's
identity marker, is to test God, while not to do so is to act in agreement with the
Holy Spirit. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is not just guiding the mission of the
church but also 'determining' the entry requirements and who to include into the
renewed community.

Since Pentecost the Lord reigns through the Holy Spirit over his church and is
proclaiming (realising) good news for the poor. The Apostle's letter represents the
church's submission under the Spirit's authority over his community and as such
the guidance of the Spirit is for the ethical life of the community.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The community's unity is a central theme in Acts and represents the this-worldly
dimension of salvation. While the summaries reflect the ideal life of the
pneumatic community, conflicts are not denied. As the Spirit is the source for the
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church’s community-life, the divine pneuma preserves her unity and is in some passages instrumental in avoiding/overcoming schisms as well as bringing new groups of people into the community and thereby experience the present dimension of salvation. The Agabus incident provides a pattern for the role of the Spirit and prophetic ministry in conflict resolution, especially in regard to mutually exclusive claims to the divine will. Human communication processes that are in a cul-de-sac are led out of it by a prophetic ministry. This ministry allows Paul and the churches to meet on a ‘neutral’ platform and to submit together under the Lord’s will, since both parties only knew in part.

The story of the conflict centreing around the overlooked widows is similar. It is suggestive that to be ‘full of the Spirit and of wisdom’ is essential to resolve the issue. The same pattern as in Acts 20:10-21:16 is found in the narratives of the Ethiopian eunuch and Cornelius. In neither case did the respective apostles know absolutely, in contrast to their audience; rather they knew also just in part. In both cases the Spirit initiated a communication process that otherwise would not have begun and both the story is told in a way to reflect the initial reluctance on the part of the ‘missionary’. The subsequent conversion and charismatic manifestation (with the Samaritans and Cornelius) redefined the community’s self-understanding by adding the converts to the church; Jerusalem and Samaria were reconciled. The inclusion of the converts realise their salvation.

The Spirit-effect in the community and her entry requirements resulted at the same time in a possible schism. During this time of crisis, the unity was preserved by remembering the Spirit’s role at the beginning of the redefinition. The Spirit-initiated mission and the outpouring of the Spirit of prophecy upon the Gentiles with its charismatic manifestations became the principle for the church’s decision; ‘It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us’ (Acts 15:28), whereby redefining the church’s symbolic universe. Therefore, prophetic ministry and charismatic manifestations have a socio-ethical dimension. The Spirit is instrumental (1) in resolving some interpersonal conflicts as presented in Acts, and (2) in realising the this-worldly dimension of salvation by bringing the converts ‘into community’. To argue that the ethical consequences of charismatic manifestations are mere ‘side-effects’ of the Spirit’s concern for the mission of the church misses the point. Rather the mission to the Gentiles is the result of the Spirit’s direct intervention in both the apostles and the Gentiles. The mission to the Gentiles is the theological consequence of the church’s experience with the divine Spirit and as such the continuation of Jesus’ proclamation of good news to the poor.
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Major aspects of healing within British Pentecostalism

Keith Warrington

Pentecostals affirm the importance of Jesus’ healing role to his mission. To a large degree, they seek to follow his example. However, a number of motifs integral to it distinguish it from their own experiences of healing. Some major characteristics of divine healing as practised by British Pentecostals¹ will be examined in order to demonstrate dissimilarities with Jesus’ healing ministry² and developments in praxis and belief.

FAITH

The issue of faith is a popular feature for Pentecostals with regard to healing and is undergirded by their song strata.¹ It is also a crucially important ingredient in the narratives detailing the healings of Jesus. However, there are major differences in the definition of faith and it is these that serve to distinguish much modern healing praxis from that of Jesus.

Whose faith?

Whether faith is to be exerted by the sufferer, the one who is praying or by both of them has been a vexed issue for many. Kingston¹ believes, “the emphasis on faith bears rather on the one who lays hands on than on the sick person...if there is no recovery...the first person’s faith to be queried is not the sick person’s but the minister’s”. However, Evans¹ states, “usually, it is the faith of the person healed” that effects the healing. Banks⁶ argues, “healing can be helped by the faith of those around us...what the (sufferer)...lacked in faith was made up by the expectant faith of others”. Similarly, Cove⁷ referring to Matthew 11:20-24, describes the negative influence on a healing situation of “community unbelief”. Horton⁸ presents the importance of all concerned exercising faith including the sufferer, minister and others associated with the sufferer. Such diverse opinions indicate confusion and consequent uncertainty concerning whose faith is to be provided.

Although there are apparent links with the ministry of Jesus in that the concept of faith is mentioned therein, these need to be carefully assessed. In particular, the identity of the faith referred to needs thoughtful delineation. In the ministry of Jesus, whenever faith is mentioned, it never refers to his own faith; instead, it alludes to the faith of the sufferer or others.

The identification of faith

In many Pentecostal writings, the identity of the faith is often not clarified,¹⁰ though some attempt an explanation.¹⁰ At times the guidance offered is unclear.¹¹ Wright¹² encourages believers to “seek to strengthen your faith” in the fact that God can heal. Often sufferers are simply encouraged to develop more of it as a result of which they may “enjoy their inheritance”.¹³ Variant views are again in evidence, suggestive of a confusing framework for ministry to the sick.

Banks¹⁴ advocates “another way of developing faith is to try it out...begin by believing God for smaller things...learn from your mistakes...try again”. Consequently, some view positively the possibility of increasing the faith that one has as a result of which restoration will occur.¹⁵ Such guidance is absent in the ministry of Jesus that many Pentecostals assume they are emulating. He never encouraged anyone to increase their faith before receiving healing, neither did he condemn anyone for not exhibiting enough faith. Nevertheless, Cove¹⁶ states, “if you have no faith there will be no healing. If you have a little faith you may get a partial healing. But if you have a strong faith you will get perfect healing”. Faith thus bears a fluidity in its expression, though this elasticity is not reflected in the use of the term in the ministry of Jesus. The statement that a “mustard seed of faith” is all that is necessary to move a mountain (Mt. 17:20) is a major contradiction to these attempts to harness more and more “faith” whereverupon God has little alternative but to grant the healing. Those who have not been healed are deemed not to have enough faith and those who are healed are assumed to have passed the faith threshold, whether they be believers or not.

For many Pentecostals, faith is equated with belief in a promise; a promise that healing is the guaranteed right of the believer, proven by Jesus’ ministry of healing. Thus, they assume that before God will heal them, they have to believe that he is going to do so.¹⁷ Anything less than this is deemed to result in rejection by God as far as receiving healing is concerned. It is, in effect, an anthropocentrically-initiated faith. The fear that a lack of faith has obstructed God in his desire to heal has resulted in many experiencing guilt due to an unnecessary perception that one may have been a block to one’s own healing or that of another.¹⁸

Tee¹⁸ states that it is “VITAL” that the person who is ill must have “an unwavering assurance, deep in their spirit, that it really is the will of God for them to be healed” stating that one can “emphatically claim that it is the will of God for us to receive healing”. He notes that there “very few exceptions”. Parr¹⁹ recommends that people be “absolutely persuaded beyond any shadow of doubt that He is going to heal them”. Many would still follow the suggestion of Hacking²⁰ that “unless and until the Lord makes it very plain to you that healing is not for you, lay claim tenaciously to the word of promise”. Hicklin²¹ insensitively suggests, illegitimately based on John 5:6, “that some folk are not healed because they don’t really want to lose their sickness, since it allows them to be the centre of attention and the recipients of tender loving care”.

Some have therefore advocated ignoring symptoms of sickness as a proof of one’s faith.²² Instead, it has been recommended that one should thank God for the healing even though it is not yet apparent.²³ There is a paucity of reflective assessment of these claims against the background of a limited number of healings. At the same time, the comprehensive healing ministry of Jesus as contrasted to contemporary healing ministries indicates that a major distinction is to be retained.
There are further contradictions and tensions expressed with regard to this issue. Canty argues that to believe that God can heal is insufficient to receive healing. However, he also notes, “God’s action often seems to be unrelated to any question of faith... Most people only have hopes... but they are still healed.” Dye states, “it isn’t worth praying if you’re going to ask with doubting” followed five lines later with the statement, “He does answer many prayers which are not made in faith.” Elsewhere, he writes, “Jesus cannot release His power into your circumstances without your confession of faith.”

Faulty exegesis has often resulted in poor application. Mark 6:5ff is a key text in the debate over the significance of faith in the context of healing. Hathaway, commenting on the passage states, “if lack of faith could bind the hands of the Master Himself, then no small wonder if it binds the hands of His servants.” However, rather than being understood as being a barrier to the activities of Jesus, this passage is to be interpreted as a decision on his part not to minister because they had rejected his person, message and mission.

The ambiguity, contradiction, difference of opinion and regular lack of clarification concerning the identification of the faith demanded in order to receive healing is a major difficulty in the articulation of a biblical statement concerning healing in Pentecostal thought and praxis. It also confirms the difference between modern healing ministries and that of Jesus. The former views are to be contrasted with the healings of Jesus where the approach to Jesus for help was viewed by him as sufficient for the restoration to occur and thus designated as faith. It is also significant to note the occasions when people were healed in the New Testament when no mention of faith on the part of the sufferer is mentioned. The statements concerning the identity and significance of faith in the context of healing by many Pentecostals are markedly different to the perception of Jesus concerning faith as will be demonstrated later. These features serve to confirm that the healing ministry of Jesus was unique. Although they claim to be emulating Jesus, in reality, many Pentecostals adopt a different agenda for their healing praxis as far as faith is concerned.

**SIN**

It is a well established belief amongst Pentecostals that sickness may be the result of judgement or divine chastisement because of personal sin. Sickness has been regularly traced back to Satan and various texts have been provided to substantiate this view. It has been assumed that sickness may be caused by demonic influence, though Barrie cautions, “it is a great danger to attribute every ailment to the work of or possession by evil spirits.” Similarly, caution is advised when diagnosing mental illness. Many Pentecostals reject the equation that illness is always linked to individual sin. Others point to the deep impact that sin has upon the culture of the world.

Personal sin has been understood to be a potential reason for a healing not occurring, though biblical substantiation is infrequently offered. Brewster provides a list of such sins, suggesting “unrepentance of unconfessed sin, pride, disobedience, the desecration of the Sabbath and the non-attendance at the House of the Lord.” It is recommended that one’s motives be checked before requesting healing, though this is rarely explained. Parker notes, “God distinctly promises health on condition of obedience” while Carter contends for the view that healing “is promised upon repentance”. Neither sufficiently clarify or support their claims from the Bible and neither concept is present in the teaching practice of Jesus concerning healing.

Within Pentecostalism, great responsibility has also been placed on those who pray for the sufferer, on the basis that the purer the lifestyle of the one praying, the more likely a healing will occur. Thus, Brewster states those who pray for the sick “must be sanctified” which he defines in terms of rejection of “intoxicating liquors, gambling, smoking, the attending of theatres and dances”.

Elements of the above views have been opposed by some throughout Pentecostal history; Gee, commenting on Trophimus, acknowledges that there is nothing to suggest that he was spiritually or morally in error as a result of which he advises, “if no apparent reasons for failure to receive supernatural healing are made clear to the conscience... we... leave the case in the hands of our Heavenly Father... without condemnation of ourselves or others”. Similarly, Canty writes, “it is wrong to suggest that some unknown state of soul can prevent healing and that it needs careful searching to discover it... sin is usually obvious”. Gee advocates an awareness that “consistently leaves a place for permitted sickness as a method of Divine love and wisdom for purposes of chastisement” though he notes this “has undoubtely been much overdone”.

Despite the above sanguine comments, much that has been written by Pentecostals concerning the relationship between sickness and sin has been speculative, unsubstantiated and is unsupported by Scripture. Most importantly, it is not reflected in the ministry of Jesus. The significance of this lies in the comparison many draw between the healing ministry of Jesus and his apparent delegated authority to believers. In the light of this stress on the latter, it is incongruous that such dissimilarity be demonstrated.

Sin was not an obstacle to the healing activity of Jesus. It was an irregular feature of the healing narratives; when it is suggested that sin may have been the cause of the illness, Jesus rejects such a view (Jn. 9:2f). The attempt by some Pentecostals to place the blame for the lack of healing on those who are ill and, in particular, on the basis of unconfessed sin appears to be the result of insistence on a belief that the ministry of Jesus may be emulated by believers today, any failure to do so being, by default, due to the unpreparedness of, or blockage caused by, the one needing to be restored. The emphasis on sin, by Pentecostals, suggests a different model is being anticipated, more akin to the teachings of Paul and James, where sin is viewed as a possible cause of illness.
PRAYER

Pentecostals have always affirmed the necessity of prayer in the context of a request for healing,64 Brewster65 preferring the term "Divine healing through prayer". As a result of this emphasis, the Pentecostal Divine Healing Partnership based in Cheltenham, England was organised by Elim in 1968, initiated by the then Secretary General, Harold Greenway and Alex Tee. A similar prayer network still exists in Elim organised by Rev. Frank Lavender on behalf of the Elim Executive with an emphasis on prayer for healing.

Prayer has been viewed as being so important that healing may not result if a prayer for healing is not offered66 or if there is a fault in the prayer or in the attitude in which the prayer was offered.67 Persistence68 is sometimes viewed as being necessary, as is fasting.69 The motives of persistency and prayer in general however, are absent from the healings of Jesus and from his advice to his disciples in their healing missions.70 Instead, the healing narratives prove his unique authority to initiate healing authoritatively.

The prayer of faith is only used once in the New Testament (James 5:15) though the connection between faith and prayer is referred to elsewhere. This aspect of divine healing has probably been, and still is, the cause of greatest confusion amongst Pentecostals today and clarification is often lacking in popular preaching and writing.71 James 5:15 clearly expects the prayer of faith to succeed and the faith referred to is integral to the request being granted, as a result of which it may be stated that "it is the prayer of faith...which guarantees healing."72 Linford73 suggests that "The aorist tense implies that this prayer is complete". The faith that is anticipated in 1:6 (2:23) is trust in God's promise, on the basis of which one can pray expecting a positive response. (Of course, there is a difference of opinion within Pentecostalism as to whether divine healing is an unconditional promise or not). It is in this respect that faith in 5:15 is most appropriately interpreted. Cooper defines it as "asking for that which God has already told me that He will give me...Faith isn't blind...It is...listening for a promise...and then waiting for its fulfilment".74 Phillips75 describes the purpose of prayer as being "co-operation with God in bringing about His will...not trying to persuade God to carry out our will".

Parker76 acknowledges that "such faith is only possible...by the direct gift of God...Divine healing is all a matter of specific leading in specific cases". This is an advancement of the view of Petts who deduces that the prayer of faith is "a prayer that commits the sick one to God knowing that His will is best and that He can be trusted to 'raise up' the sick whether it be immediately by a miracle of healing or ultimately at the Parousia".77 Cognisance of the necessity of the will of God in prayer may therefore be presupposed by James in the context of 5:15.78

The prayer of faith is not to be understood as a presumptuous assertion that God always responds by granting the request. Neither is it only a statement of belief that God can provide restoration nor is it merely to be equated with a desire to be restored on the part of the sufferer or those involved in offering support. Rather, because of its complete and guaranteed success rate, it is to be understood as a dynamic belief derived from God.79 The faith required is itself given as a gift by God.80 Thus, Tee67 interprets Mark 11:22 as "have the faith which God gives."

James presents the concept of faith within the previously stated limits of trust and obedience, though, in this case, the trust is best experienced and the obedience most clearly practised if the will of God in the particular situation is determined. A number of principles and implications may be drawn from James' concept of faith in relationship to prayer:

1. Only the prayer that is offered in the will of God may be appropriately termed "the prayer of faith."
2. Consequently, while the prayer is being offered, an attempt should be made to ascertain the will of God in order to pray most appropriately (1:6).
3. In this context, the Elders (v.14) and/or the righteous person (v.16), because of their experience, wisdom and righteous lifestyles, may be best able to determine the will of God and pray accordingly.
4. Thus, the prayer of faith may be identified as a prayer that engages the members of the church in a process that seeks to identify and effect the will of God in the life of the suffering member. Such a prayer is able to be offered by one who has taken time to tap God's resources of wisdom and appropriate it to a particular situation. Only this prayer can provide the comprehensive guarantee of restoration promised by James.

THE GIFT OF FAITH

This gift is viewed by Kingston81 as being the "basis of the Gifts of Healings...and Miracles". Carter82 differs and states that it does not operate with other gifts. The Pauline gift of faith which is different to the faith involved in trusting Christ for salvation,83 and the fruit of the Spirit84 is to be understood as a supernatural gift of the Spirit which allows a person to be confident that a prayer to be offered or an act to be discharged is in keeping with God's will and will therefore be successful.85 Linford86 describes it as involving "authority to command the hosts of heaven to our aid...for a special task to promote the will of God or frustrate the wiles of the Devil".

With regard to praying for the sick, Greenway87 notes that when given "to the believer he has a perception of God's purposes that brings complete certitude-he knows...becoming conscious of what God was going to do". Carter88 defines it as "a supernatural operation of the Holy Spirit in the experience of the possessor which enables him to sustain an unwavering trust in God for his personal protection and the provision of his needs". Kingston89 sees its operation in the realm of the supernatural and in times of crisis.

However, one may not exercise it indiscriminately or mechanically for it is sovereignly initiated by the Spirit.89 Canty90 writes "it can only be received; it
cannot be achieved." Thus, he advises "if He grants knowledge of His will in any particular case...I gently encourage expectation on the grounds of that revelation." Barrie states that it is "given to some...to whom God has revealed His high purpose, enabling him to accomplish that purpose in spite of every contradictory circumstance of life", Kingston noting that it is "not limited to a few".

**GIFTS OF HEALINGS**

These are mentioned in 1 Corinthians 12:9, 28, 30 as an example of the manifestations of the Spirit in the Church. The plural form, "gifts of healing" is generally taken to indicate the potential for healing varied forms of sickness. Squire suggesting that "God decides to bestow the 'Gifts' from time to time...when God sees it is time and people are ready to be healed." Others prefer to understand the term to refer to "every individual manifestation of healing" as being "a grace gift". Gee suggests that it "seems to indicate a variety of forms of this gift". Barrie combines both options noting "The double use of the plural nouns seems to point to the different classes of sicknesses to be healed and the fact that each healing is a particular gift from God". Likewise, Urch describes them as "specific gifts for specific people" for "the N.T. does not concur with the idea of wholesale healings". Canty describes each healing as being a gift. Similarly, Hathaway concludes that "continual observation has taught us that the exercise of this gift is largely limited to...special visitations".

Those who minister as a result of a gift of healing do not "carry healing power with them wherever they go producing healings on tap". Rather, the gift of healing is most appropriately offered in conjunction with the gift of faith, the former depending on the latter for its success, Woodford noting that "each manifestation of healing through this ministry is conditioned by the will of God" given on specific occasions. Hathaway concedes that "it is evident that it is not God's will to heal all indiscriminately" and defines the gifts of healings as "bursts of healing". Similarly, Gee states "there are no indications that...members of the early churches...went around healing everybody...or...all that were sick within the Church. Then, as now, there were some healings".

Barrie comments that "certain men are used in the healing of particular diseases more than others", Kingston describing them as "specialists for different diseases". However, Hathaway rejects this view as does Linford who comments, "it would be difficult to find anyone in Scripture or experience who has limited ministry to one class of sickness. Wright offers guidance to help determine if one has the ministry of healing. Linford notes, "the gift can flow through a human channel without blessing the channel" while "the outflow of life to others can leave the channel exhausted". Canty writes, "the gifts of healing are not normally in operation in assembly life" but in the context of "unsaved people in special circumstances".

**THE LAYING ON OF HANDS**

This is a significant feature of Pentecostal healing praxis, Dinsdale describing it as a "central doctrine". The hands are generally placed on the head, it being recommended that they be applied gently. Although traditionally, the practice was carried out by only the Minister, this has now been also recognised as the privilege of others in the congregation. Nevertheless, care has been called for in the identity of those who receive it.

Sacramental tendencies are generally deemed to be inappropriate in this context as are unacceptable practices though physical experiences (shaking, tingling, heat) have been claimed to have been felt by the ones who have laid hands on the sick, some suggesting that the manifestations are proof of divine activity. Rather, it has been regarded as "an act of sympathy and compassion than a formal rite", a symbolic act, the opportunity for God's power to be manifested or even the occasion for "the faith of the person prayed for and the faith of the person praying...to be released", though this is not explained. Sacramental approaches to the laying on of hands has been resisted in Pentecostal thought. Petts noting that "not all who have hands laid on them will be healed". Nevertheless, it is assumed that the act itself has no supernatural value unless it is combined with faith. In this respect, pentecostals mirror a major aspect in the healings of Jesus.

**THE NAME OF JESUS**

For Pentecostals, there is great significance in the use of the name of Jesus. One of the clearest emphases in Pentecostal prayer for healing is the incorporation of the name, though the perceived reason for this on the part of many may be more due to the historical context of received practice than to an understanding of its biblical basis. Jeffreys, for example, states, "The servant may lay hands upon the sufferer, but it can only be efficacious when done in the name of the Lord", though he does not explain this comment. Canty offers a rare alternative opinion in that he concludes that it is not necessary to incorporate the name of Jesus in a prayer for the sick in order for restoration to occur, though he does acknowledge that its mention may be of use "to let hearers understand our Christian authority". Dye accurately writes that the use of the name of Jesus is only appropriately incorporated if one's prayer "lines up perfectly with the will of God". Of pertinence is the fact that the guidelines offered by James (5:14ff) are being followed and not that reflected in Jesus who chose to use no name in His healing praxis.

**THE ATONEMENT OF CHRIST**

Undergirding a great deal of healing praxis is the belief in the significance of the atonement of Christ to divine healing. A major debate relates to the
substitutionary element of the Atonement. Carter argues that on the Cross, Jesus "bore our sicknesses substitutionarily...it is not sympathy but substitution." Cove writes "Satan cannot legally lay upon us any sickness for God has already laid them upon His Son." However, Petts concludes that no texts "when correctly exegeted, support the doctrine...of Christ's bearing our sicknesses substitutionarily...I regard the concept as incapable of meaning or intelligibility." Similarly, Jeffreys rejects any suggestion that "Christ was made sick for our sicknesses."

However, although some claim that Christ's death guarantees restoration to physical and mental wholeness before the final resurrection, it is the standard position of Pentecostal belief to recognise that although we can claim deliverance from some of the impact of sin in our lives, "we have to wait until some future time before the full benefits of the atoning and redeeming work of Christ on the cross can be realised." Taylor comments on the "dubious as to exactly how the healing benefits of the atonement can be appropriated by the sick believer". Thus, for most Pentecostals, healing is an indirect result of the Atonement though not inevitably so in this life. Brewster stating that it is "the fruit of the atoning work of our Lord Jesus Christ".

Hathaway confirms that although "healing is provided for in the Christian experience...on the basis of the Atonement...every healing...anticipates the final redemption which will be ours when Christ comes. Physical healing is therefore given to us in grace and cannot be claimed as our right". Thus, Gee accepts that "Divine healing is provided for in the Atonement" though notes that "the Epistles do not apparently apply it to the problem of present human sickness".

Petts provides a careful treatment of the topic concluding with a modified presentation in which he understands healing to be "ultimately and indirectly in the Atonement." However, he also disallows mechanical healing resulting automatically as a consequence of the Atonement, whilst still accepting that healing is ultimately available at the Parousia though is also possible "through the work of the Spirit who is given on the basis of Christ's atoning work and who in turn bestows gifts of healing." Similarly, others have sought to distinguish between the benefits of forgiveness from sin that has been achieved by Christ on the Cross and other potential benefits available to the Christian, including the possibility of healing.

However, others prefer to teach that bodily healing has been included in the Atonement and "it is up to the Christian...to appropriate by faith...the healing that we need". Carter notes that, "The Atonement has provided for the body all that it has provided for the soul." Banks believes "Salvation and healing are both provided for mankind in the Atonement of Christ" while Baldwin contends that "forgiveness for sin and healing of the body are both to be found and appropriated from...Calvary." Parsons states that "the greatest reason for believing that healing is undoubtedly God's will is that Christ to carry both our sin and sickness".

Matthew 8:17 is a key text in the discussion of healing and its place in the Atonement although few Pentecostals have interacted with the text in a lucid way. Petts is an example of the latter. He rejects the view that this text supports the view that healing is an unconditional result of the Atonement. Instead, he understands the verse to be part of "Matthew's overall emphasis on Jesus as the fulfilment of O. T. hopes and ideals...manifested...in the healing of all who are sick." One of the other main texts used to support the link between healing and the Atonement is 1 Peter 2:24. In response to this, Petts argues against the doctrine of healing in the Atonement on the basis of 2 Corinthians 12:7, Gal. 4:13 and especially Philippians 2:27, 1 Timothy 5:23 and 2 Timothy 4:20 stating that "It was because of man's sin that atonement...was necessary. No atonement was needed for sickness. Sickness is not a misdeanour which attracts a penalty". Similarly, Woodford believes "Sickness and disease did not require atonement...they required removal...He did not atone for sickness and disease: He conquered them as elements present in a world of corruption."

ANointing with Oil

Anointing with oil has retained its place in the context of prayer for the sick in Pentecostal practice despite the fact that Parker believed that the oil was not essential for it was only of value "to show that the healing is of the Holy Spirit".

The oil is understood by most Pentecostals as symbolising the Holy Spirit. Pentecostals have traditionally used oil, generally sparingly applied to the forehead.

Oil had ceremonial, cosmetic and dietary functions in Judaism. Both the Old Testament and other Jewish writings also record the medicinal properties of oil. Oil was used as an embrocatory therapeutic aid and was also regarded as being a medicinal agent outside Judaism. The religious and symbolic usage of anointing finds a ready and comprehensive reservoir of information in the Old Testament for although anointing is not related to healing situations there, the religious and symbolic connotations are manifest. As such, it indicated the presence of the Spirit and was used to signify an infusion of the deity in whose name the person or object was anointed. This however, was redundant for Jesus as he was anointed by the Spirit in full measure. However, it is an appropriate element in the healing procedure of his followers. As such, it offers hope and encouragement to sufferers, reminding them that they are in the presence of God. The usage of oil in contemporary healing practice is therefore of value; however, it is significant to note that the use of oil is not recorded as being present in the healing ministry of Jesus. To incorporate oil in a healing scenario indicates a recognition that one is engaging in a model that is distinct to that of Jesus and aligned to the practice encouraged by James (5:14-16).
GRADUAL HEALINGS

Gradual healings have always been accepted as valid by Pentecostals. Cove finds support in Mark 11:21, from which he argues, "the change was not revealed until the next day"; however, the text has nothing to do with healing. Dye offers potential reasons for gradual healings, the main one of which relates to the possibility of pride on the part of believers who "ache for God's name to be honoured by the instant, dramatic, sensational". This alleged situation demands evidence before it is taken seriously; without it, it forms a serious and unsubstantiated slur against nameless believers. Greenway states that healings "should always be immediate". Similarly, Petts notes, "there is very little Biblical evidence for partial or delayed healings...and should hardly be considered to be normal". The limited nature of instantaneous healings in contemporary Pentecostalism is indicative of the fact that a model other than that offered by Jesus is being followed by those with healing ministries today.

BENEFICIAL SUFFERING

A developing perception within Classical Pentecostalism is that sickness may be of benefit to the sufferer concerned. This however, differs markedly from the healing ministry of Jesus; he did not comment positively on illness, rather choosing to remove it. At the same time, this highlights the tension within Pentecostalism where although healing is the expectation, sickness is often the experience.

Although Jaegar blandly suggests, "it is God's will to heal, not teach through the sickness", alternative views are more prominent in Pentecostalism. Throughout Pentecostal history, there has always been a willingness to express ignorance concerning the reasons why some Christians remain ill after prayer for restoration. Jones comments, "we have to accept that pain is God's mystery and there are some questions that we cannot give an answer to". Kingston acknowledges, "there are divine reasons...for the apparent non-recovery of some". This has developed into a recognition that, at times, illness may be viewed positively as a benefit for the believer. In a limited but interesting empirical study of an AOG church, it was discovered that as well as demons and/or acts of disobedience and/or the Fall being understood as being causes of illness, many believers recognised that "theistic theories" were also to be borne in mind whereby God was viewed as bringing the sufferer into a closer relationship with him through the suffering. Smith makes an attempt in this direction in his analysis of suffering as being "something which will lead us closer to the Saviour". Similarly, Hacking advises the unhealed "ask if there is any further lesson to be learned". Richards states of Timothy, Paul (Gal. 4:13), Trophimus and Epaphroditus, "they were granted to be preserved in their sickness...the exception to the rule...probably to teach some divine lesson".

Parker states, "God uses sickness...for His glory to keep His people humble and obedient". Wright acknowledges, "God converts our affliction into a seat of learning" noting, "there are some things we can learn no other way", including God's peace and comfort and a sense of our own mortality. Benrose notes, "some folk working in close co-operation with God...exploit it as a way of bringing glory to God". Wright views the experience recorded in Galatians 4:13ff as proof that Paul's physical affliction actually "accomplished God's will" and a church was established as a result. Hicks speaking of his wife, writes, "God in his sovereign love had decided to heal Joyce in her spirit, not in her body and take her to be with him...sovereign love says 'God gives the best'".

An assessment of current Pentecostalism would suggest an increasing alliance with the latter views. A testimony of a blind person who was not healed was recorded in Redemption Tidings. A similar account, but of a young married mother who is confined to a wheelchair as a result of having contracted polio as a child, was presented in Bread.

Thus, sickness is viewed as a potential ally to believers and a useful instrument in the hands of God for their benefit. However, the perception that Jesus is viewed unconditionally as the healer of all our illnesses is thus precluded and any paradigmatic role is to be questioned for, according to the Gospels, he did not teach that illness was potentially beneficial for the sufferer. The recognition that benefit is derived by the believer as a result of illness or disability is a significant shift away from a belief that Jesus has apparently delegated to believers the authority to excuse all sickness from the life experience of the believer. It further undermines the idea that Jesus' healing ministry is a model to be emulated by believers, given that Jesus healed all who came to him, never recommending that anyone identify potential benefits resulting from their sickness.

CONCLUSION

There are similarities between Pentecostal healing praxis and that of Jesus, but there also significant dissimilarities. Likewise, although some common terms and concepts are referred to, their significance differs markedly in each context. The differences between the healing ministry of Jesus and that of contemporary Pentecostal believers are significant to question the assertion that the latter are emulating, or able to emulate, the ministry of Jesus. The apparent paradigmatic function of Jesus' healings is unproven and it is more germane to identify Jesus' mission as uniquely phenomenological.

Endnotes

1. This article will concentrate on the two major Classical Pentecostal denominations of the Assemblies of God (AOG) and the Elim Pentecostal Church (Elim).

2. (Taylor, M., "A Historical Perspective on the Doctrine of Divine Healing", Epa Bulletin, 14 (1995) 74) accurately notes, for example, "one feature of modern healing ministries in Pentecostalism is the belief that the healer can receive 'revelation' of the sickness and its causes...spoke out publicly in a word of knowledge". However, although it is claimed that this is located also in the ministry of Jesus, it is a distinctive element in contemporary healing praxis and absent from the record of the healing ministry of Jesus.
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In the EBC questionnaire relating to healing, mentioned above, the following question was asked: Will God always heal a sick person when prayer is offered for the healing with true faith? It is significant to note the phrase "true faith": no clarification is offered for this concept and no guidance advanced as to whether it differs from "faith" and if so, how. More importantly, the responses demonstrate that a significant majority of those questioned reject the accuracy of the view that the presence of faith presumes the occurrence of healing.

**Ministers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
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Are Pentecostals Pentecostal? A revisit to the doctrine of Pentecost

Colin Dye

OVERVIEW

This paper looks at the distinctive aspects of Pentecostal doctrine and experience that have arisen this century and it examines whether these are being upheld among Pentecostals in the west today. I begin with a brief analysis of Pentecostal beginnings and its current world wide influence. Then, taking Spirit Baptism as the major Pentecostal doctrinal distinctive, I explore five main facets of this Pentecostal belief and practice and issue a call to return to a full-blooded Pentecostalism today. The five areas I deal with in the body of this paper are:

• The experience of Spirit Baptism
• The theology of Spirit Baptism
• The sign gift accompanying Spirit Baptism
• The purpose of Spirit Baptism
• The supernatural consequences of Spirit Baptism

INTRODUCTION

Is the question, 'Are Pentecostals Pentecostal?' the right one to be asking at this time? To be addressing it could suggest self-serving or even sectarian motives. Are there not more important issues to consider? Should we not rather be building on the success of 20th century Pentecostalism rather than plunging into yet another identity crisis?

As we approach the beginning of the 21st century we should be looking forward, rather than backwards. We should be seeking dialogue and greater co-operation with the wider body of Christ. We must work together with all God's people to see a credible global witness to Christ and his saving love. The Great Commission is the real task facing us all.

World evangelism must be the primary goal of Pentecostalism today, but not at the expense of our own distinctive. After all, that is in keeping with New Testament principles relating to the body of Christ. We offer to one another our distinctive witness to Christ and we learn from the distinctive witness of others. Then we combine these strengths and present a united witness to the world.

This is both the motive behind and the framework within which the question is being considered in this article.

PENTECOSTAL BEGINNINGS

The events in the Azusa Street mission in Los Angeles from 1906-1909, are the commonly accepted beginnings of the modern Pentecostal movement.¹

The Azusa Street Papers published from 1906-1908 record this revival in detail. Issue One began with the banner headline, 'Pentecost has come!' It was essentially a claim: "This is that!" Acts 2 had come back to the church. Two questions arise from this:

Was Azusa Street (and the events surrounding it) a genuine Acts 2 experience? In other words was it a genuine restoration of 'pentecostal' experience in the modern day church?

As Pentecostals have we kept the experience alive today?

In answer to question 1, we might well point out that 'wisdom is justified by her children'. The subsequent history of the 20th century suggests that it was a genuine outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2 terms. Peter Wagner maintains that initial rejection of Pentecostalism could not be maintained in the light of the clear manifestations of the fruit of the Holy Spirit and the unprecedented numerical growth of the movement.² The Pentecostal revival has brought about the greatest growth of the Christian faith in history.³

The growth and influence of Pentecostalism this century has recently been acknowledged by an unlikely source, well outside the borders of Pentecostalism. Three decades ago, Harvey Cox, the present Victor Thomas Professor of Religion at Harvard University, wrote the best seller, The Secular City. In this book, he tried to work out, 'a theology for the "postreligious" age that many sociologists had confidently assured us was coming.'⁴ Some twenty-five years later, challenged by Time magazine to comment on the growth of Pentecostalism, Cox undertook his own research. He published his conclusions in his book, Fire from Heaven, which is subtitled, The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-First Century. He says, 'Pentecostalism ... is by far the largest non-Catholic grouping, accounting for one in every four Christians. It is also the fastest growing Christian movement on earth, increasing more rapidly than either militant Islam or the Christian fundamentalist sects with which it is sometimes confused.'⁵ And he goes on to say, '... after a mere ninety years, what began as a despised and ridiculed sect is quickly becoming both the preferred religion of the urban poor and the powerful bearer of a radically alternative vision of what the human world might one day become.⁶

Growth and influence alone do not authenticate the spirituality of a religious movement. However, the genuine Christian nature of Pentecostalism itself and its impact on Christianity in general surely validate the early experience at Azusa Street and the Pentecostal movement that arose from it. Pentecostal influence has been so pervasive that the 20th century will be remembered as 'a century of Pentecost'.

In answering the second question, we need to know whether we measure up today.
to what God was doing in the beginning of our Pentecostal history. Cox himself speaks of a dilemma facing Pentecostals, '... that they may not survive. At least they may not be able to survive it and still remain true to their origins'. The dilemma, according to Cox, has to do with the pressures acting upon Pentecostalism to conform to today's world rather than demonstrating a radical religious alternative. Cox is not impressed with the way Pentecostals are facing this dilemma. In unnerving terms that approach the prophetic, he says, '... today, some pentecostal preachers seem so obsessed with the techniques of rapture that they have forgotten the original message'.

Another approach would be to ask whether we have become victims of our success. The influence of Pentecostalism extends far beyond its own boundaries. This tends to make it hard to distinguish Pentecostals from other groups impacted by them. In the light of this we may ask, is there even a need for a distinctive Pentecostal witness today? Malcolm Hathaway suggests that some British Classical Pentecostal denominations have indeed become victims of their own success and it could be said that 'they have lost their distinctiveness but not yet found a role'. After almost one hundred years of Pentecostalism, it could be argued that we have come of age. One of the features of maturity is that it is not obsessed with self-identity. By now, Pentecostals should know who they are, be secure in their position and be able confidently to engage with and participate in the wider Christian community. However, along with the growing acceptability Pentecostals enjoy there comes a desire to play down the more controversial elements of Pentecostalism. There is a danger of becoming bland and losing the cutting edge of Pentecostalism. Perhaps our success has brought complacency.

Originally, Pentecostals were very different. Their distinctive emphasis on the Baptism in the Holy Spirit accompanied by speaking in tongues was unique. It was also a much-persecuted position. But down through the years Pentecostal-type experiences have become common to most, if not all, Christian denominations. Originally, many in the charismatic movement adopted the Pentecostal view of Baptism in the Spirit. But more recently the shift among Protestant charismatics has been towards a more standard evangelical view of the Holy Spirit. Evangelical theological misgivings present from the beginning of the charismatic movement have tended to re-emerge in a fairly set and non-negotiable form. And yet, there is a definite new emphasis in evangelical pneumatology. The crucial place of the Spirit as an experienced reality is being restored. Few evangelicals would disagree with the emphasis given to the Spirit by Gordon Fee, a modern specialist in Pauline pneumatology. Coming from a Pentecostal background, he invites modern Christians to read Paul afresh and discover the crucial role of the Spirit in his life and thought. Fee suggests, '... the presence of the Spirit, as an experienced and living reality, was the crucial matter for Christian life, from beginning to end'.

A DISTINCTIVE PENTECOSTAL WITNESS TODAY?

The early days of Pentecostalism were pioneering days. Out of this 'primitive' Pentecostalism there has grown at least five other Pentecostal (or Pentecostal-type) groups. Some have remained within the Pentecostal movement and others are very distinctly separate but owe their origin either directly or indirectly to Pentecostalism itself.

Primitive Pentecostals

There is a discernible difference between the pioneers of Pentecostalism and those that came later. The pioneers had a radical edge in evangelism and church planting that is often missing in modern Western European Pentecostalism. This emphasis is being revived today as many younger Pentecostals are rediscovering their early heritage. A new radical wing among Pentecostalism is emerging.

Classical Pentecostals

The main line Pentecostal denominations come under this category. In Britain these consist mainly of the Elim Pentecostal Church, the Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland, the Apostolic Church, the New Testament Church of God, the Church of God of Prophecy and the Churches of God, UK.

Independent Pentecostals

These range from radical groups who mirror much of the features of primitive Pentecostalism to those independents who identify with the more classic expressions of Pentecostalism.

The Charismatic Movement

Beginning in the 1960's this movement was identified as Pentecostalism within the historic denominations. But it soon began to disassociate itself from its Pentecostal roots and now it is seen by many as being very different in theology, culture and ethos from the Pentecostalism that gave birth to it.

The Third Wave Movement

This term was coined by Peter Wagner to describe those within contemporary evangelicalism who are influenced by both the Pentecostal and charismatic movements but who do not fully embrace either. This movement is somewhat ambiguous as it includes both fully practising charismatics (such as the Vineyard churches) as well as those who exclude the 'charismatic' manifestations from the main services of the church. Peter Wagner's own answer when asked if he considered himself a charismatic or a Pentecostal was, 'I see myself as neither a charismatic or Pentecostal. I belong to Lake Avenue Congregational Church. I'm a Congregationalist. My church is not a charismatic church, although some of our members are charismatic'.

The Revival Movement

Currently, this consists of two main discernible streams. One arises out of the Third Wave movement, and is associated with the outpouring (beginning on 20th
January, 1994) at what was then the Toronto Airport Vineyard church, in Toronto Canada. And the other comes from the classical Pentecostal tradition and is identified with the outpouring (beginning on Father's Day, 1995) at the Brownsville Assemblies of God church in Pensacola, Florida. In this kind of setting the question must surely be asked, 'What does it mean to be Pentecostal today? Surely it must mean that we uphold the Holy Spirit as an experienced reality and that this is close to the heart of our belief and practice. But there are many non-Pentecostals who also uphold experiences of the Holy Spirit. Anything less is arguably sub-Christian. It must also mean that for us the distinctive gifts of the Spirit as outlined in 1 Corinthians have a place in our Christian life and Church fellowship. But, again, there are many groups who would accept the gifts of the Spirit today but who would not identify themselves either as Pentecostals or charismatics.

We are left with what is (and always has been) the distinguishing feature of Pentecostalism. The Baptism of the Spirit with the distinctive evidence of speaking in tongues is surely the essence of Pentecostal doctrine and experience. While some Pentecostal groups do not hold to tongues as the initial evidence of the Baptism, tongues, in relation to the Spirit-baptised life, is the great hallmark of authentic Pentecostalism.

Are we then left with simply defending and/or developing Pentecostal views on the Baptism in the Spirit? Is this the great test of what it means to be Pentecostal? Pentecostal influence has been successful in shaping much of the 20th Century Church's understanding of experience of the Holy Spirit. It has also been successful in winning the debate with cessationists concerning the continuance of the gifts of the Spirit. Even if the most widely acceptable forms of the argument today are being put forward by evangelicals, it is nevertheless the basic Pentecostal view of the non-cessation of the charismata that is being upheld.

The ground that remains does seem to be the Pentecostal doctrine of the Baptism of the Spirit, which is still almost universally rejected by the wider evangelical community including many charismatics today. This may mean we have some re-examining to do. Certainly we have to do some careful listening. The debate seems to be stuck in the somewhat theologically axiomatic assertion that every Christian has the Holy Spirit which (at least to those outside Pentecostalism) appears to be denied by the Pentecostal insistence on subsequence, that is, the belief that the Baptism in the Spirit is a post-conversion event. And so, subsequence, as well as consequence, or the belief that tongues is the sign gift that accompanies the Baptism, still remain our distinctive contribution to the current debate on the work of the Holy Spirit.

And yet, to be Pentecostal surely must mean far more than defending the narrow (though critical) territory of the most distinctive features of our belief and practice. The danger here is that we can so concentrate on Spirit Baptism, both in our doctrine and our experience, that this feature of Pentecostalism becomes almost an end in itself. We must not forget that for the New Testament, as well as the early Pentecostals, the experience of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost was primarily to equip the Church for her Mission in the world.

The coming of the Spirit in Acts is the essential pre-requisite for the continuing ministry of Christ through his body on the earth. The Church of Acts moved on in the power of the Holy Spirit to take their cities for God and pioneer evangelistic thrusts across the then known world. It all happened within the context of a vibrant community full of the Holy Spirit. The Christian community as described in Acts 2:42f is precisely what the Pentecostal pioneers experienced at the beginning of the 20th century. And it is happening today in many different parts of the world - especially in the developing nations.

But how is western Pentecostalism faring? Are we alive to these issues? Are we presenting a Christian witness that is fully Pentecostal? One way of answering these questions is to begin to identify a number of features of early Pentecostalism that were also found in the 'pentecostal' church of Acts. Where these are lost or sidelined by Pentecostals today they must be recovered. Otherwise we are not being true to our history or our identity and we will, therefore, be robbed of our destiny as we move into the 21st Century.

PENTECOST REVISITED

The Experience of Spirit Baptism

The language 'baptism in the Spirit' is borne out by Acts. However, we must take note that the New Testament uses the verbal forms of 'baptise with', 'be baptised with'. These descriptions are probably to be preferred over the less dynamic noun form adopted here for the purposes of doctrinal discussion.

The early Pentecostals enjoyed a robust experience of 'being baptised with the Holy Spirit'. Like the Holiness groups before them they looked for a definite encounter with God. But the Pentecostals soon adopted the power-for-service theme rather than holiness as their emphasis on the Baptism in the Spirit.

However, the real difference lay in the Pentecostal association of tongue speaking with the Baptism. It was this that gave Pentecostalism its distinguishing mark. From our perspective today it is difficult to appreciate the enormous impact this made at the time. It cannot be over-emphasised. Pentecostals were called 'tongues people' and the movement soon was called 'the tongues movement'. People flocked to Azusa Street from everywhere having heard that believers were being baptised with the Spirit in the same way the Apostles had been on the day of Pentecost.

In Britain, people like Smith Wigglesworth went in search of the Baptism at Sunderland. He received it at the hand of Mrs. Boddy and was transformed. Wigglesworth's wife Polly was sceptical until she saw for herself the difference it made to him. When Smith returned from Sunderland, Polly is reported to have said, 'I am as much baptised as you are, and I don't speak In tongues.' But she decided to put him to the test: 'I've been preaching for more than twenty years...
and you have sat beside me on the platform tongue-tied. But on Sunday you'll preach yourself my man, and I'll be there to see what there is in it".38 The following Sunday Smith's preaching was so powerful that all Polly could do was speak out in amazement, "That's not my Smith. That's not my Smith".39

Some of this is a far cry from much contemporary experience of the Holy Spirit. First, many people today would have told Wigglesworth not to go to Sunderland - he had surely got all he needed of the Holy Spirit at conversion, or in the great experiences of the infillings of the Spirit that were common among the holiness groups of which the Salvation Army34 was but one. Others would have been sceptical of any linking of tongues to the experience.

More serious still, it appears that, much contemporary experience of the Baptist (even when linked to tongue speaking) has far less of God in it than these early Pentecostals. The seeking meetings, the prostrations, the preparatory confession and repentance of sin and the sheer hunger for God meant that few would settle for anything less than a genuine 'fullness' of the Holy Spirit.35 Pentecostals today seem to be influenced by the same shallowness and glibness that has beset much of the rest of evangelicalism. A return to such themes as the majesty of God, his holiness and the fear of the Lord is very much needed. It is the hungry who are filled. And this hunger must be for God, his kingdom and his righteousness.

In our Pentecostal insistence that tongue speaking accompanies the Baptism in the Spirit, we have perhaps at certain times in our history fallen into the error of making tongues our pursuit, rather than God. The consequence is that people can come to be prayed for in order to speak in tongues rather than to be filled with the Spirit. This is entirely out of place in true Pentecostal thinking and practice. However, there is a tendency to drift into the charismatic or third wave practice of bypassing all reference to Spirit Baptism and praying for a 'release' of the Spirit. Often there is a call for people to receive prayer to be released in tongues but even this practice appears on the decline.

However, the current revival movements in North America, and their counterparts in Europe, place a healthy emphasis on seeking God and experiencing the Holy Spirit in a powerful and life changing way. This may well be a prophetic pointer to the whole of Pentecostalism today. How much of God's awesome majesty and real, life-changing power do we really know in modern Pentecost? How filled are we really? It is up to individuals and churches to answer that for themselves. But the relatively low impact of much British and European Pentecostalism suggests that something is lacking. Certainly, there is a need for Pentecostals today to return to their roots in the matter of experiencing the Baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Perhaps we also need to re-examine the pre-Pentecostal holiness themes of the Holiness groups. The Brownsville revival has successfully re-established the holiness motif in all that they do. However, this is not strictly linked to a post-conversion experience of the Holy Spirit. Rather, in Brownsville, the call to holiness is part of the call to salvation with repentance as the key. On this base of holiness everything else is constructed: being filled with the Spirit, living for Christ, worship, Christian service and evangelism. Many Pentecostals would accept this as a welcome corrective to much shallowness in Pentecostalism today.

**THE THEOLOGY OF SPIRIT BAPTISM**

After a century of the Pentecostal movement it might be assumed that there was little left to do in relation to the development of a Pentecostal theology of Holy Spirit Baptism. After all, it is our distinctive doctrine. But it seems that we have only just begun to do the necessary hard work theologically. There have been many valiant efforts taking us in that direction.60 But these do not yet seem to have made any great theological impact on the wider Christian world. It seems that evangelicals consider themselves to have spoken the last word in the matter. Many evangelical, charismatic and third wave publications simply dismiss the Pentecostal position as being wrong, without always following through on their reasons.61 This may well be because the readership in view is more often than not, non-Pentecostal. But one is left with the feeling that most evangelical scholars think that the Pentecostal view no longer presents a serious challenge to their theology.

Others, like John Wimber (of the third wave movement), are kinder to the Pentecostal experience of Spirit Baptism and yet reject the theological, doctrinal and biblical thinking that undergirds it. John Wimber's often-stated position on the matter was that he was 'evangelical in doctrine but Pentecostal in experience'.62 This surely is an inadequate standpoint. How can we accept an experience and reject the theology that gives rise to it? It might well be justly pointed out that the Pentecostals did not come to their experience at first through theological reflection. But they have had almost a century of such reflection since then. And this reflection must surely not be dismissed so easily by those groups who only lately have begun to appreciate the need for a Pentecostal-type experience. Furthermore, if an experience is to be discounted theologically, should it not be abandoned along with the theology? And, if you admit to needing an experience not provided by your theology, wouldn't it be wise to conclude that it is your theology that is inadequate?

Of course, the issue is more complex than that. Pentecostals are seeking to influence an evangelical theological tradition that can be traced back to the Reformation, and even before. While there are some notable exceptions,63 the sheer volume of evangelical scholarship tips the balance in favour of their view. However, opinions are not justified by the weight of scholarship in and of itself. Ultimately the test is Scripture. And there are a number of unresolved biblical and exegetical points in the evangelical position.64

However, it seems to me that much of the debate has gone stale and is no longer a live issue for many contemporary Pentecostals and evangelicals. For our part, we surely cannot let that continue. Our Pentecostal convictions are worth defending if for no other reason than to present our perspective to the wider Christian
community as our distinctive witness to the work of the Holy Spirit. But there is an even more important reason. The debate has gone stale because we have failed to hear and answer at least two major evangelical sticking points.

First, there is the New Testament teaching that all Christians have the Holy Spirit. We must face this squarely as Pentecostals. Our doctrine of Spirit Baptism must include the work of the Holy Spirit in bringing people to Christ, working in them repentance and faith and cleansing them in the re-birth. We need to give attention to these areas by developing a Pentecostal theology that includes the work of the Spirit before and in as well as after conversion. We need to describe the Spirit’s work in bringing someone to repentance and faith and not just emphasize his empowering work in the believer.

And then, there is the New Testament emphasis on Spirit Baptism taking place in the context of Christian initiation. The New Testament describes Christian initiation as a process that includes Spirit Baptism. David Pawson in his books on Christian initiation and Spirit Baptism makes this point repeatedly and eloquently. He identifies the new birth as the four-fold process of a person repenting, believing, being baptised in water and receiving the Holy Spirit. David Pawson argues that, Christian initiation or conversion, like salvation itself, is a process. Both the Pentecostal post-conversion view of Spirit Baptism and the evangelical insistence that every believer ipso facto has the Holy Spirit are wrong.

His reasoning against the commonly held evangelical position is correct. Spirit baptism always follows faith. This point is a major weakness in the evangelical position. David Pawson’s arguments against the Pentecostal position are also challenging. He is certainly right in critiquing the Pentecostal tendency to separate Spirit Baptism from Christian initiation. He is also right to point out that in the New Testament, ‘being baptised in the Spirit and ‘receiving’ the Spirit are one and the same thing. But we must be extremely careful not to draw hasty conclusions from these observations.

Pawson says that Spirit Baptism is tied to ‘initiation and salvation’ (italics added). Here, Pawson seems to blur the distinction between conversion and full Christian initiation. Is it not possible to be converted to Christ without experiencing full Christian initiation? The thief on the cross is hardly a model of Christian initiation. The circumstances were unusual. However, it is proof that a person may have their eternal destiny altered and be saved from the condemnation of sin, without experiencing full Christian initiation. The thief on the cross clearly believed in Jesus, but had no opportunity to be water baptised, receive the Holy Spirit or to show his repentance by a godly lifestyle. But he was ‘saved’. Jesus said to him, ‘Today, you will be with me in paradise.’

Pawson argues that we should not restrict the term salvation to mean ‘justification’. It certainly means more than that. As the Apostle Paul says, anyone in Christ is, not only justified, but is also glorified, and is a new creation. The effectual calling of God in Christ brings a person into an assured position before God. The term salvation can also be applied to sanctification both in its objective aspect of ‘being set apart to God’ and in its practical aspect of ‘living a holy life’. But the real question is, ‘Can a believer in Christ be justified without experiencing full Christian initiation?’ The question is not merely an academic one. Neither is it an obsession with finding the irreducible minimum: ‘what is the least I must do to be saved?’ Rather, it is a vital theological question that goes to the heart of the gospel itself. To suggest that justification does not take place until full Christian initiation has occurred is to run counter to the gospel. The basic response the gospel calls for is faith. That is the condition for salvation. The New Testament position is ‘believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you will be saved.

Salvation, in its totality, may be a process but justification is not. For the believer, it is a past, completed event. While Justification is an eschatological concept, and therefore fundamentally future, in Christ the eschaton has arrived. Our future judgement has been brought forward and we have been found, ‘not guilty’ before the bar of God. We will be cleared on the Day of Judgement, because in Christ we have already been justified.

Now, at which point in Pawson’s scheme of conversion are we justified? This is not merely an example of the evangelical obsession with having a ‘ticket to heaven’. It raises fundamental issues concerning the gospel itself. Either we are justified by faith alone or we are not. If a believer in Christ remains under divine condemnation until he or she has been water baptised and has received the Spirit after the manner of Acts, then the Reformation doctrine of justification by faith alone is being compromised. The reformers taught that Justification is not received through any intermediate persons (priests) or any intermediate means (sacraments).

I am not suggesting that Pawson teaches the views outlined above. Anticipating some of these objections he says, ‘Forgiveness of sins is not connected with Spirit baptism in the New Testament. It is linked with repentance, faith and water baptism.’ While upholding a form of sacramentalism, Pawson seems to fall short of suggesting that a person is justified only when fully initiated. This is what Pentecostals would want to be careful to maintain. It is possible to be a believer in Christ and not yet have received the Holy Spirit in Spirit baptism. But a person need not be Spirit baptised in order to be justified. Pentecostals will want to maintain the priority of faith in the whole conversion-initiation process. The Pentecostal doctrine of subsequence does this admirably. God gives the Spirit to the justified believer in Christ as the seal or proof of acceptance.

However, Pawson is quite right to remind Pentecostals that the New Testament invariably places Spirit Baptism at the beginning of the Christian life. In that sense it is part of Christian initiation. We have been so careful to maintain that Spirit Baptism is not something that happens automatically at conversion that we have given the impression that it must be experienced after conversion. There is a technical correctness about this position. The case of the Samaritans in Acts 8 is proof of that. This is the most striking example of subsequence in the Acts...
The Samaritans were surely converted to Christ as they had believed and even been baptised in water. And yet they did not receive the Holy Spirit until what must have been a matter of at least days later. What was their standing before God during this interim period? The question must be asked regardless of the theological explanation given for the delay in Spirit Baptism. Clearly this example is not meant to be normative. The more familiar pattern of Acts is that Spirit Baptism comes much earlier on in the process of initiation. But, the point remains that, as Pentecostals argue, there is a theological, practical and (very frequently) a temporal distinction between believing in Christ and receiving the Holy Spirit.

While Spirit Baptism in Acts, as Pauwson maintains, invariably follows faith and almost always water Baptism, it nevertheless is associated with Christian beginnings. Petts expresses the timing of the Baptism of the Spirit in relation to water Baptism by using the happy phrase 'at/after'.

**THE SIGN GIFT ACCOMPANYING SPIRIT BAPTISM**

Speaking in tongues has been associated with Spirit Baptism from the earliest days of the Pentecostal movement. In fact, as has been pointed out, it was this combination unique to Pentecostal belief, that gave rise to Pentecostalism in the first place, and what arguably, has sustained its existence as a distinctive group within Christianity this century. But can it be maintained today? Once more, the evangelical argument appears to prevail. They maintain that the New Testament does not present tongues as the normative manifestation accompanying Spirit Baptism. The evidence is ambiguous and there is no such categorical statement justifying this position anywhere in the New Testament. Indeed, it is argued that it is wrong to limit the Holy Spirit to this gift as the evidence of the Spirit's presence. The Spirit moves as He wills and distributes his gifts accordingly. Again, we must hear the evangelical objections carefully. Often, Pentecostals approach this subject with almost sectarian zeal. On the other hand, an increasing number of Pentecostals appear to have been influenced by evangelical and charismatic opinion and are in doubt about the matter. A surprising number of British Pentecostal pastors do not agree with the traditional Pentecostal position.

There is no point in maintaining a position for the sake of tradition alone. And yet we must be very careful before we reject a view so close to the historical heart of the Pentecostal movement. Tony Campolo offers advice on how to be Pentecostal without speaking in tongues. But we need to ask the question, 'Can you be Pentecostal without speaking in tongues?' Of course the answer at one level is, 'yes'. You can be a member of a Pentecostal Church without being a tongue speaker. But the issue is deeper than that. Does the New Testament know of a Pentecostal without speaking in tongues? Of course the answer at one level is, 'yes'. You can be a member of a Pentecostal Church without being a tongue speaker. But the issue is deeper than that. Does the New Testament know of a Pentecostal without speaking in tongues? The book of Acts certainly places a very strong emphasis on tongues and strongly suggests that this gift was the definitive (and perhaps the exclusive gift) of the Spirit that, in the first instance, signalled Spirit Baptism.

However, to argue that tongues must be present in every instance without exception before a person may justly claim to have been baptised in the Spirit, is to go beyond the New Testament evidence. This does not undermine Pentecostal views on tongues as initial evidence or tongues as the sign gift accompanying Spirit Baptism. A sign does not necessarily have to be carried by every individual without exception for it to be valid in the community that owns it. Tongues speaking is as much a community sign, as it is an individual sign. Therefore, the fact that one cannot establish simply on exegetical grounds that every believer in the New Testament spoke in tongues at or during Spirit Baptism does not invalidate the basic Pentecostal position.

On the positive side, Pentecostalism today does have a strong contribution to make to the ongoing debate on the issue. Exegetical support from the relevant Acts passages is certainly not lacking. And there are a number of significant theological arguments that can be put forward to help extend the traditional evangelical understanding of the relationship between tongues speaking and Spirit Baptism. On purely theological grounds, it can be demonstrated that tongues is wholly appropriate as the sign gift of the Baptism in the Spirit. There are a number of biblical considerations that further support tongues as the sign gift for Spirit Baptism.

**The association between prophecy and the coming of the Spirit**

There is a long-standing biblical tradition that links prophetic speech with the coming of the Spirit. When the Spirit came upon the 70 elders of Israel in Numbers 11, they prophesied on one occasion only. However, when Eldad and Medad continued to prophesy, Joshua complained to Moses. The response of Moses is a strong foundational Old Testament statement on the association between prophecy and the presence of the Holy Spirit:

> Then Moses said to him, "Are you zealous for my sake? Oh, that all the LORD's people were prophets and that the LORD would put His Spirit upon them!" (Numbers 11:29).

Prophecy is linked to the coming of the Spirit in the Saul episodes (1 Samuel 10:6,10-12; 19:23-24).

A case of prophetic speech is attributed to the Holy Spirit coming upon Amasai in 1 Chronicles 12:18. This pattern is repeated in the full-blown prophetic utterances of 2 Chronicles 15:1-2: 20:4-15 and 24:20. And the link between the Spirit and the prophetic inspiration of the classical prophets is clearly stated in Ezekiel 11:5:

> Then the Spirit of the LORD fell upon me, and said to me, "Speak! Thus says the LORD: Thus you have said, O house of Israel, for I know the things that come into your mind." (Ezekiel 11:5).

The wish of Moses is extended by Joel into the latter's prophetic statement in which he clearly establishes the link between the universal outpouring of the Spirit upon Israel and the resulting prophetic phenomena (Joel 2:24ff). This is the first point of a series of points...
prophecy that Peter refers to in his sermon on the day of Pentecost applying it to the events of that day. The tongue speaking witnessed in Jerusalem pointed to the arrival of the Holy Spirit. And this, in turn was the fulfilment of the eschatological promise:

'And it shall come to pass in the last days, says God, that I will pour out of My Spirit on all flesh; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your young men shall see visions, your old men shall dream dreams. And on My menservants and on My maidservants I will pour out My Spirit in those days; and they shall prophesy.' (Acts 2:17-18).

The purpose of the coming of the Spirit

Another crucial theological link can be established between prophetic phenomena and the presence of the Holy Spirit. There is a strong biblical connection between prophetic revelation and knowing God (1 Samuel 3:7). The prophets were supremely called to the revelation of the knowledge of God. Only those who had the Spirit could truly know God on an intimate level. Jeremiah prophesied of a day coming when this privilege would be extended to all God's people. And it is this prophecy that is offered by the writer of the book of Hebrews as the essential promise of the New Covenant:

For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put My laws in their mind and write them on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. None of them shall teach his neighbour, and none his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,' for all shall know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them (Hebrews 8:10-11).

Tongues as prophetic speech

A strong exegetical case can be made to show that the tongues speaking of Acts fits into the category of prophetic speech. The same word is used for tongue speaking (Acts 2:4) and Peter's inspired utterance that followed (Acts 2:14). Those who heard the disciples speaking in tongues on the day of Pentecost recognised that they were declaring the wonderful works of God. All of these examples of Spirit-directed speech could be called prophetic. The same could be said for Cornelius' household whom the Jews heard speaking with tongues and magnifying God (Acts 10:46). The association of tongues with prophecy is even clearer in Acts 19:6. Here the Ephesian disciples spoke with tongues and prophesied when the Apostle Paul had laid his hands on them. Joel promised that prophetic manifestations would accompany the outpouring of the Spirit on 'all flesh'. And God gave tongues as the initial fulfilment of that promise. This was the clear manifestation that signalled the fulfilment of the promise. The Spirit was now available for all.

A new sign gift for the new era of the Spirit

The coming of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost began the new era of the Holy Spirit (John 7:39; Acts 2:33). Speaking in tongues was the specific prophetic manifestation that God gave as the Pentecostal fulfilment of the promise of Joel chapter 2. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that God gave a new form of prophetic speech to coincide with the new era of the Spirit-speaking in tongues.

THE PURPOSE OF SPIRIT BAPTISM

A very important aspect of any spiritual emphasis is the purpose attributed to it. And Pentecostalism has always been a purpose driven movement. Pentecostal experience finds its most characteristic expression in effective evangelism and witness. Their aversion to mere theory can make Pentecostals appear unduly pragmatic. But, when the driving force of Pentecostalism is examined, it compares favourably with that of the Early Church and indeed of the book of Acts itself. Acts 1:8 is the foundation text for this Pentecostal emphasis. It signals Luke's interest in providing a history of the growth and spread of the very early church. But it must also surely reflect the concern of the risen Christ to empower the infant church for her mission to the world.

Throughout this century, there have been many different purposes attributed to the Baptism of the Spirit. The Pentecostal emphasis has always been on power for service. This replaced the earlier emphasis on sanctification among the Holiness groups. Some reforming evangelicals have linked Spirit Baptism with assurance. In recent years, Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones was the most famous exponent of this view which can be traced back to the English Puritan, Thomas Goodwin. However, the standard evangelical view holds that the Baptism in the Spirit and receiving the Holy Spirit at conversion are one and the same. This equates Spirit-baptism with Spirit-indwelling. And evangelicals generally see Spirit-indwelling as the characteristic Christian distinctive. It is what makes a Christian a Christian.

In recent days, the differences between the Pentecostal approach and that of standard evangelical theology has been highlighted in the works of Turner and Menzies. Turner sees Spirit baptism as the definitive reception of the Spirit who, in Luke-Acts, is the 'Spirit of witness'. And Menzies upholds the Pentecostal view of 'power in service' being the definitive pneumatological theme in Luke-Acts. According to Turner, there is no suggestion that the believers of Acts became especially empowered for witness once they had received the Spirit. And in the cases where the charisma benefit mission in Acts these benefits are, according to Turner, only secondary. They are not the main point of the narrative.

Perhaps the difficulty is that we are dealing with different strands of New Testament evidence, which we cannot easily weave into a consistent pattern. Theologically, it seems best to understand the coming of the Holy Spirit, both corporately at Pentecost and personally in the individual lives of believers thereafter, as the Holy Spirit taking up grand residence in the Church. This appears to be the most consistent way of unifying the evidence. Holy Spirit residency is at the heart of the covenantal promise of God to His people and is totally consistent with the Spirit's work as the one who mediates the presence and activity of Christ in the Church.

In this view, Spirit Baptism involves the Spirit taking up personal, conscious and
full residence in the life of a believer. It is liked to initiation, if not properly a part of it. This residency of the Holy Spirit does not deny his presence in, with or upon believers prior to the moment of Spirit Baptism. Indeed it would be inconceivable to suggest otherwise. How could anyone arrive at faith in Christ without the internal convicting work of the Spirit? The gospel preached in the power and demonstration of the Spirit must also be received through the same influences of the Spirit.  

If this understanding were correct, it would be a simple matter to see how the various New Testament writers draw out their own particular emphasis to suit their purpose in writing. Once the presence of the Spirit is established in a believer's life he can be about his great business of empowering the church for witness, purifying the church for fellowship with God and shaping the church into the image of Christ. That Pentecostals have emphasized power for witness is surely not wrong. It lines up with the central purpose given to the Church in the Great Commission. And any inadequacy in Pentecostal theology at this point is part of a wider problem. Evangelicalism in general has had difficulty in finding a cohesive and all-embracing New Testament pneumatology. The model suggested here draws on both Pentecostal and evangelical insights.

The strength of the Pentecostal emphasis has become evident through the worldwide growth of the Church. World evangelism is synonymous with the Pentecostal outpouring of the 20th Century. The last one hundred years have seen the most dramatic growth in the entire history of the Christian Church. Granted not all church growth in this century can be described as Pentecostal. But much of it certainly can be attributed either directly or indirectly to Pentecostalism itself. And, more specifically, most people would attribute all evangelistic and missionary success to the work of the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of witness. The Lukan emphasis suggests that the purpose of the coming of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost was to draw people to Christ. Pentecost was a feast connected to harvest. 3,000 people were added to the Church as a result of Peter's preaching that day. Peter's sermon also pointed to the eschatological harvest anticipated by the prophet Joel. The gift of the Spirit was given to prepare the Church for the eschatological task of witness. There is an urgent purpose behind the coming of the Spirit: the task of mission.

How true to this purpose are Pentecostals in the west today? Are the fires of Pentecost dying down? There are some positive signs to show the link between the Spirit and witness is not being lost. In Britain and Europe, many of the fellowships that are growing are evangelical churches. Most of those outside the institutional churches are open to the Pentecostal-type manifestations of the Spirit. But there are some deeply disturbing trends that need to be challenged.

In keeping with the experience-centred nature of our society, it seems that many Christians today seek spiritual experiences more out of a desire for personal fulfillment than to be equipped for sacrificial service. The success of the Toronto-type 'drinking meetings' were no doubt due in part to the perceived lack of experience of the Spirit in many evangelical and, indeed, charismatic churches also. There was a 'spiritual dryness' and thousands came together to 'be filled'. But, as many Pentecostals, including myself, warned at the time, this is not the purpose of the coming of the Spirit. He comes not just to fill the spiritual and emotional needs of people, but to revolutionise their lives and equip them for effective witness.

The excessively experiential nature of some of these meetings was characterised by the place given to the accompanying phenomena. The laughing, shaking, falling and jerking were so spectacular that it was hard for some that were dazzled by such spiritual phenomena to separate them from the real work the Spirit had come to do. External phenomena are only valid in so far as they point to the internal workings of the Holy Spirit. And, in any case, many phenomena are themselves best understood as human reactions to the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit. Laughing, falling and shaking are not, strictly speaking, manifestations of the Spirit.

The danger is that people can be content with these things as 'signs' of the Spirit's presence when in fact, after a time, it can be demonstrated that the experience was shallow and transient. There was no lasting change, no on-going intimacy with God and very little evidence that the true purpose of Pentecost was being adhered to. Of course there are many, many examples to the contrary. It seems that those who were truly hungry for more of God and set their hearts to seek him have a different story to tell.

Many churches and individuals saw beyond the phenomena and heard the underlying call of the Holy Spirit for genuine spiritual renewal. They allowed the Holy Spirit to do his deep and intended work in their hearts. Lives were profoundly changed and the Holy Spirit achieved the essential preparatory work necessary for the next level of his work. The renewal emphasis of the mid 1990's has now sharpened into a revival focus apparent in many places both in North America and Europe.

And yet there is still a very long way to go before the true purpose of Pentecost is re-established. The Holy Spirit is still being called upon to bring 'a blessing'. His influences are mainly being seen on the Church. But what about the lost? What of the harvest? We must ensure the primary focus of our encounters with the Spirit is to be empowered to reach the lost. Even those in the revival movement concede that most of the responses being recorded are by those returning to a former Christian commitment. The unchurched are increasingly, but not yet significantly, being touched. We are far from the dynamic of the Day of Pentecost when 3,000 people were added to the Church. We have still yet to see our nations awakened by a popular move to Christ. Can we settle for anything less? Is anything less than this truly Pentecostal?
THE SUPERNATURAL CONSEQUENCES OF SPIRIT BAPTISM

Traditionally, the Pentecostal view of Spirit Baptism is that it is the gateway to spiritual gifts (that is, the gifts of the Spirit outlined by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12). Tongues received in Spirit Baptism is the starting point, but the Pentecostal ideal is that each believer grows and develops in spiritual openness to all the gifts. In practice, however, a number of things have counted against this emphasis being consistently carried through.

First, there was the strength of certain Pentecostal ministries. The pioneer days appear to have been characterized by 'anointed individuals': the 'apostolic' personalities who spearheaded the miraculous. The emphasis tended to be upon a few mighty men and women of God 'doing it all'. John Wimber called this the Pentecostal model and contrasted his approach which he called 'equipping the saints'.

Then, there was the emphasis given to tongues. At some stages in Pentecostal history, the impression might have been given that the purpose of the Baptism was for tongues, and that once you have received the gift of tongues you had arrived. It was as far as you were expected to go. This was never the official Pentecostal position but it could easily be wrongly assumed or adopted by the popular mind. The distance between theory and practice can at times be very great.

But there is perhaps an even more important reason why all the gifts of the Spirit have not always flourished among Pentecostal groups. It is now commonly acknowledged that British Pentecostals entered into a time of spiritual decline during and following the Second World War. Much of the Pentecostal fire had been domesticated or died out altogether. Perhaps tired of the persecution many Pentecostals endured they tried to appear more acceptable to other evangelicals. It may also have been due, in part, to the general coldness that prevailed in British Church life at the time.

Certainly, there seems never to have been a clear Pentecostal 'apostolic succession'. The role models of early Pentecostal miraculous ministry were now dead and Pentecostalism entered into a 'sub apostolic period'. With some notable exceptions there are few western Pentecostal leaders today modelling anything like the ministry of the miraculous that was found, for example, in George and Stephen Jeffreys and Smith Wigglesworth.

Many who do bring signs and wonders to the foreforn of their ministry tend to be on the fringe of Pentecostalism. Classical Pentecostals are usually suspicious of such men and women. For them, to enter this area is to enter the shadowy world of radicals and mavericks, not to mention charlatans and heretics!

It is also possible that some Pentecostals today are being influenced by the way other groups approach the gifts of the Spirit. Having disputed the Pentecostal doctrine of Baptism in the Spirit, it is not surprising that charismatics and third wave believers would deny the gateway theory. For them, the Holy Spirit equips believers with healing, with prophecy and with the whole range of Spiritual gifts without the belief and practice of Pentecostal Spirit Baptism.9

They cite many instances of those who have never spoken in tongues and have never claimed a Spirit Baptism subsequent to faith who, nevertheless, experience many gifts of the Spirit in their life and ministry. This is, however, to beg the question. The Holy Spirit is sovereign and he works as he chooses. The New Testament is not a strait-jacket. Many charismatics and third wave believers do have a 'Pentecostal' experience but are unlikely to call it such. And if experience is an indicator, surely it is a matter of historical record that it was the Pentecostal movement that ushered in the revival of the gifts of the Spirit this century. It is an observable fact that wherever people are encouraged to experience Holy Spirit infilling, spiritual gifts tend to flourish.9 The prerequisite is openness to the Holy Spirit. Tongues is the gateway gift only in so far as it is the sign gift that accompanies Spirit Baptism.

Nevertheless, when charismatic strengths are set against Pentecostal weaknesses there does not seem to be, in the minds of many people, any place left for the Pentecostal approach to these matters. But that is not a fair analysis. It would not be fair to turn the tables and play Pentecostal strengths against charismatic weaknesses. But, if we were to do so, an entirely different picture would emerge. The lack of an adequate theology of Spirit Baptism has left the charismatic movement floundering. For the most part, today it is shapeless and without direction. However, our task is to set our own Pentecostal house in order.

A promise of Pentecost is being neglected. Jesus said, "these signs will follow those who believe".8 He also said, "he who believes in me, the works that I do he will do also; and greater works than these he will do, because I go to my Father". This is our Pentecostal inheritance. Quite simply we have left our first love. It is time to see restored to the Church full Pentecostal power. Jesus promised that those baptised in the Spirit would receive the power to produce the supernatural proof that Jesus is alive.

During the weeks between the resurrection and the ascension of Jesus, he showed himself to be alive from the dead by many 'infallible proofs'. And then, in his departure from this earth, he promised the disciples Holy Spirit power to continue this proof-producing ministry: "You shall be my witnesses".

That this was supernatural ability to work signs and wonders is confirmed by the subsequent history of Acts. Repeatedly, it is the ministry of the miraculous that pushes the work of witness forward into its destination. Gordon Fee has made an extensive study of Pauline pneumatology and his conclusion is that Paul's method of evangelism is characterized by proclamation and deed, that is, through signs and wonders, all of which was accomplished by the power of the Holy Spirit.8

Pentecostalism brought about a revival of signs and wonders in the Church in the early part of this century. And today, Pentecostal signs and wonders are making an impact in many nations across the world. It is time for British and European Pentecostals to rise up and claim their birthright in this area. There can be no true
Pentecostal evangelism without signs and wonders. But the gifts of the Spirit are not just for evangelism. 1 Corinthians 12 places the gifts in the context of a Christian meeting for building the body of Christ. Pentecostal churches should be rich in these gifts and spiritual manifestations. And yet it seems that we are far from our heritage at this point. We must become Pentecostal in more than name. No Pentecostal pastor, church or movement should rest until the gifts of the Spirit are being exercised in an effective and widespread manner. We are in need of a fresh visitation from the Lord.

CONCLUSION - PENTECOSTAL REVIVAL TODAY

In this paper I have called for a revival of true Pentecostal experience today. We must return to the values, fervour and ethos of primitive, pioneer Pentecostalism. There is a need to rediscover the real power of Pentecost and its God-given purpose. In particular, we must act to ensure that vibrant Pentecostalism is sustained by a renewed confidence in the biblical experience of Spirit Baptism. We must continue to engage evangelicals and other Christians in theological dialogue presenting a more clearly defined understanding of this doctrine, its practice today and the consequences of living a truly Spirit-filled life. We must regain a lost confidence in the place of tongues both as the sign gift and its role in edifying the believer.

Having said all that, however, we must remember our greatest historical strength has not been in the intricacies of theological argument but in powerful action. We cannot ignore the fact that our influence has extended not through mere theological debate but successful proclamation of the gospel with the demonstration of the Spirit in power. We must seek God for a restoration of a genuine Pentecostal experience and practice today and the consequences of living a truly Spirit-filled life. We must regain a lost confidence in the place of tongues both as the sign gift and its role in edifying the believer.

The Pentecostal emphasis is apparent, for example, in the story of Dennis Bennett. This British born American Episcopalian minister was “baptised in the Spirit” and “spoke in tongues” in 1959. He and his wife, Rita went on to become leading pioneering figures among the emerging charismatic movement. His story is told in his book Nine O’clock in the Morning. (Eastbourne: Kingsway, 1998).

It is debatable whether there was ever a shift away from orthodox evangelical theology in relation to the Spirit. But the tendency in recent years has been to re-establish a traditional evangclical pneumatology in relation to Christian beginnings while retaining aspects of charismatic or Pentecostal experience and practice.

A British example from this period of someone, eager for charismatic renewal and yet resistant to the Pentecostal theology that came with it, is Tom Smail. He attended a ministers’ meeting in the mid-sixties where Dennis Bennett was speaking about renewal. Impressed by Bennett’s joyful relationship to God and experience of his presence, power and promises, Smail nevertheless was convinced that Bennett’s theology was impossible. According to Smail, Bennett, ‘seemed to have swallowed classical Pentecostalism quite uncritically’. See Smail, Walker and Wright, Charismatic Renewal, (London: SPCK, 1995), 14.
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The gateway theory does not deny the presence and practice of spiritual gifts in those who have not spoken in tongues. The gifts of the Spirit are never listed in ascending order of availability or importance suggesting that a believer graduates from tongues to the 'greater gifts'.

Mark 16:17.

John 14:12.


William Fetler - Friend of Pentecostalism in Latvia

Valdis Teraudkalns

INTRODUCTION

People who have left marks on pages of history have often been people who sacrificed their personal interests in order to dedicate their lives to some great cause. One such a person was William Fetler (1883-1957), known also as Basil A. Malof (during World War II, at the time of his naturalisation in USA he changed his name to the name derived from the Russian adjective 'maly' meaning 'little' and Basil A. Malof became his pen name for the rest of his life).

He had an impulsive personality and others often had difficulty getting along with him. It explains the fact that books and articles written about Fetler are often emotionally charged with a whole spectrum of responses: from Dr. A. McCaig's (Principal of Spurgeon's College) appraisal, "there was a man sent from God whose name was Basil" to the description of his being an 'extreme reactionary' given by Soviet author E. Stabins.1 While remaining a Baptist, he was at the same time very much involved in contacts with people from other Evangelical groups.

Fetler was Latvian but his activities went far beyond his native land. In a period of over fifty years, he had responsibilities in Moscow, St. Petersburg, Warsaw, Berlin and Paris. From 1939, he lived in the United States from where he developed a world-wide ministry. These were varied and included the following ventures. When he heard the reports of Eastern European refugees, he set up a Society for their welfare; he tried to reach refugees in Hong Kong. In order to distribute the Scriptures, Fetler incorporated a new society under the old name - the Russian Bible Society.3 President Dwight Eisenhower was the first to receive a copy of the new edition of the Russian Bible printed by the Society.4

Fetler can be described not only as pastor but also as a hymn writer, choir leader and editor. He translated books written by F.B. Meyer, A. Murray, R.A. Torrey, D.L. Moody and C. Spurgeon.

FETLER - PENTECOSTAL IN PRACTICE

Fetler's interest in Pentecostalism started from the early days of this movement, in 1907. While working in St. Petersburg, Fetler got in touch with Moncur Niblock who has been described by Donald Gee as one who in Wales "boldly taught the full truth about the Pentecostal blessing".5 Niblock travelled to St. Petersburg where he met Fetler who arranged meetings for him.6 During the same time period, Fetler published in the leading Latvian Baptist periodical an article about the beginnings of Pentecostalism using as a source the journal Apostolic Faith and informing readers about the activities of Parham and Seymour. Pentecostal faith was something new for Latvia but Fetler was not the only Latvian touched
By it - some impact was made by Eleanor Patrick’s visits to the Baltic provinces; the Baptist periodical Avots published information about the Brazilian Latvian Baptist minister Karlis Andermanis who got involved in Pentecostalism and had to leave his Baptist congregation. Ideas from the Holiness movement, spread amongst Lutheran Pietist circles and Free-Church people, prepared the ground for the coming of new players on the religious scene in the Baltic region.

Worship services led by Fetler during that time were held in typical revivalist manner - nobody would know in advance how long the service would last, the atmosphere was emotional - some participants wept and shouted during the meetings. When the pastor cried out “hallelujah”, the audience responded with the same. Some of their attendees ironically described them as 'theatrical' and as 'Christian-Evangelical-dramatical performances'. Some members of his church at St. Petersburg wanted to go further than their teacher and this created turmoil which pressed Fetler to excommunicate some members of the church. One of the observers of these developments stated that people who joined the new-born Pentecostal movement at St. Petersburg mostly came out of Fetler’s Gospel House Church.

Soviet researcher A. Klibanov mentions as Pentecostal in character the fact that Fetler “founded the society of the Brotherhood of the Acts of Apostles, raising on its shield “Pentecostalism - the outpouring on the Apostles of the Holy Spirit”. However, it is important to note that this title as such does not mean that people using it belong to one of the Pentecostal denominations; at the turn of the century, some of the Holiness assemblies used the same title to designate their churches.

After the First World War, Fetler opened a large church at Riga, the Salvation Temple, opened in 1927 (during the Soviet rule after the Second World War, it was used as the Sports Hall of the University). It was a place which continued to nourish a dynamic revivalist tradition. The same can be said about Fetler’s publications like the magazine Kristīgais Vestnesis which published, for example, an article concerning the baptism in the Spirit from George Jeffreys’ (founder of the British Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance) work. It is interesting to note that the Salvation Temple has a distinctive Prayer Tower, much used by Pentecostals from the very beginning: Charles Parham converted one of the domes of the unfinished mansion in Topeka into a prayer tower while Aimee McPherson had an upper room built in the Angelus Temple.

Fetler had contacts with many revivalist preachers around the world. It is no surprise that he was linked also with the leaders of the Apostolic Church: in 1935, he, together with D.P. Williams, unveiled the foundation stone of the Bible School belonging to this denomination; earlier, D.P. Williams had been preaching in Fetler’s church in Riga; because of this established link, Janis Bormanis from Latvia was able to spend a year at the Apostolic Church Bible School in the 1930’s.

From the history of Pentecostalism in the USA, we know that in the 1920’s, Pentecostals got involved in Fundamentalist controversies; paradoxically, the movement which talked so much about the Spirit got captured by sticking to the letter by religious absolutists. Fetler was involved in the same struggles. While in the United States during the First World War, he became acquainted with many theological traditions amongst Baptists. It was a real shock for him to read Clark’s Sixty Years With the Bible. Later, Fetler described it in a rather dramatic way, typical of him: “It was towards two or three in the morning that I got through with it. As I read page after page, I repeatedly had to stop. You would have seen me on my knees again and again, sometimes even prostrate before God. I cried out to God: can it be possible that this book has been written by one calling himself a Baptist? Can it be possible that this man really knows God as personal Saviour and that he has been born again? Is it true that a man writing like that has been a teacher of others?”. As a result, Fetler strengthened his ties with Fundamentalists. For example, in the Bible school at Philadelphia, organised by him, among the teachers were Dr. C.I. Scofield and Dr. Blanchard, President of Wheaton College. As an alternative to the Latvian Baptist Seminary at Riga, supported by Northern Baptists, Fetler opened in 1925, the Bible and Mission’s School. There, students were nurtured in the atmosphere of strict Evangelical spirituality. A student, J. Vagars, writes, “Every morning at 7.00 a.m. all students have to be in their seats at the class in order to spend one hour in silence, praying and reading the Bible. After that they have corporate prayers and an explanation from God’s Word led by W. Fetler, Director of the School. Then, breakfast and after that, beginning of classes”. Documents of that time clearly show his theological views: He wrote, “I believe in the plenary (full) inspiration of both the Old and New Testaments, in the Trinity of the Godhead, in the Virgin Birth and Deity of Jesus Christ, His atoning sacrifice through the blood of the cross. His bodily resurrection and personal return”. All members of the Russian Missionary Society had to sign this statement. In the letter, written in 1935, Fetler states, “All my theological views are strongly conservative. According to my understanding, I am following the teaching of Spurgeon, Moody, Torrey and Wesley. In my personal convictions, I have never been sectarian but I consider all people who are born again as brothers in Christ in spite of which church they belong to. In matters concerning the sacraments and order to different churches, I acknowledge that it is possible to hold different views which cannot be forced upon others”. There are inconsistencies in these words if one compares Spurgeon’s and Wesley’s views with his. But, again, we need to remember that Fetler’s theology, just as in Pentecostalism, is experiential and practical, not concerned with polished definitions.

FETLER’S PNEUMATOLOGY - HALF A STEP FROM THE PENTECOSTAL THRESHOLD

McCaig, in his books where he gathers memories from travelling around Russia and also Latvia, mentions two factors - the Welsh revival and Finney’s literary heritage as important in the formation of Fetler’s own spiritual life. It places him within the tradition of the Holiness movement. As it is known, Finney
believed that the baptism in the Spirit was an endowment of power for service which had one basic task - to convert the world. Finney was convinced that all Christians could receive it. It has been reported that Fetler preached in St. Petersburg that "the minister of the Word of God can only be a person who has received the baptism of the Holy Spirit and gift of preaching". This is close to Finney’s belief that the baptism with the Spirit should be the primary qualification for Christian ministry. In his introduction to the Latvian edition of Fulfillment of Holy Spirit, by Charles Irwod Fetler, he writes about the baptism of the Holy Spirit, understanding it as an instantaneous experience with the following signs:

- Jesus Christ becomes for the person very precious, especially His cross and the merit of His blood;
- sin is seen in its true light, whilst at the same time there comes a longing for a holy and pure life;
- the willingness to sacrifice one’s personal interests;
- genuine love.

Later, in his lecture on the baptism of the Holy Spirit, given in 1931, at the Congress of the Second Baptist Union at Riga, Fetler again underlined the idea that this experience is needed for those "who want to receive a special power for spiritual ministry".

Fetler had been influenced also by Keswick conferences. The Spirit-filled life was one of the main topics of the Keswick convention. As in Fetler’s case, its attendees were not so much concerned with intellectual reflections as with a deepening of practical Christian life. In 1906, in one of the Baptist periodicals, we find Fetler’s exalted impressions about Keswick - “Giants of faith who already have experienced their Pentecost have come to show others the way and to teach them how to receive the Holy Spirit, not through the deeds of law but through faith”.

Fetler’s views were disputed amongst ministers of his own denomination. Especially zealous in the dispute with Fetler was his former co-worker, pastor P. Lauberts who defended the classical Evangelical viewpoint. He wrote a book with the title Is Fetler a Baptist?, rebuking Fetler in the matters of ecclesiology, pneumatology and his understanding of the Christian life and holiness, including Fetler’s belief that filling with the Holy Spirit is separate event. Another Baptist pastor, R. Ekesteins from the respectable Riga Seminary Church, was amongst those who retained the traditional Evangelical doctrine, writing, “Baptism in the Spirit is a once-for-all event or experience. It happened when we were converted and received Jesus as our Saviour ... it is only one baptism in the Holy Spirit but several (many) fillings with him”.

**AT THE MIDST OF TENSIONS**

For a better understanding of the tensions within the Latvian Baptist community mentioned earlier, we need to have a short historical introduction. The Latvian Baptist movement between the two wars was well established in Latvia. In 1938, in Latvia, there were 109 local Baptist churches with over 12,000 members, 96 pastors and almost the same number of assistant pastors. Church services were held in 74 specially created church buildings and in about 60 halls adapted for such services. This was a period of institutionalisation of the Baptist movement with all the typical problems for such a period: clashes between denominational leaders and charismatic personalities, setting of doctrinal standards. Some of the state laws assisted in the process of establishing strong denominational policies. For example, according to the law, appointment of ministers in the local churches had to be confirmed by the Council of the Baptist Union. Independent personalities like Fetler were not ready to accept this.

In fact, conflict started already before the First World War. Fetler’s activities and especially his methods of evangelism were not received well by all of his fellow-believers. Tensions exploded when Fetler as the second minister of the Jelgava Baptist Church wanted to take part in the Latvian Baptist Congress (1913, Riga) and was not admitted because of the fact that temporarily, he did not live in Latvia. From 2 June until 24 June, 1926, in the village of Velda the annual Congress of the Latvian Baptists was held and again Fetler and J. Bormans who were delegates of the Congress did not receive a mandate from the mandate committee. A resolution of the Congress states, “Taking into consideration reports and discussions of the delegates regarding W. Fetler as well as his previous activities which manifested in the confusion of the Baptist principles accepted in the Baptist churches and concerning Baptist doctrine, Congress recognises that Fetler cannot be considered as a Baptist”. One of the indirect moves against methods used by Fetler and his associates involved a resolution passed by the meeting of Minister’s Fraternity: “regarding the evangelistic activities in order to avoid flashy advertisements”. Fetler remained a Baptist for his whole life in spite of open doors for him to follow some of his associates in joining the Pentecostals. He also did not join the extreme wing of Latvian Baptists which turned into an emigration movement to Brazil in the 1920’s. American Latvian pastor Vilis Vaskis in one of the interviews given in the United States in 1982, stated that Fetler’s evangelistic efforts separated him from what he calls ‘the second phase of revival’ which went into extremes - the practice of glossolalia flourishing in some Baptist congregations and prophecies about the necessity for believers to leave the country. What Fetler and his sympathisers did resulted in the formation of the Second Baptist Union of Latvia which existed until 1934 when Latvian Baptists again reunited. In the annual congress of the First Union, pastor A. Meters reported that 18 congregations left the Union, which constituted 1/5 of all member churches. The First Union was very strict in its position against the new-born Union. In 1926, the President of the First Union, Dr. J.A. Freigs, and the Secretary of the First Union, J. Riss wrote in the letter to the Minister for Internal Affairs, “The only Baptist organisation in Latvia recognised by the World’s Baptist Alliance is the Baptist Union of Latvia”. The Regional congress of Baltic Baptists which was held in 1926 at Riga with the presence of Baptist international leaders was used to prove this point. When
Fetler and his co-workers complained, Dr. Mullins met them together with the members of the Council of the First Union. Later, Fetler received a letter where Mullins explained his position. Mullins wrote, "Every Baptist general body is autonomous. Each of them governs itself and prescribes its own conditions of membership. It and it alone determines whether a messenger or group of messengers should or should not be seated ...". Relationships between the sides involved remained distanced in spite of a reconciliation in 1934.

CONCLUSION

Fetler did not have well articulated, systematised theological views but it is undeniable that his writings and his personality influenced many Christians. This heritage has not vanished. Recently, interest in Fetler has been renewed by British Baptist minister's John Wood's brochure *Born in Fire.* He also has informed the author of this article about the existence of the church building in South Wales (Bethlehem Baptist Church) modelled as the Gogalga Baptist Church at Riga (one of the churches established by Fetler before the First World War). In 1993, the Salvation Temple at Riga again was returned to the church and its Latvian and Russian congregations are continuing Fetler's revivalist tradition. That the building is used also by a Latvian Pentecostal congregation indirectly reminds us how close these traditions stood in Fetler's mind. In 1991, the Apostolic Church renewed regular contacts with Latvia establishing local churches connected to this Pentecostal denomination. Its members acknowledge Fetler as somebody who has been spiritually close to them - Fetler's name is mentioned in a brief history of the Apostolic church presented in the Department of Social and Religious Affairs. One of Fetler's associates, pastor Janis Bormanis is among the founders of Pentecostalism in Latvia; after some controversies, he, together with his followers in 1930, broke away from the Riga Ageniskalns Baptist Church and established another Pentecostal Church. Today, the Latvian Association of Pentecostals is continuing that which was started before the war.

Donald Gee had come very close to truth when he stated, "William Fetler of Latvia was first used to bring the wide spiritual harvest fields there (Eastern Europe) before the Pentecostal friends in both America and England but he never maintained a full connection with the movement". He was Pentecostal, not doctrinally, but by heart and in praxis. We may disagree with his views but his challenge remains - to remain faithful to the ultimate cause, till the end.
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The Pentecostal Missionary Union and the Fourfold Gospel with Baptism in the Holy Spirit and Speaking in Tongues: A New Power for Missions?

Peter Kay

The doctrinal spine of Pentecostalism can be found in the notion of a four-fold gospel of Jesus as Saviour/Sanctifier, Baptist in the Spirit; Healer and Coming King which A.B. Simpson, the promoter of world missions and founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, had combined in a synthesis of prevailing theological movements in 1890. That this quartet of Christological assertions gave shape to primitive British Pentecostal missionary theology in particular can be seen with reference to the life, times and writings of the major figure of the PMU, Cecil Polhill.

CECIL POLHILL

Cecil Polhill (1860-1936), an Anglican layman, was, with Rev. A.A. Boddy, the co-founder of the Pentecostal Missionary Union (PMU). As President and major policy maker, Polhill directed its course for the duration of its existence between 1909 and 1925, before it was absorbed into the newly formed Assemblies of God of Great Britain and Ireland as its Foreign Missions operation.

In 1884, at the age of 24, he had experienced Evangelical conversion with his brother Arthur, and ‘yielded to and trusted in Jesus Christ as my Saviour, Lord and Master’. In 1885, together with C.T. Studd and four other Cambridge graduates, the brothers sailed for Shanghai as members of Hudson Taylor’s China Inland Mission (CIM), formed in 1865 with the purpose of evangelising the interior of China beyond the treaty ports. Polhill saw himself as one of ‘the King’s ambassadors’ offering the unevangelized Chinese ‘the message of life .... so that they may choose between life with Christ for evermore or death eternal’. An uncomplicated Evangelical view of the priority of spiritual reconciliation as the dominant human need together with the determination required to set and achieve goals characterised Polhill during his years as President of the PMU.

Polhill returned from China in 1900 on doctor’s orders, after gruelling, largely unfruitful work, in and around Tibet where in 1895 he had become the leader of the CIM’s Tibetan Mission Board. However, he never relinquished his missionary vocation and his yearning to evangelise Tibet, in particular. He was to make at least five further trips to China within the next twenty years. On the first of them, he went in his capacity as a member of the CIM London Council to develop a strategy for expanding their Tibetan work but received scant support from D.E. Hoste, a fellow member of the Cambridge Seven and Hudson Taylor’s successor as CIM Director.
On his return journey, he made a detour via Los Angeles, having heard reports of the outpouring of the Spirit at Azusa Street Mission. Whilst in the city, Polhill received the Pentecostal baptism and was 'twice filled with laughter and sent to the floor', then 'the Lord spoke through me in a new tongue'. Within two months of returning to England, Polhill was with Boddy and, appropriately enough, about 120 others, at the first major gathering of early British Pentecostalism - the Whitson Conference in Sunderland in 1908.

In January, 1909, at another meeting in Sunderland, it was decided to establish 'The Pentecostal Missionary Union for Great Britain and Ireland' and an Executive Council was set up. Alexander Boddy who was, until the end of the First World War the 'outstanding personality in British Pentecostalism', a member of the PMU council between 1909 and 1924. *Confidence*, the monthly magazine he edited during the same period, devoted a section to the PMU based on correspondence from the missionaries. The PMU remained the major expression of institutional structure linking the Pentecostal works until the formation of the Assemblies of God of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in 1924.

In the initial Resolutions of the Council there was a distinctive, Pentecostal emphasis: (As for candidates) they must be from those who have received the Baptism of the Holy Ghost themselves. They must be sincere believers in the Atonement through the Blood, with both pardon and deliverance, and succeeded by the anointing of the Holy Spirit with the Signs and Gifts.

In addition to paying heed to the demands of Tibet, the PMU aspired to provide a framework of training, supervision and support for an anticipated stream of volunteers of whom some were already missionaries but wanting to return to their work under a Pentecostal agency. The first missionaries trained by the PMU sailed for China in September 1910. In all, by 1925, the PMU sent out sixty missionaries of whom thirty-six were women and twenty-four were men. Of these, around ten had previously served with another missionary society. The PMU opened fields in India (1909), the Belgian Congo (1913) and South America (1917) but over half the PMU missionaries worked in Yunnan province adjacent to Tibet in line with Polhill's original plan.

PMU multidenominational character and its 'faith' policy of not guaranteeing an income to its missionaries, reflected Polhill's association with Hudson Taylor's CIM on whose London Council he remained until 1915. As Edith Blumhofer has written of the PMU's attitude to denominational allegiance, it required its missionaries:

*to profess neither rigid nor particular polity preference but endorsed and supported those Pentecostals of all Protestant affiliations who considered themselves called.*

Polhill, in fact, remained a lay Anglican for all of his life in the style of those Evangelicals who took their denominational allegiance much less seriously than their spiritual affinity with all those with kindred convictions about the authority of the Bible and the atoning death of Christ. Polhill had convened Pentecostal Conventions and weekly Prayer meetings for any seeking the baptism in the Spirit without reference to affiliation. In the years leading up to the first World War he was organizing, and often financing, seven such meetings a week in London.

Hudson Taylor's emphasis, learnt from the Christian Brethren, on the fundamental unity of all true believers and his own experience of interdenominational cooperation within the CIM in the interests of speedy and systematic evangelism, led Polhill to expect that all Spirit-filled believers would share his conviction that the coming of the Spirit signalled the eschatological renewal of the whole Church in order to harvest the elect from the four corners of the world. However, Polhill did not follow the CIM model of field-based mission leadership. His own upper class background, training within the hierarchical structures of the British public school system and then of the British army and his personal wealth predisposed him to take up an authoritarian role as virtually both the financial and administrative controller of the PMU. There is clear evidence that there was a clash between Polhill's presumption of class-based superiority and the understanding of some missionaries of the implicit egalitarianism of Spirit-directed and relationships.

**THE ROOTS OF THE PMU**

Polhill edited a missionary magazine, *Flames of Fire*, between 1911 and 1925. Its editorial content reflected the contemporary pessimistic, individualistic and urgently premillennial tone of the revivalist section of the missionary fraternity. Polhill and Boddy's personal experience and influence ensured that the PMU arose out of an existing mainstream tradition of early twentieth century Evangelicalism. From Keswick they would have espoused a doctrine of baptism in the Spirit as the means of sanctification understood as empowerment for sacrificial dedication to Christian work, especially missionary service. Prayer circles had sprung up both at Keswick and under the aegis of Reader Harris' *Pentecostal League of Prayer* which gave clear expression to the perceived link between revival and mission. The Welsh Revival of 1904-5 had been perceived as part of the End-time outpouring of the Holy Spirit to revive the Church and so provoke a movement of world-wide evangelization before the return of Christ. Its missionary orientation was further enhanced by a number of derivative revival outbreaks on the mission field in China, India and Korea. Polhill described the mission of the PMU as 'the speedy evangelization of the world'. Its stress on primary and diffusive evangelism with its priority of 'reaching the unreached' echoed the CIM. Its view was that mission entailed extension - central to the ethos of the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference of 1910. It was also the motivation behind the founding of the spate of new independent, 'faith' missions from 1895 among which the PMU belonged.
THE PMU'S APPLICATION OF THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL

The feature which perhaps best reveals the continuity between PMU teaching and existing streams of missionary thinking was its firm theological rooting in the notion of the fourfold gospel. Pentecostal preaching emphasized the four faceted role of Jesus as Saviour, Sanctifier, Healer, Baptizer in the Holy Spirit and Coming Kingdom. As noted above, this was a formula popularized by the influential Presbyterian, A.B. Simpson (1843-1919), whose writing on Mission-related topics appears in Polhill's Flames of Fire. Simpson's formulation of the gospel was echoed thematically, if not in the same words, by other prominent Evangelical leaders of the time like A.J. Gordon the American Baptist and author of The Holy Spirit in Missions (1891) and The Ministry of Healing (1882) and Andrew Murray who foresaw 'an end time renewal of ... apostolic power and spiritual gifts'. Gordon devised a restorationist eschatology in which the end time renewal of early Christian vitality could include the exercising of apostolic power and spiritual gifts. Many looked for a 'pneumatic millennium' which anticipated worldwide revival of faith in Jesus as Saviour through the preaching of Spirit baptized missionaries and endorsed by signs of healing before the return of the King.

I want to ask the questions: how did PMU teaching and praxis concerning the Baptism in the Holy Spirit diverge from this contemporary, radical Evangelical missiology and did any divergence provide evidence of a new power at work in a Christian missionary agency?

JESUS THE BAPTIZER IN THE HOLY SPIRIT

The PMU was clearly an example of how radical Evangelism at the end of the nineteenth century had aligned itself with a doctrine that the Spirit was given to Christians not merely to make them impervious to sin but also that they might become powerful in missionary activity. The term 'baptism in the Spirit' had gained currency from the 1850s. The influence of Revivalism first through Charles Finney and then in D.L. Moody's Northfield Conventions had replaced the Wesleyan association of the Spirit and ensure sanctification by that of new power for service, especially missionary service. It was, for instance, a cliché in Keswick teaching at the end of the nineteenth century that 'consecration and the spiritual gifts'. Gordon devised a restorationist eschatology in which the end time renewal of early Christian vitality could include the exercising of apostolic power and spiritual gifts. Many looked for a 'pneumatic millennium' which anticipated worldwide revival of faith in Jesus as Saviour through the preaching of Spirit baptized missionaries and endorsed by signs of healing before the return of the King.

Polhill perceived the Spirit empowering ordinary men and women to preach with an authority which resulted in conviction of sin and saving faith on the part of the hearers. His own experience had convinced him that the Spirit also renewed the life and strength of Christians who had become weakened by their labours or personal tragedy.

To Polhill, the baptism in the Spirit brokered a clearer Biblical revelation of Christ and the ability to bear witness to it. Merely intimate personal experiences of 'special and private prophecies' which resulted in Kathleen Miller, the first PMU missionary in India, quickly agreeing to resign, only served to harden his opinion that strict control was needed over those claiming Spirit baptism. From then on, field activity was within a framework of strict accountability to the PMU Council which had introduced a question into the Candidates Schedule in 1911 which asked applicants.

Are you willing to work in harmony with those who may be placed over you in the Lord should you be ultimately accepted for foreign service?

Polhill's distaste for disorder and inefficiency and abiding sense of the hierarchical structuring of relationships was at odds with the view that the Spirit conferred an implicit freedom on all Christians to take initiatives with the Spirit's authority. This alienated him from both younger Pentecostal leaders like W.F.P. Burton and Smith Wigglesworth and prevented him from allowing that PMU missionaries be given more responsibility in reliance on the Spirit's leading and teaching. Polhill effectively exercised this control through the mechanism of the PMU Council and even the first PMU Field Superintendent was not appointed until 1921.

SPEAKING IN TONGUES

Dayton and Faupel have shown how tongues speaking did not constitute the essential defining ingredient of early Pentecostalism. However, contemporary analysis of the movement often concentrated on tongues speaking. Tongues was the most obvious innovation which constituted Pentecostalism as a new movement and this was particularly so in the case of the PMU - its first British missionary enterprise. Tongues provided the spark of energy which brought new life to ailing revivalism by providing contact with the 'spiritual universe' with which Evangelical Christians had always been so familiar in theory but ignorant of in practice. Spirit Baptism with tongues speaking brought access to the experience of a world view understood by Biblical prophets and apostles in which 'no boundaries may be drawn between the supernatural world, the domain of nature and that of man'.

Initially, the PMU reaped a legacy of inter-confessional cooperation from Polhill's experience of the multidenominational policy of the CIM. PMU missionaries came from Denmark, Holland and America as well as the United Kingdom. The PMU reflected early Pentecostalism's initial self understanding as a movement to 'melt away denominationalism' and to bring spiritual revival to the
Church. Polhill was instrumental in the formation of a council of missionary societies comprising the PMU; the China Inland Mission; the British & Foreign Bible Society; the Christian & Missionary Alliance and Independent Pentecostals to work together in Yunnan Province. Others had shared the hope that the baptism in the Spirit would provide the church with a demonstration of uniquely Christian unity. William Seymour of Azusa Street Mission had regarded speaking in tongues as 'a sacrament of unity' which united God's children across barriers of class, race and nationality.

However, to Polhill's dismay, its attitude to tongues became the focus of opposition to the new PMU within the missionary fraternity. The good relations between the PMU and the CIM were finally breached over the question of tongues as the vital sign of the Spirit. By 1914, the China Council of the CIM with which he had made an arrangement to extend oversight and various support facilities to PMU missionaries, was at odds with Polhill. The substance of the disagreement was that the PMU missionaries were holding waiting meetings in which the Spirit and his manifestations were being sought. It was the belief of D.E. Hoste, director of the CIM, that seeking the Spirit in such a way could lead to dangerous consequences, 'the strain on the brain occasionally (is) ... such, that in some cases insanity has ensued.' Polhill, whilst not committing the PMU to a fully fledged doctrine of initial evidence, would not gainsay the connection between Spirit baptism and speaking in tongues. The result was that CIM property and facilities were closed to PMU workers. As in the case of Christian & Missionary Alliance, the CIM, as represented by Henry Frost (the American Director), did not rule out speaking in tongues per se. The stumbling block for them was to accept it as a desirable norm of Christian spirituality to be sought and welcomed. Tongues as the seal of Spirit baptism may have engendered unity among the recipients but it resulted in the formation of Pentecostal denominations and a blow to the missionary ecumenism so highly commended at the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference. Polhill regretted the resulting sense of isolation from the mainstream Conservative Evangelical missionary fraternity. A major motive behind Polhill's propensity to quote from a wide range of sources such as Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, the Bishop of Madras, Roland Allen, William Booth and A.B. Simpson in Flames of Fire had been his determination to show that the Baptism in the Spirit with signs and gifts had a respectable and extensive pedigree in the Church Universal.

Even under Polhill's open-minded leadership, speaking in tongues as the sign of the Spirit became the doctrine that distinguished the PMU from other missionary bodies. Its candidates had to testify to a tongues experience and due to the inclusion linking Spirit baptism with tongues in the PMU regulations, accept it as normative. There is clear evidence that A.A. Boddy and Polhill favoured a more continental and Pietistic approach to the evidences of Spirit baptism which insisted on accompanying fruits of love and holiness; however, it was not until the PMU had become part of the Assemblies of God in 1924 that Polhill began to consistently express any serious reservations about emphasizing speaking in tongues. At first, he was happy to speak of tongues as the 'first manifested evidence' of the Baptism but by the late 1920s he often spoke of the danger of indifference to moral standards which could result from accepting tongues as sufficient evidence of the baptism. In January 1929, he finally wrote to T.H. Mundell, long time Secretary of the PMU, 'I would alter the name Pentecostal Missionary Union.'

The tendency among younger PMU missionarries on the field was to look for the sign of tongues as sole and sufficient evidence of the Spirit's baptism. This appeared to become standard policy after the break with the CIM and C & MA. It was glossolalia which determined whether a convert had merely received an 'anointing' or the 'baptism' itself. One value of the evidential view of tongues may have been to provide perceptible evidence of conversion and readiness for baptism in water which was always an issue for missionaries aware of the need to identify mere 'rice' Christians.

WHAT DID TONGUES ACCOMPLISH?

From the time of the exclamation at the first Christian Pentecost, 'What is the meaning of this?', the choice of speaking in tongues as a distinctive mark of spirituality has been a cause of perplexity. One method of assessing the value of tongues as a missionary resource is to observe what the users, the PMU personnel, considered its benefits to be.

Under the influence of Charles Parham of Topeka, Florida, the earliest Pentecostal missionaries had believed that speaking in tongues had been a xenolalic gift which would enable them to preach consistently in a foreign language without the rigours and delays of language learning. But, as early as May 1908 and before the PMU's inception, Confidence printed an article from a missionary denying knowledge of any fellow worker being given the gift of a whole language. In 1911, in a section of a paper entitled 'The Pentecostal Baptism - Counsel to leaders', Boddy explicitly warned against anyone leaving home in the belief that they have received a foreign language. Before doing so:

they should take steps to verify the fact that they really have received a complete language in which at all times they can preach the gospel.

Flames of Fire makes no reference to the use of tongues as an evangelistic gift, even when coupled with interpretation, to address someone in his native language. The emphasis in the PMU was always on language learning.

Polhill linked tongues to preaching in the sense that it represented an 'ambassadorial sign of the heavenliness of the message'. Tongues, like healing, was a confirming sign of the gospel and of the authenticity of its apostolic messengers in the last days; it was also a symbol to believers of God's supreme desire that the gospel should be preached to all nations. It was not as a mere badge of membership but as both an ongoing and an initial sign which bore witness to its own significance as Spirit inspired prayer confirmed the Spirit's
presence, that tongues functioned within the PMU. In addition, the tongues
speaker would become an inspired vernacular speaker so that 'the words God give
you burn as they are listened to,' Polhill appreciated the gift as an aid to private
prayer whilst he feared that the ability to make a few strange sounds could give
someone license to claim the Spirit as the source of his every utterance and fancy.
He came to insist that other tests of the Spirit's presence needed to be applied and
so appeared to advocate a baptism which was ultimately to be attested by moral
rather than verbal or physical signs.

This followed teaching within the PMU which endorsed physical, though chaste,
contact between the sexes in the name of 'spiritual affinity' - the issue over which
Smith Wigglesworth was made to resign from the PMU Council. In similar
fashion, adherents of the 'Bride Teaching' had inserted a romantic, quasi-sexual
element into fellowship with Christ, 'seeking and experiencing physical
manifestations ... and asking Jesus ... to kiss them'. Three members of the PMU
Council and two missionaries resigned rather than denounce this strange notion.
To Polhill, such practices would almost inevitably encourage unseemly
emotionalism, and, worse still, immorality. Once the 'human element' got in
'lamentable' results could follow and bring 'listlessness, lifelessness etc. etc. and
seldom ... soulwinning fervour'.

Furthermore, insistence on tongues as evidence of the Spirit might lead to
emotional manipulation of those seeking the gift, whilst doing nothing to bolster
their evangelistic drive. Polhill accepted tongue speaking as a healthier response
to the Spirit's presence than other motor reactions which might follow an intense
spiritual encounter and which constituted 'crankiness', but was cautious about
overloading its significance and advocated further checks and balances. Thus, for
the PMU, tongues came to be seen primarily as a prayer language and a means of
intimate communion with God. When it became clear that speaking in tongues
had no xenolalic significance for missionaries, tongues speaking was widely
credited for fostering spiritual grace and fruit in the hearts of those who prayed in
this way. For missionaries it was deeply relevant that tongues 'fills our souls with
the love of God for lost humanity' and the holiness which issues in increased
devotion to the missionary task of saving souls. The love that it fostered was not
a romantic affection felt by 'the Bride for Jesus' but an infusion of the same divine
love that empowers and energizes because it goes out in love to the whole
world.

SPIRITUAL WARFARE

In two respects, however, Polhill and the PMU missionaries saw the gift of
tongues as a continual source of spiritual power. It was itself a means by which
the Holy Spirit strengthened the missionary for his or her continuing evangelistic
task, 'energising the worker to accomplish deeds of daring, ventures of faith,
steady persevering, successful work in the face of odds'. Just as the Spirit
imparted bodily health through union with Jesus the Healer of their bodies, so he
imparted confidence and assurance through glossolalia. Sigrid Mclean bore
testimony to this as a CIM missionary seemingly at the end of her tether who was 'revived for more work' and evangelism through her Pentecostal baptism.

Articles in Flames of Fire concentrated on tongues as a medium of
communication: with God but with a further usage as a facilitator of intercession
and aggressive prayer or 'war in the heavens'. Prayer as spiritual warfare had
been a major spiritual weapon in the arsenal of the CIM with whom Polhill had
worked. It had been popularized by the redoubtable Jessie Penn Lewis in her
books, from as early as 1897. She had spoken on 'The warfare with Satan' at the
CIM Hall in London, although she later disputed Pentecostal teaching on
manifestations of the Spirit in her book The War on the Saints (1912). The PMU
missionaries 'were immersed in a world in which spiritual forces often loomed
larger than tangible realities'. To them the realities were the intangible forces
demons and spirits who were controlling the lives of indigenous peoples through
'idolatry'. Prayer in the Spirit was vital in the battle with 'the stronghold of satan'
that was Lamaism (the Tibetan form of Buddhism). And, just as prayer had
precipitated the Revival in the beginning so it would lead to its full flowering.
It became commonplace among Pentecostals that the new movement was
'essentially a prayer revival'. Answered prayer brought testimony to 'Christus Victor' in what are now defined as 'power encounters'. It was for prayer from
their supporters that PMU missionaries longed so that: through the effectual
working of the Holy Spirit and your cooperation through intercession these shall
be brought out from the bondage of Satan.

INDIGENOUS LEADERS

The importance of the PMU's attachment to signs such as speaking in tongues is
underlined by their relevance to the development of indigenous leadership.
Polhill's views were borrowed from Roland Allen. Signs authenticated God's
messengers. Allen, with a clear awareness of the consequences for ecclesiology,
rote of 'miracles as universally accepted proofs of the Divine approval of the
message and work of him through whom they were wrought'. Both men
expected national leaders to emerge with their identifying gifts to free the
missionary-apostles for further pioneer evangelism. Writing of China, Daniel
Bays has outlined the attraction of the egalitarian ethos of Pentecostalism in
foreign-dominated cultures with its credo that all believers had:
access to direct revelation and knowledge of God's will through ... the gifts of
prophecy, tongues and interpretation. Any Chinese believer could have equal
access to all this.

Bays saw this as an important contributor to the growth of the Independent
Chinese Church at a time of resurgent Nationalism. In a similar way, the 1906
revival in the Khasia hills of India with its Pentecostal manifestations led to the
launching of the National Missionary Society:
the outpouring of the Spirit in people who had been dominated politically, militarily, economically and ecclesiastically by colonial masters signalled that the hour for indigenous leadership had arrived.

The application of this aspect of missionary strategy was not something that Polhill felt easy to implement and his own practice within the PMU lagged behind what he saw in the New Testament. Historically, of greater impact in the context of PMU missionary work was the formation of the Chinese Republic and the end of the Manchu dynasty in 1911. This momentous event may well have predisposed the minds of the tribal peoples to innovation and change and deepened the need for new localized bases of community and identity among the ethnic Chinese in Yunnan province.

THE LASTING MISSIOLOGICAL VALUE OF PENTECOSTAL SIGNS

The awareness within the PMU of palpable and physical manifestations of the Spirit's saving presence provided evidence that Christianity was not only an intellectual explanation of reality but that it also had experiential dimensions. From its earliest days the PMU's work in China illustrated David Martin's thesis in Tongues of Fire, his magisterial sociological study of Latin American Protestantism, that a source of the power of Pentecostalism has been the fusion of 'the most ancient world of the pre-literate with the most recent world of post-literacy' which puts its followers 'in touch with spiritual charges and discharges lodged deep in the indigenous culture'. The PMU's interpretation of the spiritual nature of the world resonated with animistic cultures in the way that the message of sanidad divina in contemporary Latin America environments 'deals precisely with the psychical and physical viewed as intimately bound together'. In Asia, David Martin has pointed out how Pentecostalism answered human need as defined by shamanism and Confucianism. Its message of a Sovereign God ruling over spirit and matter meant its audiences were confronted by Jesus in the midst of everyday existence and not merely as the Judge at the Second Coming.

In its communication of God's message with 'signs' of healing and tongues alongside its verbal and literary formulations, the PMU was adopting a 'communication system', which Hollenweger has maintained is 'vital for pre- and post-literacy cultures'. Pentecostal signs became one means by which oral cultures could see and hear Christian salvation and constituted what Martin has called, a "field' which is integrated around the notion of transformation'. They have led in theory and practice to a fruitful understanding of missionary proclamation as an intercultural exchange as Third World oral cultures have tuned in to, and contributed to the development of, Pentecostal-style methods of communicating the gospel.

The twentieth century medical commonplace that Man is a psychosomatic unity matches the PMU's supernaturalist epistemology of reality as spiritual as well as material so that health, life and salvation are understood holistically. The PMU gospel of 'full salvation' began to impinge on this theme as the missionaries realized that "it was perfectly natural" for native people 'to believe for the body as well as the soul'.

THE LEGACY OF CECIL POLHILL AND THE PMU

By his unrelenting concern for pioneer evangelism and zeal for soulwinning, Cecil Polhill's legacy through the PMU was to ensure that in the minds of its first British adherents, Pentecostalism was linked with world mission rather than the inner world of religious experience alone. His understanding of the Baptism in the Spirit as an 'end time' and 'missionary gift' for the Church Universal also kept Pentecostalism within the doctrinal gestalt of traditional revivalist Evangelicalism. His desire that its missionary zeal and ecumenicity would lend credibility to Pentecostal teaching about the Spirit and his gifts is finding remarkable fulfilment as Pentecostal/Charismatic spirituality is now seen as a major hope for the revival of the cooperative and Christ-centred ecumenism that heralded so much missionary interaction at the turn of the century. As an example of its productive ecumenicity, the PMU together with similar early North American Pentecostal Missionary groups provided substantial numbers of existing missionaries with a new dynamism and a therapeutic spirituality in which self edification through tongues of praise and communion with God became an intrinsic part and a bulwark against burn out as they either joined or received the baptism in the Spirit through the Pentecostal missionaries. It is not impossible that the transdenominational and inclusive ethos of the PMU has contributed to a situation where the Pentecostal movement has lost its doctrinaire and sub cultural orientation to the extent than it can now be described as full of a 'bewildering pluralism' of theological interpretations and ecclesiastical practices.

That the growing PMU could only maintain financial viability by becoming the missionary wing of a new denomination oriented around the distinctively Pentecostal view of speaking in tongues disappointed Polhill certainly. But the linking of the Pentecostal experience with tongues speaking contributed to the sense of identity and therefore to the survival of the new Pentecostal movement. This movement brought lasting benefits to missions in its eventual championing of the indigenous church principle which was already current within missionary circles in the writings of the Methodist, William Taylor, the Presbyterians, John L. Nevius and the Anglicans Henry Venn and Roland Allen but still largely untried. It has been computed that by the year 2000, 90% of Third World Christians will be Pentecostal/Charismatic/ Independent. This is in great part a consequence of the indigenous church principle and the faith which Pentecostal people have in the ability of the Holy Spirit to give spiritual gifts and supernatural abilities to the common people' (which') has raised up a host of lay preachers and leaders ...'. Church planting - although with only limited leadership powers devolved to either national or missionary leaders - was clearly a facet of PMU evangelistic strategy from the start as was the reaching of 'unreached peoples'.
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But Polhill would have drawn satisfaction from knowing that the PMU helped ensure an emphasis on the present working of the Holy Spirit within missionary theology and strategy which was to pay great dividends as the century progressed. In the same way that the essence of Keswick was exported by the Keswick ‘mission to missionaries’ through the visits of Charles Inwood and others to China in 1898, so Polhill was instrumental in setting up a structure whereby European Pentecostal distinctions first travelled to the mission field. However, the only truly distinctive teaching of the PMU was speaking in tongues as the expected sign of the baptism in the Spirit. Although I have suggested ways in which PMU missionaries may have understood and utilized the gift of speaking in tongues, it is impossible to appraise its precise influence on the missionaries’ labours. One may say tentatively that although distinctive of the PMU and Pentecostalism, speaking of tongues was never the essence of the movement. This was its supernaturalism but a Biblical supernaturalism in which there is only the one world – that of God the Creator. The ‘natural’ world and ‘natural’ or human activities such as speaking and preaching transparently mediate the power of the transcendent but immanent Spirit of God (at least for those with eyes to see). 53

And so, finally, to return to the title of this paper, the power of the PMU may have been its ability to counter the modernist or rationalistic (today we might say Cartesian or Enlightenment) orientation of Biblical studies which Polhill and others repeatedly denounced for weakening the power of the Church’s witness.54 According to a contemporary Pentecostal missiologist, Paul Pomeroy, ‘at that time rationalism ‘eliminated “the witness of the Spirit” in verifying Christian experience’, reducing the locus of Biblical theology to the text of Scripture alone, increasingly interpreted according to ‘Higher Critical’ methodology’. 55 Polhill with his concern for a message ‘vindicated by Almighty God by the preaching of the word with signs following’ ensured that early British Pentecostals taught that the Spirit spoke through both signs and Scripture and for both literate and oral cultures. His priorities for mission echoed the present understanding of the Pentecostal/Charismatic movement as a ‘third force’ with a missiology of its own which is not merely part of wider evangelicalism but is ‘a corrective to the classical traditions of Christian faith’. 56 As the era of post Enlightenment modernism has drawn to a close and the Postmodern age has dawned, the power of an approach to Mission which expanded rationality and rehabilitated metaphors and signs has become acutely apparent.57 Not only will such power enable the church to speak meaningfully to its own post Christian generation but it will facilitate the doing of mission in cross-culturally and even within cultures outside a Christian framework. Through an intercultural approach which looks for the Spirit of God to be active preveniently in the traditions, rituals, beliefs and expectations of all cultures and to make the message of the Kingdom of God resonate within every cultural heritage without necessitating surrender to any political, economic or cultural imperium.
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BOOK REVIEWS


This Festschrift, in honour of William Menzies, is a collection of biblical, theological and missiological papers from familiar and unfamiliar names residing in North America, Europe and Asia. Fee, in an article dedicated to Pauline teaching on glossolalia, offers sanguine advice, of value to all classical Pentecostals. He succinctly reflects on a Pauline theology of glossolalia accurately identifying tongues as a private and Godward gift of the Spirit. Furthermore, he supports the view that Romans 9:26f is to be equated with glossolalia; his main thesis is that tongues is best understood as an opportunity to reflect one's weakness (in speaking in tongues) but which simultaneously reflects God's strength.

Walter Kaiser explores the role of the Spirit in the Old Testament, demonstrating that the Holy Spirit was expected to be involved in regeneration in the Old Testament era as well as the New Testament era, appealing to Psalm 51:10 and Ezekiel 36:25-32. Indeed, the differences between the role of the Spirit in the two covenants, he adduces, are threefold: only in the latter Covenant at Pentecost, does the Holy Spirit visibly come "in state" whilst at the same time incorporating believers into the Church; the third difference is that the Spirit in the new Covenant enables believers to emulate Jesus (2 Cor. 3:18). This provocative thesis would merit fuller dialogue and development.

Robert Menzies explores the relationship between Spirit-baptism and spiritual gifts, concluding that the former "is the 'gateway' to a special cluster of gifts described by Paul, the prophetic-type gifts which are associated with special revelation and inspired speech." (59) This is an interesting thesis, though more evidence is needed to be certain of its viability.

Roger Stronstad provides a case for the reintroduction of the gift of prophecy to the contemporary Church as a fundamental characteristic of the mission of the Spirit. Simon Chan reopens the question relating to tongues as initial evidence of the Spirit-baptism. He attempts to prove that tongues may be viewed as initial evidence of Spirit-baptism by the apparent intimacy expressed by the use of tongues. In this regard, he concludes that there are "two functions of tongues (tongues as evidence and tongues as prayer)", both of which are to be distinguished for while the former is a Spirit initiated/controlled experience, the latter is less so. This novel thesis merits further reflection though it will not be easy to completely substantiate it.

Peter Hocken provides a personal insight into the distinctiveness of Pentecostalism as contained in the baptism in the Spirit in comparison to Evangelicalism. Cecil Rollock provides a detailed exploration of the movement by the American AOG into co-operation with other church denominations between 1920-1965 through mission enterprise. In particular, he traces the
ambiguity, private and public, pronounced with regard to such involvement by AOG with national and international bodies of churches; he also notes how much private involvement, when publicly announced, caused inevitable problems for the leadership, eventually resulting in the demise of such co-operation and the backward move to quasi-sectarianism.

Russell Spittler offers a bibliography relating to spirituality and attendant issues. Benjamin Sun offers a straightforward biblical definition of the priesthood of all believers but more interestingly and enthusiastically explores practical implications and examples of this doctrine in Pentecostal and Charismatic contexts. As a counter proposal to Sun's enthusiastic diagnosis and prognosis of Pentecostalism, Del Tarr's paper is a call to a renewed Pentecostalism in the seminary context in order to be "the instrument of renewal that the AOG presently needs" (199).

Miroslav Volf explores the conversation the Church can have with contemporary society, offering some pointers as to how this should be undertaken. To help apply some of the concepts he explores, practical implications and examples would have been valuable and may well have been the next stage of this exercise. Li Yue Hong investigates the phenomenal growth of Pentecostal/Charismatic Christianity in China since 1976, indicating the importance of the legacy of Pentecostal missionaries and believers in China for this development. However, he concludes that a major factor of the growth of Christianity has been the demise of Confucianism, an event that occurred as a result of the Cultural Revolution. Interestingly, he provides a historical backdrop to Volf's article in which issues of accommodation and differentiation are considered.

Continuing the missiological emphasis, Julie Ma compares the Pentecostal worldview with that of the animistic Kan Kana-ey of the Philippines. Comparisons and contrasts are noted but of particular significance is the conclusion that Kan Kana-a Pentecostals are distinct among other Christian groups with regard to their proactive evangelism and spiritual warfare, a major reason potentially being that they are reflecting their previous religious orientation whilst enhancing them in their new Christian setting. As a result, it is no surprise to find the success in planting churches in the area. An issue that may well be explored in this context is to what extent their previous context of life and reason potentially being that they are reflecting their previous religious worldview or biblical paradigms provide the undergirding rationale and belief structure for the Kan Kana-a Pentecostal lifestyle.

Wonsuk Ma offers a comparison between the influence of the Spirit on leaders of Israelite society and Igorot tribal churches, the latter being a mountain tribe living in the northern Philippines. After exploring the role of the Spirit in the lives of Israel's political leaders, he identifies the two main functions of the Spirit as affirmation and empowerment (this provides useful bases for New Testament dialogue concerning the role of the Spirit). Ma concludes his paper by noting the outstanding of such features in the lives of Pentecostal church leaders from the Igorot tribe including that, in God's economy, the role of the Spirit is continuous with regard to these two characteristics, Pentecostal pastors operating in the ministry with the dynamic granted by the Spirit.

Gary McGee explores the role and need of the supernatural in modern missions, locating the journey of the supernatural activities in the context of mission in the 20th century. Cornelis van der Laan provides a profile of Elize Scharten who ministered as a Pentecostal missionary in China in the early 20th century whilst also setting the wider backdrop of Dutch Pentecostal mission activity in the Far East at the same time.

This edited work has been put together well with few errors (special (58): "quiet" instead of "quite" (228); "where" instead of "were" (244); "eccentric" instead of "eccentric" (353)). This is an interesting collection and there will be something here to appeal to most readers.

Keith Warrington


Karkkainen's work, his doctoral thesis, details the discussions that have taken place over three decades between Catholics and Pentecostals, in particular highlighting the understanding of pneumatology during this period. After introducing the dialogue, he analyses the discussions that took place in three key areas, namely hermeneutics, soteriology and initiation, and ecclesiology. Each of the sections details the areas on which there was common agreement and then explores the areas of dissonance, at times highlighting the need for further theological reflection by both parties.

The three areas provide much material for further thought. The issues raised during the hermeneutical discussions reflect the developments in Pentecostal thinking and scholarship. Interacting with the work of Ervin and Arrington in particular, Karkkainen raises questions about the possibility of a specifically Pentecostal hermeneutic, but applauds the desire for hermeneutics to be done concursively, so avoiding the over-individualistic approaches to scripture that characterized early Pentecostalism.

The chapter on soteriology raises the questions of the part that water baptism plays for the Pentecostal. The emphasis of the discussions centre on the personal nature of the convert's commitment for the Pentecostals and the significance of Catholic baptism being linked to the nature of the church. The chapter also details the discussions that have taken place concerning the baptism in the Spirit - a concept on which there is agreement from within both camps.

The final two chapters are the most detailed - on the nature of the church. The nature of koinonia is discussed and consensus found between both parties, particularly as it is agreed that the understanding of koinonia is to be set within the context of the doctrine of the Trinity. The final chapter deals with the differences between the participants, in particular the relationship between the
Spirit and sacrament, the relationship of the local church to the wider church and the nature of charismatic versus hierarchical structures of church. An extended discussion concerning the role of tongues is provided.

The book is of interest on a number of different levels. As a historical record it provides a picture of the relationship between two wings of the church that have been most suspicious of each other. In other ways, the book demonstrates the development of Pentecostal theology. It has been the past three decades that have seen the emergence of Pentecostal theologies, rather than the sermons and tracts that had often served this purpose previously. In this respect it is interesting to note that at the first gatherings in 1972 the Pentecostal positions were taken by Rodman Williams, a Presbyterian, and Arnold Bittlinger, a Lutheran. By the mid-1980s, the discussions were being held with Pentecostals such as Miroslav Volf, Peter Kuzmic, Howard Ervin and Cecil Robeck. For Pentecostals reading this book, it provides evidence not just of Pentecostal development in theology, but also areas wherein further thought needs to take place. It is only in dialogue that these areas become apparent, and so provides an alternative to the endless discussions on themes that have become well-worn for many Pentecostals.

However, the book raises a further question, namely the ultimate value of the dialogues. The aim of these dialogues is stressed on numerous occasions - simply to share experiences and learn from each other, rather than any desire for an expression of formal unity. The fact that Pentecostals have been engaging in meaningful and helpful dialogue with Catholics has not been a widely known fact. It certainly has not been common knowledge amongst pastors and the laity within Pentecostal churches. That is a great pity for it is in dialogue, when we are forced to outline our beliefs and have our blind-spots exposed, that we are brought to a healthier position. Rather than these debates happening amongst a handful of theologians, it would be of real value in bringing Pentecostalism to maturity for people to know of these gatherings and to know that there is little to fear in dialogue. This is equally true of Catholics. Donald Gee’s famous challenge of 1962 is repeated here: when we have said our last word against ecumenism, there still remains the great prayer of our Lord that His disciples may all be one. What are we doing about it? What is our constructive alternative?

The book will be of value to those teaching Pentecostal theology as well as to those in process of developing Pentecostal self-understanding. The fact that the author is European means that Pentecostal theology is drawn from a wide background rather than the usual American-only focus.

Neil Hudson


Access to the history of the Pentecostal traditions in Japan is, for most European and American scholars of this global religious tradition, hampered by a number of factors. Firstly, there is the fact that missionaries espousing Wesleyan/Holiness and Pentecostal ideas were being spread by several distinct branches of that tradition: the Wesleyan/Holiness Methodists, the Wesleyan/Holiness daughter churches of Methodism, the Oriental Missionary Society and World Gospel Mission as well as the Salvation Army (from 1895) and the Seventh-Day Adventists (from 1896). Methodist Episcopal and Wesleyan Methodist (British) were early arrivals in Japan.

There were also missionaries promoting ideas of Keswick Holiness within the context of the “mainline” USA and British mission agencies, especially the missions of the Presbyterian and Anglican Churches (especially after 1900). Other Wesleyan Holiness believers served as missionaries under the aegis of independent missions, such as the Japan Evangelistic Bands. From the beginnings of the Pentecostal revivals, missionaries from all over the world have been carrying the Pentecostal vision of Christianity to Japan. Among these were Pentecostal missionaries from the USA, Britain, Australia, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, India, Brazil, Sri Lanka, Korea and Thailand.

The second problem confronting European and North American scholars is that mission agencies, and institutions related to those agencies, rarely collected non-English material related to the traditions. As well, once materials are identified and collected, there are few with the linguistic and cultural skills to read and analyse them. Now, with the publication of Mark Mullins’ book, the study of the Pentecostal and Wesleyan/Holiness traditions in Japan has been made even more complicated and much easier. It is easier because Mullins has provided careful bibliographic and prosopographical information about indigenous churches in Japan. It has become harder, for it is clear that all of the meta-theory of what it means and has meant for groups to be defined as Pentecostal or Wesleyan/Holiness churches has become less clear.

Mullins analyses thirteen indigenous churches. As in other places, indigenous groups were formed that adopted Holiness and/or Pentecostal spirituality with careful attention to Japanese cultural structures. They have always been completely independent of foreign mission organizations. Some are more Wesleyan/Holiness than Pentecostal. These include, in order of foundation: (1) The Way (1907); (2) Christ Heart Church (1927); (3) Glorious Gospel Christian Church (1936); (4) The Holy Ecclesia of Jesus (1946); and (5) Sanctifying Church (1948). These are Wesleyan/Holiness in theology and praxis, incorporating continuing revelation, and "baptism of the Holy Spirit" with strong traditions of healing and exorcism. The others, in order of foundation, incorporate biblical concepts of "speaking in tongues" continuing revelation and Spirit Baptism together with the healing and exorcism. These are: (1) Living Christ One Ear of Wheat Church (1939); (2) Christian Canaan Church (1940); (3) Japan Ecclesia of Jesus (1940); (4) The Spirit of Jesus Church (1941); (5) Original Gospel (also known as the Tabernacle Church (1948)); (6) Life Giving Christ (1966); and (7) Okinawa Christian Gospel (1977).

For a summary of Mullins’ analysis of the theological structures see his chart on page forty-eight. The Nonchurch Movement has a more traditional Christian
page forty-eight. The Nonchurch Movement has a more traditional Christian theological framework, but still deserves more study on these questions. All of these churches share an adaptation of traditional Japanese relationships with the dead. The rites and ideas work themselves out in different ways in the different groups, but are significantly different from what one would find among the missionary founded Japanese churches.

Of particular importance is the chapter entitled, "Japanese Christians and the World of the Dead" (pp. 129-155). Relations with the dead are of paramount importance throughout the world. Mullins suggests the traditional Japanese patterns and rituals for dealing with this problem. He then describes in detail and analyses the way each of the indigenous churches have come to terms with the problem. While there is significant variety in the approaches, each has worked to find ways to be truly Christian and truly Japanese. For most traditional Pentecostal and Wesleyan/Holiness theologians, this chapter will be the most challenging.

Many have understood indigenenity (as has this reviewer) to be essential to the healthy growth of a church within a culture. The data presented by Mullins in his chapter, "Comparative Patterns of Growth and Decline" (pp. 156-182) in which he traces the developments of the thirteen indigenous churches from their foundations to the present, suggests that "indigeneity" is a much more complex factor than has been generally recognized.

Mullins has also identified the bibliography produced by each group and presented a short history of each church. His study opens new vistas for understanding the intercultural transmission of ideas in general and of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movements in particular. The problems (ecclesiological, historical, and theological) posed by the phenomenological analysis of the traditions in Japan are not unlike those posed in other areas. For example, there are Wesleyan/Holiness, Keswick Holiness and traditional Pentecostal aspects to the development of the African Initiated Churches. In other areas there are churches like the "Hope of Bangkok" church in Thailand and the "Church of the Universal Reign of God" in Brazil, both of which have become active missionary churches. In North America, most of the African-American churches, especially the "sanctified" churches, including the so-called "Oneness" Pentecostals, both of which have become active missionary churches.

These features emerged from the 'womb' of the specific American context, the Perfectionism of nineteenth century Holiness movements with their cross-fertilisation with British Holiness teaching, and the 1857-58 revival experiences. The gestation period was marked by the changes in understanding of the Weslyan expectation of sanctification. Faupel traces the introduction of the pneumatological emphasis of sanctification from John Fletcher through to the ministry of Asa Mahan. By the mid-nineteenth century, sanctification was understood in terms of Spirit-baptism. In a similar way, there was a shift in eschatological expectation - from post-millennialism to pre-millennialism. However, the results of this were far more than merely theological; they entailed a shift of world-views.

The birth-pangs of Pentecostalism's birth are detailed through the accounts of the lives and ministries of John Alexander Dowie, Frank Sandford and Charles Parham. It is significant that Faupel places Parham in this chapter, thereby viewing the birth of Pentecostalism as having occurred at Azusa Street through the ministry of William Seymour. He then presents the account of the development of Pentecostalism throughout the rest of America.

The period of the initial growth of Pentecostalism is seen through the events of the two major disputes: firstly, Durham's insistence on the 'finished work' of
Christ, thereby negating the need for an experience of entire sanctification; secondly, the contentment of the 'New Issue' which led to the development of Pentecostal Unitarianism. Of significance in this section is the explanation for the acceptance of these new ideas. Early Pentecostals are portrayed as desperately expecting God to do a 'new thing' before the return of Christ. When new theology was proposed, particularly theology that emphasised the centrality of Christ, it was embraced whole-heartedly.

Faulp's work draws on the major work produced in recent years and as such provides a useful and detailed overview of the development of American Pentecostalism. For readers from a European perspective, it is interesting to compare the development of the child born in the cradle of Pentecostalism to its cousin in Britain and Europe. Faulp's presentation of Body's dismay at the bitterness of the contention in America in 1912 contrasts with Body's practice of gentlemanly discussion and determination that British Pentecostal theology should be determined by consensus. The task lies with Europeans to prepare a similar work to Faulp's, to show the development of European Pentecostalism. There will be areas of significant similarity, but the significant differences will help to explain the contemporary differences in Pentecostal thought and practice.

However, for all students of Pentecostal history, theology and spirituality, Faulp's work will remain an essential work.

**Neil Hudson**


In 1995 a group of theologians met in response to a request made by the Church of England Evangelical Council to produce a Statement regarding the response that should be made to homosexuality. This request came at a time when gay activists were pressurising the church into changing its traditional attitude to homosexuality by, amongst other activities, 'outing' gay clergy.

This aggressive activity is illustrative of the passion that has been engendered by both traditionalists and revisionists within the Church and society. The attempt of the St. Andrew's Statement was to respond to the debate both theologically and pastorally. The desire was to be credally orthodox, centring on a strong Christological approach, with an application that was pastorally adept. The application therefore argued that ones identity was not to be addressed in terms of ones sexuality, but rather in terms of ones identity in Christ, which may include elements of self-denial because of the claims of the gospel. It also sought to debate with homosexuality whilst being governed by the Bible and yet also open to empirical observation, affirming that there are only two biblically acceptable alternatives for expressions of sexuality - celibacy or marriage. It was deemed that this was to be more rigorously applied to clergy than laity because of the need for a good example. The application of the Statement closed with a brief acknowledgement of the eschatological fulfilment that will take place in Christ.

Responses to this Statement were invited and these form the basis of this book. They range from traditionalists who felt that the Statement was in danger of becoming an area for compromise to revisionists who argued that the Statement was totally unhelpful and unacceptable for gay Christians. The contributors were Professor Gerald Bray, Dr. Thom Brown, Dr. John Colwell, Martin Hallett, Dr. Jeffrey John, Dr. Dave Leal, Professor Oliver O'Donovan, Dr. Elizabeth Stuart, Professor Anthony Thistles. The issues discussed ranged around whether ones identity was defined by homosexuality or heterosexuality; whether same-sex relationships were authentic example of Christ-like fidelity; the extent to which scripture was meaningful to the debate. This last issue was dealt with in most detail, in the longest chapter in the book, by Anthony Thistles. The hermeneutical developments were charted and then the relevant Biblical passages were dealt with in impressive detail, emphasising the relevance of Scriptural teaching to the whole debate.

The book as a whole is an interesting overview of the current debate amongst Christians. As such it needs to be read and interacted with. One will invariably have many areas of disagreement with potentially all the contributors, but one will be stimulated by the arguments presented here. For ministers engaged in pastoral care and for student wanting to catch up with contemporary thinking on this significant area of ethics, this book is a useful gateway to the debate.

**Neil Hudson**


Having established a rationale and methodology for the project, Dwyer establishes that the topic of wonder meets the necessary criteria for establishing it as a motif in Mark. Using statistical analysis, he establishes that wonder appears to be a motif to a much greater degree in Mark than in Matthew and that although Luke (34) has two more references to wonder than Mark, his use of the term differs and is arguably inferior. His conclusions are fair, though statistics can be used to prove many things. Perhaps a further comment on wonder in Luke (and Matthew) would be more appropriate rather than concluding that only Mark arrests our attention concerning the topic.

In chapter 2, he argues that wonder does not function as a theme in Graeco-Roman miracle stories, a conclusion drawn from a survey of relevant literature from the 4th century BCE to the 3rd century CE, including "divine man" stories, where the term is only mentioned twenty times. Miracle stories in the relevant literature incorporate the term just five times. As a result, he concludes that any dependency upon Graeco-Roman literature and Mark is unlikely with regards to this motif. Nevertheless, he does acknowledge that more references to wonder do occur in the contexts of an intervention by God, notably in Philo, but also in other Jewish Hellenistic literature and also some Graeco-Roman biographies. Nevertheless, his claim that wonder as a motif is more prominent in Mark is well
established as is the recognition that it is difficult to be certain whether wonder as a theme functions as such in other Greek literature.

In chapter 3, turning to Jewish literature, Dwyer discovers rather more evidence of the feature of wonder as a response to God or God's acts. This wonder increases in an eschatological context in and with reference to Messiah. The characteristic of wonder is further located in contexts where the emotion acts as proof that the cause of the wonder is divine or has divine backing, with clear potential links to Mark's presentation of Jesus who amazes people.

In chapter 4 in an attempt to further develop a potential literary background for Mark's presentation of the concept of wonder, Dwyer explores a variety of early Christian literature, including some New Testament books. In this section, a number of insights are to be gleaned including the indication that (if fear/wonder is being used more thematically), the author of the fourth gospel demonstrates that fear of Jesus is never the experience of the disciples; only of the opposition, in which negative connotations are implied such as disdain or derision. Also, wonder in John is not referred to miracles. In the other literature explored, the use of wonder appears to be rather more varied and hermeneutical constants less certain. Indeed, opposite reactions are provided in contexts of wonder. The danger inherent in such discovery is that in attempting to locate Mark in a context in which wonder has functioned thematically is that its variety of earlier uses means that Dwyer cannot be proved wrong: however, neither can he be certain that Mark is influenced by earlier literature. Indeed, the redaction by the Markan author may need to be given more credibility.

In chapters 5 and 6, Dwyer turns to Mark, his main area of exploration. His conclusions, based on a thorough survey of all the texts including concepts of amazement are twofold. Wonder, as a motif, is preferably followed by obedience or a recognition of the true identity of Jesus, and wonder, in Mark, follows acts intended to demonstrate the coming of the Kingdom.

For Pentecostals, Dwyer's contribution is important in that he demonstrates that wonder is not simply used by Mark as an expression of amazement at a miraculous act, but is what that act indicates. Thus, wonder is expressed not simply because one is healed, but because forgiveness has been granted (Mark 2:12). Similarly, it is the restoration of the outcast, not simply an exorcism, that becomes the cause of wonder in Mark 4:41; 6:50f. The parabolic nature of the miraculous is thus rightly accentuated. He concludes, “wonder is a response to Jesus' authoritative words on the Kingdom, the vanquishing of Satan in exorcisms, the submission of creation to the creator and the healing and restoring of individuals in to community” (198).

Keith Warrington