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Foreword

This edition of JEPTA includes a collection of articles relating to theological, biblical, historical and missiological issues. Each of them, in their own way, offers comment and analysis on issues important to Pentecostals. In so doing, they reflect the fact that increasingly, Pentecostals are engaging in developing their pilgrimages in a context of objective enquiry, itself a sign of developing maturity within Pentecostalism as a whole.

One of the recent books to be written concerning the role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts by Roger Stronstad receives a probing analysis by Max Turner; William Kay offers some more evidence for trends within British Pentecostalism, this time relating to the significance of beliefs concerning initial evidence. Historical articles are concentrated on analytical surveys of the development of Pentecostalism within countries in Eastern Europe and Norway; Wojciech Gajewski and Krzysztof Wawrzeniuk offer insights into Polish Pentecostalism, Josef Brenkus analyses the Pentecostal Church in the Czech and Slovak Republics while David Bundy surveys the development of the Pentecostal Church in Norway; John Tipei offers some conclusions concerning the role of the laying on of hands, determined as a result of his doctoral studies. The collection concludes with an analysis of Finnish mission activity in the twentieth century.

I am pleased to welcome Neil Hudson to the editorial board; he is to function in the role of editorial consultant and his contributions are anticipated with interest.

Keith Warrington
Editor

Max Turner

I am grateful for this fuller opportunity to respond to Roger Stronstad’s recent short JPTS monograph, The Prophethood of All Believers. As the subtitle indicates, it is a ‘Study in Luke’s Charismatic Theology’, and it seeks to clarify and to elaborate a position first advanced in the author’s landmark 1984 publication, The Charismatic Theology of Saint Luke. It focuses on a particular element of that theology, namely the relation of the gift of the Spirit in Luke’s writing to different sorts of prophetic vocation, and the essence of his conclusion is neatly summed up in the well-chosen title for the work. The book’s scope and substance will be summarised briefly in part I, I will then set it briefly in relation to broader Lucan scholarship in part II, and probe more significant disagreements with the author’s position in part III.

PART I: STRONSTAD’S POSITION

Chapter 1 addresses introductory questions about reading, interpreting and applying Luke-Acts as historical narrative. Here Stronstad argues that Luke’s are not merely historical works, but also theological and didactic in nature. The carefully crafted parallels between Jesus and his disciples, the programmatic passages (Luke 3-4 and Acts 1-2), inclusio, and other literary devices, are all used by Luke to convey a specific theology of the Spirit, viz. that Jesus has ‘transferred the Spirit of prophecy from himself to his disciples’ with the consequence that ‘they will have, both as a community and as individuals, the same kind of prophetic ministry as he himself had’ (17). What is implicit in the patterns is also undergirded by Luke’s appropriation of what Stronstad regards as the entirely charismatic pneumatological language of the LXX, and by the explicit teaching of Christ and that of his disciples in the sermons and other discourses of Acts. When he turns to the question of ‘applying’ Luke-Acts today, Stronstad tackles those such as Stott and Fee who are more cautious than

---

1 The Prophethood of All Believers, JPTS 16: Sheffield: SAP, 1999. Space limitations for my review in EvQ (forthcoming) made my response there all too abrupt.


3 Prophethood, 26-27.
he is about using the narrative parallels as paradigms for today. He dubs their position (somewhat unfairly?) a ‘hermeneutic of denial’. By contrast, he commends his own position - which essentially asserts, ‘Apply the paradigm or principle, not the historically particular or mere practice!’ - as the appropriate ‘hermeneutic of affirmation’.1

Chapter 2 examines Jesus and the Spirit, and concludes that his baptismal experience of the Spirit is paradigmatic for the later disciples. It is essentially the reception of the Spirit of prophecy, and the Gospel narratives go on to portray Jesus with traits of the Elijah/Elisha cycle; the Isaianic prophet (drawing from Isa. 42 and 61), the Mosaic prophet, etc. Accordingly, argues Stronstad, the idea of Jesus’ messianic kingship, adumbrated in Luke 1-2, is effectively played down until the end of ch. 18, and the following events in Jerusalem. The allusion to Psalm 2.7 in the heavenly voice in Luke 3.22 is thus to be understood as primarily retrospective, while that to Isa 42.1 is genuinely prospective - reception of the Spirit thus makes Jesus’ public ministry first and foremost that of an eschatological prophetic figure rather than of a king.2 As such he provides a ready paradigm for the disciples after Pentecost.

We may then conveniently take Chapters 3-6 together, for they are about the disciples, and they argue that Luke sees the Spirit poured out at the theophanic event of Pentecost as:

1. the fulfilment of Jesus’ promise that the disciples would be ‘baptised in Holy Spirit’ (so 1.5); 
2. paradigmatically conferring an endowment with ‘power from on high’ for witness (so 1.8; Stronstad radically disagrees with the attempt by Schweizer and Menzies to disengage the Spirit of prophecy from mighty works: 61-64); 
3. fulfilling the promise of the Spirit of prophecy made by Joel to all God’s people (Acts 2.17-39); and 
4. the transferal of the Spirit of prophecy from the ascended Elijahic prophet, making all who receive a community/nation of prophets.

Accordingly (so Chapter 4), Acts 2.42-6.7 portrays the community as one in which all are prophets (at least, from 4.31 onwards, if not from the day of Pentecost: there is a tension in Stronstad’s work here). Chapter 5 then argues that Acts 6.8-12.24 is dedicated to a portrayal of ‘five charismatic prophets’, viz. Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, Agabus and Peter, while Chapter 6 claims Acts 12.25-28.31 does something similar for the ‘prophet’ Paul.3

Finally, Chapter 7 provides a conclusion, synthesizing Luke’s data about the prophethood of all believers and offering remarks on the potential contemporary relevance of this. For Luke, disciples are typically like Jesus in that they are Spirit-filled, Spirit-led and Spirit-empowered for a ministry of witness through proclamation and acts of power. That is not to deny that the Spirit also brings other gifts, such as ‘praise, purity [scil. Acts 5.1-11], joy, generosity and courage’ (122), but the Spirit is above all charismatic/prophetic rather than soteriological in nature and focus (121-22). The non-Pentecostal/non-Charismatic churches are challenged to restore this Lucan emphasis. But so are those Pentecostals and Charismatics who have become excessively preoccupied with the self-seeking experience, emotion and blessing of the Spirit, rather than service and witness.

PART II: STRONSTAD IN RELATION TO THE WORLD OF LUCAN SCHOLARSHIP

Stronstad’s book began its life as inaugural lectures given at the Asia Pacific Theological Seminary in Baguio to an audience of students, teachers, pastors and missionaries. And the author appropriately warns that he deliberately addresses an implied readership of similar mix. Hence he has avoided ‘tedious lengthiness’ and over-technicality,2 and we should expect neither the degree of originality, nor the density of argument, in this work, that one might anticipate of, say, a doctoral thesis or post-doctoral research monograph. Indeed, he only refers to about a dozen Lucan scholars, and then only briefly. This is rather a positional and ecclesiastically-orientated restatement of Stronstad’s earlier writing, informed by some of the more recent debates.

Those who are aware of recent Lucan scholarship will recognise, however, how in tune with it Stronstad’s volume is, even if he has worn

1 Prophethood, 27-34.
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1 This paragraph is largely taken from my review in EvQ.
2 However, the Press may need to recognise that this should not lead to a relaxation of their customary vigilance in the typesetting and correcting of the Greek. There is an unusually high proportion of errors: dih, ghsm for di4, no less than 4 times (pp. 13, 19, 23; similarly logon for logoy (13, 23); or ‘kej (55; no accent); th, e kidhian (sic) for his kibiais three times (72-73); apofe, igonai (83; lacking breathing); trapezaij (86; no accent); paraklein (sic) for parakal[ion] or parakale,iv (93); etc.
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his scholarship lightly. It is widely accepted that Luke has a distinctive, and in some sense 'prophetic', pneumatology.¹ This has been fully emphasised, and analysed (differently), in at least three other volumes in this very series of monographs.² To be more precise, it is the almost unanimous consensus of broader Lucan scholarship (since von Baer's work in 1926)³ that for Luke the Spirit is above all the charismatic 'Spirit of prophecy' and the 'driving force of the mission'. Seminal works on Luke's view of the Spirit by G.W.H. Lampe (1951, 1955),⁴ E. Schweizer (1956),⁵ and G. Haya-Prats (1975),⁶ essentially re-confirmed von Baer's position, and a plethora of more recent scholarly monographs on the subject - including, of course, Stronstad's own 1984 publication - have raised this to what appears an almost indisputable position.⁷ The only significant NT scholar dissenting was perhaps James Dunn, most notably in his 1970 Baptism in the Holy Spirit, but he has signal failed to convince Lucan specialists of his somewhat Pauline reading, and has more recently relented.⁸

---

³ H. von Baer, Der heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926.
⁵ pneuma, kú: TDNT VI, 389-455.

---
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At three other related points Stronstad's work can also readily be identified as elucidating what are mainline positions of Lucan scholarship:

(a) Since the advent of redaction-criticism in the 50s and of literary/narrative criticism in the 80s, 'Luke, the historian' has suffered something of an eclipse in fashion, while Luke's theological, didactic and edificatory purposes have come (if anything probably too much) to the fore. In this light, the argument of Stott's earlier The Baptism and Fullness of the Holy Spirit,⁹ -- to the effect that the revelation of the purpose of God should be read from the didactic parts rather than the historical parts of Scripture - - might now seem to some a little quaint (and, of course, Stott has revised his position), and barely in need of the response offered by Chapter 1. In this respect, however, Stronstad is facing rather an anti-charismatic sector of the church that has simply not caught up on the developments of NT studies.

(b) Much space in Stronstad's volume is occupied with spelling out parallels between Luke's portrayal of Jesus' ministry, and those of Peter, Barnabas, Stephen, Philip and Paul, which point to them as similar charismatic figures. Such interest in the literary parallels between the charismatic leader figures in Luke-Acts had first been highlighted by Schneckenburger of the Tübingen School.¹⁰ With the rise of redaction-, composition-, and narrative-criticism, it is hardly surprising that interest in such parallels has flourished again more recently in works by English language writers such as Mattill, Talbert, Spencer, Tannehill and others.

(c) More specifically, the parallels between these charismatic figures and similar OT, specifically prophetic, figures (especially Elijah, Elisha and Moses) has been a regular topic of discussion. No-one doubts that Luke has a tendency to portray Jesus, Peter and Paul in this way, and many would include Stephen, Philip and Barnabas too. This has been a commonplace not merely of more general works concerning early Christian prophecy, but of essays and specific monographs on Luke-Acts on these various characters, or

---

combinations of them. Indeed, it is only somewhat surprising that Stronstad almost gives the impression this aspect has been ignored (86-87). When such different writers as Lampe, Chevalier and Shelton claim that Luke’s pneumatology is essentially an OT prophetic/charismatic pneumatology they do so with just such parallels in mind. Yet in another respect Stronstad may be right that there is room yet for a thorough monograph devoted to the topic, and it may be hoped that his own work will stimulate such a study.

In sum, one of the strengths of Stronstad’s book is that in so many ways it represents what is typical of Lucan studies of the Spirit. And he writes with an admirable and compelling lucidity that makes the fruit of Lucan scholarship available, enjoyable and challenging at a non-technical level. No-one completing this book will be able to read Luke-Acts again without recognising the extent and importance of the charismatic/prophetic pneumatology it contains. And anyone attempting to dismiss his account as a merely partisan Pentecostal reading will have to take on and defeat the majority of Lucan scholarship to make their point stick.

Having profited so much in the past from Stronstad’s contribution, it is with considerable reluctance that I move on to discuss some criticisms and areas of disagreement.

PART III: IN CRITICAL DISAGREEMENT WITH STRONSTAD

By way of a general criticism, I should say that I regularly found controversial conclusions to have been reached with rather too much ease, and opponents seem to be slightly caricatured, and then fobbed off rather than being genuinely answered. But what I have hereby identified as weakness may simply be the shadow side of the book’s strength - its lucidity, its liveliness and the semi-popular ‘availability’ of its argument. Stronstad may well feel that to meet my criticism he would have had to transgress into the over-lengthy and over-technical. So I will lay that disquiet temporarily to rest, in order to concentrate on the more central issues. For the purpose of what I hope will be our on-going dialogue I will concentrate on three related questions: (A) What do the patterns of parallels between Jesus and the disciples prove? (B) Does the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ make all that receive the gift ‘prophets’? (C) What is the relation of the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ to Luke’s concept of ‘salvation’?

A. The Import of the Patterns, Paradigms and Parallels

Stronstad offers what is in a sense a fairly typical classical Pentecostal account of the parallels between Jesus and the disciples, though he extends it by the inclusion of Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, Agabus and Paul, taking advantage of the contribution of Lucan studies at this point. Jesus’ baptismal experience of the Spirit (3.21-22) is depicted within the Gospel as an anointing/empowering to act as the messianic Prophet (cf. esp. 4.16-30), full of the Spirit (4.1, 14), led by the Spirit (4.1b), and empowered for mighty acts by the Spirit (4.14, 16-21; 7.21-22; Acts 10.38). Acts correspondingly depicts the disciples as ‘filled with/full of’ the Spirit, working signs and wonders by the Spirit and being led by the Spirit. The parallels thus demonstrate that at his ascension, as the Elijianic prophet, Jesus ‘transferred the Spirit of prophecy from himself to his disciples with the result that both as a community and as individuals’ they will have ‘the same kind of prophetic ministry he himself had’.

I am less sure what the parallels demonstrate. This is not because I have any doubts as to whether Luke’s narrative is essentially ‘theological’, but because several quite different theological readings can be obtained from the same narratives (I think that is Fee’s essential point, not that he embraces an alleged ‘hermeneutic of rejection’), and Stronstad has simply pressed the evidence in favour of one (the classical Pentecostal) possibility. Another well-known reading would be that the Spirit ensures some measure of continuity of Jesus’ mission by raising up powerful charismatic/prophetic leaders, but that Luke regards them as somewhat heroic examples, rather than as paradigmatic of ‘everyman’s’ experience (whether potential or real). In other words, the Spirit ensures the community shares salient aspects of Jesus’ prophetic ministry (while preserving the uniqueness of his anointing), but not necessarily that every individual (or even a majority of individuals) does so. We shall have to examine the implications of Peter’s claim that Joel’s ‘Spirit of prophecy’ is given to all in the next section, but nothing else in Luke’s narration suggests he thinks all believers are prophets or prophesy regularly. Luke clearly uses the term ‘prophet’ of a relatively restricted group, with the apparent implication that others are not (cf. Acts 11.27; 13.1; 15.32; 21.10). Similarly, when he points out that Philip’s four daughters used to


1Prophethood, 16-17, and frequently.
prophesy (21.9), he will hardly have made this observation if he thought all believers regularly prophesied. It is interesting how often Acts is read with democratizing, idealising and individualising spectacles that turn all that is said of the heroes into an expectation of all believers. But this is quite unwarranted. While we should certainly not read Luke-Acts as though it supported some kind of clergy/laity dualism, it has frequently been observed by acute commentators that (in so far as he gives one at all) his portrait of believers in general does not suggest he thinks of them all as prophets or even as outwardly and markedly charismatic. While he regularly portrays the apostles, and some others, full of the Spirit, as receiving revelations, proclaiming the gospel, and working signs and wonders in the power of the Spirit, he does not suggest this of the rest of the believers. Most notably, the Jesus/leader parallels that Luke regularly uses in relation to the twelve, Peter, John, Stephen, Philip, Barnabas and Paul, are surprisingly never extended to the church in general. For example, in his summaries of the church in Jerusalem, Luke tells us that believers devoted themselves to the apostles’ teaching, had all in common, attended the temple together, broke bread together, praised God together and enjoyed the favour of the people (2.42-47; 4.32-37; 5.12-16, etc.), but it is precisely not said that they received revelations, prophesied or worked signs and wonders. These things are attributed to the apostles in such contexts, but notably not to believers in general. If Luke wished to suggest that all who received the Spirit thereby became robustly charismatic/prophetic figures like Stephen and Philip, he missed glorious opportunities to make such a point! A similar situation pertains in the descriptions of the churches beyond Jerusalem. The way that the ‘Pentecost’ reception of the Spirit is ‘repeated’ in Samaria (Acts 8.14-18), Caesarea (10.45-46; cf. 11.15-18; 15.8-9), and Ephesus (19.1-6), has encouraged Pentecostal interpreters to think these later groups of disciples all become prophetic ‘proclaimers’ of the gospel, but once again Luke is surprisingly reticent. In Acts 8 he tells us that Peter and John went on to preach the gospel to many Samaritan villages (8.25), and he continues to narrate Philip’s preaching, but (surprisingly) nothing is said of any Samaritans preaching. He may well have believed that the Spirit did raise up some among the Samaritans to be fully involved in the church’s prophetic mission (cf. 9.31?), but it is striking that he does not say so (far less that ‘all’ were so involved). Similarly, he is utterly silent as to whether Cornelius’ household or the Ephesian ‘twelve’ went on to demonstrate prophetic ministries of any kind.1

1That ‘all’ were understood to be involved in proclamation - at least ideally - has sometimes been deduced from 8.4, 11.19-20 and 15.35. But these verses do not make the required point. While it is affirmed that ‘all’ were scattered in 8.1, we are not told


Stronstad makes two other moves to strengthen his case. First, with most Pentecostal interpreters, he takes Acts 1.8 as a paradigmatic statement of the essence of the gift of the Spirit - it is for all an empowering to witness (and such proclamation is seen as an essentially ‘prophetic’ function). Second, he interprets 4.31 as a reference to the reception of the Spirit by the five thousand converts of 4.4, understood as assembled together in the only place large enough for such a gathering, the temple.1 If this interpretation of 4.31 is correct, it would provide an important piece of support for Stronstad’s theory (though by no means a conclusive one). But neither of these points can be sustained.

Acts 1.8 relates with certainty only to the Galilean disciples present, probably the eleven (cf. 1.2, 11), but also envisages Matthias (1.21-26), and perhaps others designated in 1.21-22. The point that I am seeking to make here is simply that Luke normally reserves the word ‘witness’ (whether noun or verb) for quasi-legal, ‘eye-witness’ testimony or advocacy, not merely confessional ‘proclamation about Jesus’. That is why it is important for Luke that the replacement for Judas is found from those that have accompanied Jesus from John’s Baptism right up to the resurrection appearances and their related table-teaching (1.21-22). Only these people are said to ‘bear witness’ to Jesus, because only these are capable of providing what Luke means by ‘witness’. There are just two exceptions (other than the prophets of the OT). Paul is the ‘thirteenth witness’, but he is appointed witness precisely to ‘the things [he has] seen and heard’, namely the Damascus Road revelation (22.15; cf. 26.16). The other exception is Stephen, whom Paul refers to as ‘your [Christ’s] witness’ (22.20) in connection with his indictment of the Jewish leaders at what was supposed to be his own trial. Other believers are called many things in Acts, but never witnesses; they may proclaim the gospel, argue it from Scripture, chat it, celebrate the great deeds of God, etc., but this is never called ‘witnessing’. So Acts 1.8 cannot be used to support the thesis

in 8.4 how many of those were involved in preaching the word; similarly at 11.19-20, 15.35 affirms that ‘many others’ were involved with Paul and Barnabas in teaching and preaching the word of the Lord at Antioch. Given the size of the city (300,000), and the importance of the church there, and given that Luke considers the Spirit to be the driving force of the mission, it is not surprising he envisages ‘many’ were involved in the mission. But that hardly means ‘all’ or even ‘a significant proportion’. Luke 1.1 speaks of ‘many’ having written an account of Jesus before him, but, as has been pointed out, that could mean as few as just two (Mark and Q)!

1Prophethood, 71-75.
that ‘all’ who receive the Spirit are thereby ‘empowered to witness’.\(^1\) In that respect the role of the apostles is unique.

What of Acts 4.31? Is this the point where the 5000 converted from Pentecost onwards first receive the Spirit of prophecy, as they gather together in the temple? It is true that, in the history of interpretation of Acts, the story in 4.24-31, with the following summary in 4.32-5.11 (\(^7\)), has sometimes been taken as derived from a parallel source to those used in Acts 2, and one that provided a more original/authentic account of the Pentecost event, perhaps even in the temple area. But within the narrative of Acts as we have it, I do not find Stronstad’s reading convincing.

In the first place, 2.28-29 programatically suggests that those who become believers, and submit to baptism, receive the Spirit without further ado. Why will it be assumed that the 3000 baptised on the day of Pentecost (and the remainder later) had not received the Spirit? There is no equivalent to Acts 8.16 to suggest that though they believed, and were baptised, the Spirit had (unusually) ‘not yet’ come upon them. But perhaps Stronstad merely means that though the 5000 converts had received the Spirit, this was their first experience of being filled with Spirit to speak boldly.

Second, 4.23 refers to the released apostles as returning to ‘their own’. This is unfortunately ambiguous. It would normally be taken to mean immediate family and/or close friends (as at 24.23), though it can mean ‘comrades in arms’ or even ‘own people/nation’. Not surprisingly, then, the commentators discuss whether the reference is to (a) a small group of friends, (b) the twelve (to whom perhaps it would have been most natural to report), (c) the core of the one hundred and twenty (Acts 1.15) that had awaited the promise of Pentecost together; (d) ‘Christians’, seen as a separate people from the Judaism represented by the persecuting Jerusalem leaders. But even those commentators who think (d) the most likely are virtually unanimous that Luke does not envisage Peter and John as meeting with all of the believers (the five thousand of 4.4), but with a relatively small (yet representative) group of them (which could include any of the options (a)-(c) above). ‘The place in which they were gathered’ (4.31) has then naturally been taken as a room in a house, perhaps the

1Peter’s call to conversional baptism (in 2.38) may have been prompted by just such a location.

2Stronstad puts a certain weight on the argument that, because Pentecost evokes Sinai (and Horeb) theophany language, it will be assumed that it too takes place on a mountain. But that does not narrow the scene to the temple: the whole city was built on a mountain.

3Stronstad argues that the LXX regularly uses oi=koj for the temple, and that Jesus identifies the temple as God’s house (oi=koj) at Lk 19.46. But this is misleading. In the LXX, oi=koj is not used on its own for the temple, but always with identifying qualifiers such as ‘of the Lord’, ‘for the Lord’, ‘for his name’ or, with God speaking, ‘my house’, etc. There are occasions in 1 Kings 6-8 where there is no qualification, but only because the referent has been clearly identified at 1 Kings 6.1-2. Luke uses oi=koj to refer to the temple only five times, and always with clear contextual markers to indicate the temple is meant: ‘the house of God’ in 6.4; ‘between the altar and the sanctuary (oi=koj)’ in 11.51; ‘my house’ (with the words of God quoted from Isa 56.7 in Lk 19.46); Stephen reminds his readers that Solomon built ‘a house for him [=God]’ in Acts 7.47 but God retorts with irony (quoting Isa 66.1) ‘What house will you build for me?’ (7.49). The numerous other references to oi=koj in Luke-Acts are to ordinary dwellings, usually of specified people, or to lineages. In brief, Luke did not favour oi=koj as a way of referring to the temple (he never uses it redactionally, always preferring other terms; cf. his use of oi=koj would need qualification to make it clear the temple rather than some other building was in mind.


‘upper room’ of 1.13-14, usually taken as the initial locus of the Pentecost experience.

At precisely this point, however, Stronstad thinks the commentators are ‘almost certainly wrong’: he wishes to argue that both the Pentecost event and the ‘repeat’ at 4.31 took place in the temple (55-59, 73-75). I can only say I rate this reading as rather improbable, and for the very reasons the commentators have noted. When, at 2.1, we are told that on the day of Pentecost, ‘they were all together in one place’ and that the noisy theophany filled ‘the whole house where they were sitting’ (2.1), this can hardly be a reference to the temple. Peter’s address to the multitude of diaspora Jews quite probably did take place in the general area of the temple - possibly outside the Hulda gates in the southern wall of the temple esplanade (where there were many purification baths for arriving pilgrims),\(^1\) though we cannot be sure. But had Luke meant the Pentecost theophany commenced inside (and filled) the temple area itself (rather than some dwelling close by),\(^2\) he would be expected to have referred rather to their being together in ‘the holy place’ and/or that ‘the whole house of God/the Lord\(^3\) was filled with the noise (and, of course, Peter’s audience would have had much more to be amazed by than merely the
hearing of miraculous tongues). The temple was symbolically so important to Luke’s story that he thought the Pentecost theophany began there he would hardly have described the location so ambiguously without qualification or clear deictic reference (e.g. ‘this (holy) place’ said by speakers inside the temple; cf. 6.13, 14). It follows that readers of 4.31 are very unlikely to take the ambiguous reference ‘the place in which they were gathered together’ as a reference to the temple. As at 2.1-2, Luke would probably have clarified that it was the temple that was meant had that been his understanding. And while it is easy to imagine a relatively small group praying the prayer of 4.24-30, it is more difficult to imagine five thousand doing so. Furthermore, it is elsewhere a relatively small number that are involved in bold public proclamation of the type suggested in 4.31, and with the working of signs and wonders as prayed for in 4.30.3 Altogether it is hardly surprising that the commentators do not regard 4.31 as a second theophany in the temple, extending the gift of the Spirit from the initial 120 to the fuller 5000. They (probably rightly) tend to understand it as an occasion when a group close to Peter and John, who had already received the Spirit, were filled afresh for vigorous and powerful proclamation, after a serious attempt to silence the gospel. I will not claim that this is an ‘inescapable conclusion’ -- as Stronstad does of his own interpretation (75) - because Luke is rather full of ambiguities.

1 Stronstad even envisages a full theophany with fire and smoke billowing around the temple, turning the celestial luminaries blood red (to match Joel’s words in Acts 2.19-20), but he admits that Luke does not actually report this (Prophethood, 56).

2 Nor will the description ‘the place in which they were gathered together’ evoke the temple. The verb used here forms an ironic contrast to the sinister ‘gathering together’ of Herod and Pilate, etc., to destroy Jesus (4.25-27). It is not earlier used of Christian ‘gatherings’, and Luke does not think of the believers as massing ‘all together’ in Solomon’s portico until later in the narrative (5.12; cf. 3.11); before that, all that is said is that they attended the temple together (probably for the set hours of prayer: 2.46; 3.1).

3 Only the apostles (2.43; 5.12), Stephen (6.8), and Paul and Barnabas (14.3, 15.12, cf. 19.11) are said to work ‘signs and wonders’. Philip works ‘signs and works of power’ (8.13, cf. 8.6), which probably means the same. Luke may well have known of other striking charismatic practitioners, but he does not actually say so.


But the usual reading is more secure than Stronstad’s (i.e. based on wider redactional considerations, and more careful linguistic analysis). In sum, the narrative patterns of Luke-Acts are probably theologically significant, and they support the view that charismatic/prophetic leadership was very important to the Lucan church, but it is far from clear that the theology the paradigms/patterns sustain is one of ‘the prophethood of all believers’.

B. The Import of Receiving the Spirit as the ‘Spirit of prophecy’.

As we have affirmed above, it is the consensus of Lucan scholarship that the ‘promise of the Spirit’ of which Peter speaks in Acts 2, and there guarantees to ‘all’ believers, is a Christian version of Joel’s ‘Spirit of prophecy’. The uninformed reader might expect the conclusion that all who receive this gift are thereby constituted ‘prophets’. Luke’s additional repetition of the phrase ‘and they shall prophesy’ (Acts 2.18) within the ‘quotation’ of Joel in Acts 2.17-18 might even seem to support such a view. But, as with so many things in Luke, first appearances can be deceptive. Three points require elucidation.

First, while the term ‘Spirit of prophecy’ is a useful label for significant aspects of Luke’s view of the Holy Spirit, we need, nevertheless, to remember that he does not himself use it, but rather the more open categories, ‘Holy Spirit’, ‘Spirit of Jesus’, ‘the Spirit’, ‘Spirit of the Lord’, etc.

Second, while the term ‘Spirit of prophecy’ is also a useful label for much of intertestamental Judaism’s concept of the Spirit (and the term regularly used by some of the targums for the Spirit), in those circles the Spirit - even where actually called ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ - was in no way restricted to inspiring prophetic speech. Rather the Spirit of prophecy was the organ of communication between God and a person, the means of God’s self-manifestation, presence and empowering. As such, the Spirit typically brought revelation/guidance, all manner of charismatic wisdom and understanding, as well as different types of inspired speech (doxology and prophecy). It would be perfectly comprehensible within this milieu to speak of people having received the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ without their ever being expected to prophesy - odd as that might sound to us. One of the OT ‘Spirit’ passages commented on most frequently by Jewish writers was an obvious case in point. In Numbers 11 we are told

1 For an account of ITP views see Turner, Power, chs 3-5, or, more briefly, idem, The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995), ch. 1.
that when the Spirit came upon the seventy elders, they all burst into prophecy, ‘but they did not do so again’ (11.25; cf. 1 Sam 10, etc.). The outburst of prophecy attested to Israel that the Spirit had come upon these elders, and so legitimated them before the nation, but thereafter the Spirit’s function is not to give them prophecy at all, but to give them charismatic wisdom to act as leaders and judges. The turgum do not hesitate to say these elders received the ‘Spirit of prophecy’, even though they could have used a different term, such as ‘Spirit of wisdom’, instead. Indeed, prophecy (which depended on revelation) and charismatic wisdom were usually seen as sufficiently closely related (cf. Philo, Vit. Mos. II.265!) that someone receiving the latter could naturally be said to have received from the Spirit of prophecy. Thus, for example, in Exodus 31.3-4, Bezalel is said to have been ‘filled with the Spirit of God, with wisdom, with understanding, with knowledge and all craftsmanship’ to devise the sacred furnishings. Targum Neofiti quite happily recognises this as the Spirit of prophecy (as does Targ. Pseudo-Jonathan at Exod 35.31), while other translators understandably prefer ‘Spirit of wisdom’. By the latter term, however, the turgum do not mean something different from the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ - the ‘Spirit of wisdom’ and ‘Spirit of prophecy’ are used virtually interchangeably, in a wide range of passages - they mean the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ giving wisdom. (Thus, for example, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Exodus 37.8 can say ‘by the wisdom of the Spirit of prophecy, he [Bezalel] made the cherubim’ on the two sides of the mercy-seat). The writers of the turgum thus freely attribute the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ to Bezalel, but they do not suggest he ever prophesied, far less that he regularly did so. In sum, and this is the important point, to say that someone had the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ meant simply that they manifested some activity enabled by the Spirit of prophecy, not necessarily prophecy as such. In Luke’s milieu, having the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ did not imply you were or would become a prophet.

Third, as we have already pointed out, the story Luke relates does not suggest that all become prophets, even when ‘prophet’ and ‘prophecy’ is used in the loosest and broadest sense of involvement in charismatic teaching and preaching of the good news (lexical senses not attested in Acts). Indeed, when Luke uses the word ‘prophet’ of Christians (he uses it more often of OT figures) it is only to designate a small group within the church - some with Agabus (11.27; cf. 21.10); a mere five (including Barnabas and Paul) at Antioch (13.1), and Judas and Silas amongst the ambassadors sent out with the apostolic decree at 15.32. Those four texts

1 The first of these concerns the initial outburst of inspired speech as the Ephesian ‘twelve’ received the Spirit (and with it we might compare 2.4,6,11 and 10.46). As we have seen, however, inspired speech at the inception of the Spirit does not presume an ongoing prophetic function. Nor is it clear Luke thought all experienced prophecy and/or tongues even at the moment of Spirit-reception: see Turner, Power, 393-397, 446-449.

2 Luke is clearly far from attempting to contradict Paul’s ‘Not all are prophets, are they?’ (1 Cor 12.29) with an emphatic ‘indeed, they are not’. Similarly, Stronstad’s view that Acts divides into four panels (1.12-2.41; 2.42-6.7; 6.8-17.24 and 12.25-28.31), each devoted to the acts of a different set of prophets, is unlikely to convince those who have read the detailed literary-critical and composition-critical arguments concerning the structure of Acts.
and inclusion into the church through baptism) are usually correctly seen as the gateway to the gift of the Spirit rather than caused by the Spirit.1

The problem is that such a truncated concept of ‘salvation’ appears to correspond neither with NT concepts, nor with that of contemporary critical Systematic Theology. It would perhaps be better (with Menzies) to refer to the triad he speaks of as ‘initial salvation’, and we may agree with him that Luke does not portray this as an outworking of receiving the gift of the Spirit. While Reformation and post-Reformation debates gave discussions of such ‘initial salvation’ great (perhaps even excessive) attention, this should not be allowed to obscure the place theology has always given to ‘continuing’ salvation (the ‘life’ of salvation in union with Christ, sanctification, etc.) and ‘future’ salvation (resurrection, participation in new creation, etc.). For the church, both continuing and future ‘salvation’ usually means the reversal of the alienations of the ‘fall’ and all its consequences. Viewed from such a perspective, salvation is arguably first and foremost restoration to communion with the Father and the Son through the Spirit, and the transformation of the person and relationships.2

Such a view is clearly built on NT teaching. In Johannine terms, ‘eternal life’ is to know the only true God and the one he has sent, Jesus Christ (17.3). This knowledge is not to be reduced to affirmation of the content of the gospel about Christ; but a living relationship of mutual indwelling of love (so Jn 14-16), or, as 1 John 1.3 puts it (summarising the heart of Johannine spirituality of ‘salvation’), ‘fellowship ... with the Father and with his Son’. And how but by the Spirit - indeed, by the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ - would such fellowship be possible? The ‘Spirit of prophecy’ is precisely the transforming, self-manifesting, communicating presence of God. So it is not difficult to see why in Johannine terms the Spirit is essential to salvation.3 The same applies to Paul for whom knowing God and knowing Christ are at the very heart of the gospel.4

1Stronstad is by no means alone here, as I have indicated in my survey in Power, 39, 56-66, 72-78. Others, however, demur: see Power, 66-72.

2It is perhaps not so surprising that NT scholars fail to note this; it is quite remarkable, however, when a writer of Systematic Theology, such as J. Rodman Williams, makes the same mistake (cf. his Renewal Theology, Volume 2 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), 186-90 and 205-207). In his case it looks like a tactical redefinition, to separate salvation from reception of the Spirit. For a much more satisfactory account from a Pentecostal systematic theologian, see S. Chan, Spiritual Theology (Downer’s Grove: IVP, 1998), chs. 1-2 and 4.

3Cf Turner, Spirit, chs. 4-6, esp. ch. 5. 

4Cf Turner, Spirit, chs 7-8. 

1See Prophethood, 63-64.

In brief, I suggest Luke's picture amounts to this: Israel was living in spiritual 'exile' because of her sins; she awaited 'salvation', the 'forgiveness of her sins', in the form of the end of her historical chastisement in a powerful transforming visitation by God; the return of her king in blessing to Zion, and the restoration of Israel as a light to the nations. In other words, she awaited the fulfillment of the Isaianic new exodus hopes of Isaiah 19, 35, 40-55, and 61 (and Luke 1-3 is replete with this imagery). Jesus announced the beginning of the fulfillment, not merely quoting Isaiah 61 as his paradigmatic text (Lk 4.18-21), but in proclaiming the inception of the kingdom of God, which meant the return of God's presence in powerful rule. The Spirit's work through Jesus is clearly the means of the presence of the kingdom, and Jesus anticipates that through his death the kingdom of God will become more powerfully present, not less so. How can this be? By what means could God's dynamic presence and liberating rule (=salvation) continue to be present, indeed be augmented, with Jesus' departure? And how could Jesus be related to it? And if the hoped-for restoration of Israel had barely materialized within Jesus' ministry, and faltered with his removal in death and ascension, how could it now come about? The perfectly obvious answer to all these questions (from a Jewish Christian perspective, wise after the event!) is through the pouring out of the Spirit of prophecy by Jesus from the throne of David at the Father's side. No other answer would suggest itself, given the OT story and Jesus' story. And the story of the first part of Acts is very much about how Israel begins to restored around the apostles, the eschatological leaders of the twelve tribes. Now, at last, Jesus' followers become a community of reconciliation and love which begins to match the hopes of Luke 1-2, and of the teaching of Jesus. And by Acts 15 James can appeal to Amos 9.11-12 as fulfilled: the nations to be admitted. There is, in short, a marked rise in the realised eschatology of salvation in Acts - and for Luke we should understand this 'salvation' to mean the dynamic presence of God, and rule of Christ, which results in a transformed community of purity, love, commitment, obedience, joy, praise, and empowering for service - a community that acts as a light to the nations. It is no accident that it begins with Pentecost, and the gift of the Spirit of prophecy. Neither Judaism, nor Luke, nor Paul nor John, know of any other means by which these benefits could be present. For Luke, a people existing in a state of merely human faith, repentance and hope, is not a people enjoying salvation, but a people waiting for it to arrive!

Now let me return to the main lines of my engagement with Stronstad, and raise the following points:

1. I cannot at all see how my broader view of Lucan 'salvation' than his makes mine 'lose all actual theological significance'. I suggest that, if anything, it deepens it, brings out its OT and ITP background, highlights the Lucan redactional interest, and (incidentally) makes it look closer to that of Paul and John than Stronstad's.

2. Stronstad's claim that 'every term which Luke uses to report the activity of the Holy Spirit [excluding 'baptized with the Holy Spirit'] ... is to be found in charismatic contexts in the LXX' (26) I again consider potentially misleading. It is used to suggest that the intertextuality with the OT singly supports the view that the Spirit is concerned with providing prophetic empowerment. But the exclusion is highly relevant: the Baptist's promise is not about the future possibility that believers will receive a second blessing that will make them prophets to outsiders; it is about the Spirit washing/purifying Israel. And the highly significant redactional references in Luke 24.49 and Acts 1.8 to the Spirit 'coming upon' the disciples as a 'power from on high' are from Isaiah 32.15 (and cf. 44.3) - a key text about the Spirit effecting the restoration of Israel. These transitional texts, of course, mesh singly well with Luke 1.35, which is widely acknowledged as an allusion to the same Isaianic motif. So, at the very beginning of his narrative account, Luke signals that the Spirit is intimately related to the renewal/recreation of Israel in and through the messianic son. This text also, incidentally, brings to light one of the problems in using Luke 3.21-22 as paradigmatic of a purely donum

---

1Prophethood, 63. Strangely, he even dubbs it a case of 'illegitimate totality transfer' (64) - an accusation which shows he has misunderstood either Barr or myself, or both. Barr's term applies to a mistaken form of word-study; e.g., the reading of the whole NT concept of 'the Church' into a single occasion of the lexeme ekklesia, such as at Mt 16.18. What I was engaged in was not lexical analysis but the study of Luke's concept of salvation. Ironically, Barr's book on Semantics was written partly to correct the very kind of confusion between word-study and study of 'concepts' that Stronstad has made here.


---

3Cf. Turner, Power, ch. 7.
superadditum pneumatology. Within the Lucan narrative, Jesus has already begun profoundly to experience the Spirit as the source of new creation before ever he 'receives' the Spirit in the Jordan event as empowerment for service. If Jesus is to be paradigmatic for the disciples, this should suggest either that they, like him, had a two-phase experience of the Spirit (on which Luke is utterly silent), or, more probably, that the Pentecost gift includes elements that correspond to both Luke 1.35 and Luke 3.21-22. That latter interpretation, which would suggest the Spirit has both soteriological and empowering functions, better fits the transitional references (Lk 24/Acts 1) to the Spirit, matches the foundational significance of the Pentecost narrative and its restorationist sequel more fully, and does greater justice to the concept of the 'Spirit of prophecy' as we discover it in Jewish eschatological and messianic hope, and as we meet it in the pages of Acts. As Stronstad himself admits, the Spirit in Acts is not just about prophetic empowerment, but also about 'praise, purity, joy, generosity and courage' (122), and (we would add) much else besides. That is to say the Spirit is not merely 'empowering to preach to outsiders' (though it is certainly that, and Luke's essentially missiological narrative highlights it), but is also the self-manifesting, transforming, empowering presence of God at the heart of the new life of the eschatological community. It is only that presence that makes the community the fulfillment of the Isaianic restorationist hopes, and so a light to the nations. And that is why Luke expects believers to receive the Spirit in the complex of conversion-initiation, not at some later point.

3. While we must all respect a theology which focuses the Spirit's function in service and mission, as Stronstad's does, we must surely draw back from the theological anomaly that suggests the Spirit's function is primarily towards the outsider, and not also at the centre of the church's communion with God and its corporate life. The 'anomaly' becomes little short of an inner contradiction (in the writings of some) when Luke's soteriology is described in such minimalistic and Pelagian terms that the Spirit almost appears to work powerfully through believers just to call unbelieving men and women in to what is otherwise essentially a Spiritless salvation. One would rather expect the polarity to be the reverse: the Spirit empowers to draw people into the church because the Spirit fuels the very 'life' into which he calls. At this point we may ask Stronstad whether the Charismatic Movement has not made a very valid point. By drawing more on the Pauline epistles, that movement has been able to elucidate the centrality of the Spirit's workings and giftings to the whole life and service of the church (of the community and of the individual) - without losing sight of the Spirit's relation to mission to outsiders. And it may be worth pointing out that Paul himself seems to have sustained a lively interest and involvement in his evangelistic goals without suggesting to his churches that all should be directly and vocally involved in it, and without attempting to justify this with the difficult doctrine that all have the Spirit first and foremost as prophetic empowering for bold proclamation of the gospel.1

CONCLUSION

Stronstad's monograph offers significant observations and challenging insights. But I think he presses the central thesis - nicely embodied in the title of his book - beyond what careful exegesis can responsibly affirm of Luke's communicative intentions. I suggest this is partly because he interprets what Luke might mean by the 'Spirit of prophecy' too narrowly. Even more worryingly, to my mind, is the way he interprets this theologoumenon as something merely successive to and separable from what Luke means by 'salvation'. This sunders what I believe Luke (and God) put together. I very much look forward to any creative future attempt he should make to persuade me otherwise. But despite the disagreements elaborated above, let us note the fundamental agreement. On either account, Luke-Acts provides a significant challenge to the our churches today - both to more traditional churches, where experience of the Spirit in Luke is 'non-soteriological' because it is not related to 'cleansing, righteousness, intimate fellowship with and knowledge of God' ('Spirit', 52), we must press the question 'By what divine means, then, does Luke think these graces present in the community?'. I cannot see he could venture any response other than the 'Spirit of prophecy' as the source of 'intimate fellowship with and knowledge of God' (so here he would naturally join Judaism, Paul and John) And as it is a common view of Judaism, and the otherwise widespread view of Christianity, he is unlikely to see eschatological 'cleansing' and radical 'righteousness' otherwise (and I have argued this partly Luke's point in the Cornelius story).

1This was a great danger in R.P. Menzies' Development, where he summed up his position (against mine): 'The disciples receive the Spirit ... not... as the essential bond by which by which they (each individual) are linked to God: instead, not primarily for themselves. Rather, as the driving force behind their witness to Christ, the disciples receive the Spirit for others.' (207; my italics). See his more cautious recent comments in 'The Spirit of Prophecy, Luke-Acts and Pentecostal Theology: A Response to Max Turner' in JPT 15 (1999) 49-74, esp. 51-54, where he qualifies his earlier 'exclusively missiological'. But does he go far enough? And when he claims

Max Turner: Does Luke Believe Reception of the 'Spirit of Prophecy' makes all 'Prophets'? Inviting Dialogue with Roger Stronstad

Is it not slightly ironic that Stonstad (chapter 1) warns of the spiritual impoverishment that will follow if we ignore the 'paradigmatic prophetic patterns' in Acts, when through most of his discussion of that 'hermeneutic of denial' he is hitting at Gordon Fee?! But Fee maintains a most positive Pentecostal vision of the charismatic life and mission of the church based in what he regards as the clearer teaching of Paul.
the Spirit of prophecy is often played down, and to Pentecostal and Charismatic churches that may, for different reasons, have moved away from the dynamic of the narrative of Luke-Acts (and of the Spirit!).

The 'initial evidence': implications of an empirical perspective in a British context

William K Kay

This paper compares the views of Elim and Assemblies of God ministers on the doctrinal issue of 'the initial evidence'. It concludes that there is a considerable overlap between the two denominations, but also that there are marked differences. It also shows that significant numbers of Pentecostal ministers do not believe their own denomination's fundamental doctrinal statements.

INTRODUCTION

This paper addresses three questions. Each concerns the Elim Pentecostal Church (hereafter abbreviated to Elim) and Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland (hereafter abbreviated to British Assemblies of God). First, what do Elim and British Assemblies of God ministers believe about the evidence, whether initial or otherwise, for the baptism in the Holy Spirit? Second, in the light of what empirical evidence shows them to believe, how closely do these ministers adhere to their denomination's fundamental truths? Third, what are the implications of these findings for any possible organisational combination between the Elim and British Assemblies of God? These three questions are interwoven within the historical development of the two denominations as the following considerations show.

From their respective inceptions in 1915 and 1924 Elim and British Assemblies of God have hesitated on the brink of combination. The conference in May 1924 at which British Assemblies of God for the first time called together its pastors and elders met George Jeffreys and a delegation from the Elim Evangelistic Band (as it was then called). The proposal to the conference that the Elim contingent become the evangelistic arm of a combined Pentecostal fellowship was received and recognised as a bold initiative that, in the end, came to nothing because powerful voices, notably Howard Carter's, thought Pentecostalism in Britain would be risking its future by putting all its resources into a single

1 I am grateful to Revd Desmond Cartwright for explaining, with historical detail, the Elim position on evidence for the baptism in the Spirit and to Dr Calvin Holsinger for explaining, with contemporary detail, the current position of American Assemblies of God on ministerial accreditation.
organization. Subsequent suggestions that the two denominations work together more closely were also made after a Unity Conference ‘to seek to find a basis for unity without compromising any vital truths’ was held in London in 1939. In 1948 fourteen leaders from five British Pentecostal groups met for two days in London and issued a joint statement. The two largest of the groups were Elim and Assemblies of God and they helped to form the British Pentecostal Fellowship whose doctrinal statement included the rubric ‘we believe in the baptism in the Holy Spirit with supernatural evidence and in the gifts of the Spirit’. The lack of specificity was deliberate. It allowed the Elim and Assemblies of God positions to be subsumed within the same form of words.

In 1922, the Elim constitutional position was that ‘the Holy Ghost, which is the promise of God, is accompanied by speaking in other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance’. In 1934, this position was changed to reflect the Foursquare Gospel and the relevant words were, ‘we believe that our Lord Jesus Christ is the Baptiser in the Holy Ghost, and that this Baptism with signs following is promised to every believer’. This position remains in current force. In essence it asserts a baptism in the Holy Spirit [Ghost] given by Christ and evidenced by ‘signs following’, that is, some form of physical manifestation - usually but not necessarily tongues.

The British Assemblies of God position was built into the Statement of Fundamental Truths it had adopted in 1924 and which appears from its phraseology and the order of its subject matter to have been strongly influenced by the similar doctrinal statement adopted by Assemblies of God in the United States in 1916. It has remained almost entirely unchanged since that time. The current British Assemblies of God Statement of Fundamental Truths says ‘We believe in the baptism in the Holy Spirit, the initial evidence of which is the speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance. Acts 2.4; 10.44-46; 11.14-16; 19.6; Isa 8.18’.

in begin with a quotation from a letter from George Jeffreys to Howard Carter (28th June, 1926) discussing the constitutional basis for unity between the two denominations. A copy of the letter is held in the interdenominational Donald Gee Centre for Pentecostal and Charismatic Research at Mattersey Hall.


3 The position with Assemblies of God in the United States is different. Ministers are required to renew their credentials annually and to fill in a detailed questionnaire about doctrinal distinctives. Where they disagree with these distinctives, a written explanation is required. Ministers are required to agree that ‘speaking with tongues is the initial physical evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit’.


over understanding of the millennium, it is normally sufficient for the position incorporated within the fundamental truths to be restated through a seminar or public presentation for disquiet to be removed.

METHOD

The study reported on here makes use of a postal survey by questionnaire. The research was carried out in the United Kingdom where the two largest Pentecostal denominations are the Assemblies of God and the Elim Pentecostal Church. Both of these denominations publishes an annual yearbook listing its ordained clergy. Both distinguish between ministers who work in the UK and missionaries who work overseas. For the purposes of this study, overseas workers were excluded. All other workers, active, retired, itinerant and pastoral were included.

Although both denominations makes use of a different governmental structure, there are broad similarities between their operations. Assemblies of God and Elim each elect an Executive Council which has a national authority. Both these Executive Councils were approached and asked to give written support to the survey. This they did and a letter endorsing the questionnaire, and signed by the Chairman of each Council was mailed with the questionnaire along with a freepost return envelope. Each questionnaire was completed anonymously, but was identifiable by means of a numerical code. This allowed follow-up letters to be sent to ministers who failed to respond. A second follow-up letter was sent out to those who did not respond to the first and replacement questionnaires were offered to those who had mislaid them. Finally, a telephone follow-up was used to selected ministers who had still not replied. This procedure led to 401 usable questionnaires from Assemblies of God ministers, a response rate of 57%, and 367 usable questionnaires from Elim ministers, a response rate of 64%. The total sample comprised 768 (97.4%) males, 23 (2.3%) females and 2 persons of undeclared sex. There were 216 (28%) respondents aged under 39, 496 (65%) aged between 40 and 64, 53 (7%) over 65 years, and 3 of undeclared age. The sample, then, was predominantly male and middle aged.

As part of a lengthy questionnaire which was anonymously answered, the ministers were presented with 118 Likert-style statements on doctrinal, social and ecclesiological matters. Ministers were asked to say whether they ‘agreed strongly’, ‘agreed’, were ‘not certain’, ‘disagreed’ or ‘disagreed strongly’ with the statements. The four statements given below are the focus of this paper. Data were analysed by SPSS 6.1 for Windows, Network version.

RESULTS

Analysis of variance comparisons were made between Elim and British Assemblies of God ministers in their responses to each of the three statements. It was found that there was a significant difference in respect of the statement, ‘Speaking with tongues is necessary as initial evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit’ (F = 189.06, p < .000) and a significant difference in respect of the statement, ‘Baptism in the Spirit can occur without speaking with tongues’ (F = 185.60, p < .000), but no difference was found either for, ‘The baptism in the Holy Spirit is evidenced by “signs following”’ (F = 2.24, NS) or for ‘I believe there is a distinct Christian experience which might be called “the baptism in the Spirit”’ (F = 0.387, NS). A breakdown of response frequencies is shown in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Certain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe there is a distinct Christian experience which might be called ‘the baptism in the Spirit’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking with tongues is necessary as initial evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism in the Spirit can occur without speaking with tongues</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The baptism in the Holy Spirit is evidenced by ‘signs following’</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Certain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe there is a distinct Christian experience which might be called ‘the baptism in the Spirit’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking with tongues is necessary as initial evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism in the Spirit can occur without speaking with tongues</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The baptism in the Holy Spirit is evidenced by ‘signs following’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Agree strongly’ and ‘agree’ categories are collapsed. Similarly ‘disagree strongly’ and ‘disagree’ categories.

DISCUSSION

Tables 1 and 2 show what British Assemblies of God and Elim ministers, answering anonymously, believe about matters in their denominational fundamental truths. Table 1 shows that 2% of British Assemblies of God ministers either do not believe or are uncertain that there is a distinct Christian experience that may be called ‘the baptism in the Spirit’. The table also shows that 11% disagree with their denominational position on tongues as the initial evidence and a further 8% are uncertain on this matter. The figure in table 1 showing that 30% of these ministers believe that baptism in the Spirit can occur without speaking in tongues need not, in the context of British Assemblies of God, be taken as direct disagreement with denominational fundamental truths. Agreement with this statement may suggest circumstances can be envisaged where baptism in the Spirit takes place but where the receiver fails to speak in tongues at the time. Such circumstances are often predicated on the supposition that the receiver could have spoken in tongues and failed to do so because of a misunderstanding of the nature of the experience. The figure showing that 8% of these ministers disagree that the baptism in the Spirit is evidenced by ‘signs following’ implies that the baptism in the Spirit has no physical accompaniment. Table 2 shows that 3% of Elim ministers either do not believe or are uncertain that there is a distinct Christian experience that may be called ‘the baptism in the Spirit’. The table also shows that 4% of Elim ministers disagree with their denominational position on the evidence for the baptism in the Spirit and a further 5% are uncertain on the matter. The figure in table 2 showing that 73% of these ministers believe that the baptism in the Spirit can occur without speaking in tongues is, in the context of the Elim position, probably best understood as showing that the evidence for the baptism in the Spirit is a ‘sign following’ but not necessarily tongues.

When the two tables are considered together to see what they say about the possibility of unity between British Assemblies of God and Elim they show that (a) 42% of Elim ministers accept the tight Assemblies of God position on tongues as initial evidence and (b) 30% of British Assemblies of God ministers (who believe that baptism in the Spirit can occur without speaking in tongues) might be willing to accept the Elim position. Moreover, there is overwhelming agreement (88% from British Assemblies of God and 91% from Elim) that some form of evidence or ‘sign following’ should be consequent upon the baptism in the Spirit. There is therefore a clear overlap between the ministers as well as a clear distinction between them.

CONCLUSION

On the positive side this survey shows how closely and frequently the majority of ministers agree with their own denomination’s distinctive teaching about the baptism in the Holy Spirit. It also shows that there is a large measure of agreement between the two largest Pentecostal denominations in Britain. On the negative side the survey shows that between 9% and 12% of Pentecostal ministers appear to reject a doctrine that ties the baptism in the Spirit to any physical manifestation, and that between 2% and 3% reject the distinctiveness of the very experience which historically led to the formation of Pentecostal denominations. Together these findings raise a set of questions about the role of ministerial training and accreditation within Pentecostal denominations and a further set of questions about the extent to which the distinctives of Pentecostal congregations are likely to be maintained when a measurably proportion of ministers fail to hold to a doctrinal position originally deemed to be fundamental.
A Historical and Theological Analysis of the Pentecostal Church of Poland

Wojciech Gajewski and Krzysztof Wawrzeniuk

INTRODUCTION

The year 2000 is the 90th anniversary of Pentecostalism in Poland. Its history and theology corresponds with the European and International Pentecostal movement. Present research, for obvious reasons, aims to present only a glimpse of the phenomenon of Pentecostalism in Poland. For this reason the writers decided to concentrate on one Church out of the whole Polish Pentecostal/Charismatic movement which in their opinion is the most representative and classical, namely, Kościół Zielonoświątkowy w Polsce (Pentecostal Church of Poland).

The Pentecostal Church of Poland is estimated to have a membership of about 19,000 consisting of 180 local churches, 50 preaching points and 330 ministers. The other Pentecostal churches put together comprise of about 10,000 believers. Some of them are officially legalized churches, while others work independently as autonomous fellowships. The Catholic Charismatic movement is active and numerous in Poland.

In the present study, the writers will firstly evaluate a historical development of the Pentecostalism in Poland. Secondly, the theology of Pentecostals will be analyzed and finally, some perspectives and challenges for future will be posited. The Pentecostal Church of Poland was recognized as an autonomous church body in the late 80s and in this short period of time, they have been effective in creating organizational structures, a clear profession of faith and united Church standpoints on important ethical issues.

1. Historical Development and Growth of Pentecostalism in Poland

When the International and European Pentecostal Movement was coming into existence Poland was not included on the political map of Europe. The national tragedy of the eighteenth century led to the fall and partition of Poland between her three neighbors i.e. Austria, Prussia and Russia. It was not until the First World War (1914-1918) that Poland regained back its independence.

The earliest signs of Pentecostal renewal were found in the eastern part of the German Empire. It was here that the most radical neo-pietistic movement (Gemeinschaftsbewegung), which predated German Pentecostalism was found.

The revival of pietistic ideas among Poles in Śląsk Cieszyński was encouraged by two Lutheran ministers: Jan Pindor (1852-1924) and Karol Kulisz (1873-1940). Pindor, during his visit to the USA, met evangelists Moody and Torrey. This exerted an influence on him and on his return, he began to publish religious literature in the style of the London Tract Society. At the same time, he made contact with English and German members of the Holiness Movement. Kulisz, who was more associated with the German circle, formed the neo-pietistic fellowship in Cieszyn called Spolecznosc Chrześcijańska (SCh), (Christian Fellowship). In the meetings participated both simple workers (the leader of the fellowship was F. Tyrik – a smith from Cieszyn) and clergy ministered together.

Probably at the beginning of 1910, contacts were made between SCh and the German charismatic movement led by Jonathan Paul. The members of SCh while visiting new German Pentecostal local churches in Dolny Śląsk experienced the baptism in the Holy Spirit. After their return to Cieszyn, they began to instill these ideas within their neo-pietistic circles. However, they faced resistance from other members of SCh and as a result, a group of about 15 people were excluded from the fellowship. The group wanted to continue their activity and formed a fellowship known as Związek dla Stanowczego Chrześcijaństwa, (The Fellowship for Resolute Christianity) which was officially registered on 15 July 1910 as Bund für Entscheidenes Christentum. The leader of the fellowship

3 Z.Pasek, Związek stanowczych chrześcijan. Studium historii idei religijnych (Kraków, 1993), 46.
4 The first meeting was held in parish building in Plac Kościelny in January 1905. See: M.Suski, "Pierwszy zbór w Cieszynie" Chrestycijanin 4 (1975): 11.
5 Rev. A.Buzek a close relative of present Polish Prime Minister, the author of popular "Church History" participated in the meetings.
7 Suski, Pierwszy zbór w Cieszynie, 12.
8 Decree: 15 July 1910 no. 30301.
was Jan Kajfisz from Trzyniec. The fellowship was closely related to a moderate wing of the German Pentecostal movement. In contrast to Classical Pentecostals from the United States, they believed that speaking in tongues was not a necessary initial sign of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. It is interesting to note that the members of the newly founded fellowship were still the official members of Lutheran Church where they got married and had baptized their children. Baptism of children remained in this church until 1947, when ZSCh joined Zjednoczony Kościół Ewangeliczny (ZKE), (United Evangelical Church). Between 1917-1939 ZSCh published Glos Prawdy (The Voice of Truth) and Spiewnik Pielgrzyma (Pilgrim’s Hymn Book). At the same time, ZSCh grew in numbers; however, it is difficult to give correct and complete data. Pentecostals gathered in autonomous local churches, the biggest of which were Cieszyn, Ustron, Wista-Malinka and Wista-Głębcze.

The second trend of the Polish Pentecostal movement, apart from ZSCh, can be identified when local churches from central and eastern part of Poland were united during the convention in Stara Czolnica in 1929. According to Tomaszewski, in the early 20s, “a wave of emigrants from United States and Canada came to Poland.” Some of them had received a charismatic experience. An American, William Felter, led a very effective work in central Poland where he opened the American British British Commission supported by different mission organizations from USA and Great Britain. In Łódź, Felter pioneered a local church, which in 1928 was led by Artur Bergholc, a graduate of one of the Pentecostal Bible Schools in London.

Felter worked closely with Gustaw Herbert Schmidt (1891-1958), the head of the Russian and Eastern European Mission (called later the Eastern European Mission) and an appointed Assemblies of God (AoG) missionary to Poland. He worked mainly in Pomorze (Pomerania – region in north-western part of Poland), and particularly in Gdańsk.
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The Pentecostal churches in eastern Poland were also very active. The Evangelical movements of sztudnyców and paszkowców founded in Ukraine in the nineteenth century and in the vicinity of Petersburg were forerunners of the Pentecostal churchesconstantly. The religious background to this development was provided by the Orthodox Church. The most active Pentecostal leaders in Wolyn were N.Kalenik, J.Czerski, M.Wierzbicki; in Polesie, G.Sielszczycki, K.Leonowicz; and in Wieliszczynna, S.Niedźwiédzki and others. Diversity of origin and culture within the movement caused differences of opinion regarding the gifts of the Spirit and led to a partition of the movement into new extreme factions. This ruined the achievements of the movement and complicated the work with other evangelical churches.

In order to stand up to the extremists a convention was held in May 1929 in Stara Czolnica (administrative district Łucki in Wolński district). The Pentecostal church founded during the convention received the name Związek Zborów Chrześcijań Wiary Ewangelicznej (ZZChWE), (Evangelical Faith Christian Assemblies Fellowship). Łódź became the headquarters of the new fellowship and A.Bergholc was chosen as chief executive. The church had a congregational structure. They published in Gdańsk Przegląd edited by W.H.Schmidt, in Łódź Przegląd edited by A.Bergholc and in Tarnopol Ewangelicki Boletin edited by G.Fedyszyn.

Pentecostals from central and eastern Poland kept close contacts with the American AoG, the Swiss Pentecostal Mission and similar organizations in Great Britain. Consequently, the Instytut Biblijny (the Institute of the Bible) came into existence in the Free City of Gdańsk. G.H.Schmidt was the founder and the first principal of the school. The institute was international and provided Pentecostal preachers for Romania, Lithuania, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Estonia,

---

1 Similar to the situation in Śląsk Cieszyński, in the east of Poland, after some believers had received the Pentecostal experience, there were splits in their mother churches and new Christian fellowships were founded.
3 Z.Pasek, Ruch zielonoświątkowy: Próbka monografii (Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy Nomos, 1992), 135.
4 The fuller list of important representatives can be found in: Tomaszewski, 33. E.Czajko, “Ruch Zielonoświątkowy” in Kalendart Jubileuszowy (Warszawa: ZKE, 1963), 68.
5 Tomaszewski, 34.
6 Pasek, Związek, 37.
Germany and Poland. It also had a significant role in crystallizing Pentecostal teaching. The Dean of the institute was N. Nikoloff (between 1935-1938), later to become the superintendent of the Evangelical Pentecostal Church in Bulgaria. A lecturer and Dean of the Institute was Donald Gee, a key figure of British Pentecostalism. Between 1930-38, about 550 people studied in the Institute of the Bible in Gdańsk. ZZChWE expanded dynamically and in 1937 was estimated to have a membership of over 21,000.

The Second World War stopped the growth of the Pentecostal churches. Both ZSCh and ZZChWE were banned. In Śląsk Cieszyński, Pentecostals collaborated with the Lutheran Church. In the rest of the country, they were incorporated within other denominations such as the Methodists or Baptists. During this time, many of the members of these fellowships were sent to labour or concentration camps. After the war, the country borders were changed again. Consequently, a significant number of Polish Pentecostals found themselves in Russia or Czechoslovakia.

In the bloc of socialist countries, the police and Secret Police (Shiby Bezpieczeństwa) executed strict control over religious organizations, especially in the late 40s after the “cold war” began. On the one hand, ministers were persecuted; on the other, churches had to join “artificial unions.” In May, 1947, Polish Communist Party Authorities forced both ZZCh and ZZChWE to form the ZKE which was made up of Cieszyn Pentecostals, Zjednoczenie Wolnych Chrześcijan (Union of Free Christians) and Związek Ewangelicznych Chrześcijan (Evangelical Christian Fellowship) and formed at a conference in Ustron near Cieszyn.

The Pentecostal Church of Poland has a congregational structure with significant centralization. The principal publication is Chrześcijanin (Christian), published by Agape Press. Ministerial Education Training is available through Warszawskie Seminarium Teologiczne (Warsaw Theological Seminary), Seminarium Teologiczne w Ustroniu (Theological Seminary in Ustron) and also through an ecumenical academy, Chrześcijańska Akademia Teologiczna w Warszawie (Christian Academy of Theology in Warsaw).

The latter two churches did not belong to the Pentecostal movement. Further pressure from the communist authorities forced two other churches to join the ZKE in 1953: Zjednoczenie Kościołów Chrystusowych (Union of Churches of Christ) and ZZChWE. For the first time, Polish Pentecostals were joined together. This was not to be for long however, because in 1956 during political changes, Pentecostals from the central-eastern tradition left the ZKE. The national authorities did not want to legalize a new church and in 1959 most of the assemblies and ministers rejoined the ZKE. The rest began to organize illegal autonomous local churches, were often persecuted and forced to work underground. The ZKE lasted until the 80s. In this difficult period, Pentecostals did not remain indifferent; they strengthened their teaching, sent students to theological universities and bible schools, worked among alcoholics and drug addicts, worked in hospitals and social welfare houses, propagated and distributed the Holy Scriptures, published books and ran a Christian radio station. In comparison to the other countries from so-called “eastern bloc” countries, Poland had more freedom than her neighbours from the west, east and south.

After the time of “the Cold War” and “the Iron Curtain”, political changes in the country led to greater freedom for Christians and on 22 May 1987, the Synod of ZKE decided to reorganize the ZKE. Out of this reorganization, the Pentecostal Church of Poland came into existence. The initial intention was to unite all of the Pentecostal assemblies of the ZKE. This, however, failed. Apart from the main church, small groups of assemblies established their own structures and headquarters (e.g. in Lublin and Wiśa-Malinka).
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The Pentecostal Church of Poland has a congregational structure with significant centralization. The principal publication is Chrześcijanin (Christian), published by Agape Press. Ministerial Education Training is available through Warszawskie Seminarium Teologiczne (Warsaw Theological Seminary), Seminarium Teologiczne w Ustroniu (Theological Seminary in Ustron) and also through an ecumenical academy, Chrześcijańska Akademia Teologiczna w Warszawie (Christian Academy of Theology in Warsaw).
2. An Analysis of Theology of Pentecostal Church of Poland

Having examined the historical development of Pentecostalism in Poland, its theology will now be analysed. Although the article aims to examine the theology of the Pentecostal Church of Poland, the writers believe that other Pentecostal Churches would identify themselves with most of the following beliefs. The outline of this section is taken from a recent Pentecostal confession of faith.  

Polish Pentecostals believe that “the Word of God (the Holy Bible) is indeed the Word of God, which is infallible and inspired by the Holy Spirit, and it is the only standard for our faith and morals.” They firmly stand on the Reformation principle: sola Scriptura. The Scriptures are the basis of Pentecostal doctrines, theology and ethics. A personal and literal approach to the interpretation of the Bible is common for Pentecostals.  
Pasek argues that they discard tradition and any plenipotentiary powers of church institutions to interpret the Scriptures. Everyone under grace has the power to understand the Bible, at least everyone is capable to find and understand how to obtain their salvation. The students of Pentecostal seminars are advised to engage in a proper exegesis of the text before they preach it. This includes understanding the literal sense of the text, its context, the historical background and the main message of the text. The most important principle in interpretation is the role of the Holy Spirit. He is the author of the Holy Scriptures and He leads the believers to an understanding of the true meaning of the Holy Scriptures.

Polish Pentecostals believe, “in one God who is manifest in/through the Holy Trinity as the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.” The representatives of the Oneness Movement are marginal in Poland. The belief in the Trinity is officially confessed. However, in some circles of the Pentecostal Church of Poland, the use of term “trinity” is avoided since is not mentioned in the Bible. With regard to Jesus and His work, Pentecostals say, “We believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. That He was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of a virgin, suffered and died upon a cross for the sins of the world and His bodily Resurrection from the dead after three days, His bodily ascension into heaven and His imminent Second Return.” Pentecostal Christology is consistent with the first four, so called ecumenical, Synods of the Early Church. However, theological terminology such as, for example, communicatio idiomatum or hypostasis, is too technical and not popular in teaching or preaching.

Polish Catholicism has pronounced Mary as “The Queen of Poland”. Pentecostals who are very much Christ centred have often an anti-Marian attitude. A series of articles had been published in Chrzécijanin regarding Mary and her position in Pentecostal beliefs, after the debate in Christian media about the Catholic desire to widen the role of Mary in the Holy Trinity.
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1. WST, validated by the government (Dz.U. Nr 41 poz. 254), is a denominational college entitled to award its graduates with a B.A. in biblical studies, systematic theology, applied theology, Church history and history of philosophy.
8. Pasek, Ruch Zielonoświętkowy, 43.
salvation, calling her co-redeemer of human kind. Polish Pentecostals argue that Mary has been given a significant place in salvation history because she is the mother of our Lord. She is a great witness and a humble servant of God. Mary was a virgin when she conceived Jesus (ante partum) by the Holy Spirit. Pentecostals reject the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary and the doctrine of the ascension of Mary. The use of the term Theotokos is being debated. Some theologians say that the title arises from the christological disputes at the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) and it primarily describes the identity of Jesus. A number of them argue that it is not a new Marian definition and it was only at the moment of Incarnation that Mary became the Mother of God. Others avoid the term and prefer to talk about Mary as "the Mother of God-human, Mother of Jesus, Mother of our Lord, Christotokos." Referring to the words of Jesus “you must be born again” Pentecostals believe that everyone should experience a real spiritual rebirth. The confession of faith says, “we believe in Reconciliation with God by Grace through Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.” They teach that God created man in His own image. However, man sinned against God, became unrighteous and the fellowship with God was broken. The sin of the first human – both man and woman – was brought into the whole human race and death reached all humans. Salvation was achieved by Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God dying on the Cross and is given to all people freely by grace and faith. The result of saving faith is justification, regeneration, adoption and sanctification. The confession of faith of 1948 says, “The salvation is given freely through grace alone (Rom. 3:24; Eph. 2:8,9); yet for a man to accept it requires a conscious and free decision of his will... Regeneration does not take place gradually, but in a moment.” The Pentecostal approach to salvation is deeply rooted in the Evangelical tradition.

With regard to the teaching on “eternal security” Matiaszuk believes that eternal life is given to all who are in Christ and as long as they are in Christ they are saved. However, they can lose the salvation when they enter the way of rebellion and walk away from Christ. Thus, according to him, salvation is conditional. This condition is to stay in Christ. God will never give up on people but they are free to walk away from God’s salvation. However, Suski says that “God wants us to be absolutely sure of our salvation,” and does not say anything about conditional salvation.

As far as the baptism in the Holy Spirit is concerned, Polish Pentecostals distinguish between conversion and the following experience of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. It is “an experience, which takes place after conversion during which the third person of the Trinity descends on a believer in order to anoint him/her and empower them to a specific ministry.” All Pentecostals believe that baptism in the Holy Spirit strengthens and empowers believers to ministry and witness. However, baptism in the Holy Spirit is conditional on repentance from sin; conversion; water baptism (although there are examples of baptism in the Holy Spirit preceding water baptism); baptism and total dedication to God and His will. There is no significant theological polemic in Polish Pentecostal writings analysing the Pentecostal position on baptism in the Holy Spirit. The work of Bruner and Dunn has not been scholarly evaluated and responded to. The confession of faith from 1998 says, “We believe in the baptism in the Holy Spirit, with each individual
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11. Suski, Zbawienie, 47.
experiencing the fullness of the Holy Spirit including all of His gifts.”

Polish Pentecostals believe that baptism in the Holy Spirit is experienced by believers, speaking in tongues is experienced but not dogmatized. However, during the time of ZKE, there were confessions published which stated that the speaking in tongues is an initial evidence of baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Other gifts of the Spirit, including divine healing, are also experienced. The Pentecostal confession includes the following statement, “We believe in Divine Healing of the sick as a sign of God’s grace and power.”

Pentecostals believe in Divine Healing experienced during worship, Christian meetings or in response to an individual prayer. It is the most spectacular act of God’s living power. It refers to the whole healing of a man both in his soul and body. The prayer is directed to God and healing is expected. The prayer for healing is practiced in the Church according to instructions in James 5:14. Pentecostals, apart from divine healing, recognize and encourage the use of contemporary medicine. However, spiritism, parapsychology and psycho-energy therapy are rejected and regarded as deceiving.

For Polish Pentecostals, water baptism is the baptism of faith. It is a sign of community with Christ in His death and resurrection; it is a sign of belonging to Jesus and forgiveness of sins. Baptism is an act of obedience to Jesus Christ and should be fulfilled, although it is not an absolute condition of salvation. Paedobaptism is rejected although not “infant salvation”, infants are dedicated to the Lord in the congregation.

The Trinitarian formula “I baptise you in the name of Father and Son and
having authority regarding church policy and matters. The General Superintendent is chosen by the Synod. The Church is divided into six districts, each having an area presbyter. There are two ordinations for a deacon and presbyter. The Principal Church Council has appointed presbyters to dispense marriage with legal consequences. Pastors who are deacons can conduct the meeting in the presence of presbyter who officially seals and signs the declaration of marriage.

With regards to a place and role of women in the Church, Pentecostals believe that women are equal to men in terms of the plan of salvation, receiving the grace of God, or spiritual gifts. However, women are not ordained ministers in the Pentecostal Church of Poland. The statute gives them the following right: “Deaconesses are women who are called to charitable and catechetical or evangelistic ministry in the Church. They have a right to national insurance.” Recently, the Doctrinal Commission has been working on an official stand of the Church regarding women. Pentecostals recognise God’s given order of authorities following the NT, according to which leadership in the Church as well as in the family belongs to men. The example is Jesus – Lord and the Head of the Church. On this basis Pentecostals believe that men are to lead the local assembly, and hold offices in the Church such as pastor, area presbyter or general superintendent. Women are permitted to minister according to their calling exclusively under the authority of leadership of a local assembly and the Church. Women can participate in the leadership of the assembly if they recognise this supervision. Women’s ministry includes diaconal functions as well as teaching, counselling and evangelism. In the mission field, women can temporarily lead an assembly and teach. There is

1 Prawo wewnętrzne, par. 17.2.
2 Ibid., par. 24.1.
3 Ibid., par. 23.1.
4 Pentecostals believe that marriage is instituted by God, a monogamous and inseparable relationship between man and woman. Divorce and remarriage are allowed as lesser evils. Contraceptives are allowed except for early-miscarriage medicaments. Abortion is a sin. See: “Uchwała Naczelnnej Rady Kościoła Zielonoświątkowego w sprawie małżeństwa, rozwodu, powtórnego małżeństwa oraz planowania rodziny” Chrześcijanin 11-12 (1998): 23.
5 Tymiętki, 109.
6 “Projekt stanowiska NRK w sprawie służby kobiet w Kościele” will be presented to the next Synod.
7 Ibid.

3. Challenges and Potentials for Future Pentecostalism in Poland

The Church entering the new millennium faces new challenges, unfortunately often with old ways of thinking and methods of work. Old in this sense does not mean wrong or backward, but the Church does not often keep up with fast changing world. In Poland, the end of the communist age brought about another social-economic age and new changes, previously unknown, came about. There are some things which should be positively welcomed: freedom of religion, economic growth, freedom to travel abroad and joining European and International economical, political and military structures. On the negative side, there are: unemployment, stratification of society (growth of poverty alongside unlimited wealth), rising standards of living require a greater commitment to work, with sometimes two or more of full-time jobs. Consequently, the life style of average Poles and the Polish family has radically changed.

Undoubtedly, a challenge for the Polish Church, in the face of the above changes will be the possible stagnation of Christianity with decreasing

1 Ibid.
3 It is an official teaching of some pastors, however, unpublished widely.
numbers of believers caused by busy lifestyles of many Poles. Pentecostal statistics are not alarming yet, although a small decrease has recently been noticed. Although Hydzik believes that stabilization does not mean stagnation, the old methods of work may not withstand the challenges of new changes.

Today, believers need more professional counselling and pastoral care. Therefore, more full-time trained church workers will be essential. Polish Pentecostals have to build their hopes for renewal with more and better-equipped ministers and church workers. This model of work, however, is still often foreign in some circles. On the other hand, sanctioning and growing number of full-time workers may cause the ceasing of many voluntary activities from church life. Allowing church activities to be completed by the small number of qualified workers may lead in future to a growth of “uninvolved Christians” who do not want to work voluntarily in the church as they once had done.

A significant role will have to be undertaken by theological seminaries and bible schools as they have to reach as wide group of believers as possible. Plans are being made to prepare teachers for different grades of teaching from local church bible schools to research institutes. Research institutes, which should be established in near future, on the one hand, will have to popularize biblical education in order to make it available to believers not being able to participate in residential bible training. On the other hand they will have to do advanced academic research leading to a better self-understanding of the movement.

One of the greatest challenges in the new millennium is a lack of unity between Pentecostals. Polish, European and worldwide Pentecostalism has to work out methods of mutual understanding and stop dividing itself into smaller pieces. Poland is not an exception from this worldwide phenomenon and its goal should be to unite Pentecostals. The first steps leading to unity not only between Pentecostals but also Evangelicals in Poland have been taken. A proposition to form an Evangelical Alliance in Poland is consistent with beliefs of the Pentecostal Church of Poland. Among the delegates there were representatives of evangelical churches as well as other organizations. The accepted statute of the new Alliance is consistent with beliefs of the Pentecostal Church of Poland.

It is interesting that Pentecostals came up with such an initiative of the Alliance since they formally do not belong to National Ecumenical Council in Poland. During the time of ZKE some Pentecostal ministers were active in the Ecumenical Council some were even given the positions of district chairmen. Since reorganization in 1988, few individuals have been involved in the movement. It seems that official participation in the National Ecumenical Council in Poland is another challenge for the new millennium for the Pentecostal Church of Poland.

An achievement of Polish Pentecostals is the legislation agreed between the Polish Government and the Pentecostal Church of Poland. The legislation sanctions many Pentecostal activities in the society, for example the right to have prison, army and hospital chaplains and, national support for alcoholic and drug addict centers. The Pentecostal Church has been recognized by the government, which is a long lasting achievement of Pentecostals. However, there is a long way for the Church to be recognized by a very traditional Catholic society rejecting and warning against cults, very suspicious of new movements and intolerant towards believers changing denominations. There have been some misleading statements against Pentecostals regarding them as a cult, to which Pentecostals have responded. It is hoped that a younger generation, which is more familiar with evangelicalism, will be more tolerant and one day a traditional saying that “every Pole is a Catholic” will no longer be obligatory.

Poland is still a predominantly Catholic nation and the relationship between the Catholic Church and Pentecostals is a delicate issue. Pentecostals openly appreciate that the international movement participates in the dialogues with Vatican. Individuals of Polish Pentecostalism participated in the Second Quinquennium. However, on the national level the dialogue does not exist. However, the first steps...
have been made. Many ministers have a very good working relationship with Catholic priests. The mutual understanding of both cultures in the future is important in order to achieve more effective evangelism.

Conclusion

The Pentecostal Revival reached Poland as early as 1907. In 1910, the first Pentecostal association was found. In 1929, the great majority of many local groups were united into the second biggest association of Pentecostals in Poland. The movement grew so rapidly that by 1939, there were over 21,000 believers in about 500 churches and preaching points. At the time of the Second World War, Pentecostals were not legalized and had to join other denominations. After the War they were forced to join ZKE. In 1988, after the reorganization of the ZKE, Pentecostals in Poland began an independent work as an autonomous church body accepting the name, Kościół Zielonoświątkowy.

Pentecostal theology is deeply rooted in the Scriptures. It is consistent with the first four, so called, ecumenical Synods of the Church. The teaching on salvation is rooted in Evangelicalism. Baptism in the Holy Spirit is understood as the experience given to all Christians to empower them to a better ministry and witness. Water baptism is practised with a Trinitarian formula and the Lord's Supper celebration is Calvinistic. The church has a congregational structure; its ethics are biblically based and culturally applicable; the believers are readily waiting for the imminent coming of Jesus Christ.

In its short history after the reorganisation of the ZKE and its legalisation in 1988, Pentecostals have achieved a great deal... "The Pentecostal Church of Poland is the second largest Protestant church in Poland." Its work and achievements have been appreciated by the National Government which passed legislation recognizing it as a valid denomination in Poland. One hopes that in the next millennium, Pentecostalism in Poland will expand, mature, overcome its weaknesses and be more influential in the society.

---

1 C. Gmyrz, "Zielonoświątkowcy" Źycie w kraju (29 września 1997): 5.
2 A pamphlet, Pentecostal Church of Poland, ul. Sienna 68/70 00-825, Warszawa.
The revival in Tesinsko was initiated by the Holy Spirit through two sources, the church and people outside the church. This revival began among the workers and miners. They experienced salvation, followed by baptism in the Holy Spirit, which was accompanied by speaking in tongues\(^1\) and manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit. Their lives were fundamentally changed, which spurred great interest among the people in the area. The two groups attempted cooperation but finally broke apart. The first group stayed in the original church, the latter founded the Association of Resolute Christians, Spolok rozhodnych krestanov, which was officially registered in 1910.\(^2\)

The Pentecostal movement also penetrated to the Free Reformed Church in Prague in 1907-1908 from Germany. This church had a group of people who prayed for revival. Many of its members experienced the baptism in the Holy Spirit, which was also accompanied by the manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit.\(^3\) This caused tension within the church as a result of which 19 members left the church on May 15, 1908. These members founded the association Zachranny Spolok Tabor, which was the foundation of the Pentecostal work.\(^4\)

**Formation of Czechoslovakia – Beginning of the Totalitarian Regime**

In 1918, significant changes occurred in the religious life of Czechoslovakia. Some Protestant churches united together as well as some evangelical churches. In 1920, in line with the movement, “Away for Rome,” “Prec od Rima,” hundred of thousands of Catholic believers left the Catholic church.

abandoned. However, if such a movement wanted to protect itself from becoming a sect, it must embrace the full depth of the Christian testimony of faith.” See Urban, J.: After a Hundred Years (Po sto letech), 6. Unfortunately, this was overlooked at the foundation of the Pentecostal movement, despite the fact that this was the initial stimulus. The Pentecostal movement in the second half of the 20\(^{th}\) century fought to embrace the full aspects of Christian faith. This was beneficial for the movement itself and it won approval of the Christian world.\(^1\) This was the foundation of the Pentecostal movement, despite the fact that this was the initial stimulus. The Pentecostal movement in the second half of the 20\(^{th}\) century fought to embrace the full aspects of Christian faith. This was beneficial for the movement itself and it won approval of the Christian world.\(^1\)

The revival in Tesinsko was initiated by the Holy Spirit through two sources, the church and people outside the church. This revival began among the workers and miners. They experienced salvation, followed by baptism in the Holy Spirit, which was accompanied by speaking in tongues\(^1\) and manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit. Their lives were fundamentally changed, which spurred great interest among the people in the area. The two groups attempted cooperation but finally broke apart. The first group stayed in the original church, the latter founded the Association of Resolute Christians, Spolok rozhodnych krestanov, which was officially registered in 1910.\(^2\)

The Pentecostal movement also penetrated to the Free Reformed Church in Prague in 1907-1908 from Germany. This church had a group of people who prayed for revival. Many of its members experienced the baptism in the Holy Spirit, which was also accompanied by the manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit.\(^3\) This caused tension within the church as a result of which 19 members left the church on May 15, 1908. These members founded the association Zachranny Spolok Tabor, which was the foundation of the Pentecostal work.\(^4\)

2. The Union was originally located in Tesin (1910), then in Nebory (1910-1912), and, finally, in Dolny Zukov (1912-1951)
3. Michal, J: Theological Profile of Free Reformed Church until 1919 (Teologicky obrat Svobodne cirkve reformovane do roku 1919), 91-2; Koceur, P.: Life in Christ (Life in Christ); 1997:3, 8.

---

**Josef Brenkus: A Historical and Theological Analysis of the Pentecostal Church in the Czech and Slovak Republics**

The Pentecostal Movement also found itself in the middle of this process of change, yet it did not use this as an opportunity for missionary outreach. As a result of this, the number of people without any religion affiliation increased.\(^1\)

Until the Second World War, churches in Tesinsko existed within the association. In 1920, the Pentecostal church in the Czech Republic united with the Czech Brethren Union and promised to abstain from contacts with the Pentecostal church abroad. When Jozef Novak, who was in contact with Jonathan Paul, entered the church, this promise was not kept. This led to further tension and consequently excommunication of the whole church.\(^2\) This church retained its contacts with Tesinsko.\(^3\)

**Life during World War II**

In Tesinsko, the activities of the Association were terminated. Many members were deported because of the Polish national origin. They were either sent as forced labor to Germany, were imprisoned, or suffered continuous oppression.\(^4\) After the war, the churches became active within the Association. It was during this time that the church accepted an important doctrinal change, water baptism through full submersion. Other forms of baptism were rejected. In the Czech region, the churches continued their activities under the leadership of Frantisek Sokol. After his death, Rudolf Sokol became the church leader.

**Establishment of the Totalitarian Regime**

The Communist regime was established by electoral victory in May 1946 and a power struggle, in the years, 1947-1948. After firm establishment of political power, the Communists started to eliminate churches, especially the Catholic church.\(^5\) They clearly outlined their perspectives

---

1. The number of people without any religious affiliation rose from 12,981 in 1910 to 728,503 in 1921. Sita and Kubovy, 50.
2. The church was excommunicated at a conference in Zizkov in 1923; Kubovy, 104; Kocur, 8.
4. Kaleta, 149
5. The fight against the church was executed based on the guidelines of the Directory of the Central Committee of the Communist Party from April 25, 1949. The guidelines were written in such a way that they veiled the true face of Communism and its protagonists. Vnuk, F.: Outline of the History of the Catholic Church (Nacrt dejin katolickej cirkev), 118-145; Judak, V.: Christ’s Church on Its Journey (Kristova cirkev na ceste), 265-269; The Dictionary of Slovak History (Lexikon slovenskych dejin), 152-156.
in the laws that were passed in October 1949. Through these laws, the regime could establish brutal totalitarianism. After 1951, churches that were not registered could not be active. They were expected to integrate themselves into the already registered churches; otherwise they were illegal. This was the case with the Pentecostal churches as well.

In Tesinsko, the Pentecostals integrated themselves within the Czech Brethren Union. Life after this union was peaceful until 1958, when J. Urban made a presentation on Pentecostal movements at a Prague conference. The churches in Tesinsko interpreted the presentation as one that attacked the Pentecostal movement. Therefore, under the leadership of Brothers Konderla and Wojnar, Sr., several churches expressed opposition to the Czech Brethren Union and organized an independent Pentecostal church. They identified themselves as the Resolute Pentecostal Christians, Rozhodnu krestania lenienc. In the Czech region, the Pentecostal church, under the leadership of Brothers Tefr and Rehak, opted for illegality. In 1958, because of pressure from the state police, these leaders were forced to sign a document that prohibited church gatherings and services. The church was dispersed into small home-cell groups, which did not coordinate their activities. This changed in the 1960s when Peter Kocur and Milan Liba became the leaders.

Attempts for Official Registration

The struggle for registration in the Czech region became somewhat paralyzed. However, in Tesinsko, it continued in several different phases. The first attempt for registration was carried out in an atmosphere of constant threat and persecution. On March 17, 1963, the Resolute Pentecostal Christians, Rozhodnu krestania lenienc, established the State Office for Church Matters. The role of this office was to "oversee the church and spiritual life in the country and to assure that it developed in accordance with the constitution and the principles of the new people-centered democratic regime." Law 217/1949 Zb regarding the Financial Provision of the Church was supposed to place priests under the state power. This law placed the ordination powers within the hands of the state. Ordination into the ministry was to be followed by promise of faithfulness to the republic. Vnuk, 125-126.

The brutality of the totalitarian regime is emphasized by the fact that the state restricted the life of the church via the state secretaries, the state police, and the Communist Party. These offices, together with legislative power, threatened and terrorized all those who did not share the pro-state paradigm. In this presentation, Dr. Urban adhered to the 'Berlin Declaration'.

The second attempt for registration was initiated by the social and political changes in 1968. The church, however, was not internally ready to use this opportunity. The leadership was not unified and the church itself started to disintegrate from within. When the initial approval was canceled in 1973, there was, in fact, nothing to be prohibited. Therefore the whole process needed to be repeated.

The third attempt for registration was organized in the summer of 1976. After establishing contacts with believers in Brno and Breclav, the church leaders agreed on cooperation and coordination of the work. Rudolf Bubik was elected to be the church superintendent. After the church created its own constitution on March 19, 1977, it submitted a plea for registration. Within a year, groups from Prague, Kutna Hora, and Chomutov joined the initiative. These steps immediately attracted attention from the state police, which opposed the registration efforts. This was done by threatening church leaders and instigating internal conflicts.

The eighties were the years of fire. On August 24, 1982, Rudolf Bubik and two other brothers from Tesinsko were arrested. On January 11, 1983, three brothers from Brno were arrested. The church in Slovakia was supportive throughout these turbulent years. Despite the threat of losing their own registration, they declared in the trials that their doctrine was identical to that of the Resolute Pentecostal Christians. As a result of this, the socialist state was accused of allowing Pentecostals in

---

1 Law 217/1949 Zb established the State Office for Church Matters. The role of this office was to "oversee the church and spiritual life in the country and to assure that it developed in accordance with the constitution and the principles of the new people-centered democratic regime." Law 217/1949 Zb regarding the Financial Provision of the Church was supposed to place priests under the state power. This law placed the ordination powers within the hands of the state. Ordination into the ministry was to be followed by promise of faithfulness to the republic. Vnuk, 125-126.

2 The brutality of the totalitarian regime is emphasized by the fact that the state restricted the life of the church via the state secretaries, the state police, and the Communist Party. These offices, together with legislative power, threatened and terrorized all those who did not share the pro-state paradigm.

3 Kubovy, 150.

4 In this presentation, Dr. Urban adhered to the 'Berlin Declaration'.

5 See Kocur, 9

6 ibid

7 Eight brothers were imprisoned; others were held for questioning.

---
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Pentecostal Christians organized a founding conference in Nebor, but this event was declared illegal and, consequently, the conference had to be dismissed. Therefore, the church continued its work illegally. The second attempt for registration was initiated by the social and political changes in 1968. The church, however, was not internally ready to use this opportunity. The leadership was not unified and the church itself started to disintegrate from within. When the initial approval was canceled in 1973, there was, in fact, nothing to be prohibited. Therefore the whole process needed to be repeated.

The third attempt for registration was organized in the summer of 1976. After establishing contacts with believers in Brno and Breclav, the church leaders agreed on cooperation and coordination of the work. Rudolf Bubik was elected to be the church superintendent. After the church created its own constitution on March 19, 1977, it submitted a plea for registration. Within a year, groups from Prague, Kutna Hora, and Chomutov joined the initiative. These steps immediately attracted attention from the state police, which opposed the registration efforts. This was done by threatening church leaders and instigating internal conflicts.

The eighties were the years of fire. On August 24, 1982, Rudolf Bubik and two other brothers from Tesinsko were arrested. On January 11, 1983, three brothers from Brno were arrested. The church in Slovakia was supportive throughout these turbulent years. Despite the threat of loosing their own registration, they declared in the trials that their doctrine was identical to that of the Resolute Pentecostal Christians. As a result of this, the socialist state was accused of allowing Pentecostals in

---

1 R. Bubik describes the events of this conference in further detail (12).

2 In the area of doctrine the church became divided because of the teachings of Kenyon, Bramhamism and the Faith Movement. With regard to church organization, there were initiatives in the church in the Tesin area to move to Poland. These were based on apocalyptic prophecies regarding Tesinsko in response to which many believers moved out of the area.

3 See Bubik, 12.

4 The Pentecostal fellowship in Brno was created from the members of the Baptist church, who were excommunicated from the church based on their Pentecostal experience.

5 The roots of the Pentecostal believers in Nejdek go back to the Apostolic church in Bratislava, Slovakia. One of those who was active was Pastor Jozef Sec.

6 The state police attempted to sow the seeds of unbelief in Rudolf Bubik (Kocur, P., 10).

7 The imprisonment is described by Rudolf Bubik in Prison Cell 304 (Pazenska cela 304) which was co-authored by Jim Dunn.
one of its republics, while persecuting Pentecostals in the other. Similar testimonies were provided to the judge from surrounding socialist countries, including the Soviet Union. The trial became a state fiasco. Still, the struggle for registration continued. More than 170 letters and petitions, which were a result of many hours of toil, prayers, and spiritual battles, were submitted to the government. The church was finally legalized shortly before the fall of the Communist Regime. On January 25, 1989, the Pentecostal movement was officially registered as the Apostolic Church in the Czech Republic, and Rudolf Bubik was confirmed as its leader.

Life and Ministry after the Fall of the Totalitarian Regime

The working conditions of the church were fundamentally changed after the fall of Communism. All anti-church laws were annulled. The church and state created a partnership, which was also reflected in all social aspects of life. The change in the church-state relationship influenced particularly the Pentecostals, who were, for the first time in history, considered equal de jure with other churches in the country.

II. SLOVAK REPUBLIC

The beginnings of the Pentecostal movement in Slovakia go back to the first decade of this century. They are indirectly connected to the Pentecostal movement in the United States and in Scandinavia. The history of the Pentecostal movement can be divided into four different periods: (1) beginnings – Second World War (1907-1945); (2) return of the repatriates – founding conference (1946-1977); (3) formation of the church after the founding conference (1977-1989); and (4) church work after November 1989.

1 Frantisek Pála described the Czech version of the trial in Jakob Zopfi’s book: (Na vselike telo), 52-54.
3 One of the pioneers, Jan Balca, experienced the baptism in the Holy Spirit in Norway. Early on, brothers from Sweden visited the believers in Bratislava.

1 The Church of God came to Slovakia from the United States through Jan Gaj, a native of Mengusovec. Initially, the church had followers in the Tatra region, in Mengusovce (1893-4), Stola (1900) and Batizovce. From these regions new members were added in Liptow and Uhrovec Dolina. In 1939, during the period of the Slovak state, the activity of the church was prohibited. During the Second World War, the believers joined the Baptists, which was the only approved evangelical denomination at the time. After the war they did not renew their activity but merged with the Baptist church. Compare to Hudec, J.: Pilgrims on the Narrow Road (Pumici na tuzky ceste). Ostrava 1999, 156, 188.
2 This town was the birthplace of the famous Czechoslovak politician Alexander Dubcek.
3 The churches worked independently, without any coordination of work within Slovakia, and they did not keep international contacts. The churches were led by elders.
4 Based on the decrees of President Beneš (1945/46), Slovaks from various regions such as Hungary, Romania, Austria, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, returned to their homeland. See Dictionary of Slovak History (Lexikon slovenskych dejin), 150-51.
5 In this time, the church had approximately 2500 members and followers.
6 The organizational structure was approved at the whole church conference on December 26, 1948, in Bratislava. Pavel Tuchyna was elected as the central pastor, Josef See became the president of the church, and Adam Zahradsky was named to be the vice-president.
The presidential office\textsuperscript{1} made the decision to merge the Pentecostals with the New Apostolic church.\textsuperscript{2} In 1968, the church regained its independence and accepted its current name, the Apostolic church.\textsuperscript{3} Yet the church did not use this opportunity to thoroughly define its relationship with the state.\textsuperscript{4} After the political atmosphere changed in 1970, the church’s presence was tolerated with disdain.

Formation of the Church after the Founding Conference (1977-1989)

The relationship between the church and state improved after 1977 when the founding conference was held. It was at this conference that the independent local churches were united into a single church with statewide ministry. Milan Bednar was chosen as superintendent. He led the movement until his death in 1988. Jozef Brenkus became the leader in 1989.

Church Work after November 1989

Pentecostals in Slovakia entered the period after the fall of Communism with a clear, internally consolidated vision for the equipping of workers for evangelism and mission, all of which led to the foundation of new churches. Today, the general presbytery is coordinating the ministry of the local churches, which are grouped into regions, through district superintendents.\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{1} Repatriates sent a delegation to the president. They protested that the government did not keep the promises such as recognition of human rights and religious freedoms, based on which the repatriates returned to the country.

\textsuperscript{2} A sect which had its leadership in the Czech Republic. Its roots go back to the revival of Edward Irving (1792-1834). Pentecostals were forced to join them because the state did not allow the registration of a new church.

\textsuperscript{3} The change of name was recorded at the Ministry of Culture under number PKI 3053/1968 Km.

\textsuperscript{4} It was not only necessary to obtain permission to change the name, but also to establish a church that could incorporate all local churches. It was also necessary to pass a church constitution and to elect the church board.

\textsuperscript{5} Among these there are the departments for mission, education, youth ministry, women’s ministry and others.

\textsuperscript{1} Some of the missionary organizations that worked in the area include the Scottish Missionary Society, Berlin Biblical Society that cooperated with the Moravian Brethren, and the Boston Missionary Society. As a result of these combined influences, the Free Reformed church was established in 1830. It was this church that produced the first believers that were baptized in the Holy Spirit. Later on, these separated to create an independent Pentecostal church (1908). See Kostal, 9,35.

\textsuperscript{2} Priest Kulisz came into contact with American revivalism during his visit to the United States, and he was strongly influenced by this experience. After his return home, this influence was reflected not only in his ministry, but he also propagated the revivalist ideas at a spiritual conference in Komorní Lhota. See Kaleta, 145.

\textsuperscript{3} ibid, 145-46.

\textsuperscript{4} This theological movement was represented by Lutheran priest, Vaclav Subert, who was in charge of the Lutheran church of Kliment located in Prague. See Kostal, 9.
influence exerted on the believers in Prague was most likely from the fellowship surrounding Jonathan Paul.\(^1\)

In Slovakia, the spiritual background was even more diverse and complex than in the Czech region. In the beginning of the 20\(^{th}\) century, as a result of anti-reformation views, most Slovak believers were found in the Catholic church.\(^2\) This was reflected in the religious background of the majority of Slovak Pentecostal believers.

In its early beginnings, after 1906, the work of Pentecostals fused with the work of the Church of God, and it continued in the lineage of evangelical churches.\(^3\)

**Teachings and Praxis**

In the beginning of the Pentecostal movements, we see a similar situation as with the reformed groups, reformation, pietism, and revival movements. The protagonists of all of these movements were not particularly interested in the reformation of doctrine but rather the reformation of life. The particulars of the doctrines were addressed with the progression of the movement, and they resulted from polemical and apologetic efforts.

Inconsistencies with respect to doctrine and their consequences became particularly obvious in the seventies when the church needed to verbalize its basic beliefs. The history of the Czech, as well as the Slovak, Pentecostal church clearly points out that the churches found themselves incompetent in doctrine.\(^4\)

If we want to at least partially reconstruct the beginnings of the Pentecostal doctrines, we can do so through the magazines, that were published at the time. Those include “The Testimony of the Saviour’s Grace” (Svedectvi o spasitelske milosti), “The Voice of Truth” (Glos Prawdy), \(^2\) and the irregularly published magazine “Apostolic Faith” (Apostolska Vira). Pamphlets also were sent to Czechoslovakia by a missionary organization of the same name, \(^3\) and from the magazine “Joyful News” (Radostna zvest), which was sent to Slovakia from Canada.\(^4\)

The basic articles of the doctrines that were widely spread in Slovakia could be summarized in the doctrines of the Apostolic Faith, which were written as a preamble and 14 articles. The preamble was strongly Christ-centered, yet the soteriological aspects were inadequately emphasized. The articles addressed the following issues: (1) repentance toward God, (2) correction of the previous mistakes, (3) forgiveness, (4) sanctification, (5) baptism by the Holy Spirit, (6) healing for the body, (7) the second coming of Christ, (8) the Lord’s commandments regarding baptism and communion, (9) the trial, (10) Christ’s 1000 year kingdom, (11) the great white throne judgment, (12) the new heaven and new earth, (13) eternal heaven or eternal hell, (14) and no divorce.\(^5\)

The magazine was published by the association Tabor. The editors of the magazine were Jozef Novak and Frantisek Sokol. There are several volumes of this magazine in a church in Prague. The tone of the magazine can be inferred from the publications of J. Mareckova, who published reprints of the magazine in her book, Spiritual Streams, in our republic (Duchovne prudy v nasej republike).

The content of the magazine can be assessed based on the reprints of some articles in a book by Mareckova and the volumes that were preserved in a Prague church.

The Mission of the Apostolic Church which was located at Northwest Six and Burnside, Portland, Oregon, USA, sporadically published a magazine called Apostolic Faith (Apostolska Vira). The magazine included educational articles, testimonies and updates regarding the most important spiritual events. There are several copies of these magazines in Slovakia. The archives of the Apostolic Faith in Portland contain the majority of the published issues and tracts.

1. The magazine was published by the association Tabor. The editors of the magazine were Jozef Novak and Frantisek Sokol. There are several volumes of this magazine in a church in Prague. The tone of the magazine can be inferred from the publications of J. Mareckova, who published reprints of the magazine in her book, Spiritual Streams, in our republic (Duchovne prudy v nasej republike).

2. The magazine was published by the Union of Resolute Christians during the years of 1919-1939. The editors of the magazine were Karel Sniegon and Karel Kaleta. The content of the magazine can be assessed based on the reprints of some articles in a book by Mareckova and the volumes that were preserved in a Prague church.

3. The Mission of the Apostolic Church which was located at Northwest Six and Burnside, Portland, Oregon, USA, sporadically published a magazine called Apostolic Faith (Apostolska Vira). The magazine included educational articles, testimonies and updates regarding the most important spiritual events. There are several copies of these magazines in Slovakia. The archives of the Apostolic Faith in Portland contain the majority of the published issues and tracts.

4. A monthly magazine “Glad Tidings Herald” (Radostna zvest) was published bilingually in Slovak and English for the needs of the Apostolic Churches of Jesus Christ in the United States and Canada, which were primarily established by the Slavonic immigrants. Anton Huba was the editor for this magazine.

5. The full description of the confession is recorded in Apostolic Faith (Apostolska Vira). a sporadically published magazine, volume 13, 3; Tract “Do you know the
This doctrine did not finalize its stance on the teachings about God or the question of the Trinity, and as a result Branhamism found a fertile soil among the Pentecostal believers.

Initial Praxis

The initial praxis of the Pentecostals placed emphasis on seeking God in prayer and fasting. It emphasized the necessity of repentance and the importance of being born again. It also focused on God's power, which the church believed to be oriented primarily toward the outside. They also emphasized healing and miracles, and often neglected to focus on true transformation of the heart and character of believers.1

The baptism in the Holy Spirit and the manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit — especially prophesies, visions, revelations, and Spirit-inspired song writing2 — took place during church meetings. During this time, the ministry of the gifts of the Spirit was not understood as a ministry of the Spirit in the context of Christ's body in which every part of the body is called to ministry. Rather it was understood as something exclusive, something that reflected the status of a minister, and not necessarily something that refers to the functioning of the body according to God's intention.

The baptism in the Holy Spirit was usually a result of the so called "prayer battles" rather than acceptance of the Holy Spirit in faith and the view that it belongs to all who believe.3 A true baptism in the Spirit was supposed to include the manifestation of speaking in tongues. Among the teaching of the Apostolic Faith? (Poznámky o Apostolskej víe?) published by Lithografia, Bratislava without further information about the publisher or the year of publication. Note: This "confession" as a unit was not declared by the Czech believers, even though it is highly improbable that the Prague church were not aware of the publication. The teaching of the washing of the feet was not practiced in the Czech Republic and Tesinsko at all.

1 When we admit to this fact, it is much easier to understand why the church was not unified at this point and why there was often jealousy among the brothers in the leadership, or why the leaders could not enjoy the manifestations of the Holy Spirit in the lives of others. The attempts for discernment were often interpreted as criticism, rather than ministry of the Spirit.

2 Several of the Spirit-inspired songs were included in the Slovak songbook Spiritual Songs and Psalms (Duchovne piesne a zalmy), which was compiled in 1950 by Pavel Tuchyna. Several songs that were composed in a similar manner in Tesinsko were included in three different songbooks published in the twenties and thirties. See Tuchyna, P.: Spiritual Songs and Psalms (Duchovne piesne a zalmy). Bratislava 1950; Kalena, 148.
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Church members believed that only those who were born of water and the Spirit were really saved. Therefore true believers were those baptized by water but also by the Holy Spirit, which was accompanied by speaking in tongues. The ministry of the Word focused primarily on encouragement and admonition rather than on systematic teaching or justification of the new spiritual experiences. The lack of biblical teaching was the reason why some of the churches could not resist the danger of "foreign teachings."

Doctrinal Problems and Struggles

Doctrinal struggles were on two levels, from the inside and from the outside. The outsiders doubted the biblical foundation of the Pentecostal doctrine and experience,1 or they criticized it.2 The struggles from inside came primarily from the Norwegian brothers,3 followers of Branham and the followers of the extreme teachings of the Faith Movement.4

Struggles with Branhamism

The spread of the teachings of Branham in the Czech region was preceded by the teachings of E.W. Kenyon.5 His doctrine was disseminated among the believers through his "living Bible study." Branhamism6 threatened the work in the Czech Republic, and it disrupted

1 These were the supporters of dispensationalism, which came primarily from the circles of the Plymouth Brethren but also from other evangelical groups. These rejected the Pentecostal movement per se.

2 One could include here the critics from the sixties and seventies who did not question the baptism in the Holy Spirit but they did not accept that the exclusive sign of the baptism of the Holy Spirit was speaking in tongues. They also criticized, and rightfully so, some beliefs regarding the doctrines and the praxis.

3 R. Bubik points out some of the negative aspects of the work of the Norwegian brothers, Brothers Schmidt. Bubik, R.: Regarding the History of the Czech Republic in the sixties. This teaching came to the Czech Republic in the sixties. The teachings had incorrect stances on the trinity and Christology, according to them, Jesus was the Christ because of his sinless life and unquestionable obedience. The ethical implications of these teachings brought practical problems to the lives of Christians. They talked about the ideal, angelic marriage that excluded sexual contact. They also had soteriological problems — that we can gain God's approval through our deeds. Later, some groups separated themselves from the churches due to the teachings of the Faith Movement. This was the case primarily in the Czech region.


5 Polteknick view of Branhamism was presented by Pavel Hanes, a Baptist pastor and theologian, in a tract titled, "What is Branhamism?" (Co je branhamismus?). In the tract he discussed issues such as who was Branham, what were his teachings and what are the key doctrines that identify Branhamism. Hanes stated: "Initially Branhamism..."
chuch life in Slovakia. The teachings were spread by Ewald Frank. Liptovska Luza became the center of Branhamism in Slovakia, and Emil Vesely, who was a former pastor of the Apostolic church (also an author, publisher and distributor of numerous tracts and literature) became the movement's leader. In Slovakia, this group is known as Christ's Church and cooperates with churches in Yugoslavia. Presently, especially after clarification of doctrines and trinity questions, this movement does not pose a threat to the Pentecostal churches.

Struggles with the Faith Movement

At the end of the seventies and in the beginning of the eighties, the Faith Movement came to Czechoslovakia. By emphasizing miracles, it challenged the credibility of Pentecostals, which the movement classified as a traditional church, and encouraged believers to leave their home fellowships. The repeated attacks on the church membership became a challenge to the church with respect to justifying its existence and also spurred the development of systematic Pentecostal theology. Today, the looks like an extremist Pentecostal movement (with a strong emphasis on the baptism in the Spirit, on tongues, emotionalism, and usage of the gifts of the Spirit). Only after closer examination one can find its false beliefs, which can vary between the individual groups of Branhamists. Next be explored ten characteristic features of Branhamism, and he stated that "Branhamism belonged to a group of false teachings and cults". See Hanes, P.: What is Branhamism? (Co je Branhamimus?) Vavrisovo 1991.

1 E. Frank, a German missionary from Freie Volksmission in Kerfelde, visited over 100 countries, including Czechoslovakia, which he visited several times. He was a TV evangelist and frequent radio speaker and an author of several publications. There were several of his books that were published in Czech. These include: Branham - The Prophet Sent by God, Kredfeld (year of publication not given), Traditional Christianity - Truth or a Lie? (Tradicne kresranstvi - pravda nebo klam?) Kredfeld 1990, Christianity Yesterday and Today (Kresranstvi včera a dnes), Kredfeld 1990, European Union (Evropska Unie), Praha 1999.

2 Examples of some of the tracts: Truth about the Church (Pravda o cirkvi); The Truth about Repentance (Pravda o poklami); We Believe, Teach and Carry (Vertine, ucime o nesience); And You Will Be My Witnesses (A budete mi svedkami)

3 The followers of Branhamism in Slovakia are not strictly followers of Branham. Even prior to its appearance in Czechoslovakia, the churches were in contact with the United Pentecostal Church. For information regarding this church, consult Burgess, S.M., McGee, G.: Dictionary of the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 860-865.

4 The background of the Faith Movement is explored in a book written by McConnell, D.R.: A Different Gospel, which was also published in Czech. The publication clarified some aspects of the movement as a result of which it was possible to balance the teachings, accept those aspects of the Faith Movement theology that were sound and reject those aspects that were extreme.

5 Compare similarities and differences in the constitutions of the two churches. The doctrines are stated in the initial sections of the constitutions. See: The Constitution of the Apostolic Church in Slovakia (Ustava Apostolskej cirkvi na Slovensku).
and on teachings regarding God, man and the plan of salvation, baptism, the gifts of the Spirit (with the purpose of ministry to the church), and on eschatological questions.

The life of the church is governed by the Holy Scriptures and the church constitution. These give autonomy to churches, but at the same time emphasize cooperation in reaching the missionary goals at home and abroad. Churches are divided into individual regions. Each church is responsible to reach their immediate area with the Gospel. The ministry of the church is determined by the vision, which is defined at the level of the central headquarters and the local churches. The vision is then re-evaluated at annual national and local church conferences.

SECTION III. NEEDS AND FUTURE POTENTIAL

Under the new conditions, the church not only focuses on the regular church visitors but also on the outside church ministry. In order to realize such plans, there is a need for more workers as well as new institutions. With respect to education, the churches already have in place the necessary institutions. What is now needed is an evaluation of their effectiveness. It is also necessary to include the greatest number of potential workers in these institutions so that the quality of the work may increase.

In the practical area of the ministry, the church was able to develop activities in the areas of mass media, charitable work, gospel proclamation, and missionary work. Currently, this work is bringing tangible results, which are reflected in church growth, and missionary outreach to the society. For decades the Pentecostals stood at the periphery of the Christian and social life. In the past ten years, the church was able to change this. Through progressive ministry and biblically balanced testimony, it was possible to communicate the message about the Holy Spirit in traditional and evangelical churches, but also in a secular environment. In both countries, Pentecostals are the fastest growing churches, which is reflected in the increasing number of churches as well as the number of the church members.

1 The churches have organized committees for spreading the Gospel. These coordinate the ministry through the country, they provide help to the local churches, whether it be in terms of material or of human resources.

2 Beside the above-described committees, the church founded Missionary Organization Life. This foundation recently started its work on an international basis, but also with other sister organizations that are united in PEM.

3 The Pentecostals were not afraid to enter unusual, previously avoided social spheres, such as health prevention efforts, AIDS, and drug education. It is also actively involved in prison ministry and ministry to the Romany population.
Historical and Theological Analysis of the Pentecostal Church in Norway

David Bundy

The Pentecostal churches in Norway are comparatively small, and yet the influence of the Norwegian Pentecostals on global Pentecostalism has been significant. Pentecostalism is now the largest "Free Church" in Norway and the church that Barratt built to house the new tradition is still in use in central Oslo (then Kristiania) and still innovative in its mission and radical in its spirituality. This essay will trace the development of the tradition founded by a de-frocked Methodist clergyman, persecuted in the press and attacked from the left and the right, to its role in defining the theology and praxis of Pentecostalism around the world. Contrary to what might be expected, the Norwegian Pentecostal church was not founded by North American missionaries, nor have the Norwegian Pentecostal churches ever been controlled by the North American churches. Like other European Pentecostal churches, indeed as the majority of the Pentecostal churches around the world, Norwegian Pentecostalism is and has always been an indigenous religious tradition with neither financial nor moral support from foreign churches.

This tradition of ecclesial and theological independence has been a central value of the Norwegian Pentecostal churches since the beginnings in January 1907. At its heart is the experience of Thomas Ball Barratt as a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. When he was ignominiously caught in the nets of institutional politics within that Church, as shall be discussed below, Barratt experienced the freedom provided by the experience of Baptism in the Holy Spirit in a new way. Barratt had no desire whatsoever to establish an episcopal system of governance for the new movement. It was also Barratt who taught a vision for the world and became a recognized leader of the global Pentecostal churches, a position which he held with dignity until his death in 1941, just as the dark night of Nazism was descending upon Europe. It is out of this crucible of world turmoil and the resulting "Anglo-Saxon" and Soviet domination of world affairs that the next chapters of the history were lived. It is within the framework of these experiences that the Norwegian Pentecostal experience must be viewed. Out of that history has come the particular theological and praxis concerns as well as the challenges that the church now faces.

Thomas Ball Barratt: From Methodist to Pentecostal

The Methodist Episcopal Church began mission work in competition with the English Wesleyan Methodist Church in Norway under the influence of Ole Peter Petersen, a sailor who had experienced religious conversion and "sanctification" (1849) within the context of American Methodism. Norway, prepared by Haugian Pietist revivalism, was welcoming to the American Methodist evangelists. The mission was strongly influenced by the American Wesleyan/Holiness movement and retained the theological emphases of the tradition long after these had been largely marginalized within American culture. The Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church quickly developed a success story in Northern Europe. It quietly paid the salaries of many of the pastors and the small Norwegian Methodist Episcopal Church bureaucracy. The problem in Norway developed as the Bishops and Missionary Society each sought to control mission policy. The church in Norway became the pawn.

An American Bishop was sent each year to Europe to hold the Annual Conferences of the mission churches. At the conferences, projects would be proposed and/or approved by the Bishop with funding from the Missionary Society. While there were sufficient funds this process worked. However, when the Missionary Society felt strategically

---

1 The World Christian Encyclopedia ed. David B. Barrett et al. (Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1982) reported 73,000 Pentecostals. However, several major components of Pentecostalism in Norway were not included in the analysis. Other informed analysts suggest that the number of members may be as low as 30,000 Pentecostal church members to which might be added another 10,000-15,000 Lutheran Charismatics. My estimate based on fieldwork and interviews (1996) led me to believe there were more Pentecostals. There is certainly the need for a congregation by congregation analysis of the situation. If Barrett is correct, or close to it, then Pentecostalism in Norway has seen modest growth since 1970; if the lower numbers are correct, then there has been a significant erosion of Pentecostal membership in relationship to population growth. My thanks to Geir Lie for reading this paper and offering corrections and suggestions. Any mistakes of fact or interpretation remain my own. This essay is offered with thanks to my Norwegian Pentecostal friends, whose hospitality has been gracious and generous.
obligated to take over and lavishly fund the formerly self-supporting missions in India, Burma, Singapore, Chile, Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Panama, and Ecuador initiated by William Taylor, the limits of cash flow were quickly reached.1 There were increasing difficulties in raising monies as U.S. Methodists angered by the conflict with Taylor began giving to independent “faith” mission agencies or to one of the Wesleyan/Holiness denominational boards. The Methodist Episcopal Church in Norway also began to decrease in speed of growth. Most of the converts wanted to emigrate to America to escape the increased marginalization due to involvement in a dissenting (non-state church) tradition. To become a Methodist meant to surrender many of their civil rights, including burial in church related cemeteries, being recorded as a citizen through baptism and many more.

The central figure of the triangle with the Missionary Society and the Bishops was Thomas Ball Barratt (22 July 1862-21 January 1940), the talented son of an expatriate British mining engineer, who had studied music with Edvard Grieg and art with O. Dahl. He experienced “sanctification” in a Methodist Episcopal Church in Bergen as a youth and entered the Methodist ministry. His abilities with English automatically made him the indispensable translator for the Bishops on their annual episcopal pilgrimages to Norway. He quickly moved up the ecclesiastical ladder. He served as a local pastor (1886-1889), was ordained deacon (1889), pastored Third Methodist Church, Christiania [Oslo] (1889-1892), and was ordained elder (1891). From 1898-1902 he was a local pastor. From 1899 he served as presiding elder of the Christiania [Oslo] district that made him even more essential to the Americans.

Each stage of his ministry was characterized by frenetic activity. He established a national youth program for the church, was active nationally in the temperance movement, created (with his sister Mary) an orphanage, worked for civil rights for dissenters, and tried to keep the Norwegian Methodists united in dealing with the Bishops and Missionary Society. All the while he struggled to obtain funds from the Missionary Society to support struggling churches and fund items as instructed by the Bishops.2 The debt ridden congregation in Oslo to which he was assigned in August 1889 had marginal chance for survival unless it became self-sustaining and had little hope of becoming self supporting because of the structures of the Methodist Episcopal Church and its mission program.

It is clear that already by 1890, Barratt was troubled by the ministry paradigm established in Norway on the American model and administered by the Bishop and the Missionary Society. He wrote extensively for the Norwegian Methodist periodical, Kristeligt tidende, on two subjects: ministry models and “Christian perfection.” The essays on William Taylor and James Hudson Taylor were more than historical essays. They reflected both the central themes of personal and social holiness, but also his appreciation for the radical ministerial styles of the two Taylors. It was also about this time that he discovered that if every church in Oslo was filled to capacity, only a small percentage of the population could be accommodated in a worship service. None of these churches were either welcoming or had significant success with the urban poor and working classes who had the most to lose by cutting the nominal membership in the state church. Engaging the larger non-church population in ways that they could hear the Gospel became a primary desideratum for Barratt’s ministry, and made the approaches of William Taylor and James Hudson Taylor all the more interesting to the struggling pastor.

Barratt began to examine other paradigms of ministry. He quickly realized that the established church of Norway and the mission churches that transported ecclesial and theological traditions of establishment from other nations (whether the USA, Germany or England) were not going to establish connections with people of Oslo. The onus of membership in these groups was too heavy to overcome. Therefore, the dream became the establishment of a form of the church that could allow for free voluntary association without the social problems posed by membership. One successful ministry in Norway was the Salvation Army which eschewed the traditional trappings of church, and which was determinedly holiness in theology and praxis. He began to cooperate with the Salvation Army and to organize inter-denominational meetings.2

1 T. B. Barratt, “Pintseloftet,” Kristeligt tidende 18,23 (7 Juni 1889), 177-178 [about William Taylor and self-supporting missions]; idem, “Biskop William Taylor,” Kristeligt tidende 18,23 (7 Juni 1889), 179; idem, “Uddrag af Hudson Taylors Fordrag,” Kristeligt tidende 18,49 (6 December 1889), 390.
During a visit to England (September 1890-May 1891), at the request of Bishop John Hurst, to raise money for the struggling Third Methodist Church of Christiania (Oslo), Barratt visited Methodist Central Hall in London. It matched precisely what Barratt had been attempting to accomplish in his ministry at Third Church. It offered a structure for a Wesleyan/Holiness ministry to the poor and the exploited working classes.¹

On returning to Christiania (Oslo), he began to explore the possibility of a “Central Mission.” The concept was presented to Bishop M. Walden who ordained him elder in 1891 and Barratt reported in his journal that “it met to a certain extent with his approval. In fact he would endorse the scheme provided the means were forthcoming.”² Barratt was not one to avoid a challenge and immediately reorganized his network of social and evangelistic ministries in Christiania (Oslo) into the Methodist Central Mission under the aegis of Central Methodist Church.

During each year of the next decade Barratt hosted the Bishop, received instructions from the Bishop and the Annual Conference about funding priorities, and politely but persistently negotiated with the Missionary Society in New York in efforts to achieve those ends. The correspondence preserved at the Methodist Center at Drew University, Madison, NJ, USA, and in Barratt’s private collection at the University of Oslo Library suggests that the response of the Missionary Society to the Norwegian importunities became ever more terse and acerbic. The problem was not just the requests filed by Barratt for funds to support his ministerial vision. The entire Methodist Episcopal Mission program was experiencing a financial crisis, and the Methodist Episcopal Church in Norway could not achieve a higher level of support for the church each year because of: (1) the ministerial structures required by the Americans; and (2) the high rate of emigration.

In the debate over funds, the American Methodist Episcopal Mission Board blamed the Norwegian Methodists for the costs of structures imposed upon them by the Americans. However, unlike in other situations around the world where this conflict raged, the Norwegian Methodists had a determined spokesperson. Barratt was willing to remind them of the participants in the decisions. The Missionary Society decided to “divide and conquer” by going around the “Presiding Elder” to another pastor to whom it offered a sizable grant in aid to cover costs.¹

This effort at co-optation was unsuccessful because the Norwegians communicated with each other and, for a variety of reasons, stood united over against the Missionary Society.¹ The triangle was formed between the Bishops, the Missionary Society and the “native” T. B. Barratt.

In 1902, Barratt was given one of his wishes. He was asked by Bishop McCabe to resign from First Methodist Episcopal Church in Christiania (Oslo) and become full time director of the Bymission (City Mission). This was accepted by the Conference only after an emotional appeal from the Bishop and a supportive address by his mentor Ole Olsen. However, the Conference did refuse to give him a furniture or salary allowance from the Mission funds which were becoming ever more scarce! Bishop McCabe personally took up an offering to which he himself contributed significantly in order to get Barratt started in the project.² The new endeavor began with Barratt renting Tivoli Theatre in central Christiania (Oslo) where he conducted a series of meetings. These attracted considerable attention in both the religious and secular press with some writers commenting on the “American” aspects of the Bymission. Through that first year, Barratt, his family and a few volunteers used social services, classical concerts and lectures as well as more traditional evangelistic means to reach the city.³ By the end of the first year, the Methodist Conference was ready give more willing approval to the Bymission. They accepted Barratt’s analysis: “Some were afraid that the Mission would weaken the other churches, but this has not been the case. It has strengthened them.”⁴

¹ Bundy, “Thomas Ball Barratt: From Methodist to Pentecostal,” 26-32. These reasons included fear of offending the Bishop who had made his support of Barratt clear and who, under the Methodist-Episcopal clergy appointment system, controlled the placement of clergy in churches, with renewal or change of appointment automatic each year.
³ Much of the information about this period is to be found in Byposten, a periodical designed to inform his constituency and to raise money. There were also articles in numerous Oslo newspapers. The Methodist press was silent! On Byposen, see D. Bundy, “Thomas B. Barratt and Byposten: An Early European Pentecostal Leader and His Periodical,” in Pentecost, Mission and Ecumenism: Essays on Intercultural Theology. Festchrift in Honor of Professor Walter J. Holmengover (Studies in the Intercultural History of Christianity, 75; Frankfurt am Main, et al.: Peter Lang, 1992), 115-121.
⁴ Barratt, When the Fire Fell, 87.
After a year of Bymission work, Barratt was still without furniture or decent housing. At the suggestion of the Bishop he wrote to the Missionary Society requesting assistance. The response from Society:

You know that it is expected on the Protestant mission field that the people will provide whatever is necessary in the way of property, parsonages and furniture...If you should be in need before the close of the year, I advise you to make application to the Board for relief, not by way of purchase of furniture, but by way of addition to your salary, if that should be insufficient.

After a lecture at the European Methodist Episcopal General Conference in Zürich where he lectured on "Methodism and Modern Social Movements" and conferred with two Bishops, Vincent and Burt, Barratt took Bishop Carroll's advice and applied for a salary grant of U.S. $150-200, making clear that: (1) it was not to interfere with or detract from the regular missionary appropriation for Norway; (2) although the work had been self-supporting, some pledges toward the family's living expenses had not been fulfilled; and, (3) more people had entered Methodism through the work of the Bymission than through any other door. Carroll wrote a curt reply refusing the request because the Annual Conference had not asked for mission funds to support the Bymission, and that there was no unforeseen emergency. Barratt argued that he had never requested funds from the mission allocation and that failure of pledges because of economic problems in Norway could not be foreseen. Carroll insisted that any pledge should be considered uncertain and therefore the non-fulfillment was not unforeseen. There is no record of Barratt responding.

This exchange is typical of the triangulation problem confronted by Barratt. At this same time, he was reading a biography of William Taylor written by the Swedish Wesleyan/Holiness Movement leader G. A.

---

1 H. K. Carroll to T. B. Barratt, 20 March 1903, General Commission on Archives and History, The United Methodist Church, Drew University, 73-74 1263-1-2:09 Letterbook 193 #483.
2 T. B. Barratt to H. K. Carroll, 20 October 1903, General Commission on Archives and History, The United Methodist Church, Drew University, 74-11 1259-7:01 Letterbook 194 #47.
3 H. K. Carroll to T. B. Barratt, 2 December 1903, General Commission on Archives and History, The United Methodist Church, Drew University, 73-44 1263-1-3:01 Letterbook 194 #64.
4 This letter dated 16 December 1903 appears to be lost but is mentioned in H. K. Carroll to T. B. Barratt, 7 January 1903, General Commission on Archives and History, The United Methodist Church, Drew University, 73-44 1263-1-3:01 Letterbook 194 #64.
5 Ibid., 1-2.

---
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Gustafson. This biographical and missiological treatise brought the problems faced by Barratt and the Norwegians into a larger framework. In *Byposten* the range of sources cited and the perspectives offered quickly moved beyond the range of traditional Methodist sources to include Scandinavian Pietism, Reformation figures and American independent Wesleyan/Holiness Movement writers. The central foci of the articles were personal holiness, radical social ministry and self-supporting ministry. Also during this period, Barratt lectured widely and wrote pamphlets in favor of Norwegian independence from Sweden. He also became a major player in the Dissenters Parliament that challenged the monopoly of the state church in civil affairs. This nationalist activism would serve him well in later years.

At the 1905 Norwegian Methodist Episcopal Annual Conference, Barratt was advised and invited by Bishop Burt to go to the U.S.A. to raise money for the expansion of the Bymission project. Burt gave a letter of support and promised the cooperation of the Missionary Society in the effort. Barratt also collected letters of recommendation and support from Bishops C. C. McCabe and J. H. Vincent. The Bishops gave him a warm reception, but the Missionary Society administrators refused to meet with him. They also ruled that he could not receive any funds for travel or for printing a brochure, and that any funds raising was to avoid mention of any support from the Missionary Society. The intervention of the Bishops did not help and Barratt was refused permission to raise money. The Society decided that no Methodist publisher or printer could print Barratt's brochures or newsletters. He was forbidden access to Methodist publications.

Barratt found some assistance among the Wesleyan/Holiness camp meetings and was invited to speak at the Iowa Holiness Association meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, an area of the USA that received many Norwegian Methodist immigrants. By the 16th of June he had purchased a ticket with the intention of returning home to Norway. However, Bishops Burt and Fowler insisted that he continue to attempt to raise money and forbade him to return home. Neither, however, provided...
funding and again the Missionary Society refused to reconsider their decisions. If he returned home a failure, he was to blame and disobedient to the Bishops. If he stayed, he incurred additional disapproval from the Missionary Society. The Bishops and the Missionary Society could not agree. Discouraged, despondent, sick and penniless, he found a place to live in A. B. Simpson’s “Missionary Home” in New York. In that refuge he reflected upon his life and ministry. He preached in New York area congregations and read through the months leading up to the anticipated departure from New York on 6 December 1906. The impasse and failure to raise funds was interpreted within the Wesleyan Holiness framework as a failure of spirituality.

While in this difficult situation at the “Missionary Home,” he received a copy of The Apostolic Faith from Los Angeles announcing the beginnings of the Pentecostal revival. He wrote asking for information and advice about his spiritual condition. After reading the first two fascicles of the periodical and six letters of advice, he experienced “Baptism in the Holy Spirit” Pentecostal style. On the basis of this data and his experience, he wrote a treatise defending his Pentecostal interpretation of theology. It was sent to William Seymour in Los Angeles for publication, but it was not published for already there were differences between the American and newly forming European Pentecostal theologies. Significantly the only source cited by Barratt other than the Bible was William Taylor! On ship headed for England, he would travel with the Mead family, among others, from Los Angeles. The Mead family had been self-supporting missionaries in Angola where they were personally installed by William Taylor in 1885.

It was they who provided “evidence” to the Azusa Street revivalists that Pentecostal glossolalia included African languages!

1 Bundy, “Thomas Ball Barratt: From Methodist to Pentecostal,” 37.
2 These letters preserved in Barratt’s papers have been edited and annotated in D. Bundy, “Spiritual Advice to a Seeker: Letters to T. B. Barratt from Azusa Street, 1906,” Pneuma 14(1992), 159-170.
4 Record Book, Methodist Episcopal Church and Mission Conference, South Central Africa, Angola. Archives, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, CA. There is now apparently no evidence as to why Barratt did not develop a positive relationship with the Mead family, but it is clear from the comments in Bypossen that he did not. It is probable that the American-Norwegian cultural differences and the independence of Barratt’s theological perspective.
5 “From A Missionary to Africa,” The Apostolic Faith 1,1(September 1906), 3.
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Throughout Norway and the World

The results of this conversion for Norwegian Methodism were far reaching. Its most independent and creative voice was silenced and the growth rate of the tradition decreased. Barratt was forced to resign from the Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Independent, not of his own choice, Barratt became the pastor of a small group of followers in a borrowed building in Oslo. It is from that nucleus that Pentecostalism in Norway developed. Soon other Methodist Episcopal clergy and lay persons joined the new movement as did not a few members of the Salvation Army. The number of converts from the Salvation Army was viewed as sufficiently grave as to require the personal attention of Salvation Army General Samuel Logan Brengle who came to Norway to debate Barratt. The outcome of the debate is unclear but it and, more importantly, Brengle’s assertion of Salvation Army discipline brought conversions from their ranks to a virtual end. Among the Baptists, perhaps the most noteworthy conversions were those of Severin Larsen and C. M. Seehauser. The most illustrative of the early converts were Oscar Halverson, who later started a ministry to the homeless in Oslo, and Johan Magnusen, a Methodist who became an important Pentecostal evangelist.

During the first eighteen months of the Pentecostal revival in Oslo, people from all over Europe and from as far away as South Africa made the pilgrimage to Oslo to observe the events firsthand and to receive counsel from Barratt. The local press was less objective and the “Barratt movement” was vilified in the press through damaging coverage and ruthless cartoons.

Barratt also sent missionaries to Sweden and Germany. In the case of Germany, the two women Dagmar Gregersen and Agnes Thelle provoked both a revival and a firestorm of criticism in the German ecclesiastical press. Barratt himself went to Britain and then on to the Middle East and India.

1 While technically Severin Larsen remained Baptist, he was recognized as a Pentecostal theologian throughout Scandinavia and his books were published and promoted by the main Pentecostal publishing houses of Norway and Sweden.
2 See the discussion of these men and their ministries in Martin Ski, Fram til Ukritismenommen. Pinsevekkelsen gjennom 50 år. Volume I (Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1956), 183-192 et passim.
4 Barratt, When the Fire Fell and An Outline of My Life.
In this evangelistic work, both in Norway and outside, he did not attempt to establish an organization with himself at its head. He worked to implement William Taylor's mission theory within the Pentecostal revival: that is, the missions were to be self-supporting, self-governing and self-theologizing. He never attempted to control the results of mission activity, even in Norway. Outside Norway, Barratt, more than any other figure in the early period of Pentecostalism, was responsible for the beginnings of new movement throughout Europe, India and Latin America. His radical insistence on the “three self” theory of Taylor allowed Pentecostalism to be flexible, entrepreneurial and ready to accept leadership of the new converts as equal to that of the founders. He, unlike the American Pentecostal and Wesleyan Holiness denominations, adopted a thorough congregationalism that cooperated for mission, evangelism and publication, but refused to establish a bureaucracy or allow intervention in the congregations. This has become the ecclesiology and missiology of most of global Pentecostalism. His influence in the U.S.A. was also important, but that is another story.

Back in Norway after his visit to India, Barratt threw himself into spreading the vision of Pentecostalism throughout Norway and the rest of Scandinavia. He visited Sweden, Finland and Denmark and successfully organized ministries or encouraged the existing churches. He intervened in disputes between Pentecostal missionaries and indigenous groups in Iceland. He also was a major force in the International Pentecostal meetings held in various places throughout northern Europe and England. One can scarcely overemphasize the importance of the model provided by Barratt for developments in Scandinavia, but also throughout the so-called Third-World before World War II.

In Norway, the role of leader of the tradition was not easy. In addition to the attacks from the ecclesiastical and secular press, there were controversies within Pentecostal ranks. Several of these will be discussed below, for they were generally theological in nature or at least fought in public as theological issues. There were controversies over baptism, sanctification, the soteriological role of glossolalia, the order of salvation, ecumenism and mission. Barratt wrote continuously in an effort to clarify issues and to state his opinion as forcefully as possible. The pages of Byposten and Korsets Seier are replete with his theological essays and those of his supporters. Others resorted to publication of independent pamphlets that circulated widely and to the pages made available in the publications of other agencies. The literature of conflict for the first thirty years of the Pentecostal churches in Norway is significant, and as yet examined only in the careful, albeit preliminary, study of Nils Bloch-Hoell.1

These controversies, and other problems, demonstrated that some organization was required for the fledgling Pentecostal Movement in Norway. A totally congregational system gave no coherence and no ability to respond to problems. With the episcopacy out of consideration, the style of church consolidation and development chosen was based on a Baptist model, argued Nils Bloch-Hoell correctly.2 The entire first three decades of the history of Pentecostalism in Norway can be understood to have been dominated by two issues: mission in Norway and ecclesiastical organization.

The death of Thomas Ball Barratt on 29 January 1941 was not disruptive organizationally for the Pentecostal churches in Norway. Barratt had already made (1934) Egil Strand associate editor of the periodical Korsets Seier. Ragnvald Frøyshov became (1934) director of the publishing house and was himself succeeded by Osvald Orlien. Barratt was, during his last decade, often absent from the Filadelfia Church in Oslo.3 The organization had to continue as best it could due to the German invasion and the establishment of a Nazi puppet government in Norway. However, his death did mean that Norwegian Pentecostalism had lost its statesman. There was no one else in a position to move into a role of global leadership such as Barratt had held. The significance of the years of World War II for the Norwegian Pentecostal churches has yet to be studied. It is clear that the numbers did not decrease nationally and in some areas there were revivals and new churches started. Immediately after the war, churches were founded in a number of cities and the numbers of Pentecostals increased significantly between 1937 (16,783 adult baptized believers in 249 congregations) and 1957 when it was reported that there were 26,474 adult baptized believers in 249 congregations and that 26 congregations reported more than 200 members.4

2 Ibid, 190-286.
4 The World War II years have only been discussed by Martin Ski, Fram til..., Volume II, 113-119. On statistics see Oddvar Nilsen, ...og Herren virket med: Pinsebevegelsen gjennom 75 år (Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1981), 185 (1937) and 277(1957).
The growth rate did not continue. Two factors led to a decline in the growth rate of the Pentecostal churches. The first and most important problem was the rapid secularizing of Norwegian society. The second reason had to do with a series of controversies and divisions that have plagued the Norwegian Pentecostal churches since the early 1950s. Given these problems is a tribute to the leadership of the movement and to faithful pastors that the movement grew at all. Indeed, by 1981 the Filadelfia related Pentecostal Churches reported 272 congregations and 30,692 members. The number of members, adherents and unbaptized children is a matter of some debate (see note 1). Some of the controversies will be discussed under the rubrics of theology and praxis below.

Norwegian Pentecostals have been active in mission since Barratt sent women missionaries throughout Europe. They have since been busy on every continent and, together with other Scandinavian countries have had a major role in defining Pentecostalism outside North American and Europe. The work undertaken by the Norwegian Pentecostal mission has generally been congruent with the values developed by Barratt during the early days of the revival.2

Theology and Praxis

The Beginnings of Norwegian Pentecostal Theology

In late 1906, a few days after his experience of Pentecostal Baptism in the Holy Spirit in New York, still with the limited data base of two fascicles of The Apostolic Faith and six letters from participants at the Los Angeles revival, Barratt wrote a theological treatise defining Pentecostal theology.3 Thoughts on Pentecost and the Gift of Tongues has been preserved in Barratt’s handwritten copybook (Ms 4° 3341) in the archives of the University of Oslo. It is comprised of 41 pages of Barratt’s flowing cursive of this period with an additional six pages of inserts and revisions plus a preface to the original which also appear to be from the same period. The draft sent to William Seymour in Los Angeles for publication would probably have had all of the inserts in their proper place.

In his cover letter dated 6 November 1906 (nine days before he experienced glossolalia) Barratt wrote that The Apostolic Faith had helped him with his search for “the blessings of Pentecost” he wanted to help others by clarifying problematic issues. “Since the good Lord,” he observed, “gave me the full Pentecost, the word of God has become clearer to my mind’s eye and more precious to my heart than ever before.” It is clear that Barratt believes that everything he is writing to be in full conformity to the revival at Los Angeles. However, he argues against the necessity of “tongues” as a sign for “Pentecost.” He insists that others in the history of the church, specifically Bishop William Taylor, John Fletcher and John Wesley among others. “Who is to say that they have not that gift?” he asked. If there was not a fulsome demonstration of power by earlier Christians, it was because they did not use the gifts as they should have!4 Barratt also insists that “this Pentecostal power” is “neither the climax or beginning... But the Pentecost gives the power to live the sanctified life and labor for the extension of Christ’s kingdom.”5 He concluded, it is not a selfish gift but is “Pentecost for service, not to be confounded with the indwelling or infilling.”6

This diverges already in significant ways from the perspective argued in The Apostolic Faith, and it is clear that while Barratt did not see that divergence. However, Seymour and the editorial staff of The Apostolic Faith saw the differences. It was neither published nor mentioned in The Apostolic Faith! Already Barratt’s theologically astute and creative mind was taking the implications of the revival in directions different from those of the American progenitors of the tradition. It can be argued that apart from the insight about glossolalia being an (or the) initial evidence of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit, Norwegian Pentecostal theology grew

1 Nilsen, ...og Herren virket med, 386-396.
2 On Norwegian Pentecostal mission, see I. M. Witzøe, ed. De Aapene Dare: Norges Fri Evangeliske Hedningemissions areider og virke gjennom 10 aar (Oslo, Filadelfiaforlaget, 1923); Martin Ski, Fram til Urkristendommen: Pinsevennenes yrre misjon i 75 aar (Oslo, 1989) see David Bundy, “Pentecostal Missions to Brazil: The Case of the Norwegian G. L. Pettersen, Norsk tidsskrift for misjon 47(1993), 171-179.
quite independently of American influence for the first half of the twentieth century.

That does not mean there was no controversy. As persons from Salvation Army, the Mission Alliance, the state Lutheran church, Baptists and others became Pentecostal within the context of Norway, each brought to the experience a theological legacy and, like Barratt, they were unwilling to describe all of their previous experience as lacking value.

One of the most contentious and intractable issues was Water Baptism. Among those coming into Pentecostalism, there was not even agreement that it was a sacrament. The meaning of baptism, its sacramental status and the time of its application in the life of the believer were problematic. Barratt, as a Methodist Episcopal minister, had always practiced infant baptism while many of the vocal converts from the Baptist tradition were devoted to a believer’s baptism tradition. Erik Nordquelle and C. M. Seehuus were the most determined proponents of believer’s baptism. After months of study and prayer, Barratt acquiesced, and on 15 September 1913, submitted to baptism at the hands of Lewi Pethrus, a Swedish Pentecostal pastor from a Baptist background. The controversy continued to smolder, but the decision of Barratt proved decisive.

Another issue had to do with the problem of “initial evidence,” that is the doctrine that speaking in tongues is the only initial evidence of Baptism in the Holy Spirit. Barratt, during the early period, argued that it was the initial evidence, but that there were exceptions such as William Taylor. Erik Nordquelle argued against that position and eventually he and his congregation established themselves as a church outside the Pentecostal movement. Barratt and the Norwegian Pentecostal movement appear to have emphasized the initial evidence doctrine less after the doctrinal battles of the first two decades wound down.

Another controversial issue was the nature of sanctification or “Christian Perfection.” Barratt was committed to a Wesleyan/Holiness understanding of the Wesleyan doctrine worked out by Phoebe Palmer and her followers in the USA. He remained so his entire life. However, the Pentecostals of Baptist background were not about to admit the necessity of the Methodist doctrine, which they had spent years of their life fighting, as prerequisite to a Pentecostal experience. Barratt was slow to compromise, but was ironic with most of his opponents, except toward

1 Anonymous, “Barratt blir døgt.” Korsets Seier (1 October 1913), 149.
2 For a discussion of the complicated and extended discussions, see, Nils Bloch-Hoell, Pissebevegelsen, 200-236, passim.
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those who chose a middle way, especially Erik Anderson and S. Ulness. Ulness, a Norwegian-American Free Methodist related missionary who had come to Norway with the Pentecost Bands (a mission organization inspired by Bishop William Taylor). Ulness and Anderson argued, congruent with the founder of the Free Methodist Church, Benjamin Titus Roberts, that at each stage of the Christian life the believer experienced the necessary sanctifying grace if they conformed to the extent possible their wills to the will of God. To Barratt and others, this smacked of Universalism. Erik Anderson was forced out of the tradition by Barratt, but the Ulness-Anderson understanding of sanctification became the standard vision of northern European Pentecostalism.

While there was debate about the process and nature of holiness, there was little debate about the necessity for a radical social holiness ministry. From the beginning, Barratt's concepts of ministry to the poor, the homeless, children and to the elderly were given sacrificial attention. Programs and institutions gave outlets for ministry to many local congregations. As well, during the early period, Barratt's vision of ministering through the use of classical European cultural structures, especially music, received serious attention. More recently, there have been initiatives addressing youth problems, alcoholism, abuse and other late twentieth century social problems. The pages of Korsets Seier are filled with notices of events and descriptions of ministries throughout Norway. On a personal level, the Wesleyan/Holiness code defining Christian life-style and social behavior has been maintained quite intact. Foreign Wesleyan/Holiness and Pentecostal visitors to Norwegian Pentecostal congregations, institutions and families would find little that is surprising.

In addition to participation in debates because he thought the issues important, Barratt was also in the process of creating a new Pentecostal reality through his writings. The approach was both theoretical and personal. On the personal side, Barratt printed from 1906 onward, a quite comprehensive diary of his activities and thoughts. This was a regular feature of both Byposten and Korsets Seier. From 1907, there were

1 The debate is chronicled in Korsets Seier (1916) and in the periodical Det gode Rådskab (1916). This debate, of crucial importance for the self definition of Norwegian Pentecostalism, deserves more attention than it has been given. Out of this controversy came Barratt's book, Aandens vei og eller livleden 3rd edition (Nordstrand: n.p., 1916). Ulness is a figure worthy of more study. Anderson broke with Ulness in 1903, perceiving that Ulness had become a Universalist, hence Barratt's analysis. The precise nature of the ecclesiastical and ideological conflicts is somewhat unclear.
2 Some of the articles were included in Nilsen, ... og Herren virket med.
treatises that reported spiritual or mission experiences. After his death, one of his daughters completed editorial work on his memoirs that were translated also into Swedish. In these texts he developed a paradigm for ministry and leadership as well as mission both in Norway and abroad.

The other approach was theoretical. Central to this project was the effort to make theological thought, including controversial issues, a regular part of the reading of Pentecostal believers through the pages of Byposten and Korsets Seier. The importance of these periodicals can hardly be overstated. A musician of some ability, Barratt also composed a hymns and gospel songs for the new moment and published them in various collections. While these are no longer widely used due to changing language and taste, they represent a coherent theological vision. Also from the beginning, Barratt published a series of theological pamphlets that were constructive. For example, there was the volume describing the general principles of the Pentecostal movement. In 1919, after the debates discussed above, Barratt wrote a careful thoughtul treatise on Baptism. There followed significant treatises on ecclesiology and Baptism in the Holy Spirit and Glossolalia. Later there was an analysis of eschatology. However, perhaps the most important was his analysis of Pentecostal history and culture. In this book, the title of which

---

1 T. B. Barratt, Da jeg fikk min pinseteåab og tungemaalsgaven (Kristiania: Byposten, 1907).
3 T. B. Barratt, Pintsevekelsen. Almindelige principer for vedligeholdelsen af broderskabsbaandet mellem pinsevanner (Kristiania: Byposten, 1911).
4 T. B. Barratt, Den kristne daap (Kristiania: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1919).
5 T. B. Barratt, De krisme menigheter (Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1933); aut, idem, Andsdp og Tungetale (Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1933).
6 T. B. Barratt, Buk død og grav. Mellemtilstanden og evigheten. Finnes der et helvete? (Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1939). Eschatology has been a flashpoint of theological discussion since the earliest days of the movement. On eschatology, see Geir Lie, “Norsk dommedagsprofeter—en presentasjon av tre hovedakter,” Humanist 2-3(1999), 58-64. Here the perspectives of Barran, C. Rein Seehuus and Albert Horth are discussed.
7 T. B. Barratt, Urkristendommen gjenopplivet—Pintsevekelsen (Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1934). This was translated into Swedish by Osmin Halldorf as, idem, Pintsevekelsen och urkristendomen (Stockholm: Förlaget Filadelfia, 1935). This book, in addition to new material, contains a thorough revision of essays published in various formats in English and Norwegian, notably in English in T. B.

---
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Connections between Pentecostalism in the United States of America and in Norway had been close since the beginning, especially because of the large Norwegian emigration to America and the development of Norwegian speaking Pentecostal churches in the USA which looked to Barratt and Norway for leadership. With the enforced shift to English during the War and the death of Barratt, that relationship emerged from the War period quite diminished. However, a different relationship evolved, based primarily on Norwegian readings of and contacts with American evangelists largely outside the established North American Pentecostal denominations who were reacting to the institutionalization of American Pentecostalism with its decreasing attention to the early Pentecostal vision of healing, exorcism, lay leadership, radical evangelism and radical commitment of time and resources to the movement. After World War II, it can be argued that much of the entrepreneurial spirit of the early tradition had disappeared from the American mainstream Pentecostal traditions, and much of that spirit in Europe had been quenched by the Nazi experience.

Into that void came ideas developed in the “Healing Movements.” Healing evangelists including William Freeman, William Branham, Gordon Lindsay, Osborn and Tommy Hicks visited Norway. Several Norwegians translated documents, studied at Oral Roberts University and Rhema Bible Institute in Tulsa, Oklahoma, USA. Ministries were established on these American models in each Scandinavian country.

The earliest contacts with the American healing evangelists were probably made by C. Rein Seehuus. William Freeman visited...
Scandinavia in 1949. However, the first to establish regular contacts and to reformulate his ministry in Norway was Åge Samuelsen. During the 1950’s he maintained a dynamic ministry. When William Branham visited Norway, he was hosted by Samuelsen. There was conflict over both theology and evangelistic methods. After 1957, Samuelsen was forced out of the regular pastoral ministry and in 1959 established the first of the Maran-Ata Churches.1 By 1980, there were 200 members and another 500 adherents in the congregation.2 The impact of these churches on the Filadelfia related Pentecostal churches was more devastating than the numbers might suggest. The existence of these churches and the Maran-Ata critique of the older Pentecostal tradition called into question the faithfulness and biblical understanding of the church. The movement also changed the theological discussion in the congregations and among the clergy. There was a need not only to establish an identity over against the state and other older churches. There was also a need to define the tradition in light of the more radically revivalistic impulse of Pentecostalism. The first to attack the new claims was Kristian Heggelund.3 Heggelund insisted that the biblical tradition instructed that the gifts of the Holy Spirit be focused through the common experience of the local congregations and that while conferred upon individuals, they were to work through the church.

Among those influenced by Samuelsen was Aril Edvardsen.4 Edvardsen was also influenced (albeit not in all probability directly) by the writings and ministries of the North American evangelists E. W. Kenyon, T. L. Osborn and A. A. Allen. He began a ministry in Kvinesdal in 1964 that has continued to expand, including a Bible School in Sarons Dal. He

1 See the apologia of Åge Samuelsen, Pinsebevegelsen, Maran-Ata og slakteofferet Åge Samuelsen (Drammen: Traktat-Trykk, 1967). Samuelsen would be later forced to leave Maran-Ata.
2 Barrett, World Christian Encyclopedia. This number appears to be incorrect. In 1981, informants interviewed suggested there were several thousand members. Those claims appear to have been exaggerated. However, there is at the moment no independent confirmation.
3 Kristian Heggelund, Våre sykdommer i lys av Guds ord (Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1958). There is an extensive literature including articles in Korsets Seier and other Norwegian religious periodicals. Among the exposes and analyses are two important books. The first is a novel by Tor Edwin Dahl, Guds Tjener Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1973, actually printed 1975) which was followed by the more scholarly historical analysis, alas without sufficient documentation, Tor Edwin Dahl and John-Willy Rudolph, Fra Seier til Nederlag: Pinsebevegelsen i Norge (Land og Kirke; Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1978).
4 Arvid Møller, Aril Edvardsen i Sarons Dal (Oslo: J. W. Cappelens Forlag, 1978); Madalene Harris, Aril Edvardsen: Drammer blir virkelighet (Kvinesdal: Logos Forlag, [1986])
that each had its contribution to make to the revival of spirituality in Norway. This positive assessment coincided with the "normalization" of relations between the Pentecostal churches and the Salvation Army in the 1990s. The optimistic view allowed a more self-confident network of Pentecostal churches to grow quickly during the decade of the 1990s.

The period has not been without its challenges as other foreign Pentecostal movements also made their presence felt during this period. Some of these are basically American Pentecostal, including the Church of the Foursquare Gospel founded in Los Angeles by Aimee Semple McPherson, the Apostolic Faith (Portland, Oregon, USA) that has long had a minor presence in Norway and the United Pentecostal Church. Others are newer to both the North American and Norwegian scenes. These include Vineyard, the Prophecy Movement (Kansas City, USA), Calvary Chapel, and the Toronto Blessing.

The Struggle over Women in Ministry

The issue of the roles of women in ministry has been especially problematic in Norway. Barratt came to the problem with his Wesleyan/Holiness commitments to an active role for women in ministry and having had extensive contacts with the Salvation Army that has recognized ministry without regard to gender since its inception. The early Pentecostal revival, however, was made up with persons from many backgrounds and those from Lutheran and Baptist backgrounds were more hesitant, often totally opposed to women being in recognized ministry. The case chosen by Thomas Ball Barratt to encourage the acceptance of women was Aimee Semple McPherson.

Aimee Semple McPherson

It is uncertain when Barratt first heard of Aimee Semple McPherson, but by 1919 he and his wife Laura were translating portions of sermons and

---

1. Anna Larssen (later Björner) was a famous Danish actress who was led into a Pentecostal understanding of Christianity by Barratt on a visit to Copenhagen in 1908. She wrote of her life story in Anna Larssen Björner, Teater og Tempel: Livserindringer (København: H. Hirschsprungs Forlag, 1935). On the subsequent problems among her converts due to Welsh Apostolic Church influence, see D. Bundy, "Swedish Pentecostal Mission Theory: Foundational Values in Conflict," Mission Studies 14(1997), 147-174, esp. 157-158.

2. Aimee Semple McPherson, This is That (Los Angeles: Bridal Call Publishing House, 1919). This was republished with significant editing as idem, This is That (Los Angeles: Echo Park Evangelistic Association, 1923) and then in a second differently numbered edition with additional material with the same publishing information. It appears that the volume was published with no indication that Barratt had received the book giving the interpretation of the kidnapping by Aimee Semple McPherson's autobiography, This is That, was more than a literary effort. Barratt and his wife were holding her up as a model for women in the new dispensation. The translations were first published in Korsets Seier and later gathered into a book on McPherson.

---

1 Oddvar Tegnander, Folkevekkelse (Oslo: Rex Forlag, 1990).
In early 1925 Barratt received a serious invitation to visit the U.S.A. and by 1927 he and Laura had decided it was time to go. He had numerous invitations from Norwegian immigrant Pentecostals in the upper U.S. Mid-West and along the eastern seaboard. He established an itinerary and decided to include Los Angeles. The only disappointment was Los Angeles. He was shunned by the Azusa Street Mission. As Angelus Temple, he seems to have fared little better. He did not meet McPherson and was not invited to preach. His experience of Aimee Semple McPherson can be described only as culture shock! It is not surprising that Barratt in his description of the trip to America spoke very highly of the evangelistic work of McPherson in Des Moines, but did not discuss the visit to Los Angeles.

**Barratt Regarding Women in the Church**

Barratt's only book on the role of women in the church, *Kvinnens stilling i Menigheten* was written in 1933. These are the essence of lectures given at the Filadelfia Church Oslo Bible School that same year. In this slender book Barratt argues emphatically, on the basis of the biblical models of Paul, Priscilla and Phoebe, for the right of women to teach and serve on the governing board of the congregation. He notes that there were no women pastors in the biblical narratives, but did not say that that narrative should limit all future roles for women. The second section of the volume deals with texts used by opponents of the ministry of women, including with I Corinthians, chapters 11 and 14, and 1 Timothy 2:1-15. Barratt's critique of the use of the passages by his opponents involves an analysis of the problems that provoked the original Pauline letters. He argues that when the context changed the response of Paul would also change as seen in the examples of biblical women. Barratt was decades ahead of his time. Only recently have Norwegian Pentecostal scholars and women been able to argue publicly for what Barratt argued in 1933! In 1984, a book arguing for women in ministry was published by O. G. Hoaas and Oddvar Tegnander. They supported the arguments of T. B. Barratt made earlier. There have been other voices in the debate, both written and oral, but the most clear presentation of the anti-women stance was taken by Toralf Gilbrant in a volume published in 1995. His arguments are based on the philosophical understanding of the Bible that under girds North American Fundamentalist theology, and in no way makes the argument on the basis of Pentecostal theological distinctives. This debate is far from over. It is to be hoped that the discussion will empower the members of the Pentecostal churches to a renewed ministry.

**The Contemporary Discussion**

Barratt concludes: "They will not seek a true headship over men, but when the Spirit calls her and the church understands the call, then the inspired woman may assume any role as her place in the Christian church."

Nowhere in the volume does he mention the example of famous Pentecostal women pastors. The experiences with Aimee Semple McPherson and Anna Larssen Björner had been less than positive for Barratt although he clearly admired both women and genuinely liked Björner. After his ambiguous experiences with the two women, he was not willing either to fight for women's roles as pastors or to foreclose the options. He fell back on the two verities that had come to guide his theology and praxis: inspiration of the Holy Spirit and the validation of the local congregation.

**Other Issues, Other Voices**

1. Ibid, 33.
Other theologians have dealt with other foundational issues. Two major efforts require at least passing mention. The first was the multi-volume systematic theology developed between 1977 and 1978 by a number of Norwegian Pentecostal scholarly pastors and missionaries. The “theme series” of seven volumes, entitled “Temaserien tro og tanke,” was edited by Oddvar Tegnander and David Østby. The individual volumes remain important contributions on the subjects addressed. Move recently, there has been the single volume systematic theology of Alf Somdal. This magisterial volume, which does not draw as deeply as it should on Norwegian Pentecostal sources and perhaps too much on North American materials, is a truly significant book. It grew out of the need of a missionary to teach theology in Kenya, and was put into Norwegian and expanded to serve the church in Norway. It is an excellent witness to the centrality of mission in Norwegian Pentecostal history, theology and praxis.

Challenges and Potential

It would seem that Norwegian Pentecostalism is strong and poised for a period of growth and renewal. In order for that to occur, it will need to continue to work to heal some of the divisions of the past, including the divisions between men and women, youth and the baby-boomers and the difference in vision between the radical faith healing traditions and those aspects of the tradition influenced, on the right and the left by the American fundamentalist traditions and the state Lutheran church. Therefore, the first order of business may be to developing an understanding of Pentecostal Theology that looks at its past for insight in the past of Norwegian Pentecostal theology and the interpretation of the Bible in that context as well as to a dialogue with contemporary theologies. This becomes crucial as generations arise who know not Thomas Ball Barratt and his disciples. The story of Barratt has been central to Norwegian Pentecostal identity, as is reflected in this essay and in all other historical work on Norwegian Pentecostalism. However, serious effort must be made to create and transmit the lives of other “saints” as well. Without stories and lives of Pentecostal laity, clergy and missionaries, the defining heroes will come from other sources, many of them indifferent to or opposed to the values of the Pentecostal movements. The Norwegian Pentecostal churches are singularly well set for such a project. The scholarly tradition within the churches is strong and has found ways to participate in the national discussion of theology and culture.

However such a task is never easy, no matter how great the resources. Most churches of the world have not been very successful at balancing the Spirit filled mind and a Spirit warmed heart. The easy route has been to see the two as opposed one to the other. Gaps in understanding, distrust and animosity between clergy, laity and church leadership is pandemic around the world. The standard paradigm has been for each group to blame the other for the ills of the churches. So far, it would appear that the Norwegian Pentecostal churches have generally managed to avoid insuperable gulf between the laity, clergy and the academics. That is most commendable. The contributions of all three groups are essential if the churches are to move toward a renewed and forceful theological/scholarly identity that resolves (if not solves) the theological and praxis crises of the past few decades.

Part of that discussion needs to be the developing new (renewed?) paradigms of evangelism in a post-Christian environment. Norway is, at the turn of the millennium, not a land where Christian religious practice is positively valued. In such a context, an examination of the beginnings of the tradition in the radical ministry concept of the Bymission (City Mission) may well be fruitful. Also the efforts of Barratt to use cultural paradigms that were congruent with Christian values but not overtly Christian may provide other suggestions. Certainly the Norwegian Pentecostal church, often under the leadership of women, has been actively engaged in addressing pressing social and ethical issues that confront the youth of Norway.

Related to this evangelistic desideratum, and crucial to it, is the effort to articulate a cultural presence in Norway. How can the Norwegian Pentecostal churches present themselves to the nation as creators of culture, as builders of civil society? During the last decades, especially since World War II, there has been a tendency to seek liberty at the expense of community culture. As new generations seek to establish their personal identities, it may be that the need will be to create culture, that is values and boundaries grounded in history and Scripture. The Norwegian Pentecostal churches are poised to be able to make such a contribution to such a project.
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1 O. Nilsen, et al. Freile (Temaserien tro og tanke, 1; Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1977); D. Østby, Ddp (Temaserien tro og tanke, 3; Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1977); O. Nilsen, Apostolenes Giengter (Temaserien tro og tanke, 4; Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1978); O. Nilsen, et al. Den Heilige And og nddegawne (Temaserien tro og tanke, 5; Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1978); D. Østby, et al. Menigheten (Temaserien tro og tanke, 7; Oslo: Filadelfiaforlaget, 1978). Two of the volumes were translated from English.

Part of this development of culture will be undertaken with believers from other religious traditions. The Charismatic Renewal in the state Lutheran and in the Methodist and Catholic churches will also be working toward these ends. The ecumenical overtures will need to be first to the other Pentecostal churches and then to those among the other churches who are willing to work together toward a construction of society. Once again, Norway has a small cadre of individuals who are aware of their history and who have the scholarly tools to engage the other traditions at a sophisticated level. The challenge will be to be engaged both in ecumenical efforts and to continue the evangelistic and missional efforts that have been the hallmarks of the tradition.

Global mission will also require both energy and attention to mission theory. The Norwegian Pentecostal church was born of mission and in mission. It is no accident that of the two volumes published to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the Filadelfia related churches, one of the volumes had to do with foreign mission. The Norwegian Pentecostal missionaries are well positioned to be engaged in additional reflection about mission theory and praxis as well as to be of assistance to other mission sending churches around the world. In a time when there are Pentecostal churches in every country of the world, the project of Pentecostal mission becomes more complicated. How can one be aggressively evangelistic and yet respectful of the call, vision and mission of the indigenous churches, or at least the churches already present in a given country? How can one be true to one's own call to mission without compromising the call of another? The Norwegian Pentecostal mission has more experience than most in cooperating with, rather than competing against, other Pentecostal churches around the world. Not all of that experience has been positive for the Norwegian Pentecostal churches and missionaries. However, from those experiences, both the good and the problematic, reflection can be undertaken that can be of importance for the entire Pentecostal world.

On another level of mission theory, the Norwegian Pentecostal churches, as well as the other major Scandinavian Pentecostal missions, did not make a dichotomy between ministry to souls and to human need as happened in other branches of the Pentecostal world, where they generally fell into the false North American dichotomy of “liberal” and “evangelical” mission. Instead the Scandinavian Pentecostals followed the model argued and lived by Thomas Ball Barratt that called for both radical personal and social witness. In this also, the Scandinavian churches have much to teach the rest of the Pentecostal world, as well as some of the older churches.

---

The Function of the Laying on of Hands in the New Testament

John F. Tipei

INTRODUCTION

The laying on of hands was practised on numerous occasions in the Christian traditions. It was a gesture used in blessing (e.g. Mk. 10:16 par.), for healing (Mk. 5:23; 6:5; 8:23,25; 16:18; Lk. 4:40; 13:13; Acts 28:28), in commissioning and ordination (Acts 6:6; 13:2; 1 Tim. 4:14, 5:22; 2 Tim. 1:6), and for the impartation of the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:17, 19:6; Heb. 6:2). The association of the laying on of hands with aspects of Christian experience and ministry so vital for the early church ensured an important place for this gesture among its practices. One text even describes it as a foundational teaching (Heb. 6:1-2). The importance of the practice for Christianity on the one hand and for biblical studies on the other, is asserted by Jean-Thierry Maertens: "De toutes les societes religieuses, l'Eglise chrétienne est incontestablement celle qui a fait le plus large usage de l'imposition des mains dans son rituel. Elle nous offre un vaste terrain d'étude".

The purpose of this paper is to analyse the occurrences of the laying on of hands in the New Testament and to uncover in each situation the significance attached to the gesture by earliest Christianity. For a better understanding of the use and the function of the gesture by the early Christian community, we need to overview first its occurrences in the O.T. Due to the limited scope of this paper, historical aspects like origin and evolution of the gesture will be discussed only briefly, leaving aside important resources like the Graeco-Roman literature. Little attention will be given also to the philological aspect of the issue.

THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IN THE JEWISH ENVIRONMENT

Old Testament

The laying on of hands occurs in the O.T. in various contexts, either as a spontaneous gesture or as a prescribed rite.

---

1. Blessing (Gen. 48:14, 17 - tv, ejpevbalen th;n cei'ra th;n dexion (LXX); Gen. 48:18 - th;n dexion (cei'ra) (LXX)).

2. Healing (2 Kgs. 5:11 - ejpíqhsai th;n cei'ra - LXX).

3. Sacrifices: peace offerings (Lev. 3:2, 8, 13); sin offerings (Lev. 4:4, 15, 24, 29, 33; 8:14; Ex. 29:10; Num. 8:12; 2 Chr. 29:23); burnt offerings (Lev. 1:4, 10 - LXX); 8:18, 22; Ex. 29:15; Num. 8:12); and the ram of consecration (Lev. 8:22; Ex. 29:19).

4. The Day of Atonement ritual (Lev. 16:21).

5. Consecration (Num. 8:10).

6. Commissioning (Num. 27:18, 23; Deut. 34:9).

7. The passing of sentence upon a blasphemer (Lev. 24:14; Dan. 13:34 - LXX).

**Terminology**

There are basically three verbs used to designate the gesture of the laying on of hands in the Old Testament, fc, tv and rms. David Daube has demonstrated that these three verbs must be carefully distinguished. Thus, rms, the third term, to press [one's hand(s) on somebody or something], always involves a certain amount of pressure, while the former two merely have the effect of 'placing or laying hands gently on somebody or something'. The distinction between 'leaning' and 'placing' the hand is not carried over into the LXX. However, the latter two terms are translated identically by ejpotivqmi, while the former is translated by ejpibavlom. Following the LXX, the English translations speak indiscriminately of 'laying on' or 'putting on' of hands.

The verbs fc, tv appear in various contexts. They are used interchangeably in Genesis 48 to describe a gesture of blessing. A few examples will suffice:

**fc:** The dying Elisha lays his hands upon the hands of king Joas while the latter is holding his bow (2 Kgs. 13:16). Although the meaning is uncertain, the gesture seems to signify a symbolic transmission of divine power. The common phrase "to place the hand upon the mouth," as an injunction to silence, makes use of fc (e.g. Jgs. 18:19). Hands are also placed on one's head as a sign of mourning (e.g. 2 Sam. 13:19). The verb is also used to indicate the taking by force of a person: to catch Athalia, soldiers "lay hands on her" (2 Kgs. 11:16).

**tv:** YHWH lays his hand on humans (Ps. 139:5). An arbitrator can place his hands upon both parties (Job 9:33). The other verb, rms is used 25 times in the Hebrew Bible: in sacrifices (20 times), consecrations (4 times), and the passing of sentence upon a condemned person (1 time).

**Significance of the Gesture in the Old Testament**

One significance of the gesture, i.e. identification, seems to fit all O.T. contexts, perhaps with the exception of sacrifices. By laying hands on a person, one identifies directly the recipient of a blessing, condemnation, or authority. The hands laid on the sacrificial animal identifies indirectly the owner of the sacrifice as the one who receives the benefits of the rite.

The laying on of hands for blessing primarily signifies identification. Since the blessing uttered took the form of a prayer (e.g. Gen. 48:15-16), it is also possible to regard the gesture as a symbol of prayer "over" a person or group. The gesture is to be performed by a gentle placement (fc, tv) of only one hand on the head of the one receiving the blessing.

The laying on of hands in sacrificial contexts primarily signifies ownership; the owner identifies the animal as his possession and indicates indirectly that the positive result of his offering is to be accrued to him. 

---


2. Cf. J. Gray, 1 & 2 Kings (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), 542. For a different interpretation see W. Boyd Barrick, *Elisha and the Magic Bow: A Note on 2 Kings 13:15-17*, VT 35 (1985): 355-365. According to Barrick, the term in v.16a refers not to "drawing" the bow but to "stringing" it. Consequently, v.16b does not refer not to "drawing" the bow but to "stringing" it. Consequently, v.16b does not refer to "stringing" but to "drawing" the bow.
The gesture may also signify substitution, however, without including the ideas of transfer of personality and substitutionary death. In all sacrificial contexts, the gesture is performed with one hand which is pressed (rms) on the head of the sacrificial victim. The ceremony of the Azazel goat on the Day of Atonement has a distinctive significance. Here both hands are pressed on the Azazel goat to transfer on it the sins of Israel (Lev. 16:21). The laying of the people's hands on the Levites (Num. 8:10) has the same significance as in sacrifices; the Levites are offered as a wave offering of the whole people. That the gesture signifies transference of personality or duty is improbable. More likely, it signifies concomitantly both ownership (it identifies indirectly the origin of the gift) and renunciation to any claim on the Levites (they are set apart to fulfill the task appointed).

In all non-sacrificial contexts where rms is used, the underlying idea is that of transference. The laying on of hands for commissioning primarily signifies transference of office and authority. The hands are laid on a person who has already proved to be qualified for the task (e.g. Joshua, Num. 27:18). In addition to the office, the gesture is understandable to confer to the new leader a faculty (or faculties) by which he is empowered to perform the appointed task (Deut. 34:9). When hands are placed on a condemned person (Lev. 16:24; Sus. 34 [Dan 13:34 in the LXX]), the gesture identifies the alleged offender and transfers him/her some

1 I. Milgrom notes: "Identification is alien to biblical thought both because it is magical and because it presuppose the belief that death brings one close to God" (Leviticus, 1-16, 151).
2 The worshipper presents the animal as a ransom price to obtain his/her freedom (Lev. 14). Other places given by Wenham, where the term means to pay a ransom are Lev. 17:11; Num. 25:13; 35:31;33; 2 Sam. 21:3-6 (Leviticus, 59-62). So N. Kiebz, Purification Offering (JSOT 56; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 118, who criticises the position taken by Janowski, Suhne als Heilsgeschehen (Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), 218-21. In Janowski's view, the worshipper participates in the death of the animal by the laying on of hands. In contrast with the meaning of the gesture on the Day of Atonement, i.e. 'transference of personality' (Objektubertragung), in sacrificial contexts the rite represents a subjective transference, i.e. The worshipper's "life-force" is substituted by the animal's "life-force" (Subjektubertragung).
5 M.C. Sansom, 'Laying on of Hands in the Old Testament', 325.


materia - contamination or responsibility (blood-guilt which the community incurs as a result of their imposing the death penalty on him/her).

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

The laying on of hands appears in the Ascension of Isaiah, a pseudepigraphal work of Christian origin from the first century CE. Forty prophets and sons of the prophets came to Hezekiah's house in Jerusalem to meet Isaiah, in order "that he might lay his hand on them, and that they might prophesy, and that he might hear their prophecy". The use of only one hand seems to point to a gesture of blessing. However, it is also described as a means by which the prophets and the sons of prophets receive prophetic utterances. Their desire to prophesy before Isaiah so "that he might hear their prophecy" points to a self-evaluation activity; the prophets request that the genuineness of their charismatic speech would be ultimately assessed by Isaiah. As Menzies correctly shows, the Old Testament and the literature of late Judaism identify the Spirit as the source of the prophetic inspiration. Contrary to a variant reading which points to a gesture of blessing, the laying on of hands in this version of the Ascension of Isaiah can be understood as a means by which an infusion of the prophetic Spirit is effected. The closest N.T. parallel to the Ascension of Isaiah in Acts 19:6, where the descent of the Spirit manifested through prophetic utterances is mediated through the laying on of hands. In conclusion, the association of the laying on of hands with prophesying in the Ascension of Isaiah can be understood as an echo of an experience familiar to the Christian circles of the first century CE. The text is important for our investigation of those cases in the New Testament when the laying on of hands induces spiritual gifts (Acts 8:14-17; 10:44-48; 19:6; 1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6).

Qumran Literature

There is only one reference to the laying on of hands in Qumran literature. The gesture is mentioned in the Genesis Apocryphon (QapGen) as part of an exorcism-healing ritual. In the paraphrased and

3 The Greek text published by O.v. Gebhardt (Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1878, 342).
expanded version of the Genesis 12 narrative, contained in col. XX of the scroll, Pharaoh takes Sarai, the wife of Abram, into his household. As a result, Pharaoh is afflicted with a plague, so that he is "unable to approach her and, although he was with her for two years, he knew her not" (20:17). At the request of Pharaoh's servant, Abram prays for the king's deliverance, by laying hands (a) on his head. The plague is removed and the evil spirit expelled.

The text reveals that healing through the laying on of hands is current in some Jewish circles, before Jesus' time. It is possible that used here by design, to convey the idea of transference of vitality or power. A transference of some sort might be also indicated by the use of two hands, rather than one.

Rabbinic Literature

The laying on of hands appears predominantly in sacrificial contexts and ordination. Two other uses are attested, namely the laying of the hands on a criminal and on the High Priest. There is no direct evidence in the Tannaitic or Amoraic literature for the laying on of hands in blessing or healing.

The evidence seems to show that prior to the destruction of the second Temple the appointment of elders to one of the seats in the Jerusalem

1 Other parallels include Gen. 20:1-18; Gen. 26:7-11; Jud. 13:11-13; Philo, De Abst. 93-96; Josephus, Ant. 1.162-165.


Sanhedrin involved no laying on of hands, the main feature being the 'solemn seating' (or elevation to the chair). Persons so appointed bore the title of 'elders'. The laying on of hands seems to have been practised at this time by the Pharisees granting permission to their student to teach in public. This ordination may have conferred the title of 'sage'. After the destruction of the second Temple, when the Sanhedrin lost its power of appointment, the right to appoint judges was transferred from the Sanhedrin to the sages. In order not to confuse the right to judge cases involving fines with the right to instruct publicly, the ordination of students was abolished until the time of R. Judah ha-Nasi when, due to some abuses, students were once again required to obtain permission from their teachers to teach publicly. It was at about the time of this reinstitution that the right to appoint judges was transferred from individual sages to the Patriarch. If our reconstruction is correct, it is possible that in the transition period between 70 and 135 CE judges were privately appointed with the laying on of hands. After the centralisation of the appointment, the laying on of hands faded into the background until it disappeared in the fourth century.

The Significance of the Gesture in Rabbinic Ordination

According to Daube, the object of Jewish ordination is "the pouring of the ordaining scholar's personality into the scholar to be ordained". For other scholars, the meaning of the laying on of hands in Jewish ordination is the transference of Moses' spirit (or the Divine Spirit) down through all generations in an unbroken sequence. It must be said, however, that

2 Mantel, op. cit., 337. However, Mantel recognises that despite this measure, outstanding students were still given permission to teach publicly. Examples include R. Akiba for public preaching (B. Sanh.14a). According to the same source, the ordination of R. Meir was not accepted, so that he had to be ordained again by R. Judah b. Baba. Scholars explain the need for his re-ordination in different ways. Mantel suggests that R. Meir's first ordination was rendered invalid since it took place outside of Palestine, during a journey (cf. M. Yeb. 121b).
neither the notion of the creation of a second self nor the claim of an unbroken chain of ordinations can be substantiated from a Rabbinic text.

There are at least two midrashim which provide positive evidence that the laying on of hands in the ordination of a student signifies transference. According to these texts, the gesture signifies a transfer of office (or responsibility) and of some graces (e.g. wisdom) by which the tasks connected with that office may be fulfilled.

THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

From all the Old Testament contexts in which the laying on of hands occurs, only the use of hands for blessing and commissioning has been carried into the New Testament. Two other uses of the rite are characteristic of early Christianity: the laying on of hands in healing and in connection with the reception of the Spirit.

The Laying on of Hands in Healing

Jesus healed people by simply touching them (Mt. 8:3; 8:15; 9:29; 20:34; Mk. 7:33), by laying hands on them (Mk. 5:23-41; 6:5; 8:23, 25; Lk. 4:40; 13:13) and occasionally by being touched by the sick person (Mk. 5:27f. par.; Lk. 6:19 par.).

The laying on of hands in connection with the healing activity of Jesus is mentioned eight times. In three places the gesture is part of a request addressed to Jesus: Jairus pleads with Jesus to lay his hand on his daughter (Mk. 5:23; Mt. 9:18); a deaf and dumb man is brought to Jesus that he might lay his hand on him (Mk. 7:32). It follows, then, that there are only five occasions when it is clearly reported that Jesus laid his hands on the sick: on a few at Nazareth (Mk. 6:5), twice on a blind man (first "on him" [Mk. 8:23], and the second time "on his eyes" [v.25]), on many at Capernaum (Lk. 4:40) and on a woman with a "spirit of infirmity" (Lk. 13:13).

Jesus' followers are promised the power to heal the sick through the laying on of hands: "they will lay their hands on the sick, and they will recover" (Mk. 16:18). Whether or not these words go back to Jesus, they surely reflect the practice of the church in the apostolic and sub-apostolic period. That Jesus' followers used the gesture for healing is confirmed by Luke in his second book (Acts 5:12; 9:17; 14:3; 19:11; 28:8).

Terminology Used

There are twenty-five direct references in the New Testament to the laying on of hands, where the terminus technicus for the gesture is used, either in its nominal form or its verbal form. The phrase 'laying on hands' appears only four times (Acts 8:18; 1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6 and Heb. 6:2). The fact that no nominal form for the laying on of hands appears in the gospels may be an indication that terminology used here is not as set as in the rest of the New Testament. The same conclusion can be drawn from the fact that, on numerous occasions in the gospels, it is used interchangeably with other verbs of touching. The most common of these is a pteisqai which occurs mainly in healing passages (e.g. Mk. 7:32-35; 8:22-26), but is also used for blessing (e.g. Mk. 10:13-16) and as a gesture of reassurance (Mk. 17:7). Another verb of touching which appears in healing passages is kratein, to hold, to take hold of something. In healing Peter's mother-in-law, Jesus "took her by the hand and lifted her up" (Mk. 1:31), but in Mt. 8:15 he simply "touched her hand". Similarly, he reanimations Jairus' daughter by taking her hand (Mt. 9:25).

The idea of taking by the hand is also expressed by eipilambanein and piavzein, both having the same meaning, i.e. to take hold of something. Jesus heals the man with dropsy by touching him, presumably by the hand (Lk. 14:4). In his second book, Luke records the healing of a lame man by Peter: The apostle takes the man by the right hand and raises him (Acts 3:7). Finally, a verbal form of the laying on of hands, less technical than eijpiqevnai, appears in the book of Revelation. When John falls at the feet of the "one like a son of man", this divine being lays (e[ikhken) his right hand upon John (Rev. 1:17). Apparently, the gesture is not intended to transfer power; it is rather a gesture of help and encouragement.

The New Testament terminology for the laying on of hands does not distinguish between the two forms of the gesture found in the Old Testament: the pressing on of the hand(s), and the placing on of the hand(s). It is, therefore, impossible to know in each given situation whether the gesture described is a gentle placing of the hand(s) or a gesture involving significant pressure.
**The Significance of the Laying of Jesus’ Hands in Healing**

According to Calvin, "Christ laid his hands on the sick so that, commending them to the Father, he could obtain for them grace and relief from their ills". Jesus’ gesture has for Calvin an episticolic value; it is nothing more than a symbol of prayer. In Plummer’s view, Jesus laid his hands on the sick as a symbol of blessing, but this aided the faith of the sick with the result that he/she was healed. Both Calvin’s view and Plummer’s psychological interpretation of the gesture ignore, however, the clear references of the evangelists to a transfer of power by physical contact. In Mark’s version of the story of the woman with the issue of blood, Jesus perceives "in himself that power had gone forth from him (Mk. 5:30; par. Lk. 8:46). According to Luke, "All the crowd sought to touch him, for power came forth from him and healed them all" (Lk. 6:19).

It must be emphasised, however, that, according to the synoptic writers, Jesus follows no established rite when he lays hands on people for healing. In their view, all that matters for Jesus is to touch the sick, and, by doing so, to transfer his healing power to them. It must be emphasised, however, that Jesus’ gesture is just one of the means by which he transfers his "life-force" to the sick. His healing power is not bound up with any physical means of transfer.

The fact that on numerous occasions the healing miracles performed by Jesus are attributed to faith alone (e.g. Mk. 5:34; Mt. 9:22) should not be interpreted as a denial of a physical transfer of power. All three evangelists intended to convey the idea that Jesus’ body was a source of power and such power could be released physically. But it is not simply the process of touch that releases the healing power. Jesus’ power is not a mana-like power, to be contained in a human receptacle and discharged into another one by a simple touch. Jesus’ healing power is not Jesus’ own vitality or "strong personality," but the power of God imparted to him by the anointing of the Holy Spirit. Consequently, when Luke says that Jesus gives the twelve duvnamin kai ejxousivan, most likely he refers to an empowering with some supernatural faculties which are credited to the Spirit.

After Pentecost, the apostles acknowledged that the miracles they perform are done "by the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 4:10; cf. also 3:16; 9:34). For Luke, the apostles’ hands are extensions of God’s hands (4:30). God’s power to heal and do signs is released "by the name of Jesus", i.e. by the invocation of this name. The phrase "by the name of Jesus" describes not the source of the apostles’ power of miracle, but the authority given to them to use such power. Undoubtedly, as in Jesus’ case, Luke would connect the power of the Jesus’ followers to perform miracles with the Holy Spirit (Acts 6:5,8).

---

3. The term "life-force (Lebenskraft)" belongs to J. Behm. He regards the laying on of hands as "the impartation of sacred life-force, as a transfer of power in a real, physical sense" (Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum, Leipzig: Deichert, 1911, 156).

---


The strongest emphasis on the fact that Jesus' power to heal is God's power and that its source is the Holy Spirit (Lk. 4:18; Acts 10:38). It is released only when the gesture is accompanied by faith (Mk. 13:58).

The laying on of hands/touch used by the apostles in healing appears to be indistinguishable in form from the gesture used by Jesus. There is, however, one element which differentiates between the practice of Jesus and that of his disciples: The gospels never indicate that Jesus prays when he lays his hands on the sick. Does this variation give one a biblical basis for distinguishing between the significance of the laying on of hands in healing by Jesus and of the gesture used by his followers? Can we speak, like in Jesus’ case, about a transfer of power through the hands or is the apostles' gesture merely symbolic?

When Jesus sent the twelve apostles to preach the kingdom of God, he "gave them authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal every disease and every infirmity" (Mt. 10:1 par.; in Luke’s version, duvnamin kai ejxousivan, 9:1). According to Luke, Jesus transfers his healing power to the twelve, but there is no indication as to what method of transfer is used (i.e. by word alone, by touching, by laying on of hands). But, as argued earlier, Luke makes it clear that Jesus’ power is not an impersonal, mana-like power, to be contained in a human receptacle and discharged into another one by a simple touch. Jesus’ healing power is not Jesus’ own vitality or "strong personality," but the power of God imparted to him by the anointing of the Holy Spirit.

---

1. Max Turner, ‘The Spirit and the Power of Jesus’ Miracles in the Lucan Conception’, *NovT* 33/2 (1991): 124-152. Eric May summarises the traditional view of the Latin Fathers and Catholic theologians: The traditional view has been that this power can be said to have gone out of Christ in its effect, the power itself remaining immanent but operating exteriorly at no loss to itself, as a cause is realised in its effect*, ‘... For Power Went Forth from Him...’, *CBQ* 14 2(1952), 101.
In conclusion, there is no biblical basis in distinguishing between the significance of the laying on of hands by Jesus and the gesture used by his apostles. In both cases, the gesture signifies transference of healing power to the sick. Given the distinctive element of prayer in the practice of the apostles, the gesture may have in this case an additional significance; it may be understood as a symbol of the epiclesis by which the name of Jesus is invoked.1

The Laying on of Hands in Blessing

The story of Jesus blessing the children is recorded by all three synoptic evangelists. Little children (παιδία, Luke has δεραυφί) are brought to Jesus, presumably by their parents in order that he "might touch them" (Matthew has "in order that he might lay hands on them and pray", 19:13).2 The purpose of the parents' action is not plainly stated. Are the children brought for blessing, healing or some other favour? None of the parallel accounts gives any hint that the gesture is requested for healing.3 If the gospel writers understood healing to be the Sitz im Leben for this episode, most likely they would have said so and the parents' action would have not met the opposition of the disciples. Without attempting to identify the reason(s) behind the request addressed to Jesus, Derrett argues that the request is based on an "intercultural, international superstition" in the magical power of the hand.4 Although some

2 The plural does not necessarily describe a gesture performed with both hands. More likely, it is part of a fixed expression. Cf. J. Ysebaert, Greek Baptismal Terminology, 255.
3 Coena J. Sauer, 'Der ursprüngliche Sitz im Leben von Mark 10:13-16,' ZNW 72 (1981): 27-30. The possibility of a gesture of healing is also contemplated by J. Ysebaert: 'The gesture performed by Jesus is called by Mark a blessing. Nonetheless, it may not be so clearly distinguishable from the gesture of healing. Jesus might in the first place have been asked to touch the children on account of the salutary effect which was associated with touching as a gesture of healing. For this reason the episode cannot be taken as proof that the imposition of hands as a gesture of blessing was generally known' (Greek Baptismal Terminology, 255).
4 Derrett is probably wrong in concluding that, in rebuking the children, the disciples tried to shield Jesus from being treated as a source of magical power ('Why Jesus Blessed the Children', NovT 25 (1983), 11). As Gundry notes, to attribute the disciples a discernment superior to that of their contemporaries would be flattering on Mark's part and in disagreement with the general non-laudatory portrayal of them by Mark (Mark: A Commentary of His Apology for the Cross, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, 547). The reason for the disciples' irritation appears to be their (and their contemporaries') view of children as unimportant to the mission of Jesus, incapable of having a saving faith (F.D. Bruner, Matthew, vol. 2 [Dallas: Word Publishing, 1990], 694). A low view of children appears to have been pervasive, especially in the ranks of religious leaders. The Mishnah gives us a glimpse of what the attitude of the educated was toward children. R. Dosa ben Archinos said: "Morning sleep, midday wine, chattering with children and tarrying in places where men of the common people assemble, destroy a man" (M. Aboth 3.10, in TDNT 5:646). Cf. also J.D. Kingsbury, Matthew as Story (1986), 116. An alternative explanation is given by Nolland who thinks that the disciples' sense of self-importance is offended by the approach of the children (Luke 1, 81-82).

5 Matthew mentions only Jesus' gesture in response to the request presented to him and Luke omits it altogether. Luke's interest is to show that the Kingdom of God belongs to the humble (Lk. 18:16). It can be deduced from the setting in which he placed the story, i.e. after the parable of the tax-collector and the Pharisee.

6 J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism (London: SCM Press, 1960), 49, reference being made to the tractate Sopherim 18:5 (see section 2.4.2.4). The disciples' indignation is explained by Jeremias as arising out of this situation; "the disciples reject the idea that Jesus should be treated as on a level with the scribes" (49).

John F Tipei: The Function of the Laying on of Hands In the New Testament
blessing as a fluid, coming down through the hands and being transferred through physical contact. As Lenski puts it, "the blessing did not flow through the hands but came through the words of Jesus." The gesture is merely a symbol of a transfer of blessing from one person to another. The symbolistic nature of the laying on of hands in blessing is confirmed by its ancillary character in other passages. No physical contact is used when Simeon blesses Jesus' parents (Lk. 2:34) and a stretching out of the hands towards the group suffices when a large group is blessed (Lk. 24:50). It can be concluded, therefore, that the purpose for a gesture of blessing (be it a simple touch, the laying on of hands or the stretching out of the hands) is primarily to identify the person(s) who receive the blessing. The laying on of hands may also function as a powerful symbol of communication between human beings. Aside from the blessing bestowed by it, the gesture is also a sign of Jesus' identification with and acceptance of this rejected category of human beings.

The Laying on of Hands for the Reception of the Spirit

There are only three cases in the Book of Acts when the laying on of hands is mentioned along with the reception of the Holy Spirit: (a) Coming to Samaria to visit the new converts whom Philip baptised, the apostles Peter and John "prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit... Then they laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit" (8:15,17). (b) While laying his hands on Saul, Ananias says: "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus who appeared to you on the road by which you came, has sent me that you may regain your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit. And immediately something like scales fell from his eyes and he regained his sight" (9:17). Nothing is said about Saul receiving the Holy Spirit. It is either an omission on Luke's part or, in view of 9:12 where the laying on of hands seems to be intended for healing only, Saul received the Holy Spirit later on, perhaps in connection with his baptism. (c) Paul meets in Ephesus some "disciples" who know nothing of his baptism. "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus who appeared to you on the road by which you came has sent me that you may regain your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit... Then they laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit" (19:6). Nothing is said about Saul receiving the Holy Spirit.

1 The verb κατατέθηκαν used by Mark, I venture to suggest that it may be understood to describe Jesus bending down to bless the children.


Jesus, ... Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they spoke with tongues and prophesied" (19:6).

For Luke, the laying on of hands is not an indispensable accessory for the reception of the Spirit. Out of five Spirit-baptism passages in Acts (2:4; 8:14-17; 9:12,17-18; 10:44-48; 19:1-6), only three mention the laying on of hands (8:17; 9:17; 19:6). In one passage, (9:12,17-18), the connection between the gesture and the reception of the Spirit cannot be established with certainty. Thus, in only two places in Acts the giving of the Spirit is attributed to the laying on of hands (8:14-17; 19:1-6). A third locus classicus in the N.T. for the laying on of hands as a means of conferring the Holy Spirit is in Hebrews 6:2. Here the gesture appears to the established rite by which the Spirit is conferred.

Acts 8:14-17
At least three things can be inferred from the language employed by Luke in his redactional note of v.16. First, 'for not yet... may indicate that the situation of the Samaritan converts was abnormal. If anything was abnormal, it was the fact that they were lacking something which they should have already had; they were lacking the Holy Spirit who has not fallen yet on any of them. The abnormality did not consist in the fact that their baptism failed to convey the gift of the Spirit. Against the view expressed by some authors, it must be made clear that water baptism in Acts 2:38 is not made by Luke the locus for the reception of the Holy Spirit.

1 The composition of Hebrews is generally dated the earliest in the 60's and no later than 95 C.E. Clement of Rome quoted it extensively in I Clement written about 95 C.E. For arguments, see H.W. Attridge, Hebrews, 6-9; A. Hagner, The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome (NovTSup 34; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 179-181; Ellingworth, Hebrews and 1 Clement: Literary Dependence or Common Tradition, BZ 23 (1979): 285-89. An earlier date (sometime between 52 C.E. and 54 C.E.) is suggested by B.W. Monaco, The Epistle to the Hebrews (1964), 12, on the assumption that the author was Apollos and that he wrote from Ephesus to the church in Corinth.
5 For Luke, the laying on of hands is not an indispensable accessory for the reception of the Spirit. Out of five Spirit-baptism passages in Acts (2:1-4; 8:14-17; 9:12,17-18; 10:44-48; 19:1-6), only three mention the laying on of hands (8:17; 9:17; 19:6). In one passage, (9:12,17-18), the connection between the gesture and the reception of the Spirit cannot be established with certainty. Thus, in only two places in Acts the giving of the Spirit is attributed to the laying on of hands (8:14-17; 19:1-6). A third locus classicus in the N.T. for the laying on of hands as a means of conferring the Holy Spirit is in Hebrews 6:2. Here the gesture appears to the established rite by which the Spirit is conferred.
Spirit; rather, it is understood as a normal (but not absolute, cf. Acts 10:44) condition. Both Acts 2:38 and the "not yet" of 8:16 suggest that the Holy Spirit was expected to be received at the beginning of one’s Christian experience (cf. also 9:17, 10:44; 19:6).

Secondly, the use of ejpipivptein, to fall upon, is descriptive of the mode in which the Spirit was expected to come. Although the terms of this verb are different from those which describe the coming of the Spirit (baptivzesqai ejn (1:5), ejpevrcesqai (1:8), pimphmi (2:4), lambavnein (2:38), or didovnai), in terms of mode of operation ejpipivptein describes a sudden and unmediated outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The outpouring of the Spirit on people is a well-known Old Testament motif. Luke’s understanding of the mode in which the Spirit will operate in the New Age is expressed in Acts 2:16-21. The Spirit will be poured in the same way, i.e. through outpourings, the only difference being that the subjects are not select individuals, but the entire ejkklhsia. That this was the normal mode in which the Spirit was expected to come upon the early Christians may be also inferred from other occurrences of the verb. In Cornelius’ house, the Holy Spirit "fell on all those who were listening the word" (Acts 10:44). In 11:15 it is used with reference to the descent of the Spirit directly from heaven on both Cornelius’ household and the original group on the Day of Pentecost. The variant reading of 8:39 in the Western text describes the sudden coming of the Spirit on the eunuch: "And when they came out of the water, the Holy Spirit fell on [him] and an angel of the Lord caught up [him]."

Thirdly, the adverb 'only' in its setting here indicates the reason why the Samaritan believers did not receive the Holy Spirit: "they had only been baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus". The implication is that Luke did not consider the giving of the Spirit to be integral to water baptism. It is interesting to see how some authors draw the opposite conclusion, when the language seems so clear. If Luke wanted to describe a deficient baptism, he would not have said "For [the Holy Spirit] has not fallen on any of them, in spite (ei j kai; cf. Lk. 11:8; 18:4) of their being baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus?"

Acts 19:1-6
The question is why it was necessary for Paul to lay hands on the Ephesian disciples? Dunn reduces the weight of this question by assuming in vv. 5f., a complex ceremony which included baptism and the laying on of hands:

The laying on of hands in v.6 must therefore be the climax of a single ceremony whose most important element is baptism, and whose object is the reception of the Spirit. This is born out by the form of vv. 5f., which could be translated: "... they were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus and, Paul having laid hands on them, the Holy Spirit came on them." The laying on of hands is almost parenthetical; the sequence of events is 'baptism (resulting in) ... Spirit'. Certainly the one action

witnesses as due either to accidental omission or to deliberate excision because of its variance with the account in verses 15-18, where it is implied that the Holy Spirit was bestowed only through the laying on of the hands of the apostles".

Most authors translate ujpairein simply by "to be" and leave it untranslated, since the clause can be construed without the verb. It is rather doubtful that Luke intended ujpairein to be superfluos. According to Thayer, ujpairein cannot be rendered by "to begin below" or "to make a beginning" (Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, 638). Consequently, the clause can be translated "for they only made a beginning (or took the first step) [by having been baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus.]" This is in complete accord with Acts 2:38 where baptism is the normal prerequisite ("first step") for the reception of the Spirit (though not an absolute condition). The implication of the above translation is that the Samaritans did not advance in their religious experience beyond their Christian-initiation which is understood by Luke as the first step. For some reason they did not take the second step which would confer the Holy Spirit.

1 Acts 2:38. First, the reference to baptism here might be a redactional insertion which reflects the normal religious experience of the new converts at the time when Luke composed the book of Acts. Secondly, the distinct function of baptism is clearly indicated in this verse: it is to be performed "for (causal) the forgiveness of sins" or "in order to obtain forgiveness of sins" (Lk. 1:19-21). This is the normal mode in which the Spirit was expected to come upon the early Christians may be also inferred from other occurrences of the verb. In Cornelius’ house, the Holy Spirit "fell on all those who were listening the word" (Acts 10:44). In 11:15 it is used with reference to the descent of the Spirit directly from heaven on both Cornelius’ household and the original group on the Day of Pentecost. The variant reading of 8:39 in the Western text describes the sudden coming of the Spirit on the eunuch: "And when they came out of the water, the Holy Spirit fell on [him] and an angel of the Lord caught up [him]."

4 The variant reading in italics. Cf. B. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), 360: "Some scholars, holding the longer reading to be the original, have explained its absence in the other
Significance of the Gesture

The scene following the reception of the Spirit by the Samaritans throws some light upon how Luke did not understand the laying on of hands. The narrator is critical of two misconceptions that Simon displays. First, Simon conceives the power manifested through the apostles as a sort of mana, and this points to his Hellenistic background. Luke is critical of such conception. For him, the Holy Spirit is not an impersonal power which, manipulated skillfully, becomes the source of wonders and portents; it is rather the controlling power by which the mission of the Church is carried out. Secondly, Simon regards the laying on of the apostles' hands as a "specially effective piece of magic" which, if he could obtain, would work on anyone on whom he lays his hands. It is noteworthy that Luke's criticism is not directed specifically to Simon's association of the Spirit with the laying on of hands. Luke himself believed that the "gift of God" can come through human hands (cf. also 9:17; 19:6). In Peter's words, Luke addresses Simon's misconception that the bestowal of the Holy Spirit can be manipulated at the discretion of the one who possesses it. The association of the apostles' laying on of hands with magic by Simon could not be condoned by Luke. The emphasis he places on the apostles' prayer indicates that for him the Holy Spirit is indeed a "gift" which God bestows, not men. The laying on of hands was, at best, the channel through which such gift was transmitted.

Following Lampe, Menzies understands the laying of the hands on the Samaritan believers as a rite of commissioning. The new converts are commissioned by the two apostles to the missionary task of the church. Unlike the seven deacons (6:6) or Paul and Barnabas (13:3), the Samaritan converts do not possess the gift of the Spirit before their commissioning; it is necessary, therefore, that the Spirit would be given at the time of their commissioning, as an empowering which makes them

---

1 Irenæus (Against Heresies 1.23) claims that Simon was the founder of Gnosticism and the leader of a sect known as Simonians.
2 Contra Bousset who thought that the Spirit is depicted in Acts as an impersonal power working apart from Christ (cited in C.S.C. Williams, The Acts of the Apostles, 293; see also Schweizer, pneuma in TDNT VI).
4 Haenchen, Acts, 304.
5 Lampe, Seal, 77. According to Dix, the laying on of hands in Acts was a rite of ordination for prophets (Confirmation, or Laying on of Hands?, 1936, 23).
fit to carry out the missionary task of the church. Therefore, the Samaritans are commissioned to and empowered for the missionary task of the church, all in one ceremony. However, the reception of the Spirit was not integral to the rite, but rather a "supplementary element".1

It is unlikely, however, that the apostles commissioned by the laying on of hands each convert to be a missionary, conducting a sort of mass commissioning ceremonies; Luke does not present the majority of the converts as being involved in evangelistic activities.2 Menzies' thesis overlooks the fact that the close association of the reception of the Spirit with conversion suggests that the gift of the Spirit is not exclusively seen by Luke as an empowering for mission. Secondly, the Jewish model which, according to Menzies, has been taken over by the church implied a period of training or some spiritual qualifications before a person could be commissioned for service. Joshua was both trained in leadership and had the Spirit of God before he was ordained. Similarly, a Jewish rabbi was ordained only after extensive training and after practicing for a while the skill of teaching under the supervision of his master.

Referring to the Samaritan believers, Horton suggests that "it is better here also to take the laying on of hands as a means of encouraging their faith and as preceding or at least distinct from the coming of the Spirit".3 But, such psychological interpretation which dissociates the descent of the Spirit from the laying on of hands contradicts Luke's clear statement that "the Spirit was given through the laying on of the apostles' hands" (8:18). On the other hand, we agree with Barrett's statement that "the Spirit does not respond to certain stimuli, such as the laying on of hands ... but is given solely ubi et quando visum est Deo".4

Probably, the best understanding of the gesture here is to consider it a symbol of prayer which accompanies the invocation of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Even when no mention is made of prayer (19:6), one can rightly see the gesture as an expression of an epiclesis, the calling down of the Holy Spirit.

The Laying on of Hands in Ordination

The first instance of ordination with the laying on of hands is recorded by Luke in connection with the appointment (kaqivsthmi) of the seven deacons (Acts 6:6). The hand-laying is accompanied by prayer and seems to be performed by the entire congregation. The other reference to the laying on of hands for appointment in Acts (13:3) has to do with the commissioning of Saul and Barnabas. Again, the gesture is associated with prayer and seems to be performed by the entire congregation.5

In 1 Timothy 4:14, Timothy is exhorted by Paul: "Do not neglect the gift you have, which was given you by prophetic utterance when the council of elders laid their hands upon you." In 2 Timothy 1:6, referring probably to the same incident, Paul reminds Timothy, "to rekindle the gift of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands." It is not clear whether the "gift" in both texts refers to the gift of the Holy Spirit or to a "spiritual gift" that makes Timothy effective in his duties. However, most commentators take the two references to the laying on of hands as descriptive of an ordination rite. The third reference to the laying on of hands in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 5:22) comes again in connection with an exhortation: "Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands, nor participate in another man's sins". Although some take the verse to refer to the laying on of hands in baptism,6 the restoring of fallen elders,7 the initiation of a...

---

1 Development, 259f. A view similar to that held by Menzies is that suggested by Dom Gregory Dix who understands the laying on of hands as a ceremony of ordination, namely "the Ordination of prophets" (Confirmation, or Laying on of Hands?, 1916, 18-19, 23).
2 See Turner, Power from on High, 359: "Luke does not suggest that all converts were immediately impelled by the Spirit to mission (the only new convert Luke implies quickly became involved in witness and evangelism was Paul (Acts 9:20)!" cf. also 398-99.
3 What Do They Say about the Holy Spirit (1976), 162.
6 Tertullian, On Baptism XVIII; Daube, New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, 144.
process of accusation,1 or even to contemporary cultic practices,2 most commentators see here a reference to a rite of ordination. Daube's suggestion that "the laying on of hands of the presbytery" in 1 Timothy 4:14 should be read "the laying on of hands in order to make elders" has stirred much debate. However, the Rabbinic phrase had primary reference to the laying of the elders' hands on the communal sacrifice.3

Significance of the Gesture

Ordination in Acts 6:6 and 13:3 is modelled on Numbers 8:10, rather than on the ordination of Joshua by Moses (Num. 27:18,20; Deut. 34:9), since the whole congregation lays hands. It is, therefore, a gesture of consecration rather than one of creating a second-self. Although the form and the terminology of ordination are present in Acts 13, the common meaning of ordination is not there. Barnabas' and Saul's previous activity (11:24ff.; 13:1; Gal. 1:21) and also Paul's statement in Galatians 1 about his apostleship prevent the understanding of the ceremony as ordination.4 In fact, the purpose of the rite is stated in 14:26: by the laying on of hands, the two missionaries were "entrusted to the grace of God". From the association of the laying of hands with prayer in 13:3 and Luke's comment in 14:26, it becomes clear that what we have here is a symbol of blessing.5

The main significance of the laying on of hands in the ordination of Timothy is the commissioning of ministers to proclaim the Word. Secondly, the gesture signifies, like in the O.T., the bestowal of some charismata to enable the person ordained to fulfil his ministry. Thirdly, by its association with prayer, the gesture seems to draw in the concept of blessing. It may be, therefore, a symbol of the invocation of the Holy Spirit to bring the needed charismata. The context is clearly charismatic (see the emphasis on ajmeleew and ajnazwpurei 'n); the rite is not institutionalised yet. From all the above and the fact that Timothy is ordained by a college of presbyters, the ordination in the Pastorals cannot be understood as an "apostolic succession". In conclusion, it may be said that ordination in the sense of creating a second-self cannot be found in the N.T.1

1 R.R. Woodward, A Commentary on 1 & 2 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon (Abilene, TX: ACU, 1985), 81.
4 Parratt, "The Laying on of Hands", 213.

From the ends of the earth to the ends of the earth" - The Expansion of Finnish Pentecostal Missions from 1927-1997

Veli-Matti Karkkainen

INTRODUCTION

For a relatively small religious group, the Finnish Pentecostals are zealously missions conscious. These men and women are not sent out by a central missionary society, but are dependent on local congregations for their support.¹

The Finnish Free Foreign Missions (FFFM)², the common missions board for the Finnish Pentecostal churches, is celebrating its 70th anniversary in 1997. After 70 years of aggressive missions work it is appropriate to offer a modest assessment of the work and its expansion. The purpose of this paper³ is to inquire into the growth and expansion of the Finnish Pentecostal foreign mission as it launches toward the third millennium.⁴ As a theoretical framework we make use of the basic thesis set out by Paul Pierson of the School of World Mission of Fuller Theological Seminary (Pasadena, CA). Pierson offers an interesting consideration of the basic factors that contribute to the growth and expansion of missionary enterprises.⁵

The missionary endeavours of the Finnish Pentecostals have long escaped the notice of western missologists at international level. Information concerning the Finnish Pentecostal Mission is surprisingly scarce in English. From the history of missions perspective, the Finnish Pentecostal Missions provides an interesting phenomenon for investigation. The proportion of missionaries is very high among these churches. The approximately 45,000 Pentecostals are currently sponsoring more than 400 full-time missionaries in almost 40 different countries.

The sources for this study are: 1) historical documents of the movement supplemented by other relevant material pertaining to the development of religious, social and historical conditions in Finland during this century, 2) statistics and information provided by the FFFM-office at Helsinki, 3) missiological literature bearing on the Pentecostal perspectives on missions.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE GROWTH OF MISSIONS

Paul Pierson has argued that there are 8 specific factors which contribute to the growth of foreign missions⁶:

1. Two structures: modality and sodality
2. Theological breakthroughs
3. Spiritual dynamic
4. Missions structures
5. Historical contextual conditions
6. Key persons
7. Information distribution
8. Leadership patterns.

1. Two structures: sodality and modality. This thesis describes the two church structures that God has used in church history - the church congregational (or nurture) structure, sometimes called "modality" and the church mission structure (parachurch organizations), sometimes called "sodality". Usually it has been the case that mission structures ("sodality") have been more mobile, elitist and more committed and innovative whereas congregational structures have tended to be more inclusive and locally oriented. The thesis states the normative use of both structures as part of God's redemptive purpose. The thesis recognizes the strengths and weaknesses of each of these structures and their interdependent nature.

2. Theological breakthroughs. This thesis refers to the observation that most new expansion and renewal movements have been accompanied by

² Interestingly enough, "Finland", the name of our country in English (the same root also in any western language, like Finnland in Swedish, and Finnland in German), refers in the original to the uttermost parts of the earth, i.e. "the ends of the earth".
³ An original version of this paper was written as a research paper for the School of World Mission of Fuller Seminary and later as an expanded version for prerequisite studies for the Th.D.-degree at the University of Helsinki, Department of Ecumenics and Missiology.
⁴ The Finnish Pentecostal Movement is an indigenous Scandinavian body of independent churches that are very mission-conscious.

1 Pierson, Historical Development.
a new understanding of some aspects of the Gospel or the Christian life previously unseen or forgotten.

3. Spiritual dynamic. Various elements seem to accompany renewal and expansion such as renewed experience with God, koinonia, and small group activity, lay leadership, renewed study of the Scriptures, new hymnology, use of spiritual gifts, mystical experiences with God, sacrificial dedication of one's life for God's sake etc. This thesis seeks to describe the underlying causes of the spiritual dynamic of expansion or renewal movements.

4. Mission structures. A major thesis that Pierson emphasizes is the use of mission structures in the expansion of the Gospel into new areas: cultural, geographical, linguistic. This thesis seeks to understand the patterns of the mission structures, their associations with each other and with the congregational structures and with the new Christianity arising from their efforts. A part of this thesis involves the generation of new mission theory and application of it by the mission structures to the expansion of the Gospel.

5. Historical contextual conditions. A key element in new movements of renewal and expansion is the historical context. There appear to be certain times when the contextual situations are "right" so that something really happens. This thesis seeks to posit that idea and to describe it.

6. Key persons. This thesis recognizes that breakthroughs, expansion, renewal movements and the like are almost always triggered by one or more key persons.

7. Information distribution. There is a contagion with movements. The spread of information about movements results in new offshoots of movements. And what is true about movements in general is true of ideas in particular.

8. Leadership patterns. Expansion, movements, and the like usually happen because of the emergence of new leadership patterns for selection and training and ministry functions. This thesis examines that dynamic.

It is in the light of these 8 specific factors that we attempt to take a critical, analytical look at the emergence, development and expansion of the FFFM-work and draw conclusions as to what degree the theory of Pierson can be validated in this specific context.
As far as political and religious conditions are concerned, Dr. Lauri Ahonen \(^1\) sees the following factors to have been the most crucial in contributing to the missionary consciousness of the emerging Pentecostal movement in Finland: (1) the political climate with all kinds of independence yearnings prepared the population at large to accept new ideas and to fight for them; (2) the religious developments were generally directed toward evangelical and fundamental Christianity; (3) various revival movements in the Lutheran State Church and also in the Free Churches had opened the Finnish mind to a more enthusiastic Christian perspective; (4) the missionary endeavours had already begun.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENT IN FINLAND AFTER THE TURN OF THE 20\textsuperscript{TH} CENTURY

The Pentecostal Movement was brought to Finland via other Scandinavian countries (Sweden and Norway). The Scandinavian Pentecostal movement started with the charismatic encounter of a Methodist minister, Thomas Barratt of Norway. While on a fund raising tour in the United States, he received the baptism of the Holy Spirit in New York in November, 1906. Upon his return to Norway, Pentecostal revival broke out. The revival gained continental fame and visitors from all over Europe came to see it. Soon, Barratt was invited also to Finland, but his visit was delayed until 1911.\(^2\)

An influential factor in the Pentecostal beginnings was the interdenominational magazine "Kotimaa" (Homeland), which was launched at the beginning of 1906 by Pekka Brofeldt, a revivalist of the Finnish Missionary Society.\(^3\) In summer 1912, the emerging movement held its first baptismsal service. The believers also shared together Holy Communion. At the same time, the Pentecostal magazine Ristin Voitto (The Victory of the Cross) was issued (at first, it was a translation of Barratt's magazine).

In the beginning, the movement was very loose and was made up of representatives from various denominations. Later on, however, those who had experienced the Pentecostal experience were disregarded and often denounced by their mother churches. Thus, gradually, a group was formed out of necessity.\(^4\)

Organization and theological development of the emerging Pentecostal Movement

The new movement gained considerable strength from several clergymen who had received both solid theological training and the Pentecostal experience. There were a variety of theological viewpoints which compelled the Pentecostals to ponder their distinctive beliefs: (1) the issue of sanctification: "perfectionism" was rejected; (2) overemphasis of prophesying; (3) "Jesus only" doctrine; (4) universalism.\(^5\) The most crucial doctrines to be decided were the doctrines of the baptism with the Holy Spirit and of the church (local church). The doctrine of the baptism with the Holy Spirit was understood very much in line with the emerging worldwide Pentecostalism, although the doctrinal statement on speaking in tongues as 'initial evidence' was never formulated. In terms of the doctrine of the church, the majority adopted the view of the pre-eminence of the local church which was to be one of the key characteristics of this movement. The final decision was made in 1920. The concept of the local church developed according to the pattern found in the book of Acts. The elders were put in charge of administration, teaching and teaching. The deacons assisted in practical aspects of ministry. Preachers, or preachers in larger churches, were usually in the paid fulltime ministry.

Organizationally, the movement was, and continues to be, extremely loose; total autonomy of the local churches is emphasized. According to the legislation in Finland, the Pentecostal Movement is not even registered as a church/denomination. However, the movement has a common publishing house, missions board, Home Missions Fund, Bible School and other related associations which seek to consolidate the unity of the movement.\(^6\)

The importance of the crucial role of the local church must not be neglected when we consider the factors which have contributed to the growth of foreign missions among Finnish Pentecostals. It has to be noted, that the role of the laity has been crucial in all kinds of ministries among Finnish Pentecostals. There is no official clergy or priesthood.

\(^{1}\) ibid, 10-11.
\(^{3}\) Ahonen, L., Helluntaihärtyksen historia, 37-41.

\(^{4}\) Ahonen, L., Missions Growth, 31.
\(^{6}\) Ahonen, L., Missions Growth, 40.
rather a "brotherhood". Surprisingly, the clergy who joined the Movement abandoned their ecclesiastical titles to stress the equality between all believers.

The role of pioneer missionaries in creating missions-consciousness among Pentecostal churches

One of the most powerful means of influencing followers is by example. The Scriptures explicitly indicate that men in Christian leadership positions should lead by their examples... It seems that example of missionaries is an essential factor in the growth of the missions. If the missionaries cannot initiate missionary enthusiasm, who can?1

The first Pentecostal missionary was Emil Anselm Danielsson (1878-1965). Before his career began, he had helped missionaries at the mission station of Kaumu (Kenya). On the way home, he met with Barratt in Norway and received a call, through a prophecy, to enter into missionary work in Africa. In 1912, Danielsson was consecrated to missionary work with two foreign ministers, G. Smidt, and J.H. King. At that time no Pentecostal churches existed as such. Furthermore, Danielsson left on his own as a faith missionary. At the time of World War I he returned home. After marrying a young woman, he planned to return to mission field, but due to a sudden illness of his wife, he had to remain in Finland. As the first Finnish Pentecostal missionary, his efforts have had a permanent influence on the Finnish and other Scandinavian Pentecostals.2

The second Pentecostal missionaries were Nikolai and Martta Poysti. After a serious illness he committed his life totally to missions, and began to work among Russians in 1923 (his mother was Russian). Upon their return to Finland in 1926, the Poystis joined the Filadelfia Church of Helsinki, and Nikolai became the senior pastor. This three year furlough in Finland was very fruitful for the cause of the missions. The Smyrna Church of Turku (a Finnish Pentecostal congregation) adopted the Poystis as missionaries and sponsored them to the mission field. The Poystis have been very influential in the development of Pentecostal missions, at least in two ways: first, through their own example they inspired many young men and women to commit their life to the missions, and secondly, their role was important at the beginning of the Finnish free foreign missions; Nikolai Poysti served for a while as the first president.1

Toimi Yrjola was the third missionary of the Finnish Pentecostals. Interestingly enough, he too committed his life to mission after a very serious illness. In 1926, at the age of 17, he entered the Missionary Training School of the Finnish Missionary Society (Lutheran). But when he received believers' baptism he was dismissed from the school, and he joined the Saalem Church of Helsinki in 1929. Within a short period of time, the necessary support was raised, and Yrjola was sent to China in 1929. His first term in China was very fruitful. He built a large church in Manchuria and introduced the Gospel to other cities as well. Yrjola travelled extensively in Finland and appealed to the Pentecostal believers. That year saw an explosion in missionary enthusiasm. Also his second term was a period of growth in China. After World War II Yrjolas left for China for the third term.2

During the furlough that followed the third term a most influential development took place in Finland. An old minesweeper was remodeled to become a floating mission station. The crew was composed of new missionaries, 28 adults and several children left with this ship. Toimi Yrjola was in charge of that new missionary "exodus". At first, the ship sailed to Ceylon and India in 1955. This mission ship is one of the reasons why Toimi Yrjola is commonly recognized as the most influential missionary among the Finnish Pentecostals so far. He has personally ushered a number of missionaries to the mission fields and has influenced many more to go. His writings continuously inspired younger generation to engage in missionary endeavor.

As can be seen from our brief survey thus far, the rise and later expansion of the mission of the Finnish Pentecostals was in a large measure the result of these key persons who by their example and appeal created a new consciousness of the need for world evangelization. Almost all the new missionaries of the first generation were in some way or another influenced by these great heroes, not to speak of their later influence on future generations!

1 Ahonen, L., Missions Growth, 48-49. Kuosmanen, J., "Suomen helluntaitheräyksen historia", 56.
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**Expansion of the missionary endeavour of Finnish Pentecostal Movement**

After World War II, foreign missions grew explosively. At that time, it was extremely difficult to get even visas or currency; however, new missionaries in some way or another found their ways to various mission fields. Those who went overseas had extremely strong faith. Missionaries were consecrated to the work by their own churches but usually the churches were unable to support them, the only support was in the form of prayer. This is what has been called 'missionaries of the one-way-ticket'-mentality.1

At times, in China, there were 17 Finnish Pentecostal missionaries! Hundreds of converts were baptized during the short period before the great country was finally closed in 1950. From China Pentecostal missionaries went to many countries and all over the world. Furthermore, new missionaries had grown up in the homeland, some of which went e.g. to Kenya and Israel.2 Statistics show the explosive growth of the Finnish Pentecostal mission after the World War II:3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Missionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>10 missionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>30 missionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>170 missionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>271 missionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>327 missionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>399 missionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>425 missionaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It might also be interesting to have a look at the growth of the funds channelled to foreign missions among the Finnish Pentecostals (unfortunately, statistics are available only from 1972 to 1985):4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount of Funds (FMK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2,4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>6,3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>10,8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>16,0 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these funds, Finnish Pentecostals have also been active in terms of Christian international development aid: in 1985, 10,8 million FMK (about 2,5 million US dollars) were channelled to these projects in many foreign countries. A recent treatise on the history of Finnish Pentecostal Movement - in fact the first comprehensive one ever written by a Pentecostal scholar - states:5

In terms of growth, Scandinavian Pentecostal churches have been at the top of mission statistics. Sweden's 100,000 Pentecostals have sent out over 900 missionaries, Norway's 35,000 Pentecostals have sent out around 350 missionaries. Finnish Pentecostals have sent out over 400 missionaries. The ratio of missionaries to church members is about 1/100. This great missions enthusiasm is unique even on an international scale. Nowadays Finnish Pentecostals are working with more than 420 missionaries in almost 40 different countries, in every continent. Bible colleges have been established in Japan, Kenya, Taiwan, Thailand, Uganda, Uruguay. The former USSR has been opening up for Christian missionary work and many kinds of social and evangelistic missionary activities are going on by Finnish Pentecostals in that area too.

**Organizational and theological understanding of missions**

In attempting to discern the factors which have contributed to the growth of the Finnish Pentecostal mission, we have to consider next both the way it has organized the missionary activities and the underlying theological view of missions as a part of the ministry of the local church. As we mentioned earlier, in 1928 the organization called The Finnish Free Foreign Missions was established. Nikolai Poysti's role was crucial here. Actually, this organization was under the supervision of the Philadelphia Church of Helsinki. The organization had already sent out one missionary, Anna Kempe, to Tibet, and plans were made for sending others, too. The reason for founding this new mission board was to help local churches in practical matters, like its "sisterorganization" Finnish Missionary Society (Lutheran) was doing. However, local churches opposed the idea of central organisation, because it was seen as a threat to the autonomy of the local churches. Consequently, the new organization was closed down for two decades.6

---

2 Kuosmanen, J., Herätyksen historia, 357.
3 Ahonen, L., Suomen helluntaihäitäjöksen historia, 370. Information from the headquarters of FFFM-office, Helsinki.
4 Information provided by the FFFM-headquarters (Helsinki).
5 Schmidt, W., Die Pfingstbewegung, 201.
6 Westman, K.B., Pohjoismaiden lähetystöhistoria, 107.
Meanwhile, the Helsinki Saalem Church, the leading Pentecostal church, had founded its own mission board called "SaalemMission" in 1929. However, the Finnish Free Foreign Mission, as a mission board, was "revived" in 1950. But now, it was made clear that the mission board was not going to replace local churches and their sovereign autonomy. The only purpose of the Finnish Free Foreign Mission was to assist in all kinds of practical matters, e.g. applying for visas and currency as well as assisting in legal matters. Mr. Odin Finell was invited to become the first general secretary. According to the official announcement, the mission board "honours the principle of the Bible, according to which mission is cooperation done under the Word of God and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the mission board is not responsible for example for the raising of the funds for the missionaries, nor it is a controlling organ...".

In other words, the mission board, even nowadays, is a kind of service organ assisting autonomous local churches which themselves select, consecrate and support sovereignly foreign missionaries. Another organization, very influential, was started in 1932/33, when Mr. Lauri Mommo and Rev. Eino J. Heinonen arranged the first missionary training courses in Hanko and Lahti. When Yrjolä returned to China in 1936, he was accompanied by nine new missionaries who had received their training in this institute. Later on, in 1982, the Missionary College, offering short three month intensive courses for prospective missionaries, was founded in Hattula. A language school has continued to offer courses in Lärsmo.

As important as these organizations have been, the 'heart' of Finnish Pentecostal mission has been, and continues to be, local churches. One of the first treatises on the role of the local church in foreign mission was written by a Swedish Pentecostal, David Landin. His book was translated and published in Finland in 1945. He writes:

> It is of most importance for us that the Christian Church has in the New Testament writings many examples and precepts as to how to
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organize the mission and what kind of methods and principles to use... we who believe that the Spirit of God created the unseen church organization, also believe that in its original form it best serves its purpose and is inspired by God. Therefore, they (i.e. the principles and the methods set out in the New Testament) are normative for all ages... and we do well if we follow them...

Furthermore, this book considered the relationships between the local churches and the missionaries on the fields:

According to Acts 13, Barnabas and Paul were sent by the church of Antioch. With prayer and fasting, the church consecrated them to the task by the laying on of hands. As fellow missionaries they were constantly in touch with the church of Antioch... Having arrived at Antioch, they called the church together and reported how God had been with them...

Landin emphasized, too, the importance of correspondence between the local church and the missionary, and he also suggested that it was biblical for the local church to financially support her missionaries.

The close bond between missionary and local church is usually made possible by the fact that it is the local church that selects and consecrates missionaries. Furthermore, it is required that candidates work at least two years in their homeland before going out to overseas, preferably in their home congregation. As far as selection for missions is concerned, academic and professional requirements are minimal, the stress is, on the one hand, on the call and spiritual gifts, and on the other hand, on the confidence gained from the church(es). Of course, language skills are required as well as basic Bible and Mission College courses, but these "outer" qualifications have always been, and continue to be, secondary when compared to "spiritual" qualities.

As far as mission structures are concerned, we conclude from the preceding discussion that the pattern of the Finnish Free Foreign Mission seems to be in some degree quite unique. According to the theses 1 and 3 set out by Dr. Pierson, God uses two kinds of structures in world evangelization: the church congregation (modality) and the church mission structures (sodality). Furthermore, in most cases God has used specific structures in the expansion of the gospel into new areas; these

1 ibid. 9.
2 ibid. 10-11.
structures have usually emerged in the periphery of the larger church rather than in the ecclesiastical structures per se.

However, from its beginnings, the mission of the Finnish Pentecostals has been extremely closely linked to local churches. From the first endeavours into new unevangelized territories all over the world to the present expansion, local churches have been both the source and supporter of missionaries, even the selector and consecrator of new candidates! In the strict meaning of the term, the mission board, the Finnish Free Foreign Mission, might not be called "mission structure/sodality" because it is totally supervised by "the church congregational" structure, and can be regarded as an assisting organ in practical matters without any kind of decision making authority. For further research, it would be very interesting to see whether the history of the foreign missions knows other examples of this kind of decision-making model.

**Spiritual dynamics**

Now that we have inquired into the background, emergence, and expansion of the Finnish Pentecostal mission as well as to the organization and theological understanding, it is time to delve more deeply into other factors which have been contributed to the growth. Two factor groups, in addition to those discussed before, seem to be critical: spiritual dynamics, and information distribution. Certainly, the first Pentecostals as well as the first missionaries had experienced a powerful renewal experience which is often one of the key spiritual dynamics in the expansion of the mission. Attached to this was a heightened consciousness of Christian fellowship. In the beginning, the congregations were small and people had a chance to get to know each other. Perhaps, the key spiritual dynamic has been prayer both in the emergence of the Pentecostal Movement and in the rise of the missionary endeavor. Pekka Brofeldt, a key leader of the first generation, tells vividly of the prayer revival in 1910s and 1920s:

> Along with general meetings, we began to hold private prayer meetings in large numbers... All of us were committed before the face of God in order to get the promised gift of the Holy Spirit. So committed were we that when we came together in the morning, very often we returned from there with the last train... In these prayer meetings the Spirit was poured out to the waiting hearts... Then, at the beginning, the manifestations of the power were sometimes very strong. When Mr. Valkama was baptized with the Holy Spirit, he had shouted with so loud a voice that a policeman had come in to see what was happening...
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In the Pastors’ Conference of Jyväskylä in 1938, Pekka Brofeldt lectured on the importance of prayer as the means to acquire more workers:

> The harvest of the world has ripened, and awaits its harvester. The Lord would need now, a great multitude of a new, diligent and wholehearted labourers in His harvest. During the days of Jesus’ life on earth, He commanded his disciples to pray to the Lord of the harvest regarding this concern that He would send labourers to His worldwide harvest field. This prayer belongs also to us. We should pray this prayer steadfastly.

In 1935, Toimi Yrjola challenged Christians to pray for twenty new missionaries during the same year. His expectations were not quite achieved. Yet, the furlough of Yrjola in Finland, and especially the meetings in Pietarsaari (where the prayer meeting took place), opened a totally new era of missionary enthusiasm among the Finnish Pentecostals.

Spiritual gifts, as mentioned before, have also contributed significantly to the growth of the foreign mission, as well as lay participation. One crucial factor still needs to be mentioned: the role of the Scriptures. In the process of the formulation of the Pentecostal theology, the Scriptures became the early Pentecostals’ standard in faith and practice. The Spirit filled Christians were sincere and they tried earnestly to follow the Biblical doctrine in every aspect.

**Information distribution concerning mission consciousness**

We have already mentioned that one of the first mass media to pay attention to the emergence of the Pentecostal Movement was the interdenominational magazine "Kotimaa" (Homeland). Also the other

---

1 Brofeldt, P. Heilunvalikeruus Suomessa. (Pentecostal Movement in Finland). (Mikkeli: Toivon Tähti, 1934) 30,32.

2 Ahonen, L., Missions Growth, 53. See also Lauri Ahonen’s Doctor of Missiology Dissertation: *Missions Growth as a New Missiological Discipline. A D.Miss. Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the School of Intercultural Studies, Biola University, Los Angeles, 1987.*

3 Ahonen, L., Missions Growth, 36.
two early magazines, "Toivon Tahti" (The Star of the Hope) and "Ristin Voitto" (The Victory of the Cross), the latter of which is still being published, contributed significantly, not only to the emergence of the Pentecostal Charismatic Movement but also to the consciousness for the world missions. Missionaries from all over the world used to contribute to these magazines inspiring and challenging believers in the homeland.

During the early 1940s, the Helsinki Saalem Mission, influenced by Toimi Yrjola, began to publish a missions magazine, "Pakanain Toivo" (The Hope of the Pagans). When this magazine was discontinued in 1947, Yrjola started a new one, "Pakanain Huuto" (The Cry of the Pagans). The publishing house of the Finnish Pentecostals, "Ristin Voitto", had been founded in 1926. In addition to the magazine that bore the same name "Ristin Voitto" and various kinds of books and music, the publishing house issued a very influential mission magazine "Maailman Aaret" (The Ends of the Earth) in 1962. Still today, this magazine is an indispensable channel of mission information for the Finnish Pentecostals.

As can be seen from our brief survey, many kinds of information distribution channels have been used in spreading up-to-date information concerning the mission of the Finnish Pentecostal churches done in various parts of the globe.

CONCLUSIONS

To summarize our findings of the growth of Finnish Pentecostal Missions in the light of the theory of Paul E. Pierson, the following conclusions have been reached: (1) Several factors in the historical contextual conditions were contributing both to the emergence of the Finnish Pentecostal Movement and to the mission work. The importance of the religious factors, like the charismatic manifestations, the emergence of free churches and the importance of laity, was noticed. (2) Without any doubt, theological breakthrough, in terms of a new understanding of the role and the work of the Holy Spirit, can be seen as one of the most influential factors. Fortunately, other theological emphases as well were present, e.g. reliance on the supreme authority of the Bible. (3) Without spiritual dynamics, like renewed experience with God, fellowship of believers, and especially, great emphasis on prayer, the theological understanding might not have led into the mission minded movement. (4) Heroic key persons, like Danielsson, Poysti and Yrjola, were encouraging Pentecostals throughout the country with the challenge of missions. Both their example and appeal inspired other believers to commit themselves to world evangelization. (5) The importance of the information distribution, especially in terms of mission magazines and other publications, has to be noted. (6) Because the Pentecostal movement in Finland has been characteristically lay movement, it has relied in its selection and training of the leadership more on the spiritual call and gifts than on academic or professional qualities. This emphasis has opened the way for many Christians to participate in world-wide missions. Of course, this lack of training has also created some problems that have to be dealt with; here we only notice the positive side of the method of selection of candidates. (7) As far as mission structures are concerned, the Finnish Pentecostal Movement has been extremely local church based. The crucial importance of the local church grew out of a theological understanding which stressed the example and teaching of the New Testament as normative for all ages, not only in the theology but also in terms of church structures. In that respect, the Finnish Pentecostals seem to be quite unique in the history of missions.

As already mentioned before, an interesting topic for further research would be to consider more comprehensively the relationship between "mission-structures" and local-church-structures, their interdependence and possible conflicts. Scandinavian-type Pentecostalism, with extreme emphasis on the sovereignty of the local church, provides interesting case-studies for this kind of exercise. It would also be valuable to compare the mission/local church-structures between Lutheran mission and Pentecostal mission in Finland.

1 Ahonen, L., Missions Growth, 50.
BOOK REVIEWS


In 1999, Larry Hurtado, Professor of NT Languages, Literature and Theology at the University of Edinburgh, presented the annual Didsbury Lectures in Manchester. This book is the collection of these four lectures. Although ‘lightly edited’, the book reflects the spoken word well and is an engaging interaction with various issues concerned with the early church’s experience of worship.

The first two chapters focus on the exclusivity of Christian worship in the Roman world. Contrary to scholars who suggest that Christianity found no willing audience because Roman religion had ‘run out of steam’, Hurtado paints a picture of a Roman world where religious devotion was not only widespread, but infiltrated every area of life. The early Christians appeared modest, unimpressive, decidedly ‘low-tech’ and odd; worshippers with no temple, cult images, sacrificial system. He suggests that the Christians appeared more akin to the philosophical schools: scholastic in their theologising and literature-based in their emphasis upon Scripture. Continuing this theme into the second chapter, he examines the shape of early Christian devotional practices. By the nature of the meeting places they had access to, their gatherings were small: up to nine people for their meals, up to 50 people if the Roman villas had atriums accessible for their worship. Their emphasis was upon social intimacy, solidarity, the democracy of the Spirit, fervour and transcendence. The picture he paints is an attractive though non-romanticised one. Leaders of smaller churches would benefit from reading these chapters to provide themselves with a picture of the early church at worship.

The third chapter is the more directly theological. He examines the binatarian worship of the early Christians. He delineates the cluster of activities that cumulatively illustrate that early Christians deemed Christ to be part of the godhead. The early Christian, he claims, worshipped Jesus after having observed Christ’s exaltation, and out of obedience to God’s revealed will (p.97). This unusual mutation of monotheism would lead the church into problems that would occupy the theological minds of those in the church over the succeeding centuries.

The final chapter picks up some of the implications of a Trinitarian theology for worship. In particular he deals with the confusion in popular piety concerning the place of Jesus in relationship to God the Father. He also sees that there are problems of sentimentalising the believer’s relationship to God as Father. He suggests that this has been because our relationship with God as Father has not been placed within a Christological framework. The chapter concludes with a plea for worship to be seen as eschatological - worship that has an eye on the wider purposes of God and worship that relativises our political allegiances.

The book is useful on a number of counts. It is a refreshing picture of the early church at worship because of the way that it seeks to contextualise their actions in a socio-political framework. For Pentecostals that are always seeking to refer back to the early church as a potential contemporary paradigm, this provides a realistic picture of what the church may have been like. The theological reflections highlight the confusion for many Christians who live and worship as de facto tritheists. His work is a useful rejoinder to these confusions, although it is clear that further work needs to be done to make these theological reflections available to the wider Christian general public. The third contribution provided by the book is in its extensive bibliography. This makes up the final twenty pages of the book and will be an invaluable resource for students preparing to work on this area of church history and theology.

Neil Hudson


In the month of June in the ninetieth year after the outpouring of the Spirit at Azusa Street, two consultations took place, one in Birmingham, England, the other in San Jose, Costa Rica, attempting to answer the same fundamental question, ‘What does it mean to be a Pentecostal?’. Both consultations recognised that because of the incredible growth of the Pentecostal Movement, especially over the past 30 years, and its attendant ecclesiastical diversity, the question of self-identity has become increasingly difficult to designate.

The consultation held in Birmingham that produced the papers published in *Pentecostals after a Century* reflected all the hallmarks of Hollenweger’s previous reflections on Pentecostalism. Therefore, it is no surprise that one of the dominant themes in the book is that of the Black origins of Pentecostalism and the ongoing racial tension that exists in...
contemporary Pentecostal denominations. Robert Beckford and Roswith Gerloff both emphasise the role played by Black Pentecostals in global Pentecostalism by examining the growth of the Black churches. Beckford, a radical Black Pentecostal, is more critical of his parent's generation and their religious practices, suggesting that a fruitful collaboration could emerge from the coalescing of Black Pentecostalism and Black consciousness. Gerloff, more eirenically, celebrates aspects of the Black churches, suggesting that the potential for a fully developed and defined Black Pentecostal spirituality is already present that would be able to produce effective social transformation.

Each of the chapters is followed by a short response. Bishop Aldred, Director of the Centre for Black and White Christian Partnership, responded to Gerloff. He appealed to writers not to portray Black Pentecostals merely either as victims of racism or as members of romanticised groups. For Aldred, this was to be untrue to both history and present reality. He called for Black Pentecostals to take an active role in dismantling walls of racial segregation erected over the past century.

Allan Anderson's personal experiences in South Africa are reflected in his chapter, entitled 'Dangerous Memories for South African Pentecostals'. The dangerous memories are the fact that early South African Pentecostalism initially spread amongst the blacks with the early Christian services in Johannesburg being interracial.

Juan Sepulveda's chapter on indigenous Chilean Pentecostalism and the challenges it presents to global Pentecostalism is helpful in reminding the reader of the width of Pentecostal practice and belief. Arguing that indigeneity was the prime cause of the growth of Pentecostalism, he points out the markedly divergent practices in Chile: infant baptism, tongues not being seen to be a sign of the Baptism in the Spirit, the close relationship between conversion and the Baptism in the Spirit. However, he suggests that, 'Being Pentecostal would mean to affirm such spiritual freedom. From such a perspective, the insistence on a fixed definition of Pentecostal identity, especially notorious in white American Pentecostalism, would appear as a western attempt at domestication of the liberating power of Pentecost.'(p.134)

Lee Hong Jung contributes a weaker chapter on Korean Pentecostalism, contrasting it with Minjung theology. Arguing that because Korean Pentecostalism is heavily based on American templates, he suggests that it will be unable to be involved in the socio-political sphere.

Hollenweger contributes the final two chapters of the book; the first questions the classical understanding of the Baptism in the Spirit and the place of tongues, arguing that tongues is a natural gift, rather than a supernatural gift given as a result of the Spirit-baptism experience. This chapter seemed unclear in its intentions, not providing any real conclusions. His second chapter was far more substantial, examining the developments and the challenges facing Pentecostalism in the areas of missiology, ecclesiology, hermeneutics and ecumenism.

The value of the work is the attempt to identify areas that need to be addressed by Pentecostals, most pertinently in the context of the breadth of Pentecostal ecclesiological practice. Increasingly, Pentecostal theological reflection will be driven by countries such as Korea, Chile and Africa. This will produce a new agenda for Western Pentecostals to interact with. However, there are several weaknesses in the book. On the whole, the papers were presented by radical Pentecostals or non-Pentecostals. If this was an exercise in observation, then this is perfectly acceptable; however, if the aim is to provoke the churches to reflection and action, then those invited to speak needed to be from a more representative background. This would have given the book a wider credibility with the general Pentecostal population.

Reflecting, as it does, a consultation, albeit a very small one, only 40 people were present, although individual articles are useful, there lacks an overall thematic coherence. However, the challenge of globalization is set out clearly. The next task is to move the debate to the denominations, to include Pentecostal ministers and laity as they grapple with the theological, cultural and sociological challenges presented to them.

The American-based The Globalization of Pentecostalism is a significant book, and will become a benchmark for Pentecostal studies, in the same way as Called and Empowered did in the 90s in the realm of Pentecostal missiology. The book is divided into three sections examining the changing paradigms in scholarly reflection, Pentecostalism as a global culture and contemporary issues facing Pentecostals.

The first section seems to have a common aim - to extend traditional Pentecostal theology to make it less sectarian, more missiological and more engaged with the socio-political circumstances in which it finds itself. Frank Macchia examines the core doctrines; he urges Spirit baptism to be thought of in a Christological framework, tongues to be reintegrated into the wider concern of global witness, healing extended to take into account the groaning of creation and an eschatological hope set...
free from dispensationalist chains. This chapter sets the tone for the whole book; it is never dismissive of early Pentecostal theologising but aware of the need for that theology to be broadened and channelled away from narrow sectarianism. McClung’s chapter on missiology is a good example of this agenda. He urges Pentecostals to see missiology widened to include not only personal evangelism, but also ecumenism and ecology, all engaged in an eschatological framework.

Wonsuk Ma follows by demonstrating the global nature of Pentecostal scholarship. His bibliographical chapter is a helpful resource for people wanting to stay abreast of recent Pentecostal theological thinking. In particular, as the dean at the Asia Pacific Theological seminary in the Philippines, he is eager to alert the readers to the non-western theologies emerging.

Everett Wilson contributes a useful essay on the historiography of Pentecostals. Stressing that Pentecostalism has always made room for the extremists and individualists, he urges that Pentecostal history is done honestly - avoiding idolatrous romanticisation yet also recognising that what early Pentecostals had in common was a desire for a personal encounter with God. They also had a ‘poorly defined set of beliefs, practices and expectations pulling into irresistible charms men and women who were not at all certain where they were going’. (p.104). The chapter concludes by pointing out that contemporary Pentecostalism is not defined by Parham or Seymour, but by the spiritual vigour displayed by Pentecostals in Korea, Brazil and Africa.

Bonino makes a response to the section. Commenting on the use of scripture which is neither critical nor literal, he outlines the need for continued debate about the multi-level hermeneutic process that suits Pentecostals in that it allows the text to be free to be used by the Spirit and yet also takes seriously the canonical approach to scripture.

The second section is a selection of reports from different continents and their practice of Pentecostalism. The section is informative and indicative of the width of concerns facing contemporary Pentecostals. The response ties together the challenges of unity, ethics, a willingness to address socio-political issues, the relationship with civil society and religious pluralism.

The final section outlines issues facing Pentecostals in a post-modern world. Some Pentecostals have viewed the philosophical shift with its stress on intuition, supra-rationalism, community and religious experience as providing a perfect opportunity for Pentecostals to escape from the stronghold of Fundamentalism. Whether this be the case or not, the reality is that Pentecostals, as all Christians, need to determine how they will proclaim their message in a radically different world. The issues covered in this section are those at the forefront of post-modernist thinking: ethnicity, hermeneutics, ecumenism and religious experience.

Gerald Sheppard’s chapter on hermeneutics is reflective of contemporary Pentecostal theology. It deals with developments in contemporary hermeneutics and then through a series of reflective testimonies, a beloved part of Pentecostal ritual, contemplates the use of language, the question of identity and the significance of Biblical interpretation. Janet Powers continues this hermeneutical theme whilst exploring the position of women leaders in early Pentecostalism. Recognising the liberation that they were given, albeit held in tension with the expectations of society’s emphasis of the leadership of males, she suggests a possible future area for debate about this issue, one that interlinks hermeneutics, spiritual experience and empowerment. After a chapter by Cecil Robeck re-emphasising the ecumenical roots of Pentecostalism, Margaret Poloma examines the Toronto Blessing, bringing together sociological insights with historical and scriptural precepts to suggest its significance for Pentecostalism’s worldview.

Harvey Cox’s response in the final chapter encourages Pentecostals to return to their ethic of suspicion towards the world, lest it be seduced away from its commitment to Christ. At a time when Western Pentecostals, in particular, look very much ‘at home’ in the world, this comes as a welcome reminder of their roots.

This book is of real significance to Pentecostals everywhere. It portrays a Pentecostalism ‘come of age’, and proposes developments that will encourage us to honour our past, whilst allowing our theology to develop in ways that are innovative, dynamic and in line with the original intentions of our spiritual ancestors.

Both books will become required reading for students of Pentecostalism. They need to be read and interacted with. Both collections present challenges to Pentecostalism not to retreat into the safety of religious isolation, but rather to come into the public arena to proclaim the message of Christ. At a time when Pentecostal self-identity is hard to pin down, there is a temptation for some to define our identity solely in terms of rigid doctrinal positions, ecclesiology or socio-ethical standpoints. These books remind the reader of the difficulty of following any of these
There has been renewed discussion of the doctrine of hell in evangelical circles in the last decade since John Stott cast doubt on the traditional doctrine, that those consigned to hell would endure unending conscious punishment, in his discussions with the liberal Anglican David Edwards in Essentials: A Liberal-Evangelical Dialogue (Hodder and Stoughton, 1988). This has led to a spate of literature arguing for and against the traditional doctrine and The Nature of Hell is an excellent survey of the current debate. Busy pastors will find it a helpful survey and theological specialists will appreciate the judicious evaluations of the varied arguments of the literature. Evangelical writers are all agreed on the reality of hell but some maintain the Bible teaches that those in hell are eventually destroyed and so the consciousness of the pains of punishment there is of limited duration. Hell may last for ever but the personal existence of those doomed in it eventually ceases.

The book fairly quickly disposes of reincarnation, universalism (the belief that all persons will eventually be saved), and purgatory, as all these beliefs are clearly contrary to the teaching of Scripture. It is noted that the Bible teaches that there will be resurrection of both the righteous and the unrighteous and that the final judgment will be a judgment which will take account of the way people have behaved, albeit the saved are saved on the basis of divine grace and the Atonement of Christ's death (p. 15f). The major portion of the book is given over to the discussion of key New Testament texts and the interpretation of them by the traditionalists (e.g., John Blanchard, Donald Carson, Ajith Fernando, John Gerstner, R.T. Kendall, Robert Morey, David Pawson, Robert Peterson) and the evangelical annihilationists (e.g., Robert Brow, Earle Ellis, Edward Fudge, Michael Green, Clark Pinnock, David Wenham, Nigel Wright). The traditionalists argue that their case is clinched by the relevant texts in the Book of Revelation (14:9-11; 20:10; 21:8; 22:15). The annihilationists point out that the words 'perish', 'destroy', 'destruction' and 'death' are commonly used to refer to the fate of those in hell in the Gospels and the New Testament Epistles, neither of which contain explicit teaching that the consciousness of pain in hell will be unending. A matter of dispute is whether the parallel between eternal life and eternal death in Matthew 25:46 implies equality of duration of conscious awareness in both heaven and hell. The Nature of Hell sets out the key exegetical arguments involved in this doctrinal debate with pertinent comments but does not aim to come to a resolution of the debate. Many looking for guidance on this will be disappointed but the agenda of the book is not that of deciding the issue but of arguing that differences on the duration of conscious experience in hell should not be a cause of division between evangelicals.

In 1995 the annual lecture of the Friends of Dr. Williams's Library in London was given by Dr. Michael Watts, Reader in Modern History at the University of Nottingham, under the title "Why Did the English Stop Going to Church?" In this lecture, Dr. Watts noted how the traditional doctrine of hell was undermined by the Congregationalist Edward White in 1846, by the Anglicans F. D. Maurice (1853) and F.W. Farrer (1878), and by the essays of liberal Christians in Essays and Reviews (1860). He also stated that what 150 well-known secularists of 1850 to 1950 found most objectionable about Christianity were the doctrines of eternal punishment, hell, the Atonement, and damnation for unbelievers (quoting Susan Budd, Varieties of Unbelief (1977), p. 116). Liberal Christians hoped that by rejecting the doctrine of hell and by updating their religion they could present a Christianity acceptable to the modern world. But Dr. Watts commented, Liberal Christianity did not help to fill the churches, it helped to empty them. By soft-pedalling the doctrine of future punishment, by quenching the fires of hell, English Christians and especially English Nonconformists, jettisoned what had been, in the first half of the nineteenth century, their most effective argument in the winning of converts.
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'solutions' exclusively. Contemporary Pentecostals need to find their unity and identity not in restrictive doctrinal dicta but in an acknowledgement of the Spirit who, in leading us constantly towards Christ, blows where (and how) he wills. By rediscovering the dynamism of the past, and recognising the diversity of global Pentecostalism, together with the continual re-creation of the Spirit, these various authors have suggested how Pentecostalism might develop into the next century.

The Nature of Hell is an excellent survey of the diversity of global Pentecostalism, together with the continual re-creation of the Spirit, these various authors have suggested how Pentecostalism might develop into the next century.

Neil Hudson
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'Christianity acceptable to the modern world. But Dr. Watts commented, Liberal Christianity did not help to fill the churches, it helped to empty them. By soft-pedalling the doctrine of future punishment, by quenching the fires of hell, English Christians and especially English Nonconformists, jettisoned what had been, in the first half of the nineteenth century, their most effective argument in the winning of converts.' Thus the answer provided by Dr. Watts to the question contained in the title of his lecture is that the majority of English churches in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries stopped preaching the doctrine of hell and the necessity of Christ's Atonement for salvation. He concluded his lecture with these words: 'The Tractarian leader Edward Bouverie Pusey once commented that nothing keeps men from the pleasures of sin "but the love of God or the fear of Hell", and that it is "the fear of hell" that "drives people back to God". The English churches by and large ignored his advice, and as a result English men and women stopped attending their services.'
The book notes how the majority of theologians in Church history have advocated the traditional view of unending conscious torment in hell, specifically referring to the teaching of Tertullian, Lactantius, Basil of Caesarea, Jerome, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Augustine of Hippo, Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley. We could add that endless conscious punishment was held unequivocally by prominent evangelical systematic theologians such as W.G.T. Shedd, Charles Hodge and Louis Berkhof. Augustus Strong conceded that 'eternal punishment does not necessarily involve endless successions of suffering, - as God's eternity is not mere endlessness, so we may not be forever subject to the law of time' (Systematic Theology, p. 1035), but he opposes any form of annihilationism and affirms that 'if the soul is immortal, its punishment must be without end' (p. 1044). Against this huge weight of Christian tradition evangelical annihilationists have sometimes argued that the traditional view has inadvertently been based on the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul, whereas the Christian view of creation would make clear that only God is intrinsically immortal and the continuation of conscious life can be terminated by God in his wrath. The finitude of that can be included within the term 'eternal punishment'. 'Pioneers of the annihilationists' case were the CMS missionary Harold Guillebaud (1941) and the prominent Inter-Varsity leader Basil F.C. Atkinson (1964), with their arguments reiterated by David Wenham in 1974. Undoubtedly the emotional pressure of the 'savage doctrine' of the traditional view, as Michael Green calls it, has been a strong motive in the creation of the modern case for annihilationism, and, indeed, many a traditionalist such as C.S. Lewis has wished that he could remove this fearful doctrine from his repertoire of beliefs. How can the traditional view defend God from the charge of being a cosmic sadist? How can it be just to punish endlessly sins performed in a finite lifetime? The answer of traditionalists that sin against an infinite God is deserving of infinite punishment does not impress the evangelical annihilationist. The book points out that the Christian tradition was unscriptural in countenancing slavery, and perhaps it could be further added by some that the vast weight of tradition evangelical annihilationists have sometimes argued that the traditional view has inadvertently been based on the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul, whereas the Christian view of creation would make clear that only God is intrinsically immortal and the continuation of conscious life can be terminated by God in his wrath. The finitude of that can be included within the term 'eternal punishment'. 'Pioneers of the annihilationists' case were the CMS missionary Harold Guillebaud (1941) and the prominent Inter-Varsity leader Basil F.C. Atkinson (1964), with their arguments reiterated by David Wenham in 1974. Undoubtedly the emotional pressure of the 'savage doctrine' of the traditional view, as Michael Green calls it, has been a strong motive in the creation of the modern case for annihilationism, and, indeed, many a traditionalist such as C.S. Lewis has wished that he could remove this fearful doctrine from his repertoire of beliefs. How can the traditional view defend God from the charge of being a cosmic sadist? How can it be just to punish endlessly sins performed in a finite lifetime? The answer of traditionalists that sin against an infinite God is deserving of infinite punishment does not impress the evangelical annihilationist. The book points out that the Christian tradition was unscriptural in countenancing slavery, and perhaps it could be further added by some that the vast weight of tradition has supported infant baptism, whereas many Christians since the Reformation have rejected the practice as unbiblical. Hence the traditional view of hell could be shown to be mistaken in the light of more careful modern exegesis of the relevant biblical texts.

A minor criticism of The Nature of Hell is that it states that evangelical annihilationists adhere to conditional immortality and so regularly calls them 'conditionalists'. But this is confusing as the doctrine of conditional immortality was commonly regarded as holding that the soul is mortal and life beyond death is conditional upon sharing by faith in the eternal life of Christ. The book includes sensitive comments on the relation between the doctrine of hell and evangelism, the pastoral care of the dying and the bereaved, and Christian unity. But it does not deal with thornier questions. Will law-abiding, humane and responsible non-Christians be eternally condemned? Can we categorically say that those of other faiths are inevitably lost and will spend eternity in the flames of hell? We may with equanimity contemplate monsters of evil like Hitler and Stalin enduring the horrors of hell, but what are we to think of the kind non-Christian neighbour next door? How can we endure the thought of non-Christian loved ones, my mother, my husband, my wife, my son, or my daughter, being eternally separate from oneself in an eternity of hellfire? Moreover, does prayer for the unconverted actually make any difference to where they spend eternity? Are people actually lost because Christians have failed to engage in evangelism or to participate in missions overseas in pagan lands? One would have liked to have seen more specific guidance on how the doctrine should be preached today. A recent survey of Pentecostal ministers in England showed that hardly any of them had preached sermons specifically on hell in the last two years. One feels that hell is for Christians today what sex was for Victorians: horribly embarrassing, unmentionable, an inappropriate topic for conversation in the best company, and best not thought about. This book may help us to deal with our intellectual questions, but perhaps we would do well to reflect on the awesome prospect of whole streetfuls of people condemned to eternal exclusion from the presence of the Lord and then to consider our own responsibility before God to share the Gospel of salvation with our neighbours.

Julian Ward


Works from within and about British Black Pentecostal churches are few and far between. Robert Beckford, currently a research fellow at the University of London and a founder and member of a Black Pentecostal church in Birmingham, has produced a work that is of note to those interested in the development of contemporary Pentecostalism within Britain.

In general, the work attempts to lay the foundations for the integration of Black Pentecostals into the socio-political framework of their societies. Pointing to the traditional passive stance that Black Pentecostals have traditionally taken towards political affairs, it seeks to lay out a theology
for involvement. To do this, he outlines a genealogy of racism and the resistance that Black communities have made towards this racism. He encourages Pentecostals to learn from the tools used by opponents of racism to help to make sense of the present, but also to offer a response to the contemporary situation. He does this by drawing on the work of Liberation and Feminist theology. By chapter 5 (p.160ff) he introduces the concepts of ‘dread’ and its relationship to Pentecostalism. Defining ‘dread’ as the Rastafarian concept that incorporates the possibility of emancipation and fulfilment, he turns to Pentecostalism to encourage it to move from an emphasis on transcendence and its purely personal application to a theology that, built on the concepts of holism, transformation and eschatology will encourage and legitimise political engagement.

For Beckford, the practical outworking of this theology is to be found within new ‘reading conventions’, by which he seems to refer to small groups prepared to engage in the wider cultural aspects of life so providing a bridge between the Black Churches and the more radical black groups, for example, Rastafarians.

As a white, male Pentecostal reviewer, it is not clear to what extent this book was designed for such as myself. The sections on racism and the re-treading of the black origins of Pentecostalism were noteworthy, but it is the extent to which this is a treatise to the Black churches alone that remains the problem. At times, I was not clear how Beckford’s suggestions regarding involvement in the socio-political structures were in fact solely a Black issue. Surely the tendency and weakness of all Pentecostals is that we have been slow to work out the corporate implications of our faith. This is not solely a Black problem. Therefore, more European work needs to be produced to challenge and suggest ways forward for all Pentecostals, not merely subsections of Pentecostalism. Secondly, whilst no-one can deny the racism that has been perpetuated by white Pentecostals on occasion, the question of reconciliation needs to be addressed. Beckford does not directly deal with this, although he recognises that resistance must eventually lead to reconciliation (p.97). The degree to which resistance needs to continue before reconciliation can begin is a matter of perspective. However, in a world becoming increasingly tribal, surely all Pentecostals, regardless of colour or ethnicity, need to stand together to see God’s transformation of the world, rather than this being merely a plea to Black, White or Asian Pentecostals. Finally, Beckford’s solution to the problems he sees in the Black churches is to stand outside them to provide bridges for them. Whether this is either possible or acceptable to Black Pentecostals is a question that only time will answer. It is possible that standing outside the churches will be a permanent situation, resulting in walls being erected instead of bridges being built.

There can be no doubt that Beckford has raised significant issues; the extent to which his ‘Dread Pentecostal Theology’ is the solution needs to be determined by those most directly communicated with as well as by the wider Pentecostal constituency.

Neil Hudson


Edward Irving (1792-1834) always caused a stir. He became London’s most famous preacher. The well-to-do flocked to his Regent Square Church to hear his passionate sermons in the 1820s. He has been regarded as a perceptive theologian, a proto-Pentecostal, a misguided fanatic and a heretic. He was dismissed from his Church in 1832 on the charge of encouraging disorderly interruptions of the services by those who claimed to have the gifts of the Spirit. The following year he was expelled from the Church of Scotland ministry from holding the heretical doctrine that Christ was a sinner. Irving then joined the fledgling Catholic Apostolic Church but was given a subordinate position. He died soon after of consumption.

McFarlane presents Irving to us as a great theologian with important things to say to us about the Incarnation. His book is in three parts: the first on Irving’s doctrine of the Trinity, the second on his doctrine of man, and the third expounds his doctrine of the Incarnation. Irving stands in the Patristic and Reformed traditions in his understanding of God, man and Christ. In the first part of the book McFarlane notes that, for Irving, the Trinity is fundamental to the Gospel (p.13). In this respect he opposed the unitarianism and Socinianism that was widespread in his own day. McFarlane notes the similarity of Irving’s Trinitarianism with the classic exposition of the doctrine of the Cappadocian fathers in the late fourth century. As with them Irving affirms that God the Father is fons trinitatis, the only one who is self-originated and the one who is the source or cause from which the Son is begotten and the Spirit proceeds (p.33).

But McFarlane’s exposition leaves one in some doubt whether Irving has provided an adequate rationale for the place of the Spirit in the being of
God. Indeed, McFarlane notes that Irving oscillates between the Western double procession view and the Eastern single procession of the Spirit from the Father through the Son (p.42). To oppose the Unitarians Irving emphasises that the economic Trinity revealed through the Jesus of history is identical to the ontological Trinity of eternity (p.50f, 57), thus anticipating the central doctrine of both Barth and Rahner. For Irving Acts 2:36 confirms that the Jehovah (Lord) of the Old Testament is to be identified with the second Person of the Trinity (p.52f), who reveals the will, grace and love of the Father, which is energised and applied to man by the Spirit (p.57f). In sum, the Father is the self-originating personal will of God that is expressed in love for the Son through the Spirit and the Son shows by perfect obedience his love for the Father, that is expressed through the same Spirit (p.59f).

In the second part of the book we are told of Irving's view of Christ's role in creation: 'In the very act of creating, the Son acts not in the blazing glory of infinite Godhead, but, as it were, through the reduced and fracted beam of created being, his future assumed form of being' (p.75). But we find little comment on this strange doctrine, except to say that it assures us that the Creator and Saviour are one. McFarlane does not make it clear whether Irving held to Augustine's (and Calvin's) view that we actually sinned in Adam or to the later Reformed view stemming from Beza that Adam acted as our legal representative.

In the third part of the book, McFarlane expounds Irving's distinctive Christology, namely, that Christ assumed our fallen human nature, and his associated soteriology. For Christ was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, who became incarnate so that by filial obedience even unto death he might destroy the power of sin in human flesh and redeem his people from their sins. McFarlane applauds Irving's insight into the trinitarian form of the incarnation that traditional theology had failed to grasp. Only through the Spirit does the Son purify and sanctify fallen human nature. We are granted the further insight that the Father is seen in the Son inasmuch as the Holy Spirit dwelt in the body of Christ and that which is visible of the Son as anointed by the Spirit is rooted in the inexhaustible fullness of the invisible Father (p.163).

We are rather left in the dark as to Irving's understanding of the Atonement. In several places, we are told that salvation is accomplished by the union of God the Son with a fallen human nature and, as one of us, in filial obedience to his Father overcoming its evil tendencies even unto death. Thus, it seems, 'his christology does not stress the idea of imputation in his doctrine of salvation. Rather, it is one of identification' (p.174). There are perhaps important ways in which Christ's overcoming life can be integrated with his atoning death and it is surprising that McFarlane does not clearly say whether Irving achieves this. But what McFarlane does do is to repeatedly emphasise the role of the Holy Spirit in both the act and the ministry of the incarnation (e.g., p.175f), a theme developed recently by Tom Smail in The Giving Gift. McFarlane has shown us that Irving's Christology is worthy of further study and highlighted its Trinitarian basis and pneumatic operation. Further elucidation of it is needed in places, especially with respect to its kenoticism and associated understanding of the Atonement. But McFarlane's exposition is well worth reading as a contribution to current Christological discussion.

Julian Ward


This book is the result of the Encuentro Pentecostal Latinoamericano held in Havana, Cuba, from 23-27 September 1998. Attending the meeting were 120 Pentecostal theologians and church leaders from forty-eight Pentecostal denominations throughout Latin America. Nearly fifty percent of the participants were women; a statistic that indicates the status accorded women in the Latin American Pentecostal churches. There were also a significant number of youth in attendance. One of the goals was to encourage trans-generational discussions. Also present at the Encuentro, were observers from the World Council of Churches (WCC) and the Latin American Council of Churches (CLAI). Some funding was also received from these international bodies to facilitate the organisation of the meeting and to help with travel expenses. The goals of the meeting were: (1) recognition of the richness and diversity of gifts which the Holy Spirit has given to the churches; (2) discern what God asks of Latin American Pentecostals as part of His one church, which takes into account both the suffering and the hope; and, (3) participate, from the basis of a thoroughly Pentecostal identity, together with sister churches, in obedience to Christ's command in John 17:21, in the development of a real unity within the church.

The resultant essays by thirteen authors from seven countries speak to these issues. They are divided into six categories: testimonies, analysis, the itinerary of the Comision Evangelica Pentecostal Latinoamericano...
The articles of analysis (by Heinrich Schaffer, Adonis Nino and Gamaliel Lugo Morales) explore the social and religious results of "globalization" and the "new world order" for Latin America. This is a region of the world that has seen the poor become more poor due to external debt taken on primarily by right wing military dictators supported by the USA, and with the advise of the International Monetary Fund. This debt now cripples the ability of the newly emergent and struggling democracies to provide services and care for their citizens. Latin American Pentecostals, large numbers of whom live in poverty, have a serious interest in the macro-economic problems. The Encuentro called for a year of "jubilee" in which the debts encumbered as part of this illegitimate political process should be forgiven. Those who do not think that Pentecostal theologians are concerned with economics and social issues or think, as do most North American scholars of Pentecostalism (e.g. Martin, Stoll, et al.), that Pentecostals are only right wing off shoots of American fundamentalism, should read these essays!

The next collection of essays (by Gamaliel Lugo Morales, Lydiette Garita and Elida Quevedo) explores aspects of Pentecostal identity in the context of the Comision Evangelica Pentecostal Latinoamericano (CEPLA). Perhaps the most important article is that of Gamaliel Lugo in which he describes the Venezuelan Pentecostal experience. Historically there were three stages. First, there was an indigenous church led by independent missionaries and Venezuelan pastors. Secondly, there was the period when this church was taken over by the Assemblies of God USA mission programme. This juridical change was, after the departure of the independent missionaries, followed by a flood of Assemblies of God USA missionaries. As a result, the Venezuelan clergy found themselves outside the decision making processes and de-facto second class citizens. They were disenfranchised in their own church. Finally, in 1956, led by the Rev. Exeario Sosa Lujan, a significant group withdrew to form the Union Evangelica Pentecostal Venezolana (UEPV). This experience strongly influenced the way the Venezuelan church understands their mission and role in the world as well as the ways in which they can relate to other denominations, missions and movements. The essay by Lydiette Garita is a careful discussion of the role of women in Latin American Pentecostalism and a review of meetings held under the auspices of CEPLA. Elida Quevedo contributed a passionate reasoned analysis of the function of Pentecostal liturgy in forming Pentecostal identity.

The discussion of ecumenism (by Roger Cabezaz, Juan Sepulveda, Israel Batista, Manuel Quintero and Juan Carlos Urrea) resulted in five carefully nuanced articles. Perhaps the most crucial essay is that of Cabezaz (pps. 83-113) which examines the large historical context of Latin American Protestantism through the twentieth century and suggests the significance of the events for ecumenism. The essay also provides a history of ecumenism among Pentecostal churches, with dates and locations of important meetings and conferences. The essay is an important historical contribution. It reflects the efforts of this tradition in Latin America to be part of defining what it means to be Christian in that context. Contributions from Israel Batista, a Methodist pastor representing CLAI, and Manuel Quintero, representing CLAI and the WCC, present their understanding of the ecumenical contributions that can be made by the Pentecostal churches. Juan Carlos Urrea explores the feasibility of and expectations attendant to dialogue between Catholics and Pentecostals in Latin America.

The Bible studies, contributed by Ross Kinsler, Professor at the Latin American Biblical University (Universidad Biblica Latinoamericana), of San Jose, Costa Rica, wrestle with the meaning of the "jubilee" in the biblical texts. The appended documents include the official text summarising the conference, and a three-year plan with goals for CEPLA, including programmatic activities projected for the same period.

This volume is truly an important historical document. It represents the effort of the branch of Latin American Pentecostalism represented by the participants to come to terms with what it means to be truly Pentecostal and to be faithful communicants in the Kingdom of God. As the book makes clear, one of the major issues facing Pentecostals is that of identity. On the one hand it seems very easy to say what Pentecostals are and are not. However, the reality in the large and complex world religious movement that is Pentecostalism requires more subtle and creative analysis. The contributors to this volume are to be congratulated on the result of their collaboration. It is hoped that this book will be followed by more contributions as the authors and their colleagues continue to work on these issues.

David Bundy

Joost Reinke, Deutsche Pfingstmissionen: Geschichte, Theologie, Praxis, with an English summary (Edition AFEM - Arbeitskreis fur evangelikale...
The history of European Pentecostal mission outside Scandinavia has been slow to attract the interest of historians. The importance of the mission traditions, both in their theory and praxis, are worthy of examination. Reinke has provided an initial study of German Pentecostal efforts that will serve as a basis from which all future studies will begin. The importance of this work is in contradistinction to its size. It is truly multo in parvo. The method of this review is to summarise the data provided regarding the German mission societies and then to turn to Reinke's efforts to place this in a mission theory context.

Reinke identifies a number of German mission organisations. These include, in his order: (1) Vereinigten Missionsfreunde (VMF, 1931); (2) Velberter Mission (VM, 1954); (3) Volksmission entschiedener Christen e.V. (1955); (4) Odenwalder Heidenmission (1964); (5) Missionsgesellschaft "Glaube, Hoffnung, Liebe" (GHL, 1965); (6) Der Weg zur Freude (1950/1967); (7) Aktionskomitee fur verfolgte Christen (AVC, 1970); (8) Christus fur alle Nationen e.V. (CafN, 1972); (9) Internationalen Zigeunermission [German branch]; (10) Missionsdienst e.V.; (11) Christliche Filmmission e.V.; (12) Das Jugund-, Missions- und Sozialwerk Altensteig; (13) Gemeinde- und Missionswerk ARCHE; and (14) Gemeinde der Christen, Ecclesia. Other groups send missionaries but not through their own organisations including (1) Forum Freikirchlicher Pfingstgemeinden; (2) Apostolische Kirche - Urchristliche Mission; (3) Christlicher Gemeinschaftsverband Mulheim/Ruhr; and (3) Gemeinde Gottes e.V. Reinke correctly notes that the earliest German mission is in Switzerland, the Schweizerische Pfingstmission (SMP, 1921). To that list should be added the Philadelphiabewegung (Leonberg) which has missionaries in South America and Asia, as well as in other areas of Europe.

Three of these are selected for more extensive treatment: the Vereinigten Missionsfreunde (pp. 35-48), the Velberter Mission (pp. 49-58) and Das Missionswerk "Glaube, Hoffnung, Liebe" (pp. 59-65). On the basis of primary sources, most of which have never been before used for historical purposes, Reinke describes the origins of the organisations, the personalities involved, the nature of the fields to which missionaries were sent, and the belief structures that give form to and sustain the particular missions. The research was carefully done. One only wishes that the project had continued to include all of the missions, but the research necessary to have done so could have taken months or years. As it is, the brief histories are major contributions.

The place where this reviewer becomes uncomfortable is by the tendency to explain German Pentecostal mission theory by recourse to North American sources. There are European sources and patterns of interaction that are much more helpful. The first is the Pentecostal Missionary Union established by Polhill and Boddy at the suggestion of Thomas Ball Barratt. Barratt eventually withdrew to form his two Norwegian mission organisations and then travelled widely in Europe providing a model for how Pentecostal mission might be done in ways that resulted in self-supporting, self-propagating and self-determining churches. The German Pentecostal churches are partially the products of such mission. Barratt's theoretical work was taken over by Pethrus, Paul Ongman, and a host of others, including the Bible School at Dantzig between the Wars. After the war, there was the presence of the English missionary activist and theorist Fred Squire who cut a wide path on the Continent, including Germany. The generally successful efforts of Pethrus and the Swiss theologians to keep European churches independent of the USA imperial period missions served as a warning to the alternatives. In addition to the Scandinavians and the English, there were significant Dutch Pentecostal missions which were in contact with their German contemporaries. It is also important to note, as Reinke does, that Pentecostals from other countries, who were formed in those missiological contexts, became missionaries under the German Pentecostal mission societies.

Another forerunner of the German Pentecostal mission effort that must be taken seriously is the British missionary and mission theorist, James Hudson Taylor and the China Inland Mission (CIM). The Holiness theology and mission theory of Taylor had a significant influence in Germany due to the Heiligungsbewegung and the Gemeinschaftsbewegung. Among the German language organisations that sent out missionaries under CIM were: China-Allianz-Missions (Barmen), Deutscher Frauen-Missionsbunds [Germany], Pilgermission St. Chrischona [Switzerland]. These joined persons from other countries influenced by the same Holiness/Keswick pietism, including: Fria Missionsförbundet [Finland], Hegelse Forbundet [Sweden], Liebenzeller Mission [Germany], Norske Kinasmission [Norway], Norske Missions [Norway], Svenska Alliansmissionen [Sweden], Svenska Missionen i Kina [Sweden]. Because of the difficulties with the conservative religious groups sparked by the Berlin Declaration, the historian is tempted to conclude that there was no
influence across the Pentecostal-China Inland Mission boundaries. Visits to German Pentecostal pastors' libraries and reading in the periodicals has convinced me that the complementary mission theories of Barratt and James Hudson Taylor were much more important throughout Europe than the American versions, certainly until World War II. Since then the American presence has been more keenly felt in all areas of European society, but it would appear that indigenous European interpretations of mission theory have remained more important for most European controlled and funded mission projects.

This interpretative discussion will be, it is hoped, examined carefully as research in the area of European Pentecostal mission history continues. It is an important discussion, for it has implications for the spiritual identities of millions of converts and churches around the world. Were the European churches merely an extension of the American cultural imperium after World War II, or were they also the carriers of traditions of mission that go back to the founders of Pentecostalism in Europe, to the Protestant Pietists and beyond. The answer to that question will make a major contribution to how world Pentecostalism is to be understood.

David Bundy

Wonsuk Ma, Until the Spirit Comes, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press [JSOTS 271], 1999).

The subject matter of Wonsuk Ma's book, Until The Spirit Comes, is declared by its subtitle, The Spirit of God in the Book of Isaiah. Wonsuk Ma writes as a Pentecostal working in an animistic culture (pp. 8, 14). He notes that studies about God's Spirit are of relevance to both concerns. He peruses the concepts displayed in Isaiah with the hope that the Protestant Pietists and others, through reading his book, might be drawn 'a step closer to the reality of God's Spirit' (p.9).

It is Ma's contention that a number of strands of tradition concerning ruach (spirit) already circulated in Hebrew thought prior to the pre-exilic period when Isaiah began to be composed. These, he suggests, were each taken up within the Isaianic tradition, and as they were, they themselves evolved, while remaining distinct. Each strand of tradition can, he claims, be traced through the pre-exilic, exilic, post-exilic, and 'canonical' stages of development in the Isaianic corpus. As this is done, the evolution through these periods of Hebrew thought concerning ruach can be discerned.

In his introduction, Ma describes his method and overviews six 'spirit traditions' found in the Old Testament (leadership spirit; prophetic spirit; creation spirit; the spirit of God's independent agent; the spirit as part of God's person or sign of God's presence; the spirit as practically a substitute for God [pp. 29-32]). At this point, Ma's book suffers from the exclusion of chapters in his earlier doctoral thesis about ancient Near East and early Israel material (p.7). A fuller survey of specifically pre-Isaianic concepts concerning ruach would have been useful.

Then, in chapter one, Ma studies the pre-exilic Isaianic spirit tradition. He concludes that previous understandings are developed, while also retaining some of their earlier characteristics. The ruach is no longer a violent external force, but an internal spiritual influence. Thus, there is refinement and 'spiritualisation'. Also, wisdom and piety are now conveyed by ruach, and the 'most distinguishing development' (p.70) is that ruach is eschatological. On the other hand, there is a continued exclusiveness of endowment of ruach to selected leaders.

Chapter two tackles the passages apparently reflecting exilic provenance. There is now the 'sudden emergence' (p.109) of ruach as agent of creation and life. There is also a continuing spiritualising and ethicising refinement, and eschatology comes increasingly to the fore. Striking too is the move to democratisation: 'nowhere [previously] is an entire nation viewed as having the outpouring of the divine spirit' (p.111).

In chapter three, Ma gives his assessment of the post-exilic development in these traditions. Ruach is still conceptualised as prophetic, but not as ecstatic. This concept is linked with that of ruach's role in leadership, not so much now through military strength as through spiritual power. What is new is a possible first step towards personalisation of ruach.

In his fourth chapter, Ma scans the whole book of Isaiah as it was canonised. This demands further lengthy methodological considerations, before a repeated review of relevant passages leads him to highlight the following roles of ruach. Ruach offers charismatic enabling to selected leadership figures lying in the book's eschatological future. Ruach is also prophetic, offered in this case not just to the nation's leaders but more widely. For the nation as a whole, ruach will bring abundant righteousness, justice, and increase. Finally, ruach is a designation for God, seeing him act in the past in creating, speaking, and delivering.

Ma concludes that in Isaiah, 'the various [ruach] traditions not only retain their unique traits, but also undergo their own evolution' (p.205). The
internal logic of his work, by which he travels from his basic assumptions to his conclusions, is worthy. His presuppositions, though, must take much of the weight of his conclusions and would not be shared by all. First, Ma assumes that when Isaiah began to be written, there existed in Israel a number of discrete ruach traditions. This assumption he leaves unsubstantiated. To argue, as he does (p.27), that, because not all germinal ideas about ruach in the ancient Near East relate to 'wind', therefore there must have been multiple origins of tradition is to employ a non sequitur. Commonly used language frequently displays flexibility of meaning and indeed of origin. Separate conceptual traditions are not necessarily also present.

Furthermore, Ma's identification of a clear evolution in these traditions depends upon his dating of the various Isaianic passages. At times, it is a little suspiciously convenient how the passages he dates fit into his schema. Why, for instance, regard 34:16-17 as exilic, when, by his own admission, many scholars regard it as post-exilic (p.75, n. 17)? In the same way, the pivotal 32:15-20 ('Until the spirit from above is poured upon us') becomes exilic, even though a significant number of scholars assign these words to Isaiah himself. Similarly, the (admittedly difficult) reference at 48:16b receives 'post-exilic' treatment. If Ma is wrong about some of these dates, the picture of evolution is not as clear cut as he would hope. And of course, those who still believe that the whole of Isaiah is essentially pre-exilic would have the greatest difficulty with Ma's conclusions.

It is also sad that Ma limits his conclusion largely to summarisation. Bearing in mind his starting point, that studies of ruach have a potential bearing on, for instance, Pentecostal mission in animistic contexts, it would have been apt for him to have written about what relevance his particular study might have. Nevertheless, this book offers a generous wealth of detailed study of God's ruach in Isaiah, backed up by excellent research in a commendable breadth of fields. It will prove useful to students of the Old Testament and of pneumatology alike.

William Atkinson


Daniel Albrecht claims that this book is about and for Pentecostals. At first it is somewhat surprising that he investigates Pentecostal worship with technical categories such as "ritual field", "processual rites" or "emic ritual symbols". He admits that this is not the vocabulary usually heard in Pentecostal churches. So you wonder, will he succeed in a critical analysis of Pentecostal spirituality and at the same time engage Pentecostals to better appreciate their practice of worship? The preface of Rites in The Spirit makes the reader wonder in anticipation.

The first two chapters (about half the book) are historical in character. Albrecht wins the Pentecostals' attention by setting the stage for his investigations in a typical Pentecostal manner. He narrates the story of the Pentecostal movement in North America and then, in the second chapter, illustrates the practice of worship in three different West Coast churches. Churches he has selected from his field studies. The first is a traditional Assemblies of God congregation, the "Coastal Christian Center", the second is a Foursquare church with neo-Pentecostal elements, named "Light and Life Fellowship", and the third congregational sketch depicts a charismatic/evangelical group "Valley Vineyard Christian Fellowship". By attentively analysing the order of worship, the importance of praise, the sociological dynamics, theological implications etc. he achieves a twofold aim. On the one hand, Pentecostals recognise themselves within this analysis and begin to be sensitive to the details that Albrecht is pointing to. On the other hand, readers from other Christian traditions are introduced to core issues of Pentecostal worship without which they could not understand the significance of the second part of the book. So far, it is enjoyable and instructive reading.

Chapter three focuses on "Selected Elements and Domains of the Ritual Field". The author studies ritual time, for instance, how these three churches allow for life-changing rites of passage such as: conversion, Spirit Baptism and healings. Further on, he has a nice section on ritual space, describing the important role of "greeting space" prior to the worship service or the function of an "altar space" where the congregation symbolically meets their God to in order to receive His blessings. During descriptions like these one recognises that Daniel Albrecht not only understands what is going one, but also constructively develops the meaning of such liturgical action. The purpose of it all is to meet God. Also non-charismatic readers studying his report can understand why Pentecostals celebrate the way they do.

Chapter four explains how a Pentecostal church service moves from "worship and praise" to the "pastoral message" and culminates in the "rite of altar/response". This sounds straight forward, but it is precisely the openness to the Holy Spirit's leading that makes the whole process
dynamic, creative and edificational. Albrecht is able to show where human effort (for instance when the music team is leading the congregation in praise) intersects with the spiritual dimension, thus making his analysis highly relevant. In the fifth chapter we learn about "Modes of Pentecostal Ritual Sensibility". In other words, we read how attitudes and sensibilities affect Pentecostal practice, be it the raising of hands, glossolalia or, to give another example, a penitent mode. Albrecht argues in chapter six that the Pentecostal/Charismatic ritual practices propel the community toward transformative consequences that relate to human concerns, social structures and theological relationships. Although critics may claim that Pentecostals are overly individualistic, they fail to recognise that their spirituality is fundamentally relationship and community oriented.

So what is Pentecostal spirituality all about? Daniel Albrecht works in the last chapter of this book with his data gathered and focuses on the human experience of God as the key element in the different forms of symbolic actions of Pentecostal spirituality. He pays special attention to three ways by which God is being experienced: supernaturally, in a communal context, and as empowering and commissioning. As far as the "supernatural" is concerned, some readers may agree, along with Walter Hollenweger, that this category is not helpful since God as the Creator is revealing himself in his creation and not beyond it, hence there is no need to argue, as it were, for a super-natural or super-creation level. It might just be that we, for instance, cannot explain a healing with our human abilities, but do we need to call it supernatural? In any case, an appropriate response would be to praise God, rather than to "explain" God. Daniel Albrecht has opted for this terminology because it is so inherent to Pentecostal speech (at least in English). If it is understood as an indigenous religious expression that inspires awe, and not as a quasi anti-scientific statement, then we might let it stand in its own right. More so, we might also be theologically more correct by speaking about God's revelation in our creational existence.

Daniel Albrecht is a keen observer of what is going on. He illustrates in a pleasant manner various elements of Pentecostal worship and liturgy pointing to their function, intentionality and spiritual meaning. Pentecostal/Charismatic readers may appreciate his emphasis on the importance of a church's communal development and spiritual growth which, together with doxology, is at the centre of Christian worship. Non-Pentecostal/Charismatic readers may learn to appreciate a religious tradition that wants to remain "open to the Spirit" and aims at making sure "that God has his way" in the order of service. They may reflect not only on the meaning but also on the effects of rituals in worship.

Jean Daniel Pluess


Horst George Pohlmann is professor for systematic theology at the university of Osnabrück. The book's title already indicates much of Pohlmann's focus: Holy Spirit: Spirit of God, spirit of our time or spirit of this world? While the book provides the reader with an overview of current trends in pneumatology, the ultimate aim of the book is to stimulate a renewed spirituality. The final intent of the author is not to supply a new definition of the Spirit, but to define a life in the Spirit; to incite a pneumatological spirituality. According to Pohlmann any attempt to come up with a concept of the Spirit is doomed to fail since the wind of the Spirit will blow any such construction away. Pohlmann's book carries this notion through to the end: since no one can control the Spirit, any pneumatological definition is just an attempt to define the undefinable.

After a short introduction in which Pohlmann expresses his appreciation for the Pentecostal and Charismatic movement, the book is structured into four sections. In the first part, Pohlmann summarises the major pneumatologies of the second part of the last century. He refers to the major German, French and English authors and concludes the section with some initial implications. His overviews are short, precise and his comments refreshing as well as provocative. The way he summarises the various contributions to pneumatology reflect his own concerns: The Spirit of God cannot be restricted to the church, nor his divine breath be confined only to Christians. Pohlmann highlights how many of the more recent pneumatologies have emphasised the spiritus creator, the divine Spirit that penetrates all of creation; there is no life without the Spirit of God. In the light of his concern, it may be a surprise for many that he did not value Moltmann's contribution, *The Spirit of Life*, as the most important one. He rather has some critical words for Moltmann and finds more appreciation for Welker's *God as Spirit*.

A possible weakness may be that at times the reader is not quite sure whether a certain statement reflects Pohlmann's view or one of the respective author that he discusses. However, most of the time it is pretty clear and Pohlmann spells out some of the uncomfortable and challenging implications of the various theological reflections.
The second part is one great, positive appraisal of the pentecostal/charismatic movement. Any Pentecostal and/or Charismatic reader will be surprised at Pohlmann’s appreciation for this kind of spirituality. Pohlmann briefly spells out the differences between the Pentecostal movement, the charismatic renewal and the so-called third wave. In reviews of his book in German journals some of his pointed comments were quoted extensively. This is unsurprising: “What else does our affectless, indifferent and hardened ‘calloused skin generation’ need more than the enthusiasm to which the Spirit enrupts us?” What would be more liberating for our ‘surprise free’ computer world and our pre-programmed life than the spontaneity, the interruption and the openness for the unexpected that the Spirit gives? What would be better for the functional coldness of our purpose oriented technological world than the blazing heat of the Spirit’s love” (my own translation). His appreciation for tongues is best captured in his statement that “we have forgotten that this world with its screaming injustice has brought us to the limits of our rational articulations.” However, at the end he has also a few words of warning for the pentecostal/charismatic movement. Any attitude among Pentecostals that reflects a domestication of, or a monopoly on the Spirit, contradicts the very belief that the Spirit blows wherever it wants. John 3:8 is also true for Pentecostals and Charismatics!

Pohlmann’s third section probably is the most interesting one. It is entitled The external evidence of the Spirit. In this section Pohlmann carried through his thesis that the Spirit cannot be restricted to work in the church only; the Spirit cannot be controlled, nor domesticated nor institutionalised. The Spirit is not just the Spirit of the church but also the Spirit of this world. Pohlmann argues that scripture itself testifies to the Spirit’s activity in creation and history. He then elucidates the testimony to the Spirit in philosophy, in psychology, in modern, predominantly German literature, in physics and in natural science. His findings are impressive and his cross-references to the theological works discussed are challenging. He highlights similar concerns in theological discussions and in "external" references to the Spirit. Pohlmann also provides the reader with criteria in order to determine whether a certain "external" evidence to the Spirit refers to the Spirit of God or not: the ten commandments and the commandment of love towards all people. However, references to the spirit as "the spirit of our time" should not be taken seriously from a theological view point and do not qualify as a testimony to God’s Spirit. Thus, while the Spirit is the Spirit that penetrates the entire world, the Spirit of God should never be confused with the spirit of our time (Weltgeist, nicht Zeitgeist).

Pohlmann concludes his book with six paragraphs about life in the Spirit; it comprises a christocentric spirituality, a mystic spirituality, a social spirituality, a dialogical (dialogisch) spirituality, a meditative spirituality and a cosmic, creational spirituality.

Pohlmann’s book is refreshing, his language a delight and his conclusions stimulating. It represents probably the most comprehensive introduction into the current discussion on pneumatology and it is only sad that among the theological reflections there is no thorough contribution from a pentecostal/charismatic view point. One almost wonders whether Pentecostals and Charismatics simply have a traditional (evangelical?) pneumatology with an appendix: Spirit baptism and charismata?

Matthias Wenk

SHORT REVIEWS


This book concentrates on the role of Jesus as miracle worker as reflected in the Gospels. Twelftree’s pedigree, especially in writings concerning the demonic, is well known and this work provides another positive contribution to the issues discussed.

His agenda is varied as is his anticipated readership. It will be the scholar, student and teacher who will benefit from this work rather than the pastor or Christian who functions in a normal church context. This is partially because Twelftree desires to interact with the Jesus of History debate as well as to comment on the miracles of Jesus. Thus, approximately half of the book comprehensively and helpfully surveys issues of authenticity and historicity (mainly provided in order to affirm the reliability of much of the textual material), the rest taken up with assessments of the significance of each miracle to the authors of the Gospels whilst at the same time, offering judicious comment on the text. The wealth of the bibliography indicates that both parts of the book have been presented in the context of wide reading. Some editing is needed: e.g. “we (are) unable to set aside” (41); the same quote from Hume is recorded 3 times, twice on adjoining pages (40f); Deinnis Nineham (368).

The miracles of Jesus are discussed from the perspectives of each of the Gospel writers thus enabling the reader to appreciate any possible reductio and the unique themes within each Gospel. The comments offered are succinct and sensitive. This will be a book that will be a set
text for years to come in the field of healing and exorcism in the New Testament.

Keith Warrington


This book, part of the author's recent doctoral thesis, concentrates on the gospels, examining the various accounts of the healings and exorcisms performed by Jesus. Central to the work is the question: to what extent is Jesus to be seen as a paradigm for contemporary healing ministries? Is he the great exemplar, or do the healings point to other aspects of Jesus' person and mission? By analysing all the passages involving Jesus' healing and exorcistic ministry, the argument is presented that Jesus chose to heal and exorcise in order to teach his disciples and to provoke a watching a world into examining the claims he made for himself.

That this is written by a Pentecostal, who does not dismiss the reality or possibility of contemporary healing, gives the book a certain controversy. Traditionally, Pentecostals have stressed the power of Jesus and the delegated authority that his contemporary disciples have. Therefore, since Jesus seems to have had a 100% success rate, except where there was lack of faith, then if healings are not evident, the problem must self-evidently be with the unhealed. But if the argument presented in this book about Jesus can be accepted, it will result in contemporary believers, both the healers and the sick, not being left in a place-of-frustration when they do not experience the full, immediate healing they believe should be theirs.

The next work to follow this one is to be a similar textual examination of the material in James and the Pauline letters to show the expectations that contemporary believers can have when they are ill or are praying for others who are sick. Meanwhile, this work is of value to those engaged in preaching and teaching from the gospels, and to those involved in the healing ministries. Included in the book is a set of questions for further reflection and an extensive bibliography of use to any involved in studying the healing accounts in the gospels.

Neil Hudson