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P.E.F. Committee Conference, 2007

The P.E.F. Committee comprises delegates from member denominations and groups from across Europe. About 110 delegates gathered in Paris from 1st to 3rd March. They represented at least twenty two nations and possibly thirty different member organisations.

From the very beginning I was impressed by a sense of optimism amongst many of the delegates. Whilst this optimism was not apparently supported by much good news about church planting or mission it was certainly encouraging to network with European leaders who genuinely feel that they can and are making a difference in their respective nations.

The format of the conference seemed to follow a familiar pattern with several plenary sessions at which papers were presented. As this conference coincided with centenary celebrations of the Pentecostal movement in many parts of the world, the theme was “100 Years of Pentecostal Revival – what has changed?; what has to be changed?” This theme was reflected in the papers presented. The first was an historical overview of the impact of European Pentecostalism. Paul Schmidgall, the President of the European Theological Seminary in Germany was obviously comfortable with this subject and presented an excellent overview with good statistical support. His best estimate is that there are approximately three million Pentecostals in Europe. This statistic differs from others such as Barrett but response from the conference suggested that Schmidgall is probably closer to an accurate assessment.

Pastor Klaus Korhonen, Senior Pastor of Saalem church in Helsinki, Finland presented a paper in which he examined the periods of growth and stagnation over the eighty five year history of his church. Two memorable facts emerged. Firstly, the moral failure of a leader in the sixties apparently caused a longer period of stagnation than any other incident in the history of the church – wars included! Secondly, using the metaphor of the stem that supports the ear of wheat, Korhonen commented that the periods of stagnation in retrospect have proven just as valuable to the long term stability of the church as the periods of growth.

I was able to present a paper on the issue of Pentecostalism – between legalism and liberalism? I made the point that any movement goes through shifts in thought and that there has evidently been some shifts in Pentecostal eschatology, social standing and even ethics over the past century. These have all had an impact on morality that needs careful attention in the early 21st Century.
The fourth speaker was Stefan Christiansen, the founder of the youth movement “Jesus Revolution” in Norway. He presented an enthusiastic motivational overview of some very encouraging initiatives amongst Europe’s youth.

One of the great values of a conference of this nature is that of networking. There was a clear sense of this taking place with excellent fellowship throughout the time. The French churches proved to be excellent hosts.

The conference concluded with an extended business session during which time the existing Presidium was re-elected for a further four year term. My overall impression is that Pentecostalism in Europe remains at a cross-roads with some encouraging areas of growth. European politics with a drive for greater federalism are slightly evident but the general desire, in my opinion, remains for co-operative fellowship. The Pentecostal organisations that serve our wider continental fellowship such as EPTA, PEM (Pentecostal European Mission) and PEF are certainly worthy of support. New initiatives such as a forum for youth ministry and for those who are editors of newspapers and magazines are also to be applauded and supported.

Paul Alexander
Principal of Mattersey Hall, the Chairman of EPTA and a member of the National Leadership Team of the UK Assemblies of God.

SPS Conference, 2007

The 2007 Society for Pentecostal Studies Conference at Lee University, Tennessee, was well attended (about 300 people), well-organised and brought together scholars from all over the world. The theme of the conference was ‘The role of experience in the Christian life and thought – Pentecostal insights’ and there were papers on the nature of experience and its different expressions within the multi-faceted and diverse Pentecostal community. Plenary sessions were well attended. Paul Conn spoke about the nature of a Christian University and saw it as one that was led by the Spirit rather than one that was defined by the allegiances of its teaching staff or the restrictiveness of its curriculum. David Daniels spoke about the experience of sound in Pentecostalism and, in an original exploration of Pentecostal music and prayer (accompanied by suitably evocative audio clips), was able to offer an alternative rendering of Pentecostal historiography dependent upon similarities of sound experience rather than of doctrinal or racial affinity. Ben Withington spoke about what is wrong with Evangelical theology and identified three areas: Calvinism has flattened opposition with a rationalistic concept of theology that is essentially modernistic but is, in his view, exegetically mistaken; dispensationalism should be dispensed with, being equally guilty of exegetical fallacies; and experience should be made the servant and not the master of theology. Allan Anderson speaking about the early experience of Pentecostals was able to show how, after initial mistakes over xenoglossia, their burning hearts led them to the mission field, often using extant missionary organisations to take the message forward.

In another strand of the work three books merited extensive discussion. Mark Cartledge’s Practical Theology (Paternoster), Amos Yong’s The Spirit Outpoured on All Flesh (Baker Academic) and Frank Macchia’s Baptized the Spirit: a Global Pentecostal Theology (Zondervan). Each of these books attracted selected respondents and, in each case, the authors spoke about what they had been trying to achieve. Among other things, the first showed a way to reflect theologically upon descriptions of charismatic experience; the second showed how systematic theology might incorporate Pentecostal understandings of the Spirit, and the third how the baptism in the Spirit might be related to the kingdom of God and eschatology rather than being tied to Christian initiation.

Many of these themes are planned for future issues. Meanwhile, in the current unthemed issue, we have a rich variety of topics (revival, eschatology, authority in preaching, to name but three) for you.

William K Kay
Pentecostalism as a Paradigm Shift: A Response to Hans Kung’s Paradigmatic Model

Harry Letson

Abstract

This article seeks to address the omission of Pentecostalism in Hans Kung’s work on paradigm shifts in his book, Christianity. It is considered a response to this omission not a critique of the whole work. Such an undertaking lies beyond the scope of this article.

In every generation God raises up an individual or a group of individuals to fulfil his will and purpose and to bring about change and new direction for his people. Hans Kung (b1928) in his book Christianity calls such an event ‘a paradigm shift’. In this monumental work Kung describes what he means by quoting Thomas S. Kuhn (1922-1996) as saying it is “…an entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques and so on shared by the members of a given community.”

So what does Kuhn actually say about paradigms and paradigm shifts? Admittedly, Kuhn’s work as a historian of the sciences centres on scientific developments and structures. The title of his renowned book tells us so: The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Kuhn was concerned with plotting the development of scientific change and how and at what point the shift took place as well as the individuals involved in the transition, or shift, in scientific thinking. Speaking of his understanding of paradigms he describes it thus in his book:

These I take to be universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners.

For example, he argues, at what point did the world change from a Ptolemaic ‘geocentric’ concept of the universe, with the earth at the centre of the universe and all the planets revolving around it to a Copernican, heliocentric one, with the sun at the centre around which everything rotates? It is this shift in perception or ‘gestalt’ as Kuhn calls it which defines the difference. However, the revolution implied here is not that something came out of the blue hitherto unknown but a gradual unfolding of concepts and ideas crystallised and formulated by an individual or group of individuals. The changes were slow and came about through the discovery of various anomalies and inconsistencies in the prevailing theories causing scholars to re-think the status quo. It was these anomalies and inconsistencies which eventually precipitated a crisis which, in time, led to a revolution in scholarly thinking, be that scientific, philosophical or theological. To use Newton’s phrase, they ‘stood on the shoulders of giants’.

We can now see why Kung adopted the use of Kuhn’s paradigm theory as it admirably helps to delineate the shifts that take place in historical periods. In Kung’s mind this can be applied with great relevance to the history of Christianity. He explains:

…thinking in paradigms means understanding the dominant structures of history with the figures that shaped them. Thinking in paradigms means analysing the different entire constellations (Kung’s emphasis) of Christianity, their origins, the way in which they mature and…the way in which they harden. Thinking in paradigms means describing the survival into the present of paradigms which have hardened into traditions.

However, Kung seems to take Kuhn’s paradigmatic idea even further by going on to elaborate on various other permutations of paradigm shifts such as ‘microparadigms’ on particular questions like the change from the Sabbath to Sunday, ‘mesoparadigms’ or partial shifts between the major shifts like apocalyptic Christology to Catholic Christology and ‘macroparadigms’ which involve whole scale movements like that from Jewish Christianity to Gentile Christianity. Viewing church history in this fashion helps us to pinpoint the junctures at which changes occur and the specific individual or individuals involved. In this way Kung plots the shifts and changes which have taken place at appropriate junctures in time in the history of the church.

Kung’s book encompasses the whole of Christian history showing the central role of structural change within the historical movements and the
various individuals within its ranks who brought about effective change to move the church forward. However, it has to be said that Kung is more interested in the way the structures changed within the progress of the church and the forces at work bringing them about. He clearly admits in his opening article that he would “…dispense with reconstructing in detail the two-thousand year history of Christianity…with all the different trends and personalities.” In other words his emphasis would not be on the individuals and their specific theologies but the forces and mechanisms which brought about the various paradigm shifts. This is not to suggest he ignores the importance of individuals in influencing change within society and the socio-political system but his interest seems to be the structures and concepts which precipitate change. So what does he mean by paradigm shifts?

The Paradigm Shifts

Kung is undoubtedly correct when he says: “A macro-paradigm needs a long time to mature before it establishes itself historically.” However, it may be possible to pinpoint the separation of a new paradigm from the previous one. Such is the case with the shift from, what Kung calls, the “Jewish Apocalyptic Paradigm” to the “Hellenistic Paradigm of Earliest Christianity” He hints at this himself in referring to “…the formal excommunication of Christians” by Jews being finalised by “…the cursing of the heretics” at the Council of Jamnia – c90. It may be fair to say from that point onwards the separation between Jew and Christian was complete and a new paradigm had come into force. It is true that many aspects of the new paradigm had already been in existence but now it is historically set in time.

The shift was then consolidated by early church fathers such as Irenaeus (c160-225), Tertullian (c160-225) and Origen (c185-254) whom Kung claims was “…the first model of a scientific theologian”. The shift was finally established, according to Kung, under Constantine at the Council of Nicaea in 325.

Other shifts may not be as observable as this. For example at what point did the paradigm change from a Hellenistic Christian Paradigm to the Roman Catholic Paradigm? Kung hints at this in showing the change of emphasis that had begun at Nicaea with the Emperor intervening in theological affairs in order to unify the church as the state religion. From this point onwards theologians and churchmen arose to consolidate the church’s supremacy. He refers to Augustine of Hippo (354-430) as the major theological architect of the change from the Hellenistic paradigm to a Latin Roman Catholic paradigm along with Leo I (d 461) and particularly Gregory I (590-604) as the instigator of the new Paradigm. What Gregory did was to build on the work of preceding Catholic thinkers in regard to the papacy. It was upon this Gregorian foundation that succeeding popes and churchmen built the powerful structure of medieval Roman Catholicism becoming more and more intrusion in the lives of leaders and rulers alike.

The Protestant Paradigm

Referring to the development of a paradigm shift Kung says it develops slowly and “…has its makings in the previous Paradigm.” It came about gradually due to discontents concerning theology and church governance and particularly issues of salvation. Those who sowed the seeds of discontent on these issues were Lorenzo Valla, John Wycliffe and John Hus, to name a few. Their discontent finally blossomed in the person of Martin Luther. The shift to the Protestant paradigm could be pinpointed to the nailing of Luther’s ninety-five theses on indulgences to the door of the castle church at Wittenberg, Germany in 1517. Whilst Luther may be seen as the initiating theologian of the Reformation period an equally strong case can be made for John Calvin although his was probably more of a consolidating role. The Reformed Churches which emerged through his teaching and theology grew to dominate Europe and America as much, if not more, than Luther’s Churches.

The Diverging Paradigms

At this point Kung introduces the idea of an Enlightenment Modern Paradigm emerging out of the Protestant Paradigm. This includes the liberal theology of Schleiermacher along with others such as Lessing, Reimarus, Strauss, Baur and Harnack. Such a paradigm to conservative evangelicals is a divergence from the path of revealed truth into the ‘by-path meadow’ of liberal vagaries. Understanding this divergence may also help to see how Kung arrives at his Contemporary Ecumenical Paradigm with its ecumenical ramifications.

---

10  Kung, Christianity, p.111
11  Kung, Christianity, p.111
12  Kung, Christianity, p.vii, viii
13  Kung, Christianity, p.87
14  Kung, Christianity, p.163
15  Kung, Christianity, p.284
The Experiential Protestant Paradigm

Following Kung’s model the dominating personality in the Experiential paradigm has to be John Wesley and his Methodist revival. This encapsulated all that was good in both Puritanism and Pietism. Wesley laid the foundation which eventually fed into the emergence of the Pentecostal movement at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Pentecostalism, like all paradigm shifts, did not occur as a totally new phenomenon ‘out of the blue’ so to speak. It came about as a gradual shift in emphasis; a steady build-up of pre-existing ideas already extant within Christianity at the emergence of Pentecostalism, especially in the western world. Following Kung’s scheme we might call these pre-existing ideas ‘micro-paradigms’ already at work within the existing paradigm of Experiential Christianity. In time these micro-paradigms crystallised into meso-paradigms expressed in Puritanism and Pietism and eventually Methodism itself.

Puritans such as Richard Baxter (1615-1691) and Thomas Goodwin (1600-1679) were influential in this respect. Goodwin, in his sermons on Ephesians seems to imply that the sealing of the Spirit in Ephesians 1:14 is a separate experience to be sought for, challenging his readers to “sue it out with God”18 or as David Martyn Lloyd-Jones paraphrases it: “sue Him for it”.19 This Reformed branch of experiential Christianity found it truest expression in the ministry of George Whitefield and Jonathan Edwards and what might be called the Experiential model of evangelical Christianity. These two divergent views of Christianity have opposed each other over the years since the Reformation.

Arguably, its fullest expression may be seen in Pietists such as Philipp Jakob Spener (1635-1705) and August Hermann Francke (1663-1727). Spener’s book Pia Desideria20 called for a further reform of the church due to its loss of godly standards during the thirty years war. Spener also advocated what might be seen as the ‘micro-paradigms’ of a return to experiencing salvation by personal conversion, the study and engagement of the Word of God, living a godly life and the apostolic format of church meetings.21 Spener’s teaching found fertile ground in August Hermann Francke. Francke is acknowledged as Spener’s natural successor in the Pietist movement on the continent. As well as influencing many to enter into a fuller experience of salvation Francke went on to found an orphanage in Halle which was to run on the basis of faith; that is without appealing for money.

It was through the influence of these men, particularly Francke that Count Nicholas Ludwig von Zinzendorf came to a fuller understanding of Christ. By permitting persecuted Pietists or United Brethren (Unitas Fratum) from the area of Moravia to set up home on his estates in Saxony near the border with Poland, Zinzendorf had unwittingly provided a safe haven for an embryonic missionary organisation. Although initially formed in 1457 in Bohemia the Moravian Church suffered great persecution almost to the point of extinction until Zinzendorf provided refuge for them and they established their ‘Herrnhut’.22 This was in effect a Christian community. The present church, the Moravian Church, dates from 1727 when an outpouring of the Spirit was experienced which thrust its members out into great missionary endeavour. Eventually a church was set up in London in Fetter Lane. It was to this church that John Wesley (1703-1791) and his brother Charles (1707-1788), came to on a visit and experienced God in an unprecedented way but later parted company on theological issues.23

This was not the first encounter John Wesley had with Moravians. He first met them whilst en route as a missionary to Georgia and was undoubtedly impressed with their devotion, zeal and faith. One Moravian actually challenged Wesley about his experience of Christ which had a profound effect upon him. He was to experience an instant conversion whilst listening to a reading of Luther’s commentary on Romans at Aldersgate and Wesley’s ‘heart was strangely warmed’ and he felt he did trust Christ, Christ alone. This was the Moravian emphasis – instant conversion and

---

16 Thomas Goodwin Sermons on Ephesians Sermon XVI http://www.newble.co.uk/goodwin/literature.html
19 Spener (1675) Pia Desideria
20 http://www.moravian.org.uk/
21 http://www.moravian.org.uk/
joyous experience of faith. After visiting Zinzendorf and the Herrnhut, Wesley was not disposed to being a Moravian. However, the Wesleys, and John in particular, were indebted to the Moravians for a number of things – the enthusiasm for preaching and missionary enterprise as well as commitment to instantaneous salvation followed by the experience of joy and peace through the work of the Spirit.

In 1729 the Wesleys were part of a group of students in Oxford University who met for fellowship and study. They were greatly ridiculed by other students and came to be known by them as ‘the Holy Club’, ‘Godly Club’, ‘Enthusiasts’ and ‘Methodists’. The last name was given them because of their disciplined and orderly life in matters of devotion and attendance to the poor. One of those who attended was George Whitefield (1714-1790) who joined the group after it was formed. He became one of the early champions of Methodism. He too had a significant religious experience as the result of a serious illness. He came through it with, “...a joyous consciousness of peace with God.”22 Whitefield differed theologically from the Wesleys in that he was a convinced Calvinist whereas Wesley, following many in the Anglican church of the day and his father, was more oriented to Arminianism.23 This may have been a reaction to the lax attitude of the clergy who did very little to reach the parishes or alleviate the suffering of the poor. Although poles apart theologically both Wesley and Whitefield shared the common Pietistic and evangelical beliefs of instantaneous conversion followed by the inner experience of the Spirit of joy and peace demonstrated in acts of devotion and good works towards those in need.

What the Wesleys and Whitefield set in motion along with the Moravians and the Pietists was the necessity of experiencing God for oneself as an inner experience of joy, peace and forgiveness expressed in greater devotion to God along with charitable acts. The other element was preaching. Wesley was a notable preacher even before his experience at Aldersgate and Whitefield was renowned for his open-air preaching. Together these individuals were instrumental in bringing the experience of salvation to many through their preaching of the gospel.

The micro-paradigms forged by these groups were that of the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer in instantaneous conversion followed by the experience of joy and peace. Without realising it, these groups brought into being a new paradigm of a distinctly experiential character which would work its way into the spiritual psyche of Christians at the time in preparation for the emergence of Pentecostalism. Yet more was to follow adding the micro-paradigms of revivalism, the second blessing and healing as well as an understanding of the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

**Revivalism and the Second Blessing**

In time the Methodist awakening led others into the search for Wesley’s ‘Second Blessing’, as David Allen describes it.24 Donald Dayton is more specific, however, in calling it ‘the second moment’ as this seems to be nearer Wesley’s definition of the experience.25 Allen, however, claims that some of Wesley’s adherents wanted to call it the baptism in the Holy Spirit but Wesley “...was reluctant to use the term....”26 feeling it would appear to divorce the work of the Spirit from the new birth. If Allen is correct in this it would show the seeds of the Pentecostal emphasis on Spirit baptism was sown right back at the time of the Methodist revival. It was this emphasis on the ‘second blessing’ or ‘second moment’ which resulted in the emergence of numerous revival and holiness groups and camp meetings. Phoebe Palmer (1807-1874) is of note here according to Dayton27 as was C.G. Finney (1792-1875) of Oberlin College. Finney was a Presbyterian who was gradually drawn to the Arminian expression of the second experience.28 In this way the scene was being set for the widespread acceptance of Wesleyan expressions of holiness in a desired second blessing. The establishment of this doctrine became so ensconced in the western spiritual psyche that by the middle of the nineteenth century it was regarded by many as orthodox as any other tenet of the Christian faith. This is encapsulated succinctly by Mark Guy Pearse when he said: “...the despised doctrine of the early Methodists has become the glorious heritage of all denominations.”29 Perhaps this is what Kung meant when he spoke of meso-paradigms – the partial shifts which occurred between macro-paradigms. In this sense it can be seen in the development of the Methodist holiness tradition nestling somewhere between the Experiential and the Pentecostal paradigms. The distinctive characteristic of this meso-paradigm is expressly seen in the emergence of the holiness movement and its emphasis on the second blessing as a “second

---

26 Allen, *The Unfailing Stream*, p.72, 73.
28 Dayton, *Theological Roots*, p.66.
definite work of grace”. Increasingly this second work of grace came to be defined in more biblical terms, specifically the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Revivalism and Healing

The other element drawn into the meso-paradigm during the nineteenth century in preparation for the advent of Pentecostalism is that of healing. The possibility of physical healing is not unique to Pentecostalism. The church down through the ages has always accepted the possibility of healing within the sovereign will and purpose of God. However, Paul Chappell suggests the modern belief and practice of healing came to the fore during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. America, he says, “...witnessed scattered demonstrations of healing within various religious communities.” In Britain notables such as George Fox (1624-1691), the founder of the Society of Friends advocated healing and regularly prayed for the sick to great effect. After his death a ‘Book of Miracles’ was found with 150 recorded healings under his ministry. In the nineteenth century Edward Irving and the Catholic Apostolic Church promoted the concept of divine healing.31 Chappell also mentions others on the European mainland that were particularly instrumental in the furtherance of the healing movement in America – Johann Christoph Blumhardt of Germany (1843), Dorothea Trudel of Switzerland (1851) and Otto Stockmayer (1867).32 Otto Stockmayer, however, gave the healing movement a nudge in the right direction when he formulated a methodology for it in his book: *Sickness and the Gospel.* Blumhardt and Trudel may have ignited the healing movement on the continent but Stockmayer stoked the fire of it with his methodology and gave it the thrust it needed. Stockmayer influenced many through his writing and ministry in such places as Keswick.

One person influenced by Edward Irving who went on to become one of the foremost advocates of healing in America was John Alexander Dowie (1847-1907). He came to his belief in healing through experiencing healings in his pastorate in Newtown, Sydney, Australia. He later migrated to America with his family and set up home in the Chicago area.

Another great American advocate of healing was a Boston doctor, Charles Cullis. He, more than anyone, gave the healing movement its greatest boost. After reading about the life of Dorothea Trudel, Cullis was convinced of the truth of divine healing. He put his faith into practice in 1870 by praying for Lucy Drake who suffered a brain tumour which paralysed her and she was healed. As a result Cullis went on a tour of various faith works in Europe and returned inspired to do the same in America. He did this with his Faith Conventions and, in time, convinced many in the holiness movement that healing was part and parcel of the biblical revelation. Cullis more than anyone brought the holiness tradition and the healing phenomenon into line with each other and in so doing prepared the way for the emergence of Pentecostalism in the twentieth century.

However, if Cullis can be seen as bringing about the fusion of holiness and healing it was left to others to knock it into shape. R.L. Stanton pushed it to its limits with his *Gospel Parallelisms: Illustrated in the Healing of the Body and Soul* (1883). R. Kelso Carter’s *The Atonement of Sin and Sickness or A Full Salvation for Soul and Body* (1884) took it even further claiming healing was provided for in the atonement of Christ. Others such as W.E. Boardman, A.J. Gordon, A.B. Simpson and Andrew Murray promoted healing through their writings and in Boardman’s case establishing his own faith home in London, Bethshan, with the help of a few wealthy friends.

By the end of the nineteenth century the healing movement and the holiness tradition were often seen as one and the same, with some exceptions. This means that the scene was almost set for the emergence of a new paradigm shift in the church in the form of the Pentecostal revival. Ideas and beliefs on holiness, experiencing God with joy and divine healing being were floated within the church. The holiness camp meetings in America and the Keswick Convention in Britain became conduits for the propagation of these emerging ideas forging a path for the coming of the Pentecostal revival in 1906 at Azusa Street in Los Angeles. It is this we need to turn to now to see the beginnings of the paradigm shift.

The Pentecostal Paradigm

Why Kung ignores the advent of Pentecostalism is truly baffling but it may be explained in that is did not fit into his ecumenical pattern of theology at the time saying: “Today being a true Christian means being an ecumenical Christian.” Yet Kung makes not so much as a fleeting reference to the Pentecostal movement. It is probably fair to say, though, it did not fit into the paradigmatic model he was building to establish his ideas of ecumenism. This too may be short-sightedness on his part as many Pentecostal thinkers today go to great lengths to show Pentecostalism’s ecumenical dimension.

33 Kung, *Christianity*, p.793.
With the coming of the Pentecostal movement at the beginning of the twentieth century the character of the Christian church has altered irreversibly for better or worse depending on your theological point of view. What we need to do is to begin to construct the details of this new Pentecostal paradigm.

As has been said above each paradigm has its dominating personality. Usually, but not exclusively, this is a theologian or radical thinker. So who might be the dominating figure of the Pentecostal paradigm shift and is this the same person who propelled the whole thing forward?

Charles Fox Parham (1873-1929).

Arguably, the theologian who initiated the paradigm shift was Charles Fox Parham. He appears to have been the channel through which all the emerging ideas of the nineteenth century flowed. Cecil Robeck states that Parham’s call to preach came through his being healed of “…a life-threatening illness as a boy.”34 He was given an outlet for his ministry within the Methodist congregations of Kansas. He also took part in camp meetings with their emphasis on holiness and entire sanctification. So in this sense he came through the avenue of the holiness movement. His main emphasis though was on healing. He was so convinced of the truth of this he went on a tour of the various healing centres to see for himself. He visited centres established by John A. Dowie and A. B. Simpson but with his sights firmly set on the work of Frank Sandford. Parham and Sandford were very alike theologically but Sandford imparted something to Parham that would help bring about a new paradigm shift. That was the belief in the restoration of the Holy Spirit. He must have known what their conclusions would be but he was so convinced of the truth of this he went on a tour of the various healing centres to see for himself. He visited centres established by John A. Dowie and A. B. Simpson but with his sights firmly set on the work of Frank Sandford. Parham and Sandford were very alike theologically but Sandford imparted something to Parham that would help bring about a new paradigm shift. That was the belief in the restoration of the Holy Spirit. He must have known what their conclusions would be but he was so convinced of the truth of this he went on a tour of the various healing centres to see for himself.

After his tour had ended Parham returned to his Bible School in Topeka, Kansas with renewed zeal. Immediately, Robeck says, Parham set his students the task of investigating the evidence for the baptism in the Holy Spirit. He must have known what their conclusions would be but he wanted them to discover it for themselves. Their answer, as was expected, was speaking in tongues. The breakthrough came on January 1st 1901 when Parham laid hands on Agnes Ozman and she began to speak in tongues. It was this event more than any other which signalled the beginnings of the paradigm shift. Of course, like every other paradigm shift, it is not the end of the story but merely the beginning.

William Joseph Seymour (1870-1922)

Parham may be rightly considered the initiator of a new paradigm but the forging of Pentecostalism into a world force is reserved for one man, William Joseph Seymour. It was he who took Parham’s beliefs and ideas and put them into fruition through his mission in Azusa Street, Los Angeles and thereby turning Pentecostalism into a world-wide phenomenon. Robeck states that between 1906 and 1909 Azusa Street Mission became “…the focus of attention…of thousands of people around the world….“35 Stories of what was happening were carried in both the secular and Christian press and much of it not very complimentary. This notoriety was further heightened shortly afterwards with the San Francisco earthquake on Wednesday 18th April 1906. On the very day the Los Angeles Times reported ‘the going’s-on’ in Azusa Street the earthquake struck. Many of those in Azusa Street saw it as a sign from God that what was happening to them was part of his plan and they were motivated to greater evangelistic effort.36

The circulation of reports concerning Azusa Street was due to the large numbers of people attending the humble shack at 312 Azusa Street, Los Angeles. Robeck claims fifteen hundred were estimated to have been in attendance on any given Sunday during this period. Such crowds attending a place of worship could not go unnoticed by the local press. Yet it was not merely the numbers turning up to the meetings that gave the place notoriety but what was happening. In the mind of those attending these happenings were nothing short of a miracle. People were coming to faith in Christ and others were testifying to being baptised in the Spirit or healed. Spiritual gifts such as speaking in tongues were also in evidence. In short it must have looked like pandemonium to the uninitiated. Meetings lasted seven days a week. They were scheduled daily, according to Robeck, at 3 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. and very often these ran into one another. Robeck describes it as, “…melding, almost, into one long three-year service through the course of the revival.”37 Harvey Cox describes Seymour as “…presiding over this gentle pandemonium with tact and…personal diplomacy.”38 There was a constant air of excitement and expectancy and for many who attended they were not disappointed.

So if anyone deserves the right to be recognised as the founder of modern day Pentecostalism it must be William J. Seymour. It was his vision, leadership, teaching and drive which kept the whole thing on track.

---

35 Robeck, Azusa Street, p.5.
36 Robeck Azusa Street, p.75, 76.
37 Robeck Azusa Street, p.136.
38 Harvey Cox, Fire from Heaven, (London: Cassell, 1996), p57
Parham, though, needs to be credited as the initiator of a new paradigm which would encircle the earth and in time change the face of Christianity in the world at large.

**Conclusion**

What Parham and Seymour unleashed in the world was a new way of seeing Christian experience and with it a new paradigm. This paradigm was not their personal invention but like so many before them they became the conduit and catalysts for all the preceding micro-paradigms and meso-paradigm to coalesce. It therefore begs the question why Kung found no place in his scheme of things for such a phenomenon. They only conclusion can be that it did not fit his theological perspective. Perhaps this study goes some way to rectify that.
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Revival – A Classic Pentecostal View

David Allen

Abstract

Beginning with the primitive Christian community – arguably a revival of the faith of Israel in its final and finest form – and using the experience of the earliest believers as a benchmark by which to judge and evaluate subsequent moves of the Spirit, this article surveys such ‘times of refreshing’ from the first to the twentieth century, concluding with comment on the links between the Welsh Revival and emergent Pentecostals.

Introduction

Mark Stibbe has recently observed that ‘Writing in a detached way about revival is like writing a doctoral thesis on love’ (Stibbe in Walker and Aune 2003:23). My own interest in revival is, like Stibbe’s, far from being merely academic, as what follows will reveal.

Brought up in High Church Anglicanism, converted under the influence of what might be described as ‘Cliff College Methodism’, I became a Pentecostal both in experience and by denomination over forty years ago. After almost a decade of secondary school teaching, I entered the ministry of Assemblies of God. Since the early eighties I have been teaching Christian Doctrine and History at that particular denomination’s training college, Mattersey Hall.

In consequence my interest in revival has a number of facets: as an active member of a Pentecostal assembly it has an important personal dimension; my regular and frequent involvement in both preaching and teaching at ‘parochial’ level means I have a pastoral interest; and, no less importantly, my ongoing commitment to teaching at Mattersey Hall is a constant stimulus to continuing research and to the vitally important matter of learning, in cooperation with my students, the often salutary lessons of history. In sum, my interest in revival is personal, pastoral, and pedagogical.

Taking the primitive Christian community as my starting-point, I shall suggest that it was, at bottom, a revival of the faith of Israel which, though firmly rooted in its ancient seed-bed, nevertheless developed, expanded, and enriched it. This added element I perceive to have been a recurrent feature of a variety of revival movements down the centuries – the Welsh Revival of 1904-05 which we are currently celebrating being a notable one.

The majority of Pentecostals, from the beginning of the last century, perceived the entire mediaeval period, with a few ‘bright intervals’, to be the ‘Dark Age’ of Aimée Semple Macpherson’s typically dramatic sermon of 1917 in which she graphically described the declension of the Church from apostolic standards – its Constantinianization being a lamentable landmark – and its gradual restoration via such movements as the Reformation, the Great Awakening and the Welsh Revival (S.L.Ware ‘Restorationism’ in Burgess and Van der Maas 2002:1019).

Each successive wave of revival, according to this Restorationist view, rediscovered and re-emphasised neglected or forgotten elements of ‘the faith once and for all delivered to the saints’ (Jude 3b) and was perceived as being ‘better’ than the previous one. But once fully restored to its former glory, and ‘terrible as an army with banners’, the Church – replete with Pentecostal power – would reap an unprecedented final harvest; and Christ would then return for His Bride.

Thus modern Pentecostalism, with its emphasis on the Spirit-baptism as a power-for-service ‘second blessing’, and its rediscovery of the primitive charismata or pneumatikoi, was seen as the restoration to the Church of the one – and absolutely vital – but hitherto missing, component. It would provide the final, great missionary thrust, resulting in an unprecedented ‘harvest of souls’ before the Parousia, as we have said. Such a view undoubtedly was behind the setting up, by Alexander Boddy and Cecil Polhill, in 1908, the Pentecostal Missionary Union – significantly the first Pentecostal organisation to be set up in the British Isles after the initial and inaugural ‘outpouring’ in Sunderland in the Fall of 1907. And, despite claims by Ian Murray that the dispensational views of most classic Pentecostals have diminished missionary zeal, Pentecostalism continues to have a strong missionary emphasis (Murray 1971:204) that is closely linked to the continuing belief that the return of Christ is imminent.

And so, after these preliminary, general comments outlining how most Pentecostals, in their hundred years of history, have viewed nearly two millennia of Church history, we shall now undertake a brief survey of that history with particular reference to significant revivals, beginning with the New Testament.
Revival in the New Testament

Though there have been various attempts to define revival, there is general agreement that it begins within the people of God: ‘In the context of Christian revival, the object of the verb revive, is the church’ (Stibbe in Walker and Aune 2003:24). It was, of course, among the people of God that the Church had its inception.

And so, bearing in mind that Pentecostals have possibly made too much of the Acts of the Apostles, I want to suggest that the Christian Church was a revival of the faith of Israel in its final and finest form and manifestation; and also that its early history, the record of a revival par excellence – not forgetting the darker pages and not just focusing on Acts – provides us with a number of important lessons.

In the primitive Christian community all the distinctive and important features of the faith of Israel were revived and ancient, half-forgotten prophecies fulfilled: women were raised from being goods and chattels to full personhood, equality, and potential ministry (Acts 2:17, cf. Joel 2:28,29); the important principle of the primacy of obedient faith over mere ritualism was re-established (Genesis 4; Isaiah 1:10ff.; Luke 18:10-14; John 4:21-24); the expectation of Messiah – relatively few had been, like the aged Simeon, ‘waiting for the consolation of Israel’ (Luke 2:25, KJV) – was actualized and realised in the person of Jesus of Nazareth; and the impassioned wish of Moses, the man of God, that ‘all the LORD’S people were prophets, that the LORD would put His Spirit upon them! (Numbers 11:29, NASV, cf. Acts 2:38b) was fulfilled. Equipped and empowered by the Spirit the New Israel would set about the final realisation of Yahweh’s promise to Abraham that ‘in you shall all the families of the earth be blessed’ (Genesis 12:3b NASV).

This revival, originating in a small group or party within Palestinian Judaism, was not, however, a bare moral reformation. Indeed not. The Epistle to the Hebrews – whatever its provenance and original destination – whilst eloquently tracing the continuities between the faith of Israel and the new messianic community, nevertheless has the clear intention of demonstrating the superiority of the new covenant over the old: ‘Christ is shown to be better than angels, Moses, Aaron, and the levitical priests. His sacrifice is better than those of the old sanctuary’ (H.W.Attridge on ‘Hebrews’, ABD Vol 3 1992:99).

The word ‘better’ sums up the message of the anonymous writer as, quite possibly, he seeks to dissuade his readers from drifting back to the synagogue, at the time of the Neronian persecution (Hebrews 10:25).

Mention of that first persecution – and possibly conservative Jewish implication in it (Frend 1982:31) – underlines the fact that orthodox opinion was decidedly against those who were followers of ‘The Way’: Stephen was stoned for his faith and Saul only escaped from Damascus by the skin of his teeth.

At this point, before embarking on a brief survey of notable revivals from a classic Pentecostal perspective, it will be useful to draw out some of the features and underline some of the lessons that we may draw from the early Church as a paradigm of revival and as delineated in the pages of the New Testament. Note that the revival...

- began amongst the people of God
- was more than a mere reformation or restoration (cf. Hebrews ‘better’)
- was quintessentially a work of the Spirit
- resulted in effective evangelism in which signs and wonders strongly featured
- affected whole communities (turned the world upside down)
- was opposed by elements of the parent body
- over time experienced diminishing ardour (Rev. 2:4) and gradual routinisation

The domanical verdict on the Ephesian Church, as summarised in that condemnatory verse from the Apocalypse, might well serve as an adumbration of the condition of the Sub-Apostolic Church as a whole: commendably proper but decidedly lacking the ardour of the years of its establishment through the ministrations of the Apostle Paul, when the cult of Diana/Artemis, according to Luke, received such a palpable blow (Acts 19:23ff.)

Revivals: Montanism to Methodism

Much to Tertullian’s disgust, Montanism, arising in part as a consequence of the routinization evidenced, for example, by the Didache, was finally condemned at Rome early in the C3rd – even though, by virtually unanimous consent, the most that can justly be levelled against them is over-zealousness (De Soyres 1878; De Labriolle 1913; Wright 1978; Trevett 1996). Their emphasis on the Spirit and His gifts was primary, their lively expectation of the imminent Parousia was productive of conspicuous holiness, and their egalitarianism shaming to an increasingly male-dominated Church. They put both lukewarm, ‘Laodicean’ Catholics and pseudo-intellectual Gnostics to shame. Significantly Louis Berkhof, representing a long tradition not known for its sympathy with enthusiasm either ancient or modern, concedes that it was a ‘Montanist reformation’ (Berkhof 1950:29). Montanism was an embarrassment to the Church because it was a spirituality that arguably was more like that of the earliest days than that which was then prevalent.

The response of the parent-body to the New Prophecy was draconian,
like that of ultra-orthodox Jews when the new ‘sect’ of the Nazarenes first arose. Local synods condemned it and Asiatic bishops attempted to exorcise the alien spirits allegedly inhabiting the followers of Montanus.

Radically different was the response of the so-called Desert Fathers to their particular disaffection with the by then highly routinized, ‘bells and smells’, episcopally dominated Great Church. Whereas Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla addressed huge gatherings in the Phrygian countryside – the New Prophecy was rural in its origins and its power-base – the eremites fled alike the urban fleshpots and the increasingly ostentatious rituals of the basilica and sought refuge in abandoned forts and even burial vaults for their wrastlings with the sins of the flesh and their spiritual warfare for the welfare of their urban brethren. Yet their emphasis on the Spirit, as in Montanism, was primary. Cardinal Suéne–n he clashed with Cardinal Ruffini at the Second Vatican Council as a result of his insistence on the continuation of the primitive *charisma* – claimed that ‘monasticism in its beginnings was charismatic...’ (Suéne 1978: 28). And even when such primary sources as Athanasius’ *Life of Antony*, the *Lausiac History* of Palladius, and the *Collationes* of John Cassian are subjected to thorough scrutiny, there remains an irreducible core of the miraculous and charismatic.

The flight into the deserts of Egypt and Syria of the so-called Desert Fathers – this began in the late third century but was accelerated with the accession of the nominally Christian Constantine – is easily caricatured as a species of self-centred escapism. And the earliest solitaries were initially distrusted by the clergy as being troublesome and other-worldly cranks. But in reality, over time, the early monastic movement had a profound effect on the Church. The exploits of the Desert Fathers – as transmitted to the faithful via the sources already mentioned – inspired a deep seriousness in many Christians to provide stability and sanity in the Dark Ages which followed the irrevocable demise of the Roman Empire – namely monasteries such as Lérins and the dual foundation established by John Cassian at Marseille.

And the Desert Fathers not only provided strong support for Athanasius in his ongoing battle against Arianism, but they equally, in their heirs such as Lérins and the dual foundation established by John Cassian at Marseille. Yet their emphasis on the Spirit, as in Montanism, was primary. Cardinal Suéne–n he clashed with Cardinal Ruffini at the Second Vatican Council as a result of his insistence on the continuation of the primitive *charisma* – claimed that ‘monasticism in its beginnings was charismatic...’ (Suéne 1978: 28). And even when such primary sources as Athanasius’ *Life of Antony*, the *Lausiac History* of Palladius, and the *Collationes* of John Cassian are subjected to thorough scrutiny, there remains an irreducible core of the miraculous and charismatic.

The flight into the deserts of Egypt and Syria of the so-called Desert Fathers – this began in the late third century but was accelerated with the accession of the nominally Christian Constantine – is easily caricatured as a species of self-centred escapism. And the earliest solitaries were initially distrusted by the clergy as being troublesome and other-worldly cranks. But in reality, over time, the early monastic movement had a profound effect on the Church. The exploits of the Desert Fathers – as transmitted to the faithful via the sources already mentioned – inspired a deep seriousness in many Christians to provide stability and sanity in the Dark Ages which followed the irrevocable demise of the Roman Empire – namely monasteries such as Lérins and the dual foundation established by John Cassian at Marseille.

And the Desert Fathers not only provided strong support for Athanasius in his ongoing battle against Arianism, but they equally, in their heirs such as Lérins, Vincentius and Faustus of Riez, countered the doctrinal novelties of Augustine of Hippo.

The Cappadocians, too, were indebted to the Desert Fathers and, in addition to their theological importance, took monasticism out of the deserts and into the context of parochial ministry. They were theologians, bishops and philanthropists second to none and, like the Masilians, sons of the desert.

Though often characterised as ‘the Long Drought’, the Middle Ages, was not without its ‘streams in the desert’. And Pentecostal scholars have been conspicuous in research aimed at demonstrating that the Spirit-baptism, and the *charismata* they perceive as flowing from it, were occasionally in evidence in that thousand-year period, there being no strictly biblical restriction of these gifts to the apostolic period (Acts 2:38,39) Writing almost thirty years ago, Stanley M.Burgess noted the ambivalent attitude of mediaeval Catholicism to such manifestations of the Spirit (in Spittler ed. 1976: 25): on the one hand *glossolalia*, prophecy, and discerning of spirits, might lead to condemnation and burning as a heretic; on the other these manifestations were sometimes adduced as evidence of sainthood! Joachim of Fiore, who viewed history as a three-stage process with each Person of the Holy Trinity prominent in these succeeding *stati*, though popular in his lifetime as a seer – he was consulted by Richard Cœur de Lion – had his books condemned at the Fourth Lateran Council. This was ostensibly because his doctrine of the Trinity was considered suspect but more likely because he saw the *status* of the Spirit as yet to come – an implied criticism of the status quo!

There was no ambivalence in the response of the parent-body to the various evangelical ‘heresies’ of the Middle Ages, though Wycliffe managed to die in his bed – unlike many of his followers who, in the ensuing years, suffered under the statute De *Haeretico Comburendo*. Jan Huss was less fortunate.

Moving on swiftly through the centuries, Reformers and early Methodists alike suffered mutatis mutandi at the hands of both unsympathetic secular authorities and their respective and colluding parent-bodies. And both movements – the Reformation and the Wesleyans – experienced routinization once the dust of conflict had settled. Ironically, Wesleyans took a dim view of the emergent Primitive Methodists on the grounds that the open-air meetings at Mow Cop – in the early years of the nineteenth century – were declared to be against the spirit of Methodism. They thereby reacted almost exactly as the Asiatic bishops had done when Montanism first arose in Phrygia.

The Protestant Reformation and the Wesleyan Revival thus provide us with typical examples of a pattern which has been frequently repeated: the revival, after initial and sometimes spectacular gains – this despite ‘parental’ opposition – itself becomes the new establishment and, in time, replicates the reactionary attitudes and counter-measures it once itself experienced. The attitude of Luther, Calvin and Zwingli to the so-called Anabaptists provides a sad and salutary example.

However, briefly returning to a point made earlier, striking a more positive note – and seen from a Restorationist viewpoint – the Great Reformation and
the Wesleys and their followers refocused on long-neglected and important aspects of biblical religion, namely the New Birth and the centrality of the Cross. Wesley and his designated successor Fletcher of Madeley also additionally stressed the need for a ‘second blessing’ and thereby became the spiritual forebears of modern Pentecostalism (Dayton 1978:35-60). Neither movement, however, held totally true to their avowed sola scriptura stance, as their continued practice of paedobaptism has no biblical foundation. Even Monsignor Knox concedes as much in his magnum opus (Knox 1950:134).

**The Welsh Revival and its Links with Pentecostalism**

We do not need reminding that Wales had already experienced a number of revivals in the decades before the Revival of 1904-1905 which we presently commemorate. But, as Eifion Evans tells us, by the early years of the last century, ‘the lamp was burning low’ (Evans 1969:35) and across the denominational spectrum there were anxious and dedicated men and women of prayer who were looking for revival. In terms of Restorationism, the revival which ensued – there were between 100,000 and 120,000 converts – can be seen as a rediscovery of the doctrine of the ‘priesthood of all believers’. The participation of many lay people – and especially very young men and women – in personal testimony and in song, has been noted by a number of commentators (see, for example, Jones 1995:165f.) Additionally, as highlighted by Hollenweger (Hollenweger 1972:176), the formal and literary sermon gave way to spontaneous, Spirit-led and highly personalised appeals, Evan Roberts being not the only but by far the most notable exponent of this. Impressed by what they witnessed in the Rhondda and elsewhere, key observers like Alexander Boddy, vicar of All Saints’ parish, Sunderland, and Joseph Smale of Los Angeles, returned to their respective congregations to report on the Revival and to urge renewed intercession for similar scenes to be enacted there. Among the young converts, significantly, were George and Stephen Jeffreys and Daniel Powell Williams – all of them destined to play a major rôle in the establishment of British Pentecostalism. Donald Gee, arguably the most balanced and influential British Pentecostal of the last century (Massey 1995:7), was converted under the ministry of Seth Joshua when the Welsh evangelist was addressing an evangelistic meeting in central London, and when Gee himself was fourteen years old.

The Welsh Revival was both the catalyst of the Pentecostal Movement via such ‘foreign’ observers as Boddy and Smale and the means by which key figures experienced their conversion. The Revival was, of course, a short-lived one; but the complex reasons – or complex of reasons – why it proved to be so I will not enter into in detail. But as a mainstream Pentecostal whose interest is personal and pastoral, as well as historical, the most striking feature of the Revival is the strong disapproval by its protagonists of those who, in the Gospel halls that proliferated in the wake of the events of 1904-05, experienced the kind of tongues-attested Baptism in the Spirit pioneered in the United States by Charles Fox Parham and his erstwhile negro protégé William J. Seymour. One contemporary critic, A. H. Rogers, wrote, for example,

Not all these halls stayed faithful to the gospel in its simplicity. We are sorry to say that some have opened the door to strange tongues and have turned from the great central road of the gospel… (Yr Efenglydd, Jan.1929:13 cited from Jones 1995:269)

Jessie Penn-Lewis, the Svengali whose influence arguably brought Evan Roberts’ ministry to a premature close – he lived on into the early nineteen fifties – was even more pronounced and vehement in her denunciation of the newly emergent Pentecostal movement. As early as 1907, shortly after the visit of the Norwegian Pentecostal pioneer T.B.Barratt to All Saints’, Monkwearmouth, she wrote as follows to Rev and Mrs Boddy:

I have been in an anguish of soul for months over what I saw coming and I knew I had light from God which would help avert the dangers…I feel sure from reports…that Pastor Barratt had been working through him a strong force of animal magnetism and it is through this that evil spirits enter the bodies of children of God… (November 9th 1907, DGCA).

She later jointly authored War on the Saints with Roberts. This was a savage, thinly-veiled attack on Pentecostalism as ‘carnal’ and even demonically inspired – charges virtually identical with those brought by the Catholics against the Montanists in the late second century.

Once again we see the parent-body disowning its own progeny. But whereas the Welsh Revival is now history, the progeny, in both its Pentecostal and Charismatic manifestations, is ‘alive and kicking’ and can conservatively boast around 500 million adherents globally. And, if Harvey Cox is to be believed, Pentecostalism is set to be the dominant and burgeoning spirituality of the present century (Cox 1996: passim).

Cox gives a number of reasons for Pentecostalism’s success; but they have caused concern amongst Pentecostals because he appears to give too little a rôle to the Holy Spirit in suggesting, amongst other things, that success is primarily due to Pentecostalism’s ability to tap into the resources of the human psyche and to utilise and Christianise elements of popular culture and religion – S.Korea being a good example of this latter phenomenon.

Despite the success of Pentecostalism in, for example, Latin America and S.Korea, much remains to be done: the great world religions are strong and Islam, in particular, is resurgent. Western Europe, once a strongly Christian continent, is largely secularised. In Wales Zions and Bethesdas are carpet-
showrooms, second-hand bookshops or antique emporia. And, apart from a few bright spots in the Principality and beyond – the Assembly of God church in Newtown, Powys, is a good example – Pentecostalism is struggling and the Charismatic wing in the so-called historic churches has not lived up to early expectations.

Still speaking of early expectations, the lively hope of the earliest Pentecostals that the revival they were then experiencing was the last great harvest before the soon-coming Parousia has, in my experience, long since given way to a ‘long-haul’ mentality which would have been unthinkable eighty years ago when my own denomination, the Assemblies of God, was set up above a garage Birmingham. And here the words of the Apostle Peter surely apply (II Peter 3:8, 9):

With the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slow about His promise, but is patient towards you, not wishing for any to perish. (NASV)

But, in the meanwhile, those who continue to hope and seek for a revival of an even greater impact and dimension than the one we are at present celebrating must continue faithfully to participate in those means of grace which, having been neglected in times past, have contributed at least in part to the creation of sort of dire situation which cries out for revival. And, bearing in mind that revival begins with and in the people of God, there needs to be less wringing of the hands in regard to the deplorably poor state of the nation’s spirituality and more of a concentration on our own needs and condition.

Bibliography

Allen, D., There is a River – a Charismatic Church History in Outline, (Milton Keynes, UK: Authentic, 2004).


Dayton, Donald, Theological Roots of Pentecostalism, (Grand Rapids Mi.: Zondervan, 1978).


Black Pentecostal Churches in Britain

Desmond Cartwright

Abstract

Roswith Gerloff and Ian MacRobert have written about the black Pentecostal Churches in Britain. In this paper I want to draw attention to neglected areas on the early history based on written records that have not been previously used.

It has generally and popularly been accepted that the first black people to be associated with the Pentecostal Church in Britain were those who first arrived following hurricane Gilbert in August 1951. There were 154 killed and 50,000 were left homeless in Jamaica. A number of them had previously been associated with the American-based Church of God from Cleveland, Tennessee.

We now know that the real beginning was in fact much earlier than this. Surprisingly this has been traced to 1907 in the same year that Pentecostalism was first introduced into Britain following the visit of Thomas Ball Barratt to Sunderland in September and October that year. Amongst the seventeen people who were baptised in the Spirit during the seven weeks that Barratt was in Sunderland was at least one black man. He was a Ghanaian businessman named T Brem Wilson (1855-1929).

The Church met in eight different places between 1906 and 1920 before moving to Sumner Road, Peckham where they purchased the former Methodist Church. Their first meeting place was in Peckham Road where the Blind Factory was situated. They were asked to quit and they removed to Rye Lane where they met under the railway arch for a year. This was followed by a brief spell with Mr Hyde of Hyde’s Birdseed. The next move was to White Hart Square, Kennington where they stayed for a year before moving again. On this occasion they occupied a place on Walworth Road opposite the Town Hall in 1911. It was here that the meeting was known as ‘The black man’s church.’ People complained that they were too noisy and they found it necessitated a further move.

In 1912 they moved to Camberwell where they met in Castle Buildings in Mansion Street. They were only able to stay there for a short time as this was in what was a ‘Red light’ district that made it particularly difficult for the females. After this they moved once more. On this occasion they located to Elder Street where they stayed for four years before removing in 1916 to Dalwood Street, Southampton Row, where they remained until their final move to Sumner Road in 1920. The church that is now linked with the Assemblies of God has continued in the same building since that time. They added another hall to the church in 1950. T Brem Wilson remained as pastor until his death on Good Friday in April 1929. His associate minister ‘Brother James’ continued there until his death in 1939. Also linked to the church, as a founder member was another coloured brother J Barnes who died in 1950 aged 82. Though we do not know a great deal about Brem Wilson, what we do know tells us about his outstanding spirituality.

When I presented a paper at the first meeting of the European Pentecostal Theological Association in Leuven, Belgium in 1981 I made a reference to Wilson. The paper was on the early beginnings of Pentecostalism in Britain. The reference to Brem Wilson was discovered when I was reading T B Barratt’s account of his visit to Britain that he published in 1927. In his book, When the Spirit Fell: An Outline of My Life, (Oslo 1927, p.156) he mentions ‘a coloured gentleman from London.’

In September 1908 when Alexander Boddy, vicar of All Saints, Monkwearmouth, Sunderland was in London he went to visit Brem Wilson. He was driven by car accompanied by Cecil Polhill. He tells how they went ‘over the Thames and past Lambeth Palace to Battersea. Here we had a blessed time of conference with a dear African Brother who is deeply taught of God and who lives in His presence.’

Another reference tells us:

T Brem Wilson is now having a great time of blessing at Bethel Hall Camberwell. The power and presence of God has been manifest in recent meetings.

When Boddy published the first copy of his monthly paper Confidence in April 1908 he issued 3,000 copies that cost £13. This was a considerable amount of money at that time and it was the equal to perhaps five weeks wages for a workingman. The cost of this was met by one who can be identified by the following note:

Cost of the first issue (3,000) copies was a little over £13. This heavy item was met by one of the Lord’s Stewards (T B W).

A subsequent reference tells us that amongst the speakers who took part...
in the Preston Convention was, ‘...Mr B Wilson of London.’

During the time that Brem Wilson was in Sunderland he seems to have made a particular contribution to at least one of the meetings. This was noted in the local paper the *Sunderland Echo* of October 4th 1907:

By about 8.30 something like a hundred were present. Suddenly a dark gentleman started a revival hymn, which was taken up with vigour by the congregation. The hymn ended, the dark gentleman began in fervid tones to ask that the Spirit of Christ might enter the hall. While so engaged he burst into loud sounds and instantly the bulk of those present broke into exclamations. Hallelujah! Hallelujah! Was shouted from all parts of the building. The excitement was intense.

What is particularly interesting in this connection is that when Cecil Polhill was in Los Angeles in January and February 1908 he visited the Azusa Street Mission with his friend George B Studd. When he heard that they still owed £1,500 on the mortgage for the building where they had been meeting for almost two years he suggested that they should take up an offering in order to clear the debt. This suggestion was not well received but they went ahead anyway. Polhill himself paid off the balance. The day afterwards Polhill was baptised in the Spirit and spoke in tongues.

Here, then, we have the debt on the first multiracial Pentecostal Church in the United States being paid for by an English country squire. Later in the same year, Wilson, an African businessman paid the debt on the first British Pentecostal magazine. This is surely an example of how multi-cultural cooperation works out in practical ways.

In subsequent years the appearance of a black person in any service was almost enough to cause some comment to be made. We find a picture of two young men in a book published in 1928. It shows one black and the other white and it carries the caption, ‘One in Christ.’ Both were members of an Elim Church but we do not know their names or the name of their church. Amongst hundreds of pictures of meeting taken in the interwar years one looks in vain for one black face.

The baptism of a black man in a tent mission in Blackpool in the 1930s found a space in the local paper as an item of interest. During World War 2 the visit of a group of American servicemen to Portsmouth was advertised as a ‘Negro Choir’ (a description that would not be acceptable today).

These rare encounters were to change. First to arrive were a small group of Birmingham where there was plenty of work but a scarcity of readily available accommodation.

One of the earliest was Oliver Lyseight who arrived in 1951 and moved into the area north of Birmingham that was known as the Black Country. This was so named because of it being the centre of heavy industry. These first arrivals had many difficulties to face. Not only was the weather cold but also there was a scarcity of suitable accommodation. There was however plenty of work to be found in the local factories. As far as the churches were concerned the new arrivals would also prove difficult to integrate.

The British churches were much more sedate than those in the Caribbean and some of them were not welcoming to their new visitors. Though there is some anecdotal evidence that some immigrants were given a frosty reception, this does not appear to have been on the grounds of colour. It was on the basis a difference of style and culture. During the same period I found that my friends and I were not altogether welcomed in a few of the mainline Methodist and Baptist Churches that we visited. On two occasions we got into some disagreement with the leaders of the meeting. It was partly to do with the style of the meeting that was very dry. It had much more to do with the content of the sermons that we heard.

A D Brown and G S Peddie joined Oliver Lyseight in 1952. They held meetings in the Wolverhampton Y.M.C.A. where there were seventeen in the first service, not all of who were believers. It was a slow start and at times there would only be half a dozen people present.

In 1952 the Third World Pentecostal Conference was held in London. David du Plessis handled the arrangements on the American side. E J Phillips of the Elim Church dealt with the arrangements in Britain. One of the problems that arose early on was the attitude that prevailed in some of the London hotels that would not accept black people. Some of the hotels displayed signs bearing the words, ‘No blacks.’ Phillips raised this with Du Plessis:

Can you tell me whether there are likely to be any Negroes from the American Assemblies of God, Church of God, Foursquare, etc? Or will they only be from the Church of God in Christ? I presume that the last named are all black. The reason why I ask this question is that we must know when booking hotels, who are Negroes, as the majority of hotels in London will not take them, though there are many hotels of course that will. We cannot ask the applicants this question, that is why I ask you for general guidance.
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In his reply, Du Plessis wrote:

I suggest that after the question as to Church Organisation you ask also that they state Race…Language…This will not appear offending and will help you to know what colour they are. After all we are going to have many different races and languages.

One of the speakers at the Conference was the veteran leader of the Church of God in Christ, Charles H Mason who was 86 years of age at the time of the Conference. There were two members of the Church of God from Britain in the list of delegates at the London Conference.

By August 1954 another congregation was started in Handsworth and in 1955 it made contact by letter with the headquarters of the Church of God in Cleveland, Tennessee. From the evidence below, it is clear that the early contacts by West Indian Christians that were made with Pentecostal Churches were not as unfriendly as it was later alleged. This how that was recorded:

The churches we contacted gave us a warm welcome and we preached and sang for several assemblies for about two years. During this time a number of our people had settled here. The spirituality of the churches was not so high as that with which we were acquainted, and many of our people did not feel free in most of these places.

After they opened the church at Handsworth they made contact with the Church of God who sent one of their senior ministers, Paul H Walker (1901-1975), to visit them in June 1955. On June 18th they became officially linked to the Church of God. Walker reported: ‘The Church of God is now anchored in England with a fine group of people.’ One year later The Church of God Evangel reported that the congregation had 150 members in 5 churches with Handsworth being the largest with 51 followed by Wolverhampton with 46.

At the very time that these developments were taking place the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance (the Elim Pentecostal Church) were holding their Annual Conference at Harrogate, Yorkshire in September 1956. A proposal was made that Elim should seek some sort of affiliation with the American Church of God. After considerable discussion the Conference authorised a delegation of three senior ministers together with their wives to visit the United States to investigate the work of the Church of God.

The origin of the suggestion can be traced to the fact that an agreement was signed by the South African Full Gospel Church and the American Church of God on March 28, 1951. Some of the ministers belonging to the South African group had connections with the Elim Church and some of their leading ministers had trained at the Elim Bible College.

In 1956 Irene ‘Sunny’ Blundell, who held credentials with Elim was on a visit to South Africa where she met Ray Hughes of the Church of God when he was visiting the then named, Full Gospel Church of God. She wrote to E J Phillips reporting a conversation that she had with Ray Hughes. He had told her that they were contemplating opening in Britain but that he did not want to disturb any other organisation. He went on to say that he ‘would not object to an amalgamation of some other group like Elim…provided that everything could be worked out to the satisfaction of all concerned.’

The extent of the almost total lack of any knowledge of who the Church of God leaders were by the Elim leaders is revealed in a letter that Mr Phillips wrote to J R Flower (1888-1970) who had been General Secretary of the American Assemblies of God since 1935. They asked him to tell them about the Church of God and to give his assessment of them. In his reply, Flower, who had been ‘trained in law’ as a young man should perhaps have been more careful in his reply. The letter contained some unfortunate phrases:

In some quarters they appear to be quite fanatical…Many of our ministers have found it most difficult to fellowship with them, because of their unethical standards.

In 1922 Ernest Boulton wrote a letter that was published in the American Pentecostal Evangel in this he warned against the proposed visit of a group of leading Apostolic brethren to the USA. There was very little evidence of active cooperation between British and American groups in the intervening years.

It is worth recording that it was the application of a group of Pentecostal Assemblies in Wales who sought to become associated with the Assemblies of God in the United States that precipitated the formation of the Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland in 1924. It was a result of this contact that the Americans sent 100 copies of their Minutes to the brethren in Wales. It was the wording of these that contained the words, ‘Initial Evidence’ that formed an integral part of the Constitution adopted by the emerging British group convened by Nelson Parr.

Interestingly, it was also an American contact with Aimee Semple McPherson that George Jeffreys made during his visit to Los Angeles in 1924 that gave rise to his adoption of the phrase, ‘Foursquare’ in the name of Elim. The name was changed from the Elim Pentecostal Alliance to the The Foursquare Gospel Alliance.
Against this historical background the Elim Conference meeting in Harrogate in September 1956 agreed that they would send a delegation of three senior ministers to investigate the work of the Church of God in the United States. Eventually W G Hathaway, H W Greenway and John Dyke together with their wives left for what was to be a lengthy stay. They did not return until March 1957 when they presented their report to the October 1957 Conference in Bournemouth with the recommendation that they should form an affiliation with the Church of God. The voting showed that 116 were in favour and 48 against. As this required a 75% majority it was postponed to the next conference where once again it failed to achieve the required number. The Church of God in Britain therefore continued on their own adding the addition of New Testament to their title.

There were a variety of reasons why the proposals did not achieve the required figures that would allow the affiliation to be brought to fruition. Some thought that it was merely for financial reasons. Donald Gee, a leading figure in the British Assemblies of God and influential voice in world Pentecostal circles (writing under the pseudonym of ‘Circumspectus’) came out with a pungent article entitled, ‘Foreign Subsidies.’ The article referred to, ‘the invasion of the British Isles by Pentecostal Sects from America, much as we welcome fellowship in the Gospel.’ It was obvious to anyone in the know what he was referring to. There was in fact no offer of any money on the table at the time. Even so, in South Africa where a similar agreement had been reached, the South African church appeared to have experienced considerable growth as a result.

None of the objections that were raised mentioned the question of colour at all. What was regrettable was a reference in one of the reports to ‘fanaticism’ in a meeting in the USA. From the brief details that were given it seems that one of the visitors was in a noisy meeting where a several people were all praying out loud and one lady became visibly excited! Two of the delegation was very staid and their report seemed to have caused them some anxiety concerning the possibility of the introduction of a similar style of teaching in the UK. Despite this the Standing Committee interviewed the British Overseer, L. O. McLachlan, who told them that they had six meeting places in London. He was recorded as stating:

Separate coloured assemblies have been opened because of racial discrimination or because of a feeling of sensitiveness and also on account of different standards of conduct...The Secretary was to assure Mr McLachlan that we welcome the Jamaicans in our assemblies, that there is no suggestion of a colour bar over here and consequently no barrier to fellowship; we are not favourable to segregation of the races because of colour.

This clear statement is reinforced by a subsequent declaration by Ray Hughes a leading minister in the Church of God:

It has been called to my attention that some dissension has arisen over the reason for the organisation of the New Testament Church of God in Britain... Unfortunately, I understand through misunderstanding some have disseminated the news among the people that we organised because of racial prejudice encountered in the English Pentecostal churches...A misunderstanding of this nature is quite unfortunate, but all concerned can rest assured that it was not because of racial prejudice in English Pentecostal churches that the West Indian Church began.

A recently published book that tells the story of the work of Henry Staples (1908-1992) shows a picture of a group of twenty-one West Indians apparently holding a meeting down by the side of the river in Newark where Henry himself was based. It should be observed there was not a
white face to be observed in this group. Amongst the many photographs that are to be found in the book there is a few that show black faces of both men and women at convention meetings in 1957 and 1958. The one taken of meetings in Burslem at Whitsun in 1958 also shows to black men occupying the platform behind Henry.

The magazine, *Pentecost*, edited by Donald Gee from 1947 until his death in 1966 contained an interesting item culled from American Church of God Evangel under the heading, ‘JAMAICANS IN ENGLAND’:

There are a great number of Jamaican emigrants in England. They find it difficult to feel at home in the more conservative type of Pentecostal service to which the British people are accustomed, so they have started their own meeting and God is blessing them.  

British Pentecostal papers rarely make political comment in their columns. Social comments, particularly relating to conduct were regular features. Yet such events as the industrial unrest caused by the General Strike in 1926 for example is hardly mentioned except where it was thought that it would cause problems for people wanting to attend special convention meetings. The plight of Assembly of God ministers in Wales and their congregations were mentioned and gifts of money, clothes and footwear were sent to relieve their distress.

When I was interviewed for the position of Editor of the *Elim Evangel* in 1974 I was told of the difficulties that were caused to one of my predecessors who had made some comment on the miners’ strike. Unfortunately, things changed dramatically between when the comments were written and when some people read the item in the magazine. It is therefore unusual to find a very strongly worded editorial following the massacre in the shantytown of Sarpville near Johannesburg. Aaron Linford long-time editor of *Redemption Tidings* wrote:

We are have been profoundly shocked at the behaviour of the South African Government in the recent atrocious mass-killing of the natives of Sharpville near Johannesburg. Such unwarranted brutality will have to be accounted for before the throne of divine justice. We equally deplore the callous and nonsensical attempt at the assassination of Premier, Hendrick Verwoerd, whose preservation can only be attributed to either luck or the mercy of God.  

In the issue of August 19th a letter was published as a response to the editorial. Its author was Senator G. R. Wessels, Vice-President of the  
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Eschatological Inclusivism: Exploring Early Pentecostal theology of Religions in Charles Fox Parham

Tony Richie

Abstract
Though contentious and controversial, Charles Parham was without doubt one of the most original and influential early Pentecostal leaders and thinkers. Parham’s theology of religions, an eschatological inclusivism of uncompromising commitment to Christ coupled with compassionate openness to devout adherents of other religions, speaks pointedly and provocatively to the contemporary context of a religiously pluralistic world. Parham’s thought suggests: theology of religions is a valid topic for discussion faithful to the Pentecostal tradition; exploring an orientation in which inaccuracies and inadequacies of world religions are corrected and completed in Christ in the eschaton holds special potential for Pentecostal theology; world religions may have a relative role to play in God’s providential purposes; and, a dynamic pneumatological soteriology is a significant element of the unique Pentecostal contribution to theology of religions.

1. Introduction
Charles F. Parham (1873-1929) is one of the most enigmatic yet important figures in early Pentecostalism. Debates regarding his formative influence as founder of modern Pentecostalism and his role in developing and popularizing the doctrine of initial evidence, as well as continuing controversy over apparent racism and an alleged moral failure remain inconclusive but intense. Yet few, if any, dispute that Parham, though obviously autocratic and idiosyncratic, has profoundly impacted Pentecostalism to this day. Therefore, assuming Parham’s importance in a carefully qualified sense for understanding aspects of early Pentecostalism, I wish to draw attention to yet another significant subject in his belief and practice becoming increasingly critical in today’s pluralistic context: Christian theology of religions. Parham unabashedly advocated what could be called ‘eschatological inclusivism.’ For Parham commitment to the absolute uniqueness and necessity of Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior complemented openness to a possibility of divine reality and redemption in extra-Christian religions consummated in the eschaton by Christ. This essay explores that thesis through an overview and analysis of Parham’s beliefs and practices and attempts applications for contemporary Pentecostal theology of religions.

2. Overview and Analysis of Parham’s Pentecostal Theology of Religions
Parham provides much needed material for the Pentecostal deliberative gristmill on one of today’s most pressing problems: how Christians ought to understand and relate to religious others.

2.1 Presuppositions in the Perspective of this Study
A plurality of ‘original visions’ existed among early Pentecostals as they were clarifying and codifying their beliefs and experiences. Ambiguity is often evident. Often differentiation was occurring more than fragmentation. Charles Fox Parham exemplifies this aspect of early Pentecostalism. For

---

1 Tony Richie (D. Min., Asbury Theological Seminary/ D.Th. Candidate, UNISA), Senior Pastor, New Harvest Church of God in Knoxville, TN. Contact: 6926 Terry Drive, Knoxville, TN 37924 USA, Email: BrothTony@aol.com


example, Parham’s non-institutional definition of the Church allowed him to believe that all who sincerely believe in God, and not just followers of Jesus, experience a sort of conversion that includes entry into the Church. He distinguished sharply, however, between the ‘merely converted’ and the ‘fully sanctified’.\(^4\) Also, though denouncing doctrines of second probationism or purgatorial salvation, he argued that the antediluvian race would be granted a postmortem opportunity.\(^5\)

Parham was an innovative and original thinker in a movement itself undergoing rapid radical metamorphosis. We ought to be extremely cautious about judging Parham’s ideas according to the now more fully developed ‘orthodoxy’ of a hundred years’ hence. We ought to be intentionally open to reflection on such a seminal spirituality and theology. Even the best trained thinkers may make missteps in the context of clearing new ground for theological cultivation. And Parham, though perhaps much better trained educationally than most early Pentecostals, and doubtless personally gifted intellectually, was not a professional theologian. We ought then to be as much on guard against harmful errors as on the lookout for helpful insights. Parham’s prominence in early Pentecostal development, however, indicates we ought to at least honestly hear him out.

### 2.2 An Eschatological Understanding of World Religions

Parham’s preaching and writing display a strong focus on biblical prophecy. Not surprisingly his theology of religions is characterized by eschatological concerns. The following overview and analysis is drawn directly from Parham’s own publications of his sermons and essays.\(^6\)

Though often admittedly esoteric, Parham’s wide reading and creative thinking yields surprisingly insightful results characterized by a sense of generous justice regarding religious others. In *A Voice Crying in the Wilderness* Parham admits that heathen who never had the law will be judged without the law but sharply distinguishes them from inhabitants of the antediluvian age.\(^7\) But Parham’s attitude toward Judaism is particularly upbeat. He refers to ‘our Jewish brethren’ and speaks of conversing with a Jewish rabbi as ‘a very dear friend’.\(^8\) He argues that Jews and Christians have separate religions in the present age according to providence but will be united in Christ during the eschaton (in the Millennium).\(^9\) In other words, at least some Jews are in the will of God by presently remaining Jews rather than converting to Christianity! A supposition that the Jews will come to see Jesus as the fulfillment of their Judaism is inherent in his thought. They will not necessarily see their eventual eschatological acceptance of Christ as a conversion from their religion to another so as much its final full realization.

Parham also addresses the status of non-Jewish religions. He says the ‘the heathen’ ‘will in the dawning of the coming age be given to Jesus for an inheritance’.\(^10\) Ascertaining what he means is arduous. Is he suggesting that such peoples will be allowed to convert in the eschaton? That seems to contradict his argument against postmortem opportunities.\(^11\) A closer look suggests his antipathy to postmortem experience does not include the unevangelized. Parham also suggests ‘the American Indian’ will be gathered with Israel in the end.\(^12\) Later, Parham repeats his idea of the heathen being given to Christ for an inheritance during the Millennial Reign of Christ. Some unconverted peoples will live at that time under Christ’s authority in their humanity with the conditional opportunity of enjoying eternal life based on obedience.\(^13\)

Parham rejected ideas that anti-Christ is a religious system such as Islam. Against those who ‘declare Mohammed to be the false prophet’ Parham argues ‘he was a true prophet of a false religion’.\(^14\) His designation of Mohammed as ‘a true prophet’ in some sense affirms the man and his ministry but not the religious system that has become modern Islam. Such a push-pull movement suggests Parham wished to acknowledge divine reality and verity in non-Christian religious individuals without uncritically affirming the religious institution to which he or she belongs. This is not a pluralistic blanket thrown over all religions. He unequivocally condemns cultic and occult expressions of religion.\(^15\)

Boldly Parham argued that in ‘the Judgment Age’ people will not be judged on the basis of the gospel plan of salvation by faith but according to their works. Those who belong to Jesus, that is, the Church, will indeed experience special glory. Others who have done good works may
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Parham returned yet again to the theme of the
judgment of the sheep and goats in Matthew 25 and Revelation 20.11-15
seem significant for Parham on this point. Parham pointedly rebutted an
exclusive redemption, arguing that God’s ‘promised Savior’ must be for all
humanity which then will be restored to a pre-Fall, Adamic existence. He
stopped short of universalism, however. The ‘unsanctified’ (less committed
Christians/those not sealed with Spirit baptism) and the ‘heathen’ (non-
Christian religions) will receive eternal life. Because of the love and justice
of God only the ‘utterly reprobate’ will actually enter Hell’s flames. He
summed up three classes or groups of people at the final judgment under
the following symbols: the ‘new heavens’, the sanctified who will receive
immortal life (glorification with Christ); ‘the earth’, the meek who receive
everlasting human life; and, those ‘who shall be no more’, or those who do
not know God in any sense and are annihilated in Hell.  

In The Everlasting Gospel Parham returned yet again to the theme of
the heathen being given to Christ as his inheritance that he may rule over the
nations as God’s Regent (cf. Ps 2.7-12). Then he stressed, however, that many
heathen who live during the Millennial Reign of Christ when tested for
worthiness to receive eternal life will rebel with Satan and be instantaneously
annihilated. Nevertheless, he still staunchly insisted many who were non-
Christians during this present temporal age will enter into life. At the Great
White Throne Judgment ‘the babes…, formalistic adherents of all religions,
the wretchedly wicked, and the darkened heathen, all who were not truly
born again’ will be present for final judgment. Humanity will be separated
at the coming of Christ at the opening of ‘the Millennial Sabbath.’ Those
who were truly and fully Christian will be rewarded then while others will
be judged at its closing. True, full Christians will ‘receive eternal immortal
life and joint heirship with Christ’ at the beginning of the Millennium. At
the close of the Millennium comes a judgment in which all are set either on
Christ’s right hand or left (cf. Matt. 25.31-46). Those on the right, the ‘meek’,
will inherit the earth, receiving only that which was lost in Adam through
the fall. This stage of salvation is accomplished by ‘the general blood of the
atonement of Jesus Christ.’ This latter group ‘will have everlasting, perfect
human life’ and live accordingly on a new Edenic Earth. He specifically
stated that ‘This company will be composed of all the babes, and all those
be rewarded with eternal life and restored to an Edenic existence. The
judgment of the sheep and goats in Matthew 25 and Revelation 20.11-15
from the formalistic churches, or wretched publicans and harlots, or
darkened heathen, whom Christ of God deems worthy of life.’ Those set
on the left, the ‘reprobates’, which seems to refer to those who intentionally,
completely, and finally reject God, will be annihilated. For Parham,
ending up with an eternal and universal condition of complete unity and
harmony is the grand plan of God. Universality is obviously present in his
thought but he avoided universalism by his acknowledgement of eternal
judgment through annihilation. Parham’s eschatological theology allowed
him to both disagree emphatically with non-Christians and to declare
sympathetically their legitimate place in God’s purpose and plan.

Essential for understanding Parham is his insistence that a level of
Christian ‘Redemption’ exists that is truly blessed beyond measure in
comparison with anything else. Redemption includes full sanctification
spiritually and physically, is characterized by the sealing of genuine Spirit
baptism, and prepares participants for indescribable glory with Christ. Only
those who participate in Redemption are eligible for the Rapture (‘the Highest
Order of the Saints’), and share in the liberation of the Jews and Palestine.
Even within Christian life in the Spirit many successive stages of experience
exist with Spirit baptism with the sign of speaking in tongues being the
pinnacle. Parham placed conversion, sanctification and redemption on a
continuum, that is, a progressive process of experiential purification and
maturation with culmination in varying degrees of reward or blessing.
More specifically (as in his ‘Chart Showing Steps of Grace in a Christian
Life’ placed at the end of the book), Parham posited progressive movement
through a soteriological hierarchy of Enlightenment and Conviction,
Repentance, Conversion, Healing, Consecration, Sanctification, Anointing
of the Holy Ghost and Baptism of the Holy Ghost, and Redemption and
Glorification. While many who are not even Christian now may receive
eternal life in the eschaton, being Christian and being part of Redemption
are most definitely desirable and preferable.

Parham’s theology of religions was characterized by universal cosmology,
elevated Christology, dynamic pneumatology, inclusive soteriology,
and, emphatically, apocalyptic eschatology. All things and every creature

---

18 Parham, A Voice, pp. 22-25.
19 Parham, A Voice, p. 50.
22 Parham, A Voice, pp. 51-52; cf. 98-100.
23 Parham, A Voice, p. 52.
24 See Parham, Everlasting Gospel, pp. 92-95.
26 Parham, Everlasting Gospel, pp. 63-69, 74-76.
28 Azusa Street, pp. 40-41. I appreciate Amos Yong’s personal insistence that no
study of Parham’s theology of religions is satisfactory without consideration of his
British Israelitism.
exist in accordance with God’s ultimate plan. Jesus Christ is the full and final representation of God’s revelation. The Holy Spirit works with and in all along ever advancing stages of divine experience. All who do not intentionally, completely, and finally rebel against God will share in some measure of salvation. The dramatic conflagration and consummation of history and prophecy will eventually and inevitably accomplish God’s intentions for eternity. Parham’s thought, stripped of esoteric elements, offers some surprisingly insightful assistance to the contemporary discipline of Pentecostal theology of religions. Parham presents today’s Pentecostals with an early and important Pentecostal paradigm of dynamic universality regarding the religions of the world without compromising the absoluteness of Christ or the uniqueness of Christianity.

2.3 Anglo-Israelite Theory and Parham’s Pentecostal Theology of Religions

Charles Parham early adopted the basically racist ‘Anglo or British-Israelite theory’ teaching that the ten lost tribes of Israel were actually the ancestors of Anglo-Saxon peoples. White, Anglo-Saxon Protestants in the United States could accordingly be viewed as their racial and religious heirs. This doctrine inspired Parham to be an ardent supporter of modern Zionism and the return of the Jews to Israel and to speculate about the role of the Jews in prophecy regarding the Second Coming of Christ.26

Robeck suggests that without excusing Parham’s latent racism, he ought to be understood as a man of the times. He did take note of African American William J. Seymour’s gifts for ministry and attempted to reach the African American community with the full gospel message.29 Parham and Seymour worked together quite closely for a time, and Seymour, who later became pastor of the famous Azusa Street mission and revival, was obviously influenced by Parham in important and permanent ways; but Seymour, always his own man, did not uncritically accept Parham’s views. Among other things, he ‘totally rejected Parham’s Anglo-Israelite theory’.26 Pastor Seymour seems to have been able to skillfully extract insightful elements of Parham’s teachings without succumbing to more suspect concepts. Contemporary Pentecostalism is well advised to follow his example.

As for implications of Parham’s Anglo-Israelite theory for his theology of religions, they seem fairly obvious but should not be overstated. His amazingly optimistic attitude toward the Jews may be better understood in light of his Anglo-Israelite ideas. If he viewed himself (and others like him) as descendents of the ancient covenant people, then he could conceivably feel their faith was not so foreign either. His attitude toward the Jews might be more of an extension of his own spiritual (and racial) identity than an honest appreciation for or acceptance of religious others. However, in discussion of Jewish-Christian relations we always ought to acknowledge this inclination, even in more nuanced and noble approaches than the dreadfully deficient Anglo-Israelitism, because Judaism is the parent religion of Christianity.31 Though clearly more pronounced and prone to distortion, Parham’s favoring of the Jewish faith is not altogether easily dismissed as an unchristian aberration entirely based on a cultic concept.

Especially significant, Parham’s efforts to extend his inclusive or optimistic attitude beyond Judaism to embrace other religions, such as Muslims, Heathen, and others, indicate a real attempt at theology of religions surpassing his possible underlying self-identification with Jews. Parham apparently felt compelled to account for the salvific status of religious others in an overall eschatological context of divine providence and redemption in an authentic effort that reached beyond even his own biases and prejudices. What we may perceive as the hierarchical and imperialistic or otherwise unacceptable and inadmissible tone of his attempt should not obscure the genuine openness of his final conclusion that all truly devout peoples will somehow end up sharing in the benefits of God’s blessedness in Christ.

3. Appropriations and Applications of Parham’s Pentecostal Theology of Religions

Parham’s thought may indeed yield constructive insights for contemporary Pentecostal theology of religions.

3.1 A Valid Topic Faithful to the Pentecostal Tradition

The attention given to the role of adherents of other religions in a major leader and thinker in early Pentecostalism, indeed someone advanced by some as its very founder, at the least implies that the subject is a valid topic for Pentecostal discussion for those laboring to be faithful to the
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tradition as a prophetic voice for today. The rise of religious pluralism or widespread exposure to its reality in our world today is not the primary reason for Pentecostal discussion of theology of religions. Popularity of political correctness and leftward, liberalizing shifts in Evangelicalism or Pentecostalism are not primarily behind it either. Inherent in Pentecostalism from its earliest days is an impulse to understand our experience of the Spirit’s moving in the context of God’s overall plan and purpose in Christ. Perhaps Harvey Cox is correct to conclude that the meteoric rise of Pentecostalism in conjunction with the first World Parliament of Religions is not coincidental. The vitality of Pentecostalism’s spirituality and theology in contexts (Asia, Africa, Latin America) where it has learned to lean on insights from indigenous religions without compromising Christian witness seems to confirm the possibility that Pentecostalism has the potential to develop a truly global Christianity.

Pentecostalism needs to tap into the roots of our movement for resources in confronting the conflicting and confusing world of faiths in which we find ourselves now immersed in ministry. Scholars, administrators, pastors and local congregations, along with missionaries and other evangelistic or outreach-oriented ministries, will do well to face the fact of pluralism from a position of strength and truth. That cannot take place by tabling discussion or labeling dialoguers as liberals or radicals. Only by honestly addressing the issue of a world of religions from a biblical stance faithful to classical Christianity and relevant for contemporary culture will Pentecostals survive and thrive in the twenty-first century. The anointing of the Holy Spirit is already leading us this way if we will but follow. Concerns about compromise are legitimate but need not be paralytic. Let us proceed carefully, even cautiously, but let us proceed nevertheless. God’s truth and power will guide us in the right way (cf. John 13:16).

3.2 Importance of Eschatological Orientation

An eschatological orientation should occupy a prominent place in all Pentecostal theology, including Pentecostal theology of religions. Jesus’

39 E.g., the literalistic and dispensationalist Duke’s Annotated Reference Bible (Lawrenceville, GA: Duke Bible Sales, Inc, 1961, 1963) has been perennially popular with Pentecostals.
dwell there then in a state of relative wellbeing through eventual acceptance of Christ? Biblical theologian Frank Anthony Spina has persuasively posited that God has all along been almost covertly including some so-called outsiders in surprising ways. A pattern of generous provision may be observed reaching from creation to consummation.

### 3.3 Providential Purpose of the Existence of World Religions

One particularly important insight of Parham’s is that world religions do not exist outside the realm of God’s providence. Recognizing that various elements of world religions may contribute to penultimate purposes of God that are superseded by and subsumed under God’s ultimate purpose in Christ can perhaps instruct us regarding why God has indeed allowed a plurality of religious reality to continue to exist. Everything and everyone in God’s plan has a purpose for good (cf. Rom 8.28). Yet these religions are not salvic in themselves but means to an end of eventually affirming the absolute Lordship of Jesus Christ as God’s Son and the Savior of the World (cf. John 4.42). While ungodly or unrighteous elements of world religions will be faced with a just God’s judgment, all religions and all religious faith will be brought under the headship of Jesus Christ (Eph 1:10). Like Paraham, only unrepentant reprobates face irrevocable damnation. Unfortunately, even the list of that number of names will be far too long (cf. Matt 7.13).

Along this line, and on strong biblical and historical grounds, James Edwards argues for a teleological Christian theology of religions. Building on numerous biblical texts (Gal 4.1-7, Eph 1.10, Rom 5, Acts 17.23, John 4.22, Rom 10.4, Gal 3.15-18) and recapitulation/fulfillment themes in the Church Fathers, Edwards argues for an ‘understanding of salvation as a progressive historical process’ ‘summed up and completed in Jesus Christ.’ A contemporary biblical scholar of solid reputation, Edwards (I assume unknowingly) joins Parham in attributing to the Jews a present day divinely ordained purpose. He insists ‘Judaism has not been superseded but continues to play a role in God’s abiding purpose’ aiming at eventual arrival at ‘its intended fulfillment in Jesus Christ.’

Though Edwards utilizes Judaism as an example he does not limit ramifications to it alone. At least some other religions may have a God-given present purpose to be consummated eschatologically in Christ. If so, then they would be less religious rivals than participatory partners, though perhaps neither we nor they are aware of how all this will work out in the end. Christians can be certain that, whatever the details involved in developments regarding religions, Christ will ultimately be recognized as Lord and Savior of all and the Father worshiped in his name as the one true and living God over all (1 Co 8.6; 15.28). In the outworking of human history prior to the eschaton, whether understood and acknowledged or not, all salvation is ultimately attributable only to Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world (John 14.6; Acts 4.12). Evangelism in such cases partly consists in helping pious people of non-Christian religions see how all that is good, true, and beautiful in their own religion points to and reaches its fullest potential in and through Christ and his gospel.

The preceding scenario is not dissimilar from that suggested by Pentecostal theologian Frank Macchia. For Macchia, cultural and religious diversity is rooted in God’s providence and graciously redirected toward the Kingdom of Christ through the agency of the Spirit. In the process all idols are abandoned and cultures corrected. Through it all the Church is still the central locus of the Kingdom but also exists as ‘a loving fellow traveler with the world’s religions’ even ‘while pointing them to the superiority of Christ.’ Yet Christianity is saved from the perils of imperialism by intentionally accenting grace rather than privilege. Macchia seems to accept that God is in some sense providentially present in non-Christian religions while consistently moving all human history, religious or otherwise, toward its consummation in Christ – a remarkably Parham-like proposal.

### 3.4 A Dynamic Base for Building a Pentecostal Theology of Religions

A dynamic pneumatological soteriology such as underlies Parham’s theology is increasingly important in Pentecostal theology today. Yong advances three emphases in his pneumatological soteriology: a ‘multidimensional understanding’ of how salvation is experienced; a dynamic view of ‘the various processes and levels’ of conversion; and, ‘an alertness and sensitivity
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to both retrieving and reappropriating’ existing Christian theological tradition.\textsuperscript{49} The second one concerns us here, and has a respectable pedigree within Pentecostalism. Pentecostal pioneer D. Wesley Myland stressed a great degree of dynamic flexibility or fluidity in the Spirit’s work in human lives. Throughout Myland’s poetic and symbolic theology God works with us and in us as individuals and not according to some mass program or mere logical system.\textsuperscript{50} Pentecostals should affirm that the Spirit may be experienced in surprising ways. The Spirit is not limited to anyone’s schematic lists.

Pentecostals have far too often succumbed to the temptation to forcefully place their experiences in paradigmatic schemas inherited from historic predecessors. How many divisive splits may have been avoided if Pentecostals had affirmed more of a variety and variability in their efforts to interpret their spiritual experiences? Should we not now suppose that the wind of the Spirit still blows where it pleases (John 3.8)? A dynamic or non-static pneumatological soteriology affects our self-understanding and also our understanding of religious others. If we ought to be wary of over-codifying even Christian experiences, ought we not also beware of insisting that pious others have had positively no true encounters with the God of the spirits of all humanity (Num 16.22; 27.16)? What about the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit (Ps 139.7-10)? Pentecostals are famous for insisting that the Holy Spirit cannot be ‘put in a box’ or restricted by human reasoning or, better put perhaps, by human rationalizations. Classical Pentecostal theologian Hollis Gause says salvation is \textit{via salutis} – or way, process, journey.\textsuperscript{51} So when does the journey begin? Might it begin with prevenient grace or pre-conversion conviction?\textsuperscript{52} Does it end at conversion? If salvation is not just the experience of a moment then it must include a process that precedes as well as succeeds that momentary experience – even though said experience (the moment of justification-regeneration in conversion), is of critical, pivotal importance in the process.

Realizing that (re)birth is an important religious symbol of spiritual life, how could that apply to Christian conversion? Specifically, is there room in an evangelical view of conversion for those who have not yet been ‘born again’ but may already be ‘conceived’ by the Spirit? Just as there is hidden or unseen life present before actual physical birth so too may there be hidden or unseen (to us, not to God) life present before spiritual birth. Yet birth is still undeniably a decisive moment in life.\textsuperscript{53} Let us identify and encourage premature life, so to speak, nourishing it up to normal and healthy birth weight. Apostle Paul sets a precedent of his own birth into Christ out of Judaism (1 Co 15.8).\textsuperscript{54} And, significantly, G. T. Haywood (1880-1931), an interesting early African American Pentecostal thinker and writer, similarly juxtaposes ‘begetting’ and ‘being born’.\textsuperscript{55} Though details of paradigmatic models may, and in fact do, often vary widely, many Pentecostals seem to stretch and strain to express their experience of the Spirit’s dynamism in words that can hardly carry the weight of reality. No wonder the same result occurs when attempting to articulate the Spirit’s wider work.

\section*{4. Conclusion}

Just for the record I am not advocating wholesale adoption of Charles Parham’s theology of religions. Several considerations counsel us to be cautious. First, the controversial nature of Parham’s person and work in Pentecostal history and theology suggest the advisability of sitting through his thought on this subject circumspectly. Second, the nature of the current developmental status of Pentecostal theology of religions, which is still in its initial stages, requires much more maturation before bolder steps may be appropriately taken. Third, and perhaps most importantly, the volatile nature of the entire field of theology of religions, where so much is at stake regarding interrelatedness of all or almost all the most significant doctrines of the Christian faith, suggests a more conservative advance is most advisable. Therefore, contemporary Pentecostals ought not to rush blindly or wildly down the theology of religions path.

Rather, I wish to present a short series of questions and suggestions for discussion and exploration by my Pentecostal peers. First, just what place should theology of religions play in the ongoing development of Pentecostalism? A quite prominent place is probable. The prominence of religious pluralism probably will necessitate that even apart from other

\textsuperscript{53} John Wesley and Martin Luther both experienced a series of more or less dramatic experiences and a lifetime of transformation that might be termed a conversionary process.
\textsuperscript{54} ‘Begetting’ and ‘being born’.\textsuperscript{55} Though details of paradigmatic models may, and in fact do, often vary widely, many Pentecostals seem to stretch and strain to express their experience of the Spirit’s dynamism in words that can hardly carry the weight of reality. No wonder the same result occurs when attempting to articulate the Spirit’s wider work.
prerogatives. Further, to what extent can or should we draw on early Pentecostal ideas for developing contemporary theology of religions? Original Pentecostals should be a major source as critical dialogue partners in the process of feeling out the issues and fleshing out their applications for Pentecostal theology of religions today. That some major figures in early Pentecostal faith frequently embraced an openly optimistic attitude toward religious others ought not to be ignored. Finally, does Pentecostal spirituality and theology offer anything unique to the theology of religions discussion? Pentecostals have a special role and responsibility in helping Christianity face the fact of multiple faiths rubbing elbows as never before in history. This falls to us in part because of our own distinctiveness as a movement and in part because of our effectiveness among the masses of the world today. Insights and experiences gleaned from encounters with the Spirit of Pentecost offer valuable material for Christian theology of religions. Inexplicable apart from God’s gracious provision, the explosive global growth of Pentecostalism devolves upon us not only triumphant rhetoric but concomitant responsibilities.

Robby Waddell has produced the first full-length study of the pneumatology of Revelation in his recently published *The Spirit of the Book of Revelation*. For this reason alone it is an important work and therefore worthy of review. That this study is written from a Pentecostal perspective makes it even more interesting. The volume is a revision of Waddell’s Ph.D. thesis written at the University of Sheffield and supervised by Loveday C. A. Alexander and John Christopher Thomas.

The book consists of four chapters: 1) a survey of modern scholarship on the role of the Spirit in Revelation, 2) a discussion of Revelation and intertextuality with a Pentecostal context, 3) a profile of a Pentecostal reader including a discussion of a Pentecostal hermeneutic for Revelation, and 4) an in-depth study of Revelation 11 that examines the faithful witness of a pneumatic church. The comments in this review article will largely follow the book’s order.

Waddell opens with the statement that “the pneumatology of the Apocalypse has received relatively little attention in comparison to other aspects of the Book of Revelation” (7). As he notes correctly, most of the discussion in commentaries and monographs focuses on references either to the seven Spirits (or sevenfold Spirit; 1:4 et al) and to the Spirit. After a review of the interpretative options for the seven Spirits, Waddell rejects the identification as angels and chooses rightly, I think, the view that they are the Spirit of God. He prefers Zechariah 4 as the intertext for the seven Spirits rather than Isaiah 11. Waddell identifies six categories in which the word *pneuma* occurs in Revelation, noting that all the scholars in his survey discuss at least one of these categories (21).

He next reviews the contributions of five scholars including myself in a section called “Christian Pneumatology.” That essay called “Revelation 19:10 and Contemporary Interpretation” appeared in a *Festschrift* for J.
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Rodman Williams in 1993. Over a decade of further study has caused me to modify the view stated in the article that pneuma should not be capitalized there and hence refers to an abstraction such as “the essence.” I mention this change in a footnote to my contribution on Revelation in the Zondervan Illustrated Bible Background Commentary, while writing in the text (4:355):

The NIV translation suggests that the testimony of Jesus is the spirit (uncapitalized), or essence, of all prophetic utterance. While this is true generally for all Christian prophecy, it fails to account for the context in Rev. By capitalizing Spirit and inserting the untranslated article “the” from the Greek text – “For the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of the prophecy” – a more viable interpretation can emerge. The seven messages (chaps. 2-3) strongly link the words of Jesus with “what the Spirit says to the churches.” Although the Spirit is clearly referred to only nine times in Rev. (the adjective Holy is never added), this text is probably another reference. To paraphrase, the testimony that Jesus is speaking to the churches is the same message that the Holy Spirit is speaking throughout the rest of the prophecy in Rev.

I would continue to advocate, however, that the normally untranslated article in 19:10 should be translated as the “Spirit of the prophecy,” as John is not advocating some general notion of a Spirit of prophecy. Waddell concludes his scholarly survey by noting that “a context has yet to be reached on a definition of the role of the Spirit in Revelation” (36). In the following chapters he then seeks to answer the question, “What is the role of the Spirit in the Apocalypse?”

Chapter 2 is a fifty-eight page exploration of the roundabout of intertextual meaning, built on a brilliant analogy of Waddell’s first driving experience in England. This literary theory suggests that all literary texts are the products of other texts. Again, he surveys various scholars in the field of literary criticism, with Stanley Fish and his critics receiving the bulk of the attention. Waddell cautions wisely that historical critics should understand that their brand of intertextual studies differs, both in theory and in practice, from that of poststructuralists (66). In the latter half of the chapter Waddell examines the use of intertextuality in Revelation studies. He wades into the ongoing discussion between Greg Beale and Steve Moyise about intertextuality in Revelation. Beale maintains that the OT intertexts such as Daniel 7, which John uses in Revelation, are determinative for understanding the meaning in its new context. Moyise, on the other hand, following Schüssler Fiorenza and others, “holds the original Old Testament meaning does not come into play” (74). He explores the positions of both scholars in depth, even providing an excursus on Beale’s position. His critique of Beale is the more severe of the two, concluding “at the end of the day, as a Pentecostal I find it inadequate” (85).

While Beale’s position has its weaknesses, I am in sympathy with his assertion that John is sensitive to the original prophetic contexts of his intertexts. Clearly at times (e.g., the content of the seven seals correlated with Jesus’ Olivet Discourse; Matt 24 para.) John is telling his audience that certain prophecies are taking place in their day. However, on other occasions John recasts the original prophecies to delocalize and universalize them (e.g., 1:7 or in 16:16, Har Magedon). I disagree with Waddell that the text of Revelation “never” (my emphasis) indicates that it contains a singular meaning or that the meaning should be identified with the intention of the author” (86). The χήρεια sayings that call for wisdom in 13:18 (666) and 17:9-11 (7 emperors) direct the audience to a specific interpretation. And in some visions an interpretation of a vision is explicitly stated. That we have difficulty interpreting these texts today should not diminish the fact that John on occasion had a specific message to communicate to his Asian hearers. Waddell approvingly cites Ruiz who holds that the appropriate context in which the text is read, interpreted, and followed is the worshipping community. He adds, “The fact that different interpretations exists between communities (or even within them) is not a reason for remorse but rather exultation” (86). But isn’t this precisely John’s (and Jesus’) problem with the Asian churches, especially Thyatira. There are differing interpretations of the apostolic teaching on food sacrificed to idols (Acts 15:29; 1 Cor 8:1-13, 10:18-33) and the interpretation of Jezebel and the Nicolaitans is seen as defective. Jezebel will be judged unless she repents so that “all the churches will know…” (2:23), thus enforcing a uniform standard among the early Christian communities.

Waddell also questions the “epistemological certainty” of the biblical writers by asking a series of rhetorical questions (86-87). To answer one of them, yes, I think John knew he was writing Scripture. Bauckham’s brilliant title “The Climax of Prophecy” says it all: John saw himself as prophesying in the line of the historic and canonical prophets such as Moses, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. I am certainly sensitive to the issues of inspiration and illumination, as I presented a paper (still unpublished) on the subject at a Society for Pentecostal Studies meeting over a decade ago. I am in agreement with Waddell’s sentiments that inspired reading is to be desired as well as inspired writing. But the unique theopneustic status of Revelation must be not diminished in our drive for Spirit-led interpretation.

This final point is the subject of Waddell’s third chapter. Here he gives a brief review of the history of the Pentecostal/charismatic movement, which is familiar territory to Pentecostals. He then surveys the discussion regarding the possibility and content of a Pentecostal theological hermeneutic, again a familiar subject. Waddell emphasizes the importance of the believing
community in interpretation: “I have become increasingly convinced that only in the community will we hear the voice of God” (118). From within that community he selects three scholars to review – S. H. Horton, R. H. Gause, and R. F. Martin. It is interesting that for his research Waddell finds limited insight on the role of the Holy Spirit from those scholars within his own pneumatic community. What I also found interesting here is the lack of mention of either myself or Kobus de Smidt, both cited in the opening chapter, as participants in the Pentecostal/charismatic community.

In section 3.5.1 “Apocalypse or Revelation?” Waddell says that “John is not using the word ἀποκάλυψις to identify his literary work with a particular genre but rather as a description of his experience” (123). He makes this point to emphasize the theological significance of the book’s opening: “the Pentecostal reader expects to experience a revelation of Jesus Christ as Jesus unveils the meaning of the text for the reader” (124). I would also like to emphasize the book’s opening, but in a way that Revelation scholars have largely overlooked. Rather than examining the complete phrase ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the word “revelation” has been atomized from its context. “Revelation of Jesus Christ” functions not only as the title of the book (cf. Matthew and Mark), but this phrase already had eschatological connotations in the Asian church. Both Paul (1 Cor 1:7) and Peter (1 Peter 1:7; 13) used the phrase to speak of the future parousia. This is likewise an emphasis in Rev, which repeatedly declares that Jesus is coming soon (cf. Rev. 1:1, 7; 22:7, 12, 20). Hence the audience is made aware that this divine revelation is about Jesus and his coming. I would agree that the genitive construction here is both objective and subjective (125) – Christ is both the source and the object of the revelation. The polyvalence of meaning in the book’s opening should suggest to readers that he or she should be open to additional polyvalent readings of the text.

My real-world “reading” of Waddell’s profile of a Pentecostal reader in Chapter 3 is that it is an idealized one. The first ten years of my Christian experience were within the context of Pentecostal church and educational communities. Within these communities I learned much about being a “person of the Spirit.” But I also learned that there was great rigidity in reading certain texts and little openness to fresh, Spirit-inspired readings. Two things forced me out of the Pentecostal movement into a charismatic context. First, my wife was divorced prior to salvation, and her background precluded me as her husband from official ministry. Although an exception was made for two years of service within a teaching context, I was advised by experienced ministers that I had no future within a Pentecostal context. Second, my study of Revelation brought insights and understandings that were at variance with the “accepted” Pentecostal reading. That this reading was not a uniquely Pentecostal one but the standard dispensational approach was no consequence. In fact, if I could have qualified for ordination on the marriage issue, I would have had more difficulty because of my variant “reading” of Revelation. Of course, I could have been silent and not taught my views, but such an approach was unacceptable to me. So to become the kind of Pentecostal reader that Waddell talks about, I had to leave the Pentecostal movement. I eventually found such a community at a charismatic Presbyterian church where I am free to write and teach my “readings” of Revelation.

As a NT scholar my main interest was in chapter 4 of the book. Here Waddell does an exemplary job in his exegesis. His discussion is clear and wide-ranging with excellent secondary sources used in the footnotes. For his target text Waddell chooses Rev 11:1-13 because it “sits at the center of the book literally and I believe theologically as well, forming the intertextual center of the role of the Spirit in the Apocalypse” (133). Yet Waddell offers little support for this assertion, instead largely following the assessment of Bauckham. But is chapter 11 at Revelation’s center? Since there are 175 verses before and 217 verses after, this does not seem to be the case. If we can introduce the assessment of a literary critic here (cf. 195), the novelist D. H. Lawrence in his idiosyncratic work Apocalypse (1931:85) instead identifies chapter 12 as “the centre-piece of the Apocalypse.” Chapter 12 has 194 verses before and 217 verses after, so statistically it is at the center of the book. (I did not take the time to do a word count but it should be very close.)

Waddell next assesses the various structures proposed for Revelation and opts for one based on John’s four “in the Spirit” experiences recorded in the book. On pages 148-49 he offers an outline of that model, shown here.

I. Prologue (1:1-8)
II. Vision of Christ and the Churches (1:9-3:22)
III. Vision of the Lamb and the Scroll (4:1-16:21)
   A. The Throne Room: God, Lamb and Scroll (4:1-5:14)
   B. Seven Seal Openings (6:1-8:1; 8:3-5)
      1. Seal Openings 1-6 (6:1-17)
      2. Interlude: Sealing the People of God (7:1-17)
      3. Seal Opening No. 7 (8:1-3-5)
   C. Seven Trumpet Blasts (8:2; 8:6-11:19)
      1. Introduction of the Seven Angels with the Seven Trumpets (8:2)
      2. Trumpet Blasts 1-6 (8:6-9:21; 11: 14)
      3. Interlude: Receiving and Delivering (the) Prophecy (10:1-11:13)
      4. Trumpet Blast No. 7 (11:15-19)
D. Cosmic Recapitulation: Interpreting the Scroll (12:1-14:20; 15:2-4)
E. Seven Bowl Pourings (15:1; 15:5-16:21)
   1. Introduction of the Seven Angels with the Seven Plagues (15:1; 5-8)
   2. Bowl Pourings 1-6 (16:1-14; 16)
   3. Compensatory Beatitude: in lieu of an interlude (16:15)
   4. Bowl Pouring No. 7 (16:17-21)
IV. Vision of the harlot, Babylon (17:1-19:10)
V. The Climax of the Story: Between Babylon and Jerusalem (19.11-21:8)
VI. Vision of the bride, Jerusalem (21:9-22:9)
VII. Epilogue (22:6-21)

It would be difficult from this outline to pick up that III.C.3 is the center of the book. Waddell notes rightly that a weakness of the outline is the inability to place the return of Christ, the 1000 years, and the judgment in a satisfactory place. He thus adds a section V, but this section also has the first description of John's vision of the new Jerusalem – the content of section VI. This text is among several double accounts of the same event that occur in the book, especially in the final chapters. The failure to account for the first new Jerusalem vision is a major weakness of the "in the Spirit" structure. Another weakness, and maybe more critical, is that the second experience in 4:1 must carry the weight of most of the book, section III (chapters 4-16), in Waddell's outline. There are just too many other major structural markers within this section to suborn them to a sub point under an "in the Spirit" experience. A chiastic structure that incorporates the overt use of sevens and that highlights the pivotal role of chapter 12 makes more sense to me of Revelation's macrostructure. Note that the divisions in the structure begin with "in the Spirit" experiences except the fourth (cf. 21:10).

A Prologue and greeting (1:1-8)
B Seven churches [1st "in the Spirit"] (1:4-4:2)
   C Seven seals [2nd "in the Spirit"] (3:21-8:5)
   D Seven trumpets/two witnesses (8:2-11:19)
   E Woman, dragon, and the male child (12:1-18)
   D' Two beasts/seven bowls (13:1-16:21)
   C' Destruction of Babylon [3rd "in the Spirit"] (16:18-19:10)
A' Closing and epilogue (22:6-21)

My point then in this discussion is that I have a methodological problem from the beginning. To make this pericope paradigmatic because it is somehow structurally central cannot be sustained upon scrutiny. I would agree that among the "witnessing" accounts that it is probably the most important, but again it is one of several snapshots of the community of saints, on earth and in heaven, that appears throughout the first half of the book (cf. 6:9-11; 7:1-17).

Waddell's introduces a fresh interpretation for the identification of the mighty angel in 10:1. Because of the angel's description (e.g., rainbow above his head, face like the sun, etc.), Waddell has difficulty along with some other scholars in ascribing these to an angel. Rather he views favorably Beale's suggestion that here is a divine being, perhaps Christ. Indeed he takes it a step farther suggesting that the Spirit is the revelatory agent. Waddell acknowledges that his suggestion that John personifies the Spirit through the symbol of the divine angel is possible, although conjectural (160). Given "that John truly is a master of his craft" (Waddell's words on p. 157), it is highly unlikely that the Revelator has misidentified an angel with a divine being. Instead he is one of the ten "another" (allos) angels and one of three "mighty" angels whom John sees (5:2; 18:21). The consequence of Waddell's interpretation is that the Spirit then becomes the narrator of the prophecy in 11:1-13 instead of an angel. The voice of the mighty angel is, in fact, joined by a heavenly voice in chapter 10 with both speaking instructions to prophesy again (10:11). Hence there can still be a divine voice speaking in chapter 11, that is, the voice from heaven.

In the discussion of the two witnesses, Waddell identifies them with the church because of the lampstand imagery. Because John fails to redefine the symbol of the lampstand (cf. 1:20), "the burden of proof will continue to lie with those who wish to identify the two lampstands as anything other than the church" (173). I agree that John has already defined the symbol, for in 1:20 the seven lampstands signify the seven Asian churches. Yet here the number is changed, and the identification comes after they have been defined as two olive trees. Waddell identifies rightly the background in Zechariah where the king Zerubbabel and the high priest Joshua are the referents. The further references in the pericope to OT intertexts point to activities related to Moses and Elijah. Recalling that the passage's genre is historical prophecy, Waddell asserts that "John is not describing the historical churches in Asia Minor nor the eschatological church at the end of the ages" (174).

But why is John precluded from linking personal referents to the two witnesses? We have earlier alluded to the polyvalent nature of John's symbols. In fact, many symbols depict an antitype/type format. I think the Asian audience would identify historical figures behind these symbols. In chapter 12 Israel is clearly the antitype of the woman but Mary is the type – the woman of Israel who gives birth to the male child (the great harlot the negative type). The dragon is the archetype of the opposition, but Herod
personifies his activity on earth to kill the male child in the slaughter at Bethlehem. I think it very plausible that the Asian audience would think of Peter and Paul who gave their testimony in Rome and were martyred publicly in the great city Babylon shortly before Revelation was written (accepting an early date).

One feature missing in Waddell’s study was its failure to discuss symbols of the Spirit in Revelation. For example, Gary Burge in his *The Anointed Community* (pp. 88-100) looks at water as a metaphor for the Spirit in the other Johannine literature. Something that has always struck me is the lack of any overt reference to the Spirit in the new Jerusalem. However, water serves as an important motif there. In 21:6 the victors are finally given water from the spring of the water of life, fulfilling the proleptic announcement in 7:16. And an angel shows John the river of the water of life flowing from the throne of God and the Lord (22:1-2; cf. Ezek 47:1ff.). The supply of this water is thus contiguous with its divine source. This river supplies the tree of life which bears twelve monthly crops of fruit that is for the healing of the nations. (Given the Pentecostal interest in healing, this should be a significant text.) So while God’s glory is the light and the Lamb its lamp (21:23) for the new heaven and new earth, the Spirit seems to be its river.

In his “Conclusion” Waddell identifies five areas for further research in Revelation. The most fruitful topic he suggests is John’s use of Zechariah (196). This lacuna has been filled in part with the recent publication Marko Jauhianen’s *The Use of Zechariah in Revelation* (Mohr Siebeck). Waddell’s volume concludes with twenty-four pages of bibliographic sources. Needless to say, Waddell’s volume was stimulating reading and highly recommended to the Pentecostal/charismatic community, even to those who usually avoid the book of Revelation.
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**A New Teaching without Authority: Preaching the Bible in Postmodernity**

**Andrew Davies**

**Abstract**

The response of the citizens of Capernaum to Jesus’ proclamation in Mark 1:21-28 highlights the ‘paradigm shift’ that his ministry inaugurated in the sphere of preaching. In comparison with the teaching of the scribes, Mark tells us, Jesus taught with authority. This paper uses this underestimated *pericope* as a springboard to explore the concept of authority in preaching, particularly in the light of the postmodern distaste for external authority, and seeks to assess the need for a further remoulding of the preaching paradigm, in terms of its very conception as much as with respect to its style. Does reconceptualizing power structures in society in general mean the death of the teacher-pupil and preacher-listener binary oppositions? Is the concept of authority now so firmly embedded in our concept of preaching, not least as a result of the ministry of Jesus, as to make it inherently ‘modern’ and doomed to irrelevance? If so, can literary criticism and the postmodern emphasis on story offer a useful model for non-authoritarian preaching (presuming the latter is both possible and desirable)? On the way I will address the question of whether cultural-critical approaches and the present focus on literary and iconic reception of the biblical texts have been the primary contribution of academic biblical scholarship to the present poor health of expository preaching before concluding with some practical suggestions for the way ahead.

**Jesus and Authoritative Preaching**

Many things may be considered by Christian theologians to be ‘new’ about the ministry of Jesus, but I suspect it is only comparatively rarely...
observed that the teaching and preaching ministry of Jesus when viewed in comparison with the approach of his contemporaries also deserves to be considered something of a ‘paradigm shift’. It is easy to neglect the fact that his first listeners saw in the proclamation of Jesus something essentially ‘other’, wholly beyond their previous experience. Perhaps this is most simply and conveniently demonstrated to us in the short but fascinating pericope of Mark 1:21-28. In this passage we learn how Jesus, in line with customary and appropriate expected behaviour for a Jewish man, entered the synagogue on the Sabbath day and, presumably at the invitation of the synagogue rulers, began to teach the people. His listeners were ‘astonished’ at his teaching, because ‘he was teaching them like someone who had authority’, which, to their mind, was quite unlike the scribes, whose authority (at least in the traditional Christian understanding) came from the sources they referred to and the teachers of the past whose learning they could draw on. Not so with Jesus. His authority was first practically demonstrated in the exorcism of a demonised man, to the amazement of the people (‘they marvelled’, Mark tells us). The people discuss the events among themselves, asking, ‘What is this? A new teaching – with authority! He commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him’. It was as a direct result of these events, Mark tells us, that Jesus’ reputation began to spread throughout the surrounding region.

There are a number of elements within this short narrative sequence that fascinate me. The irony of this illustration of the authority of Jesus being set in the synagogue, a context where he had no authority, no intrinsic right to speak, had he not been invited so to do by the one with authority; the fact that Jesus, though a key character in the development of the narrative, features rather less prominently than the people (probably more precisely, the men) he ministers to; and then the subtlety and quality of the characterisation of the protagonists, even in so few verses. Most of all, though, I love the way the growing and deepening astonishment experienced by the congregation as the story develops is so beautifully represented and masterfully crafted. They begin with astonishment (literally ‘they were struck out of their senses’), which grows to amazement (and this time we are explicitly told this affected ‘all’ of them). Then the question asked by the people to one another repeatedly – and the structure of the Greek goes awkwardly out of its way to make sure we understand this repetition – seems to accelerate with each phrase, racing toward a dramatic conclusion: what is this – a new teaching – with authority – he commands unclean spirits – and they obey him! We can well imagine how the excitement spread like wildfire through the region.

It seems clear to me that whilst the authority at issue here finds its ultimate illustration in the fact that unclean spirits obey the command of Jesus, his authority does not depend upon that submission. The authority with which Jesus taught is first noticed by the people back in v. 22 in the difference between his preaching and that of the scribes; only secondarily is it evidenced in a demonstration of spiritual power, and only after that, in v. 27, is the authority attributed to the teaching rather than the teacher. In the first instance, it is the fact that he teaches as one possessing authority that impresses his hearers. It is worth observing that the people do not credit the teaching of Jesus with more authority than that of the scribes; rather, his teaching is unlike theirs because it is with authority, which clearly implies that theirs was not, at least in the perception of the people. Judging from the responses attributed to them, the exorcism and the demonic acclamation of Jesus which prompts it surprise the people more than the content of Jesus’s teaching (which Mark does not attempt to outline for us in this instance, telling us only that the people thought it was ‘new’), but the obedience of unclean spirits is only a further demonstration of an authority which was initially demonstrated in the manner, not even the message, of the teaching of Jesus. This is particularly evident when Jesus’ method is presented in opposition to the didactic approach of the scribes.

Whereas the scribes, as presented by Mark at least, sought to draw on authorities, and to present themselves as the sole exegetical and interpretative authority within the religious system of the day, Jesus the teacher seems somehow to create authority (out of nothing) as he speaks, without formally possessing it or ever citing it. For all the Johannine Christ has to say about his message being not his own, that he speaks only the words entrusted to him by the Father (John 14:10, for instance), the authority

---

2 An earlier version of this paper was presented to the Biblical Studies and Homiletics Consultation of the Society of Biblical Literature 2006 Annual Meeting, Washington DC.

3 All biblical quotations here are taken from the NRSV.

4 The parallel in Matthew 7:28-29 has ‘their scribes’, in itself an interesting reallocation – a disowning even, of traditional authority structures. Luke, on the other hand (4:32), tones the statement down and merely has Jesus speaking with authority (literally, ‘his word or message was [in or] with authority’). Luke actually substantially tones down the whole episode and particularly the popular acclamation of Jesus in 4:36.

5 Mark however, has already alerted us to the fact that Jesus is the Son of God in 1:1.
of Mark’s Jesus is so very much centred in and exuding from his person. This relocation of authority from tradition to teacher, I suggest, is precisely what the synagogue congregation here sees most fundamentally as different about the preaching of Jesus. The significance of his message is presented as being less interesting to the people than the issues of authority, power and significance which underlie it. And this highlights for me how fundamental the whole area of authority is for preaching and preachers, both ancient and (post)modern, and facilitates the realisation that preaching, broadly any proclamation of religious or spiritual insight perceived by its proclaimer and/or listeners as in some manner ‘truth’, is of its very essence a power discourse, in at least the areas of the perceived truthfulness of the message and the location of the proclaimer over against the listeners. Since Foucault, none of us should be surprised to see the conjunction of knowledge and power highlighted in this way, but it is perhaps a more unexpected find in a first-century setting. Nonetheless, it seems quite clear that in Mark 1:21-28, Jesus shifts the preaching paradigm by transforming the authority structure upon which it hangs. He taught with a different kind of authority, and I believe a similar quantum leap in the thinking of Pentecostal preachers is needed in this area today, albeit with a move in a very different direction.

For here is the great problem for preaching and preachers today. The postmodern western world is notoriously resentful of any external authority. The authority structure, in terms of society at large as well as in the field of biblical scholarship, which much of day-to-day, classic Pentecostal homiletics assumes and upon which it depends has changed radically, and yet there appears to be little evidence of the effect of such transformation upon most preaching models regularly in operation in our churches. It is only barely a parody to suggest that we sometimes have to choose between an otherworldly and cold exposition of texts, which are never truly applied to any sort of relevant context, delivered by preachers better versed in nineteenth-century commentators than the reality of contemporary society on the one hand, and a barely Christianised motivational presentation; the latter clearly empowers and encourages its listeners but could hardly be called truly biblical preaching and fails to build real understanding of the scriptures.

Surely there must be a third way, however – a model of biblical proclamation that deals with the realities of today’s world and tomorrow’s congregations. And it seems to me that a fundamental feature of such preaching, if it is to impact the postmodern generation, is that it should be anti-authoritarian. We need to transform our handling of authority structures just as Jesus did centuries ago, to deal with a changed circumstance. For it is my thesis that one reason that some biblical preaching can seem dated and distant in today’s world is that it can presume a view of hermeneutical and exegetical authority (let alone of the authority of the communicator and the church which stands behind him or her) which bears no relationship to contemporary understandings of the fundamental principles of biblical interpretation and has nothing in common with conceptualisations of power structures in contemporary postmodern society. Too much exposition is based on the assumption that the text means the same thing in every context (even, that it actually means anything in itself). And that, to most biblical scholars trained in the last twenty years, is a laughably dated concept. For better or worse, biblical studies has sped on ahead, and I fear homiletics may have lost us at the last traffic lights.

### Authority in Postmodern Biblical Interpretation

Perhaps it will be useful, then, to briefly map the route biblical scholars have travelled since that junction. The great paradigm shift in Biblical Studies was of course the movement towards literary criticism proper which began in the 1970s. Instead of using the well-honed tools of generations of biblical critics, scholars began to turn to the methods of a different discipline, and developments there have, in my experience, singularly failed to influence let alone transform present practice within the church (with the exception of the ‘emerging church’ – and that movement would hardly see itself as consciously adopting the insights of scholarship). It is possible, perhaps even likely, that this is closely linked with the increasing average age of Pentecostal ministers in the UK.

---

6 This ambiguity is facilitated, if not invited, by the very word for authority, ousia, which, structurally if not etymologically, is formed from the preposition ἐκ (out of) collocated with the present participle of the verb ‘to be’, ouσια which is usually translated ‘essence’ or ‘substance’, and is in itself such a theologically weighty word, fundamental to the history of trinitarian theology and at the centre of more than one controversy. Authority, is therefore, when read wilfully overliterally, something ‘out of essence’. In both Greek and English the preposition involved can denote motion or location, of course, so ousia embodies a concept and a quality at one and the same time rooted in an individual’s essential nature and wholly ‘other than’ them. It is freestanding, though internally deeply located. It arises out of the essence, and stands essentially outside, of a person - most intimately theirs and most fundamentally distinct from them.

7 The authority with which he teaches comes from the fact that his message is not his own, I would venture to suggest, if that did not sound so uncomfortably Johannine in this context.

8 It is worth stressing here that I have in mind popular rather than academic homiletics; some of these issues have begun to be addressed within the academy, but conclusions
and found them worthy of wider application. Although what used to be known as the ‘new literary criticism’ has hardly shattered the hegemony of historical criticism in the guild, even to this day, it has taught at least its adherents a number of things – foremost among them that there is no such thing as a universally ‘true’ and globally applicable interpretation. The goal of delivering an authoritative interpretation has been replaced by the desire to explore potential meanings and to investigate significance (in every sense of that word). It has been a long while since the primary question to be addressed when reading any biblical text has been, what did the writer mean when he wrote this? The road from historical-critical exegesis to postmodern biblical interpretation has often been bumpy, but biblical scholars have successfully negotiated many of the rules of the road on this little voyage of discovery. I think popular homiletics could benefit massively from listening to the journey biblical scholarship has travelled and from the issues we have begun to address. Many of them involve concepts of authority, and all of these have potential implications for the principles and practice of preaching. Let me briefly summarise them as I see them.

The Authority of the Word

‘The Word was God’, John tells us, but contemporary society says ‘image is everything’. Logocentrism died a couple of decades after God, this time at the hands of French rather than German philosophy. And it is probably the fact that we live in such a graphic-conscious and media-savvy society that nailed down the coffin. For the most transforming and exciting single development in Biblical Studies recently, to my mind, has been the rise of cultural criticism. Viewing the Bible as an artefact of world culture and examining its reception within that culture over the centuries, reading it through film, art, music and literature, has resulted in some fascinating and often highly entertaining work and reasserted the value and relevance of the Bible for contemporary secular society. However, I wonder if, so far at least, it has hindered rather than helped the religious appropriation of the Bible, partially because so little of this work is seen as applicable in church and synagogue contexts, but also because the focus of preachers has always been the text of scripture itself and not how and by whom it has been handled down the centuries. In fact I would argue that for these

10 In the UK at least, this has exacerbated the disjunction between the academic and the ecclesiastical reader of the biblical text, and left the Bible Colleges and seminaries in the unenviable position of choosing which agenda to serve.
11 John 1:1
12 That was partially its intention, at least in certain quarters.

reasons among others, cultural-critical approaches and the present focus on literary and iconic reception of the biblical texts which is increasingly dominating the cutting edge of our discipline may have been the primary contribution of academic biblical scholarship to the present poor health of expository preaching.

The Authority of the Text

If word has been replaced by image then it is equally clear that the idea of a single determinate meaning has also been replaced by polyvalency, and the quest to find a text’s meaning exchanged for an exploration of its possible meanings. Literary critics accept that whilst there can be plenty of wrong answers, there is never an exclusively right one. Interpretational, as well as propositional, ‘truth’ is seen as relative and contextual. Now diversity is not something with which the pulpit, or even the church, is intrinsically comfortable. For all my commitment to it, and I am a neo evangelical Pentecostal who is as passionate about my Christianity as just about anyone else in my denomination – and that means passionate – the Church does not have a good record historically in accepting diversity and dissent without it producing disharmony. It suits ecclesiastical politics quite nicely to have one authority figure in the congregation who delivers with authority a single authoritative interpretation – the meaning – of a passage from a single authoritative book, acceptance of and compliance with which is the primary prerequisite for admission into the community. Biblical scholarship no longer permits them that luxury. Then, of course, we have also begun to understand the role of the reader in producing meaning. Undoubtedly, texts have the power to influence their readers (albeit not to compel them) to what Kathryn Darr labelled ‘particular perceptions of reality’. But we have also learned to resist their power, read against them, subvert and undermine them... even to play with them. Quite a comedown for the previously omnipotent text, which, dethroned, has become a tool, a resource, rather than a power base. And, it might be felt, this is hardly appropriate treatment for a book which is seen by its religious readers as in at least some sense the inspired Word of God. In this respect too the disjunction between the academic and the religious applications of the Bible is broadened and deepened.

The Authority of the Interpreter

It is also evident that the classic binary opposition of teacher-pupil is increasingly being undermined. I know of one lecturer who says of his students ‘we’re studying together’, and this increasingly reflects the mindset of educators in the arts and humanities as it has perhaps a little longer in the sciences. The status of a tutor and the respect in which they are held depends, for most contemporary students, far less on their learning, qualifications and job title and rather more on what they contribute to the student’s personal and intellectual development. The teaching task itself has changed from one of communicating information to one of facilitating the student’s own discovery and in the process, we have discovered the need for engagement, mutual analysis, critique and evaluation, and the joy of participation together in the interpretative journey. That at the same time requires and produces a good dose of humility on the part of the teacher. Actually it is to the great credit of anyone that they do not merely accept a viewpoint proposed because of the professional status of the proposer. Great academics are unfortunately just as prone to lapses of judgement and critical analysis as any of us; they just encounter them less frequently. However, whilst even at undergraduate level we encourage those new to academic reading of the Bible to question everything they read in or about it, preachers in my experience are prone to complain about the scrutiny their sermons are put under by congregations. For reasons political as well as historical, it suits preachers to raise their platform above the congregation and protect themselves with the heavy oak of the pulpit, and such a privileged environment is alien to scholars.

The Authority of the Community

Any text must be interpreted in its context, of course. No radical realisation there, it might appear, but I have in mind the contexts in which the Bible is read and not those in which it was written. With the benefit of hindsight, it is difficult to see why anyone would ever think that words would have the same universal meaning to those of different gender, social and geographic location and life experience, but this was a fundamental insight into the nature of language which transformed the task of interpretation. Most ideological-critical approaches, including feminist and materialist criticism and postcolonial interpretation, depend upon this realisation, as does the recent movement towards global contextual interpretation represented by projects such as the Global Bible Commentary and the Africa Bible Commentary.16


15 But this means, as David Clines once observed, ‘biblical interpreters have to give up the goal of determinate and universally acceptable interpretations, and devote themselves to producing interpretations they can sell – in whatever mode is called for by the communities they choose to serve’ (D.J.A. Clines, ‘A World Established on Water (Psalm 24): Reader-Response, Deconstruction and Bespoke Interpretation’ in D.J.A. Clines and J.C. Exum (eds.), The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), p. 87).

16 Fifty years ago, I suspect many preachers would have found the Journal of Biblical Literature a useful source of expositional ideas and insights, but I doubt it continues as one today even though it remains a comparatively conservative journal. As for Biblical Interpretation and the late lamented Semeia, let’s not even go there.
to the same issues that Biblical Scholarship has, broadly successfully, confronted. These observations would benefit from a more detailed exposition and perhaps that is a task I will return to in a future paper on the topic. First, it seems evident to me that preaching would benefit from becoming much more image dependent and audio visual. There are good practical reasons for this. Sitting listening to a single person talking for what can in some congregations be easily over an hour without some sensory stimulation is not always a straightforward or entertaining duty. Educationally, as well, there is good evidence for believing the support of visual aids facilitates learning and memorisation. But above all I believe there are solid ideological reasons for the process.

Second, I do think the dualistic preacher-listener model of communication needs to be done away with. ‘Preaching as power discourse’ has done nothing but undermine ‘preaching as proclaimed deliverance’, and continues to do so. As biblical scholars recognise that their authority arises from serving the needs of their community, preachers too may need to be reminded that ‘authority is rooted in the community of listeners’, as Barbara Blaisdell has observed.\textsuperscript{17} Preaching therefore needs to become a dialogic, listener-focussed process, where the individual listener needs to play an active role in the production of meaning.\textsuperscript{18} And, though I don’t have time to explore this, I suspect literary criticism and the postmodern emphasis on story can contribute to a useful model for non-authoritarian preaching.

Third, there is the question of the text itself and how we use it. Preaching needs to become inductive rather than deductive; to let the text tell its story instead of forcing it into a convenient mould. And, perhaps we need to let other texts tell the story of the Bible on its behalf. Maybe preaching the Bible in postmodernity need not always involve preaching the words of the Bible – perhaps. Maybe its teaching can be better communicated sometimes by starting from a different viewpoint.

None of those quick suggestions are particularly radical or even especially original, but addressing such areas with enthusiasm and vigour might just result in a transformed preaching model which could relate in a new way to an increasingly spiritual but nonreligious western world. If an unreconstructed high modern conceptualisation of authority continues to underlie the Church’s proclamation, then it is surely doomed to irrelevance and a slow death by desertion.

However, I do believe there is cause for optimism. We must learn to see that denying the possibility of a single determinate meaning offers an opportunity as well as a challenge to preachers. In fact it even guarantees the future of and the need for preaching. Diversity of interpretation and of context means there will always be someone to ask, what does this mean? Polyvalency means the Bible will always be worth preaching and that every preacher-scribe will have something new as well as something old to bring out of his treasure like the master of a household.\textsuperscript{19} We saw at the beginning of this paper how Jesus in a similarly challenging context in Mark 1 deprofessionalised biblical interpretation and preaching and seized them back for the people, rejecting the authority structures of what had to that point been considered ‘best professional practice’. Maybe preaching could survive as the church’s primary means of communication if a generation of preachers were prepared to follow the example of Christ in this area as well as others.

\textsuperscript{17} In Ronald J. Allen, Scott Black Johnston and Barbara S. Blaisdell, \textit{Theology for Preaching}, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997), p. 44.

\textsuperscript{18} Actually this is far from a new idea, being proposed over 30 years ago by Fred B. Craddock, \textit{As One Without Authority} (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971).

\textsuperscript{19} Matthew 13:52.
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Abstract
The theme of the EPTA conference included the concept of empowerment. Scholars have not been able to agree on a definition of empowerment (Beairsto et al. 2003; Dewettinck et al. 2003; Herrenkohl et al. 1999; Siitonen 1999). The concept is used in multiple contexts with various meanings. They range from mystical personal experiences to cutting edge definitions used in business practices and academic debate. In the academic discussions, two notions are pertinent. On one hand, empowerment is considered as something positive that can add value to current practices in leadership, organizational development, and scientific understanding of our world. On the other hand, the researchers are growing increasingly sceptical about the meaning and usefulness of the concept of empowerment and its practical applicability (Beairsto et al. 2003; Dewettinck et al. 2004).

Windows into the Theoretical Understanding of Empowerment
Volumes have been written in attempt to define empowerment and build scientific theory around the concept. In what comes to scientific efforts to understand empowerment and the practical value of the concept, a few basic assumptions need to be explored. First of all, the idea to empower presumes that there is an individual or collectivity that is in some sense powerless, disempowered (Freire 1970; Gutiérrez et al. 1998). Secondly, there is an assumption that the same can be empowered in some way. In societal contexts, disempowerment is seen to an extent a result of prevailing
structures in a given society or a community. Therefore, empowerment can be seen as the removal of these restrictions and creating avenues for change (Freire 1970; Adams 1996; Järvelä & Laukkanen 2000). These two basic assumptions will eventually lead to the core of empowerment debate. That is, to which extent empowerment is an intrinsic or psychological phenomenon and to which extent it is defined by external factors such as prevailing conditions in a given society or an organization (Fetterman 2001; Kuokkanen 2003; Siitonen 1999). In other words, is it possible to empower an individual or a collective in the first place or is empowerment such an intrinsic phenomenon that external factors cannot restrict it nor catalyze it (Siitonen 1999)?

Currently, it seems that researches recognize the two aspects, the intrinsic and the external, as inherent components of the concept of empowerment. The intrinsic factors include such issues as motivation, volition, self-image, efficacy beliefs, self-authorization, self-determination, and other cognitive, affective, and conative processes and constructs (Beairsto et al 2003; Fetterman 2001; Kuokkanen 2003; Siitonen 1999). The external factors bearing to empowerment include leadership styles, organizational structures, restructuring public sectors, legal advice access to information, and so on (Argyris 1998; Fetterman et al 1996; Koberg et al 1999; Nayaran 2002; Ruohotie 2001). It is assumed that there intrinsic and external factors bear on one another in such a way that it is meaningful to search ways to facilitate and catalyze empowerment (Siitonen 1999). For the purposes of this seminar evolving around equipping and empowering for God’s service, we will peek through four different windows to broaden our perspective on empowerment: sociological, psychological, organizational, and biblical.

Sociological Perspective
In the introduction, it was hinted that a substantial part of scientific empowerment discussions evolve around societal factors. Ruhlin (1998) suggests that social conditions may be such that they feed feelings of powerlessness. An individual feels that he or she is incapable or has a restricted ability to control time, space and options. Such feelings will accumulate and lead to an overall sense that one cannot influence and solve problems that relate to life. At worst, such a condition may lead to feelings of grief and depression.

If looked from the positive perspective, an empowered person is able to solve problems, make decisions, to be proactive, and have a sense of control even in problematic situations (Fetterman 2001). Empowerment can also be researched in communal or group contexts. In such cases, empowerment relates to the attempts of marginalized groups to advocate for their cause, seek for their rights, have their voices heard, and participate in the mainstream of life (Adams 1996; Eklund 1999). At the heart of forming empowerment groups are attempts to increase control over circumstances, manage problems, reduce hierarchies, collaborate, and experience a feeling of power generated by common experiences (Adams 1996). In essence, empowerment is influence. Eklund (1999) has also suggested that an empowered community believes that through political processes it is possible to change things and. Pertinent to this belief is the basic assumption that change is possible. That, in turn, creates hope. Interestingly, Adams (1996) notes that collective attempts to empower may turn against themselves. This may happen when the person becomes too dependent on empowerment acts.

Mason, McNulty, and Aubel (2001), have put together a manual for community empowerment for CARE. They suggest that for community empowerment it is crucial that: all groups involved in the process may have their voices heard, concern for common good prevails over personal ambition, the community is able to recognize and prioritize the needs of all members, the community can take action locally to solve problems, and the community is able to plan, implement, and evaluate activities on their own. A number of the notions merely highlight what has been said before. However, an interesting nuance can be observed in the second statement. It suggests that when community is empowered, concern for common good overrides personal interests (also Siitonen 1999). Therefore, a component of empowerment seems to relate to right values.

Psychological Perspective
Psychological empowerment refers to intrinsic mental processes and feelings that relate to empowerment (Koberg et al 1999; Spreitzer et al 1999; Siitonen 1999; Ruohotie 2001). Thomas and Velthouse (1990) along with Spreitzer and others (1999) have studied empowerment in work related contexts. They suggest that empowerment consists of four dimensions: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact. A person must attach value to the role he or she is to play at work place or in any other contexts where certain tasks are to be performed. It is also crucial that a person feels able to perform a given task with a skill. Such a belief boosts intrinsic motivation. The researchers also suggest that in order to be or feel empowered, a person should have a say in planning, initiating, and choosing courses of action. This creates a sense of autonomy. Finally, for a person to embark on a process to perform a task, he or she needs to have an innate sense that it is possible to influence strategic, administrative, and operative outcomes. It seems that all of the discussed dimensions relate in one way or another to...
motivation and volition. Therefore, empowerment, to a great extent, can be seen as motivational and volitional concept.

A number of researchers have looked at empowerment in the context of life-long learning and professional growth. Beairsto and Ruohotie (2000) have reflected on professional growth of teachers and suggest that it is not enough to equip teachers with information and pedagogical background. In terms of professional growth and competence such qualities as persistence, self-regulation, motivational control, self-efficacy, curiosity, and optimism will play an increasing role in teacher empowerment. Such qualities enable for life-long learning which is seen as an avenue of empowerment. Beairsto (2000, 50-56) has painted a picture of the ideal life-long inquirer: adaptive, willing to change, able to endure insecurity, team player, curious, insightful, honest, courageous, optimistic and honest. Some of the concepts are interesting. Beairsto has defined them as follows. A curious person keeps inquiring and wondering. Insight gives access to assumptions that are not explicit. Courage can be seen as an ability to permit ambiguity, acknowledge paradoxes, and initiate change. Optimism, in turn is an inclination to anticipate positive outcomes. For Beairsto and Ruohotie, these qualities of a life-long learner are also qualities of an empowered person in terms of their psychological and cognitive inclinations.

Kuokkanen (2003) has studied empowerment in a nursing context. In line with the ideas presented above, she also sees empowerment as a concept linked to self-reflectivity, motivation, self-regulation, goal orientation, and a sense of contextual control (Kuokkanen 2003, 20-21). An empowered nurse, among other things, is depicted as a person with clear moral principles, abilities to work under pressure, courageous, mentally resourceful, autonomous, future-oriented, innovative, open minded, and socially responsible (Kuokkanen 2003, 33-43).

Siitonen, who, of the recent scholars on empowerment, has made, perhaps, the most comprehensive inquiry into the processes of empowerment sees it also as an intrinsic concept. He uses four main categories to describe empowerment: intentions (goals), ability beliefs, context beliefs, and emotions (Siitonen 1999, 157-158). These categories contain such concepts as intellectual competence, ability beliefs, self-confidence, self-reflectivity, self-talk, voice, optimism, motivation, risk-taking, freedom of action, possibility thinking, and self-awareness (Siitonen 1999, 90). However, although the concepts relate to psychological processes, he recognizes that empowerment is a phenomenon that takes place in a social setting.

**Organizational Perspective**
The psychological aspect of empowerment marries practice in organizational

settings. The organizational setting makes it worthwhile for businesses, educationalists, and leaders to study empowerment and judge whether the theoretical constructs are of any practical value.

One of the most popular concepts in management theory and organizational research in recent years has been organizational learning. Byrgyone (1996, 14-15) has proposed that organizational learning occurs on three levels: procedural, adaptive, and developmental. Procedural learning is finding something, forming a procedure, and institutionalizing it. Adaptive learning means adaptation to changing markets and other factors in the operational context that determine survival. Finally, developmental learning has to do with the issue of sustainability. An organization is able to genuinely contribute to its environment. The concept goes beyond mere adaptation to the operating environment. Developmental organization moulds the environment to be more conducive to operate and other stakeholders to work in.

Argyris and Schön (1996) share a similar view. An empowered organization is a learning organization. Learning organization cannot be simply defined as an organization that acquires, stores, and makes use of information to improve performance. A learning organization needs to take another loop of learning, that is, to change the tacit theories-in-use that subtly influence organizational performance and cultures. Argyris has popularized the concept of double-loop learning. However, Beairsto and Ruohotie (2003) suggest that, in fact, in an empowering or empowered organization one has to go beyond double-loop learning. They say that what is needed is triple-loop learning, that is, generation of new processes that create new mental models.

In addition to learning, organizational empowerment has to do with technical adjustments supposed to catalyze empowerment. The technical aspects of empowerment include articulation of empowerment intentions, effecting structural changes, providing resources, and rewarding actions evidencing empowerment (Beairsto & Ruohotie 2003, 135). Such technical factors evoke ideas that empowerment is close to delegation. However, empowerment and delegation is not one and the same thing.

One of the key characteristics of empowerment is participation. Participation is crucial since it is believed to breed commitment. It is typical of organizations that they generate either internal or external commitment. To nurture internal commitment, participation is needed. Participation also creates a sense of ownership. (Argyris 1998.)

Yet another crucial aspect of organizational empowerment is leadership. It seems that leaders are in key position to enhance or to inhibit empowerment. Leadership is, to a great extent, a two-way influence process between two

---
or more people. (Sadler 2003.) Traditionally, leaders have been described as directors, heroes, captains of cavalries, navigators, captains of the ship, etc (Senge 1993, 339-360). Empowering leadership calls for other images. A leader should influence the permanent structures of the follower: attitudes, schemes, and scripts. This will effect permanent changes in followers. (Ruohotie 2004.) An empowering leader is able to influence the upward ladders of the organization which consequently will strengthen the belief in his or her followers that they are influential too. An empowering leader is also able to generate new innovations that will create an atmosphere of moving forward and success in the work force. An empowering leader is an inspiring leader, he or she is proud of the work force, shows respect to all, and has confidence in and trusts the followers. (Spreitzer et al 1999.)

Biblical Perspective

The Bible is not a scientific book in essence. Therefore, quite often, the efforts to marry the Book and science lead into violence against its nature and purpose, artificial interpretations, and naïve conclusions. The Bible is not a handbook of empowerment. However, in light of what has been presented above, it is thrilling to ponder on some biblical personalities and events in light of current empowerment theories.

Moses has been considered the leader of all times. His task can be looked from the perspective of God’s salvific activity in history, of course. On the other hand, the Bible is not quiet about the reality of Moses’ time – prevalent social injustice. A sociologist could refer to the story as a prime case of empowerment. There are a number of empowerment related elements present in the story. There is a need to correct social evils. There is a feeling of general powerlessness among God’s people. There are basically no resources available to Moses to tap on. When God calls him as a murderer hiding in the wilderness, he is not asking Moses what he would need to deliver God’s people. God asks what Moses has at present, which, of course, was a mere staff. Then, in the wilderness, the ability to endure paradox and nagging by his flock is called for.

David, in turn, faced a similar situation. In the natural, he is the last choice to battle the feared Goliath. From empowerment perspective, David draws his courage and power from devoured values. To David, Goliath’s mockery is an insult against the sacred, the Holy one of Israel and the experience of the people of God. Goliath is challenging the grounds of the very existence of the Israelites. David, again, draws on what is available to him, stones, that he has experience in using. Of course, he does this only after having denied the armor that was too big for him. From an empowerment perspective, he fights the powerlessness of his own people to fight the enemy, draws on the little but available resources, and fights for the good of his people, not for himself. All of these qualities would fit well the depictions of empowered leader.

A number of biblical personalities and events could be looked in the light of empowerment theories. To conclude, we will shortly comment on two New Testament phenomena that are very intriguing. The first is the calling and endowment of the disciples. A bunch of ordinary people were entrusted to preach the gospel to all nations. No vehicles were promised, no house allowances were provided, no contracts were signed, no back up was promised, and no blue print was given for the task. Yet, the message has spread to, almost, all corners of the world. What a story of empowerment. What are some the empowering factors contributing to success? I suggest that some of them are: belief in the presence of supernatural, values, love for neighbor, and a deep sense of personal ownership and the value of the experience to be shared.

Secondly, the existence of Church is a unique empowerment phenomenon. In relation to developing countries donors are emphasizing the need for sustainable interventions and organizations. The funds used are to deliver babies that would grow and sustain themselves. Yet, the common feeling among development actors is that such efforts have been unsuccessful more often than successful. Not so with many churches. Thousands of Pentecostal churches have been established in areas that are the most unlikely places for anything to blossom. In the midst of extreme poverty, drought, lack of material resources, and insufficient education, churches prosper. What can we suggest as the fundamental reasons for this in the light of empowerment theories? Some of the factors could be: belief in and personal experience of the supernatural, values, a sense of ownership, a sense of part to play in a greater cause, a glimpse of hope amidst earthly existence, and something to contribute to others.

Challenges

In relation to the topic, ‘Equipping and Empowering for God’s Service’ some questions need to be asked. In our Pentecostal learning institutions, are we empowering disciples to be innovative, ready to face challenges with strong belief system in God’s abilities or merely transmitting information, traditional patterns, and to fit into the existing systems we have created over the years? Is the leadership we show to arising leaders and disciples empowering, or is it still permeated with the captain of the ship and doctrinal and moral watch dog mentality so common in the past? What is the role of Pentecostal experience in empowering for God’s service? Is there true and systematic effort in our churches and training institutions to
nurture the Pentecostal experience that seems so crucial to the success of the early church and Pentecostal / Charismatic movement in the 20th century and on? What is the role of Holy Spirit in empowerment? How does the Holy Spirit empower us for Service today?

Bibliography


Beairsto, B. (2000), ‘What Does It Take to Be a Lifelong Learner?’ in Beairsto, B. & Ruohotie, P. (Eds.), *Empowering Teachers as Lifelong Learners*, (University of Tampere, Hämeenlinna: Research Centre for Vocational Education).

Beairsto, B. & Ruohotie, P. (Eds.), (2000), *Empowering Teachers as Lifelong Learners*, (University of Tampere, Hämeenlinna: Research Centre for Vocational Education).

Beairsto, M. Klein & P. Ruohotie (Eds.), *Professional Learning and Leadership*, (University of Tampere: Research Centre for Vocational Education).


The overall aim of the present article is to question the term ‘magic’ and its content. This sceptical attitude to a well-known phenomenon in the history of religion and other academic fields, has been prompted by problems in writing Pentecostal history.

Introduction

In Part II of Lewi Pethrus’ memoirs, ‘While Telling the Stars’, published in 1953, we can read about an incident in 1911. Lewi Pethrus, the rising leader of the Pentecostal movement in Sweden, had just left Lidköping and was moving to Stockholm where he would become the main pastor of the Filadelfia church – a small congregation at the time, but in a few decades the largest free church congregation in Europe. On the way he stopped in Forshem to see some friends. At the coffee table the group decided to take a ‘manna slip’ that Pethrus could ‘take along on the trip.’

The Bible portion that came up was Jeremiah 1:17-19 that says ‘I have made thee this day a defended city, etc.’ Pethrus took this as ‘a divine revelation, as a prophesy.’ In tough years to come, he faithfully clung to this prophesy.

This was not the only time that Lewi Pethrus’ move to Stockholm was...
endorsed by so called ‘manna slips’. When the recently founded Filadelfia congregation was praying about a new pastor, already in September 1910, they ended a prayer meeting by taking a ‘manna slip’. Lewi Pethrus himself explains it in the following way:

[‘Manna slips’] were biblical quotations printed on small slips of paper kept in a little bowl. This was a way of taking Bible messages that was much used in the beginning of the revival. After the mentioned prayer meeting one of them took such a manna slip and got Acts 10:5 where it says ‘And now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter’.5

Incidentally, the Swedish word for Peter in this context is ‘Petrus’. Thus, the wording: ‘call for one... whose surname is Petrus’ must have felt very convincing.6

I was deeply moved, Pethrus writes. ‘A superficial human being would laugh at the simplicity that the acts of these Stockholm friends reveal, but I did not see it that way. I saw it as a revelation from God and it reinforced my faith that God was behind the whole thing.’

After this emphasis on ‘manna slips’ or ‘the Promise Box’, Pethrus seems to feel a need to explain the whole practice:

In general it functioned that way that one received a biblical quotation, or that somebody else gave it to you, and this was taken as an answer to one’s questions and as guidance in the situation where one was. What Urim and Thummim were in the days of the Old Covenant – some type of spiritual deciding by casting lots in important situations – this is what the biblical quotations have meant to Pentecostals ever since the initiation of the movement.7

Following this introductory note, the question is inevitable: -Was the use of ‘manna slips’ or the ‘Promise Box’ actually a type of divination – that is, closely related to investigative magic? Did the early Pentecostals in fact practise magic? What is really the relationship between the Bible, Pentecostalism and magic?

To answer these questions, it is necessary to explore the semantic fields covered by the terms ‘divination’, ‘magic’ and some related terms, starting with a few thoughts on ‘divination’.

Divination

The etymology of the word ‘divination’ tells us that it comes from Latin divinus, divus and deus, that is: ‘god’. ‘Divination’ could thus freely be translated ‘divine knowledge’ or just ‘finding out what [only] God knows’.8

The phenomenon itself has been defined more or less as follows: ‘Divination is universally concerned with practical problems, private or public, and seeks information upon which practical decisions can be made’.9 Another characterization is: ‘Divination is the effort to gain information of a mundane sort by means conceived of as transcending the mundane’.10 Both these definitions seem to align well with what happened to Lewi Pethrus and the people around him. The manna slips were a ‘mundane’ way (slips of paper in a bowl) of finding out what God had in mind for the future, so that the actors could feel ascertained that they acted in the ‘right’ way. They actually based their ‘practical decisions’ on the ‘information’ they obtained from the manna slips.

To Pentecostals the Bible has always been of prime authority. Especially early Pentecostals let themselves be directly inspired by Hebrew ways to an extent that is rarely found in any other modern or postmodern Christian denominations. Therefore it is important also to scrutinize the Hebrew view of divination.

From what we find in the Biblical narratives, divination through asking for ‘signs’ or the casting of ‘lots’ were well accepted in Hebrew as well as early Christian culture. An early, well-known example of divination through ‘signs’ is found in the story of Gideon in the book of Judges.11 On this occasion Gideon negotiates with God and asks for a sign. He places fleece on the ground and first asks God to let it be full of dew while the ground is dry. Later, he asks for the opposite. When the miracles happen, he is he convinced of God’s intention – and proceeds to act upon this certainty.

The fleece placed on the ground is a typical example of divinatory ‘signs’. But there is also an early tradition of ‘casting lots’, a practice that seems to be initiated by Jahveh himself. In Exodus 28:30 we read the about the garments of the priests that ‘Urim and Thummim’ should be placed ‘in the breastplate’.12

These lots obviously have symbolic as well practical functions. They symbolize Jahveh’s non-mundane, seemingly unpredictable and almost haphazard intention as well as the errant lives of the Hebrews in the eyes of

---

6 Pethrus 1953:203.
7 Pethrus 1953:204
8 Pethrus 1953: 206
12 Judges 6:36-40
13 This quotation is from Exodus 28:30. See also Ezra 2:63.
the perfect God. These communicative devices even have personal names: ‘Urim’ and ‘Thummim’.

On the annual ‘Day of Atonement’ these divinatory devices were put into practice. ‘And he [Aaron] shall take the two goats, and present them before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat.’ 

This type of casting lots for divinatory purposes is repeated again among the first Christians, naturally still under the influence of Hebrew culture. Just after the death of Christ, the remaining disciples search for a twelfth apostle to replace the deceased Judas: ‘And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles.’ 

It seems to be clear from the Old, as well as the New Testament, that this type of divination in no way is seen as opposed to proper Hebrew theology. We may even find something like a theological justification in e.g. Proverbs 16:33: ‘The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord.’ This seems to indicate that, as long as man leaves ample opportunity for God to influence the decision, divination is justified – at times even necessary.

Even if man is allowed to seek divine guidance in practical matters, however, there is also a limit to these inquiries. This becomes clear from the story about Saul in 1 Samuel 28, an incident that came to constitute the epilogue of his history. While David, in the same narrative, turns to the ephod of the Lord, and obviously gets his answers in an authorized way, Saul uses other means. He first turns to Urim and Thummim. Then he tries dreams, and finally prophets, but without an answer. In desperation he goes against what was stated in Mosaic law, and turns to a woman oracle, akin to a spiritist medium.

The woman ‘brings up’ Samuel, the deceased prophet of Israel and the two speak together. Saul actually gets to know about the future – including his own imminent death. This shows that it was possible to speak to the dead, and to gain what we would call ‘supernatural’ knowledge from them. Saul, however, becomes a negative example of what one should not do.

Among Pentecostals, at least in Sweden, the attitude towards what I have defined as divination, followed the Bible and Hebrew culture fairly well. In matters ranging from the destiny of Sweden to where to find water, different forms of divination (echoing those of 1 Samuel) were employed: prophecies, messages in tongues, dreams, manna slips, thumb verses and oddities like a forked stick for finding water. 

One of the reasons for the doubt about the forked stick, expressed by Pentecostals, was probably similar to the reason why I treat ‘divination’ in connection with ‘magic’ – the obvious similarity and probable affinity between the two. In many cases, people tend to think that the same type of power is behind both phenomena. ‘The ultimate mystical power of diviners, however, may be thought to be the same as that behind the forces of magic.’

So, when the references to a phenomenon were not entirely from a Biblical or a quasi-Biblical context, Pentecostals questioned the forces behind it. And if they were the same as those behind ‘magic’ they did not want to have anything to do with it.

**Magic**

If we look at the etymology of the word magic, we find that the term is derived from the Greek ‘mágos’, (plural: mágoi) that might be translated as ‘priests of the Medes’. This originally derives from old Persian magíšu. The phenomenon was thus originally associated with a non-Christian, religious practice. Interestingly enough, today we somehow associate it with ‘non-religious’ practice.

The definition of ‘magic’ that I myself used for many years was formulated by the Uppsala professor of theology, Helmer Ringgren, also a denoted historian of religion. He states that:

While one in religion bows to the power or the forces that are considered to shape one’s destiny, and possibly tries to influence it by prayers and sacrifices, — magic tries to master and control these forces. A magical act is considered working independently, whether a divine being wants it or not. It works mechanically, automatically, according to the purpose of the act.

---

14 Leviticus 16:7-8.
16 See 1 Samuel 23:9, 1 Samuel 30:9.
17 1 Samuel 28:6-7.
19 The Swedish language even has a lexical term for the forked stick: ‘slagruta’ (roughly ‘shock-rod’ from German ‘Schlag’ [‘cut’, ‘pull’, ‘jerk’] and ‘Rute’, i.e. ‘rod’). The woods used for the forked stick are, incidentally, strikingly similar to the ones used by Jacob in the story, referred to in the text, from Genesis 30.
If this definition were true, it seems that we would have a fairly clear distinction between religion and magic – and thus, perhaps, between what would be ‘permissible’ for Pentecostals, and what would not be. As we shall see, in reality, the picture is much more complex and the distinctions much more blurred (something that Ringgren also, somewhat unwillingly, admitted later on in his work).

If we first have a brief look at Biblical practices, we may start with the well-known narrative about the struggle between Moses and the Pharaoh of Egypt. As an initial demonstration of power, God lets Moses use a typical example of ‘transformative magic’. In the passage from the Bible (Exodus 7:9) God says to Moses: ‘thou shalt say unto Aaron, Take thy rod, and cast it before Pharaoh, and it shall become a serpent.’ And this is precisely what happens – an event that triggers the power competition between Aaron and the ‘magicians’ of Egypt.

Another type of ‘magic’ is found in the story about Jacob and his uncle Laban. When Jacob is to receive compensation for the fourteen years of service that he had done for his uncle, he asks for nothing but the ‘ring-streaked, speckled and spotted’ individuals in his uncle’s herd. To increase that type of offspring, he puts ornamented rods before the herds that come to drink. Thus he influences the patterning of the animals to be born (Genesis 30), using technique that is fairly common in what we, in line with James Frazer’s works, would define as ‘homeopathic magic’.22

James Frazer states that ‘like produces like, or that an effect resembles its cause’. This has been called the ‘Law of Similarity’ which is the basis of homeopathic magic. By using something that is similar to the original, the latter may be influenced just by manipulating the first.

In the events that followed in the life of Moses, mentioned above, we find a second example of ‘homeopathic magic’. When the people of Israel complain in the desert, a great deal of the population perishes from snake bites. To survive, they turn to Moses with a plea to forgive and to save them. Acting upon divine advice: ‘Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole; and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived’ (Numbers 21:9). Gazing at an image of what happened – an event that triggers the power competition between Aaron and the ‘magicians’ of Egypt.

Another type of ‘magic’ is found in the story about Jacob and his uncle Laban. When Jacob is to receive compensation for the fourteen years of service that he had done for his uncle, he asks for nothing but the ‘ring-streaked, speckled and spotted’ individuals in his uncle’s herd. To increase that type of offspring, he puts ornamented rods before the herds that come to drink. Thus he influences the patterning of the animals to be born (Genesis 30), using technique that is fairly common in what we, in line with James Frazer’s works, would define as ‘homeopathic magic’.22

James Frazer states that ‘like produces like, or that an effect resembles its cause’. This has been called the ‘Law of Similarity’ which is the basis of homeopathic magic. By using something that is similar to the original, the latter may be influenced just by manipulating the first.

In the events that followed in the life of Moses, mentioned above, we find a second example of ‘homeopathic magic’. When the people of Israel complain in the desert, a great deal of the population perishes from snake bites. To survive, they turn to Moses with a plea to forgive and to save them. Acting upon divine advice: ‘Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole; and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived’ (Numbers 21:9). Gazing at an image of what caused the harm, people were healed. Thus similarity – or ‘homeopathy’ – saves.

Another of Frazer’s categories was called ‘contagious magic’. This was based on the idea that things that had once been in physical contact with each other later continued to act on each other at a distance. This has been called ‘The Law of Contact’ or ‘The Law of Contagion’. Thus, manipulation of bodily parts, as hair, nails, etc. are used in the ‘black’ or negative variant, while saliva often is used in its ‘white’ version. Accounts of ‘contagious magic’ is found fairly frequently in the Bible, for example in the passage in Mark when Jesus heals a deaf and dumb man where ‘he spat, and touched his tongue’ and thus healed him.23 A parallel passage is found in John 9, when Jesus heals a blind man.24

A third example of this type of procedure is found in Acts 5 when Peter heals the sick – this time using a less common medium, that is his own shadow.25 A fourth example is more in line with the mediums used in classical ‘magic’ – and, as we shall see below, also in line with Pentecostal praxis: ‘And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul: so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them.’26

Magic is often associated with different types of formulae. In ‘black magic’, certain word combinations are associated with imprecations and curses.27 In ‘white magic’, similar phrases are supposed to result in blessings.28 In Matthew 16:19, we find an example of what scholars might claim to be an incantation: ‘And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.’

The examples provided above are but a few of all those that we can find in the Bible. Interestingly enough, these examples are most frequent also in Pentecostal history. As an example of ‘contagious magic’ we may take the phenomenon that (at least in Sweden) was called ‘intercession cloth’,29 made famous by e.g. Swedish Pentecostal preacher Georg Gustafsson, from the 1930s up to the 1970s.30

In accordance with Acts 19, Gustafsson literally prayed for thousands of ‘intercession cloths’, and then sent them by post to people in need. The recipients were instructed to place the piece of cloth on the affected part of the body and pray at a certain time, when Gustafsson joined them in prayer from his home. There are hundreds of examples of people writing back to

22 Frazer 1998 (1890).
23 For the whole story, see Genesis 30:31, 37-39 & 43.
24 Mark 7:34-35.
26 Acts 5:15
27 Acts 19:11-12
28 Curses are found in e.g. Numbers 5:21 ff. (the priest) and Mark 11:14 & 21 (Jesus).
29 Acts of blessings are found in e.g. Genesis 27 (Isaac), Genesis 48 (Jacob). See also e.g. Romans 12:14 and 1 Peter 3:9.
30 In Swedish the lexical term for ‘intercession cloth’ was ‘böneduk’.
Gustafsson, claiming that they were healed at the time they were instructed to pray.

A fairly well-known example of ‘homeopathic magic’ is found in one of the first books by Yonggi Cho from Korea. Theologically, Cho bases himself upon the words in Genesis 1:2 that, in one translation, is said to state that ‘the Spirit of God brooded over the water’. It is possible for every Christian, Cho claims, to repeat this pre-creative act. The only thing the person needs to do is to visualize that which God will do. ‘That which becomes pregnant in your heart and mind will occur in your circumstances’ he says.32

A striking example is when Cho wants a bicycle but does not receive one, because he has not been detailed enough in his request. When he learns to visualize the American bicycle that he wants, and to describe it to God in detail, he immediately receives it.33

In Pentecostal circles, many participant observers have experienced that the use of the name of ‘Jesus’ sometimes echoes a spell or an incantation rather than prayer. Another phenomenon that has been treated in much the same way is ‘blood’.34

At the ‘Word of Life’, a neo-Pentecostal church in Uppsala, Sweden, the technique itself has been elevated to theology: ‘war tongues’35 is a way of speaking in tongues aloud and at a high speed. If performed in the proper way, it is said to be most efficient against spirits and demons of all kinds, even against the Devil himself.

During the preparations for this presentation, a technique that echoes ‘protective magic’ suddenly surfaced. I interviewed one of the old pastors of the Swedish Pentecostal Movement, Nils Thörevik. When a young pastor in the 1950s, his mentor Einar Halldorf told him ‘not to place the Bible on any Tom, Dick and Harry’.36 But if he encountered evil spirits, Halldorf told him to use the Bible as a protective device: ‘Hold the Bible between yourself and the possessed person. When you pray for the afflicted, place the Bible upon the words in Genesis 1:2 that, in one translation, is said to state that “the Spirit of God brooded over the water”. It is possible for every Christian, Cho claims, to repeat this pre-creative act. The only thing the person needs to do is to visualize that which God will do. “That which becomes pregnant in your heart and mind will occur in your circumstances” he says.

For true Pentecostal believers, my review of so-called ‘magic’ in the Bible and within Pentecostalism must be most confusing. Pentecostals in general would refuse to become associated with anything ‘occult’ or anything that is associated with ‘magic’. My intention, however, is not to prove that Pentecostalism is closely associated with magic. On the contrary, I use concepts, conceptions and practices from the Bible and the Pentecostal movement to show my own scepticism about the whole concept of ‘magic’. By using phenomena that most actors (Pentecostals) would not classify as ‘magic’ – but that most observers (e.g. historians of religion) would classify precisely as ‘magic’, I question the whole semantic field supposedly covered by the term.

To start with, I claim that ‘magic’ is a confusing category. It was once based on sheer ethnocentrism – the Greeks’ view of Mede priests. These were foreigners and thereby priests who, according to the Greeks, did not believe or practise the right faith. Later, when adopted into Christian circles, the word came to denote ‘heathen practices’ in general, i.e. ‘the others’ way – not ours’. These practices were seen as ‘relics of paganism and as heresy’.37

In the late 19th century, among evolutionists, ‘magic’ came to stand for the practices of the ‘savages’, once again representing an ethnocentric view. Tylor distinguished between ‘religion’ as ritual concerned with ‘a personal, conscious, and omnipotent spiritual being’ while ‘magic’ was thought to be ‘an expression of an external impersonal force in nature’.38 One example of the latter, often referred to, was the Melanesian-Polynesian mana (typically written with a lower-case ‘m’).

Furthermore, these evolutionists distinguished between the ‘religious ritual’ and prayer on the one hand, and the ‘magical rite’ and incantation on the other; stating that the former’s principal function was sociological, the maintenance of a sense of cohesion among the members of the church, while the function of the latter category was individual, even selfish, in character.

---


34 See the Los Angeles Daily Times. April 18, 1906, p. 1.

35 In Swedish: ‘Livets Ord’

36 In Swedish: ‘krigstungotul’.


In this way, phenomena that apparently shared many characteristics were unscrupulously dichotomized.

In colonial times, religion was often defined as something that the ‘savages’ did not have\(^{40}\) (but that they might acquire through evolution). And if they did not have religion, the conclusion was that they must have ‘magic’ instead. In this way, the dualism between ‘us’ and ‘them’, in the main based on ignorance, was cemented even further.

In the course of time, intellectuals, including theologians, refined this dichotomy to include even Western society. What they defined as ‘orthodox religion’ or ‘World religions’ were classified as ‘religion’ per se. More popular expressions, or religious activities and beliefs associated with non-intellectuals, were sometimes defined as ‘folk-religion’ – and sometimes as ‘magic’. And this is where scholars with an interest in Pentecostalism face a problem, because, in the main, early Pentecostals were uneducated, non-intellectuals who practised a form of Christianity, heavily influenced by African American epistemology where any rationalist limitations to ‘what God can do’ were deemed improper. Thus, if we maintain some type of respect for the opinion of our subjects or consultants, this religion-magic dichotomy is unacceptable.

I am not the only one questioning this dualism. Fiona Bowie states that ‘both magic and religion ... serve the same psychological function.’ She even calls the theories of Malinowski and Freud on magic ‘guess-work’.\(^{41}\)

Another scholar, John F. Middleton, supports my claim that this distinction is something that is constructed on the basis of ethnocentrism: ‘many anthropologists tend to make use of the ethnocentric distinction between religion and magic.’\(^{42}\)

Not only is the dichotomy based on ethnocentrism. We also have acute problems in separating the two categories even if we were to accept the postulate. Historian of religion, Geo Widengren already in 1971 claimed that: ‘Religion and magic have always existed side by side, often mixed with each other’. ... ‘It is often hard to decide whether we are dealing with a magical or a religious attitude in a person’ [and] ... ‘it is often hard to separate prayer from incantation’.\(^{43}\)

Almost 25 years later, based on observation of practices, Morton Klass claims that the two categories merge in a way that makes them impossible to separate: ‘Given the particular belief system, some clerics will offer prayers, some will perform sacrifices, and others will engage in magic – and some may, at different or appropriate times, do all three.’\(^{44}\)

Much of what we are taught ‘at school’ about magic is based precisely on the postulate referred to above, that magic is related to an impersonal force, while religion is related to a personal God. In 1951, William J., Goode stated that:

There is thus an implicit acceptance of the impersonality of magic. / This instrumental and impersonal nature of magic suggests an emphasis on personal ends, not groupal ends. – However, (...) a complex cult development seems to be possible.\(^{45}\)

More than half a century later, scholars are increasingly doubtful about the ontological difference between for example ‘Allah’ and ‘mana’. What if they are more similar than we have previously thought? What if they are actually just variations of one and the same vision of the Supreme force? What if all these ascribed differences are just ethnocentric imperatives? What, then, becomes of ‘magic’?

Another ascribed duality, most certainly also based on ethnocentrism, is the one between ‘positive’ and ‘negative’. What ‘we’ have, that is ‘religion’, is positive while what ‘they’ have, that is ‘magic’, is negative. This ascribed distinction has followed ‘magic’ in particular, so that most associations to the phenomenon have represented something repulsive, or at least questionable.

In due course, however, increasing secularization, among other factors, has caused a decrease in the negative imprint of ‘magic’, especially to non-Christian scholars. When Eugene Genovese writes about spirituality among Antebellum North American slaves, (i.e. one of the roots of Pentecostalism) he states that: ‘Hence magic, or the magical element in religion, has been rooted in the process of production and has strengthened the community in its collective as well as individual aspects.’\(^{46}\) In this context it is obvious that Genovese not only blurs the distinction between religion and magic, but also that he is overtly positive to the effects of what he calls ‘magic’.

In consequence with the attitude demonstrated by for example Genovese, many present-day scholars of religion have tried to define ‘religion’ as something that actually includes magic. In a fairly recent work, (1994) Robin Horton has provided us with the following definition of ‘religion’: [It is] ‘an extension of the field of people’s social relationships beyond the confines of
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purely human society’ in which human beings see themselves as being in a dependent relationship vis-à-vis their ‘non-human alters’.47 Here it suffices to state that the divisive line between ‘religion’ and ‘magic’ has become almost invisible.

A final argument for questioning the concept of magic was provided by Africanist scholar Axel-Ivar Berglund as early as 1976 in his famous study of Zulu Thought-Patterns and Symbolism. Berglund, born and raised among the Zulu himself, rejects the concept of ‘magic’ because it has been ‘misused’ – and because it is a misnomer from the Zulu’s point of view. While scholars have defined the phenomenon as ‘techniques of coercion, based on what we would consider false premises’ that ‘lack interpretation’, Zulu spirituality as described by Berglund represent the opposite. To them, the phenomena labelled ‘magic’ are in no way lacking meaning or interpretation. On the contrary, they are most meaningful and placed in an ordered universe that makes Berglund conclude that: ‘Adopting this view and relating it to the aims of this study, i.e. to describe intelligibly Zulu thought patterns and symbolism, the use of the word magic automatically falls away.’48

Berglund seems to base himself on two disparate dynamic arguments: doubts about the content of the term and respect for the emic view of the subjects.49 This combination of arguments has not been weakened in the decades that have followed, but align well with what we face in the study of Pentecostalism. The concept of ‘magic’, is, as we have seen, not only most dubious as regards the definition, but also most ethnocentric. Thus it belongs to a type of condescending terms or forms of classification that we should rid ourselves of. Finally, it represents a type of misnomers that collide not only with recent classifications but also with how Pentecostals themselves regard these phenomena.

On the basis of this assertion, I suggest a discussion on how to find other criteria for the classification of religious, and possibly non-religious, or anti-religious phenomena and acts. My main suggestion is to try and grasp the intention of the act rather than the form. The need for this paradigmatic shift is not the least necessary in the study of Pentecostalism. This is because Pentecostal practices often have been associated with ‘folk-religion’ and therefore have been treated derogatorily – a condescending attitude that is becoming increasingly old-fashioned.

In the brief examples taken from the Bible above, we have seen that there is no easy distinction between what we up until now have called ‘magic’ and ‘religion’. In the Bible there are other ways of defining what is right and what is wrong. In the case of divination, we already noted that Proverbs 16:33 attributes the divinatory activities to humans, but that the outcome is guided by divine intervention. Thus, at least divination in this context is implicitly associated with orthodox religion.

On the contrary, when speaking about certain rituals and practices, in for example Deuteronomy 18:9-11, the Bible becomes most explicit about what is not acceptable in this new environment.50 Here, Israel are expected not to take up the customs of the new neighbours. The examples include letting one’s ‘son or daughter pass through fire’ or consult mediums.

In Pentecostal history there is no unanimous stand as regards these types of practices. Instead, ‘the discerning of spirits’51 seems to have been trusted for deciding what has been acceptable and what has not – if the particular correspondent has not been found in the Bible. Therefore we find ‘slips of manna’ and a ‘forked stick’ together with intercession and prophecy on the positive side, while spiritism and communication with the dead are placed, together with curses, on the negative side.

Thus, to analyse these phenomena, I suggest that we investigate intentionality, the driving force behind the act. Such an attempt requires a new discussion, for example about how we define and measure intentionality. What are the parameters? Are they ‘egoism’ or ‘factionalism’ versus the interest of the congregation? Or are they the interests of the congregation versus those of the local community?

The conclusion of the present contribution is thus just an admonition: to abolish the concept of ‘magic’ in every way, because it is dubious, ethnocentric, condescending or even erroneous – and to initiate a discussion about potential alternatives.

**Bibliography**
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confusion reigns as there is minimal discernment in the church as to validation of such claims. Moreover, his emphasis on the moral conduct of the speaker and the moral and theological content of the message would be welcome criteria in an age of rich televangelists and prophets whose influence is widespread and whose message is often one of personal prosperity and well being.

Bradford A. Anderson, CFI Training Centre, Greystones, Ireland


On the face of it, a book on Catholic missions in Africa has little relevance for scholars of Pentecostalism. This study of a particular Catholic missionary society during a particular period in Africa, however, in its extensive use of primary sources is not unlike the study I have just completed on early Pentecostal missions. It is important for historians of any movement to understand the context of this period, and this book gives a fine example of how effectively this can be done. Aylward Shorter is one of the premier Catholic missionary anthropologists and African historians, presenting an historical study of what has been described as ‘Africa’s most dynamic missionary society’, the Society of Missionaries of Africa (‘White Fathers’) of east central Africa.

This period was the heyday of colonialism, when European countries (especially Britain and France) were falling over each other in the attempt to gain large regions of Africa for themselves to exploit at their whim. The story of the ‘White Fathers’ during this period is an extraordinary one that no historian of the church in Africa will want to miss. Not only does this provide a valuable background to the context of colonialism, slavery, virulent epidemics, intertribal and colonial violence and anti-colonial resistance during the period before the Great War, but it more specifically describes the fierce opposition the pioneering Catholic missionaries encountered in the Belgian Congo (because they were mostly French) and in British and German East Africa (because they were Catholic).

There is, unsurprisingly, a total disregard for Pentecostal missions, by 1914 in their infancy in this region – British Pentecostal missionaries William Burton and James Salter first arrived in the south-eastern Belgian Congo in 1915, and a handful of American Pentecostal missionaries led by Clive Miller had been eking out a precarious existence on the eastern shores of Lake Victoria since 1908. Nevertheless, this book provides a useful introduction to the context of these missions and the missionaries that Burton and others were often at odds with. It might also help some of us with lingering anti-Catholic prejudices to see the story of missions in Africa from a very different perspective.

The ‘White Fathers’ derived their nickname from the long white garments they wore; as Shorter shows, some of them were Africans, even at this early stage. They were founded in Algiers in 1868 by Cardinal Charles Lavigerie, and operated in fifteen African countries. The focus of this book is on the work under Lavigerie’s successor Léon Livinhac, the first Catholic bishop in Central Africa. Each chapter treats the history thematically, including the missionaries’ relationships with colonialism, their reactions to slavery, mission strategies (including attitudes to African religions and Islam), their monopoly of education, understanding of African religion and culture, and the early beginnings of the Africanisation of the church. The ‘White Fathers’ were responsible for the first seminary education for Africans in Central Africa, resulting in the emergence of a highly educated African clergy.

An interesting vignette is the Catholic take on the work of CMS missionary George Pilkington, a Keswick revivalist in Uganda baptized in the Spirit in 1893 on an island on Lake Victoria. He soon had a regular congregation of 20,000 in Kampala, but his diatribes against ‘popery’ caused the Catholic missionaries to consider him ‘in a hysterical condition’ and ‘completely mad’, and his ‘fanatical frenzy’ was attributed to the devil (p.231). Pentecostal historians will recognize the déjà vu.

In all, a very readable book for anyone interested in the history of Christian missions in Africa.

Allan Anderson, University of Birmingham

The Unique Christ: Dialogue in Missions, Matthew Philip

This book is a first salvo into the world of publishing for the author. Philip is a Pentecostal pastor/bible teacher, graduate of Bangalore’s South Asia Institute of Advanced Christian Studies (SAIACS) and is Dean at Kerala’s Gospel for Asia Biblical Seminary. His Masters thesis triggered the book as the author considers the subject of the uniqueness of Christ of utmost importance. Yet he is very aware in his home context of India that he is in a pluralist world and uniqueness is not tolerable. The model he chooses for illustrating how to handle this is the well known missionary to India in the first half of the 20th Century, Stanley Jones. Whereas evangelicals, with crisis conversion prefer to assert themselves dogmatically, Jones developed the ‘Round Table’ for inter-faith dialogue.

In the early chapters Philip presents us with a summary of the ways dialogue has been used – exclusivist, inclusivist, and pluralist. By chapter five he presents the centre piece of Christ as unique and universal, as redeemer and healer, obviously presenting the exclusivist model followed by Harold Netland and indeed John Stott. Then in chapters six and seven he discusses an abundance of global writers on all sides of the debate and how this uniqueness can be related in a missional witness to Christ in this pluralist world. He brings in the trinitarian perspective of Christology. Philip takes for granted that he is...
writing for sympathetic hearers rather than arguing for why non-evangelical inclusivists should change their ideas. His book seems to intend to assist the exclusivists in their apologetics, rather than in inter-faith dialogue: perhaps a synthesis is intended – ‘dialogue is part of proclamation’ (p.161). As befits an admirer of Stanley Jones, he does emphasise right attitude within dialogue – ‘a great openness, humility and a spirit of conversion’ (my emphasis). It was a way of life for Jones, and advocated by Philip (p.173& 178-81).

This book in a sense, does not relate anything new, so much as provide a useful summary for those not familiar with the scholars in the theology of religion. Philip makes clear his own sense of urgency for declaring mission as Christocentric and appropriate for global reception. ‘Many Stanley Jones’ are needed today’ (p.184).

Anne E Dyer, Mattersey Hall
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