

PENTECOSTAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONTEMPORARY CHRISTOLOGICAL
THOUGHT: A SYNTHESIS WITH ECUMENICAL VIEWS

by

SEAN DAVID HOUSE

submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of

MASTER OF THEOLOGY

in the subject

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF E VAN NIEKERK

NOVEMBER 2006

Student Number: **3600-206-2**

I declare that PENTECOSTAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONTEMPORARY
CHRISTOLOGICAL THOUGHT: A SYNTHESIS WITH ECUMENICAL VIEWS
is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been
indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.



SEAN DAVID HOUSE

November 20, 2006
DATE

SUMMARY

Pentecostalism, which developed its essential character during the classical period of 1901–1916, has many significant contributions to make to modern theology. Often viewed as a type of fundamentalism, it is actually a theological tradition in its own right that deserves consideration along with the other two major streams of protestantism, conservative evangelicalism and more liberal ecumenical-mainline thought. Although it emphasizes the experience of the Holy Spirit, pentecostalism is highly Christocentric as is evidenced by its foundational symbol of faith, the fourfold gospel of Jesus as savior, healer, baptizer, and coming king. This work examines how the pentecostal fourfold gospel, as a functional, from below Spirit Christology, anticipates and intersects with trends in twentieth century ecumenical theological thought. The result of the study is the articulation of a fuller, more holistic understanding of the work of Christ in salvation in the world today.

KEYWORDS

Pentecostal movement; fourfold gospel; functional Christology; Spirit Christology; work of Christ; perichoresis; soteriology; ecumenical theology; liberation theology; neo-orthodox theology; salvation; healing; Holy Spirit baptism; sanctification; delay of the parousia

Dedicated to the memory of
Rt. Rev. P. Victor Premasagar
October 14, 1927–December 1, 2005
Former Moderator, Church of South India
Founding Principal, Bethel Bible College, Guntur, India
Pastor, Scholar, Friend

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

With warm gratitude, I acknowledge the help of many who have inspired and supported me in this work:

- My supervisor, Prof. E. van Niekerk, whose guidance, especially at the beginning, sent my mind in many fruitful and rewarding directions
- Rev. Scott Norling and Rev. P. N. S. Chandrabose, founders of Gospel Mission of India, for their unstinting support that made this endeavor possible
- My colleagues and students at Bethel Bible College, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India, for their understanding and affection
- Dr. J. Rodman Williams and Dr. Vinson Synan, professors emeriti of Regent University, U. S. A., who sowed in me the seeds of love for systematic theology and pentecostal studies
- My wonderful wife, Lydia, our parents, and our children, Vivian Samuel and Katherine Aradhana, for their love and encouragement

In this one hundredth anniversary of the Azusa Street Revival, this work is offered up as a theological labor of love for the pentecostal movement and its potentialities. *Soli Deo gloria.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Thesis: Pentecostalism and the Christological Problem of Twentieth Century Theology.....	1
1.2 Objectives	2
1.3 Methodology and Approach	2
1.4 Scope and Limitations.....	3

CHAPTER 2: PENTECOSTAL CHRISTOLOGY IN THE CONTEXT OF TWENTIETH CENTURY THEOLOGY

2.1 Streams of Protestant Theology: Evangelical, Ecumenical, and Pentecostal	6
2.1.1 Evangelical Theologies.....	7
2.1.2 Ecumenical Theologies.....	10
2.1.3 Pentecostal Theologies.....	12
2.1.3.1 Origins and Basic Features	13
Table 1: Types of Classical American Holiness and Pentecostal Movements	16
2.1.3.2 Pentecostalism and Evangelicalism	17
2.1.3.3 Pentecostalism and Ecumenism.....	23
2.1.3.4 Pentecostalism and the Charismatic Movement	25
2.2 Features of Classical Pentecostal Christology.....	28
2.3 Ecumenical Meeting Points: Functional Spirit Christology from Below	31
2.3.1 Functional Christology.....	31
2.3.2 “From Below” Christology.....	36
2.3.3 Spirit Christology.....	39

CHAPTER 3: THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL OF THE SAVIOR

3.1	Jesus as Savior: The Gospel of Full Salvation.....	46
3.1.1	Justification: Solidarity with the Reformation.....	47
3.1.2	The Language of Salvation: Revivalism and Existentialism.....	49
3.1.3	Subsequence: Conflict with the Protestant Majority	52
	3.1.3.1 The Charge of “Spiritual Elitism”.....	53
	3.1.3.2 Subsequence as a Defense of Justification by Faith	54
	3.1.3.3 The Christian Life Beyond Justification.....	55
3.1.4	Justification, Regeneration, and Adoption as Functions of Christ and the Spirit.....	59
3.2	Jesus as Healer: Spiritual and Physical Salvation.....	61
3.2.1	The Theological Purposes of Healing in the New Testament.....	64
3.2.2	The Traditional Protestant Understanding of Healing and Its Impact on Conservative Theology.....	67
	3.2.2.1 The Reformers and Contemporary Miracles.....	67
	3.2.2.2 Benjamin B. Warfield and the Formalization of Cessationism	68
	3.2.2.3 Dispensational Cessationism	71
	3.2.2.4 Contemporary Evangelicalism’s Caution	71
3.2.3	Healing in Liberal and Ecumenical Theology	72
	3.2.3.1 Healing in Neo-Orthodoxy	74
	3.2.3.2 Healing in Liberation Theology.....	76
3.2.4	The Holiness-Pentecostal Contribution: Healing in the Atonement.....	77
	3.2.4.1 Criticism and Response.....	79
	3.2.4.2 Pentecostal Healing and the Word of Faith Movement.....	83
	3.2.4.3 Toward a More Mature Understanding of Healing in the Atonement	86
3.2.5	Toward a More Holistic View of Salvation.....	87
3.2.6	Excursus: Healing and the Demonic.....	91
3.3	Jesus as Baptizer: Power for Ministry	94
3.3.1	The Pentecostal <i>Sine Qua Non</i> : Origin and Evolution.....	96
3.3.2	Initial Evidence and Real Evidence: Purposes and Accomplishments of the New Pentecost	99
	3.3.2.1 The Value and Utility of Tongues	100

3.3.2.2	The Importance and Purpose of Spirit Baptism.....	101
3.3.3	Spirit Baptism and the Tradition: Defense and Synthesis	104
3.3.3.1	The Experience of Acts Today	105
3.3.3.2	Subsequent Spirit Baptism and the Tradition	110
3.3.3.3	Ecumenical Contributions.....	113
3.3.4	The Replication of the Ministry of Christ.....	118
3.4	Jesus as Coming King: The Christian Hope	121
3.4.1	Pentecostal Eschatology: From Prophetic to Apocalyptic.....	124
3.4.1.1	The Latter Rain Restoration: Pentecost as an Eschatological Sign ...	125
3.4.1.2	The Ascendance of Dispensational Apocalypticism.....	127
3.4.2	The <i>Parousia</i> of Christ as the Centerpiece of Eschatology	131
3.4.2.1	The Delay of the <i>Parousia</i>	132
3.4.2.2	Ecumenical Insights: Eschatological Liberation and Hope	135
3.4.3	Synthesis and Adjustment.....	137
3.4.3.1	Millennial Revisioning.....	138
3.4.3.2	The <i>Parousia</i> of the Holy Spirit.....	140
3.5	Jesus as Sanctifier: The Forgotten Fifth Point	141
3.5.1	Evolution, Controversy, and Stagnation within the Pentecostal Traditions ..	142
3.5.2	Salvation as Sanctification: A Full Ecumenical Synthesis	145
3.5.2.1	Sanctification and Justification	146
3.5.2.2	Sanctification and Healing.....	147
3.5.2.3	Sanctification and Spirit Baptism	148
3.5.2.4	Sanctification and Eschatology.....	150

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

4.1	Summary and Evaluation of the Research Findings	151
4.1.1	The Fourfold Gospel as a Contemporary Christology	151
4.1.2	Emergent Issues	155
4.2	Present Trajectories of Pentecostal Theology.....	157
4.2.1	Evangelical or Ecumenical?.....	157
4.2.2	Pentecostalism and Roman Catholicism.....	159
4.2.3	Salvation as <i>Theosis</i> and Christification.....	159
4.3	Toward an All-Inclusive Christology for Human Needs.....	160
	Works Cited	161

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Thesis: Pentecostalism and the Christological Problem of Twentieth Century Theology

The problem of Christology lies at the heart of twentieth century Christian theology. Of course, Christ has always been central to the religion that bears his name, but the Enlightenment and the accompanying development of the historical-critical approach challenged received orthodoxy, opening the door to reevaluation and reformulation of all aspects of Christology. The reported demise of the quest for the historical Jesus at the pen of Albert Schweitzer (1911) did nothing to lessen interest in both the historical Jesus and the religious significance of Christ, issues that dominated the major theologies that developed during the past century. From the radicals to the neo-orthodox, from fundamentalists to liberationists, the place of Jesus in modern Christian life should not be underestimated, nor the importance of Christology as the organizing point of systematic theology.

In surveys of contemporary theology, however, the pentecostal¹ tradition is frequently neglected. Often viewed as simply a type of fundamentalism or evangelicalism, pentecostalism developed separately from these movements and has its own distinct theology that merits consideration and study alongside the other major streams of Christian thought and life (Newbigin, 1953, pp. 94–122). As a relatively young revivalist movement, pentecostalism has produced comparatively few scholarly theological works, but its rich “nonacademic theology” (Macchia, 2002, p. 1120) has much to contribute to ecumenical theological conversations, particularly in the areas of Christology and soteriology. While it is commonly thought that pentecostalism is primarily concerned with the Holy Spirit, in reality the movement is heavily Christocentric (“Word and Spirit, church and world”, 2001, p. 48 ¶17), sometimes even to the overshadowing of its pneumatology. The movement’s paramount symbol of faith, the “foursquare” or “full” gospel, is in fact a Christological statement.

¹Standardized English lacks consistency in the capitalization of different Christian traditions. For clarity and equality, within the body text of document none are capitalized unless referring to a specific proper name. As in all other matters, capitalization within quotations follows the conventions of the original sources.

Pentecostal Christology is unique, definitely the most innovative arising from a conservative theological standpoint, and many of its distinctive teachings parallel and even anticipate theological developments in other movements. The pentecostal contribution to contemporary Christological thought can, through dialogue with ecumenical theologies, lead to a richer understanding of Jesus Christ in modern Christianity.

1.2 Objectives

1. To examine points of meeting and unification between pentecostal and ecumenical Christological thought.
2. To show the place of pentecostalism as both a teacher and a learner within contemporary theology.
3. To propose a multi-dimensional, “universally responsible” (Kasper, 1976, pp. 20–21) Christology relevant for the contemporary church and world.
4. To recommend specific directions for further development of pentecostal theology generally and Christology specifically.
5. To make a small contribution to the nascent field of pentecostal scholarship.

1.3 Methodology and Approach

This study represents a dialogue between different theological traditions, namely classical pentecostalism and mainline or “ecumenical” theologies generally associated with members of the World Council of Churches. As such, it involves primarily critical investigation, reflection, and negotiation of the relevant texts, belief systems, and perspectives. An exercise in ecumenical theology requires critical analysis not only of doctrinal beliefs but also of their historical development. Differences and conflicts are sometimes highlighted and emphasized, not for the purpose of judgment and separation, but in order to arrive at a better understanding of one’s own beliefs and those of one’s dialogue partners. Similarly, ecumenical theology does not seek to erase doctrinal distinctions and achieve unity through homogenization. Rather, it hopes to fine-tune the instruments of each member as they contribute to the rich symphony of Christian doxology and mission. The study contains no empirical components; specifically, investigation of claims about individual religious experiences is altogether outside of its scope.

The researcher, a missionary-educator in India, comes from an American classical pentecostal background, specifically the Assemblies of God. The American conservative approach to theology, modeled by evangelicals and emulated by pentecostals, starts with the premise of the total inerrancy of the Bible. This presupposition has had the unfortunate effect of walling off these traditions from other theologies that do not hold an identical view of inspiration. Although one need not

accept all of the conclusions of historical criticism, it has irreversibly changed the Christian understanding of the Scriptures and what revelation means. As a conservative, the researcher recognizes and consciously acknowledges more liberal ecumenical theologies as valid sense-making approaches, attempts to gain relevance and truth from revelation and faith. Working from the premise that critical theology need not be subtractive, this study is a deliberate leaping of the wall of inerrancy to allow theological systems that do not normally meet to dialogue and enrich one another. As will be shown, this approach is quite compatible with the critical tradition present in classical pentecostal thought (Hollenweger, 1992).

The second chapter presents the background and rationale beyond this methodology at greater length, elaborating the place of pentecostalism within the broader framework of twentieth century protestant theology.

1.4 Scope and Limitations

As this study is a form of dialogue, its borders are defined by the dialogue's participants, the theologies of classical pentecostalism and traditions associated with the modern ecumenical movement. The first partner in the conversation, modern pentecostalism, is a twentieth century phenomenon; its beginning is generally dated from January 1, 1901, with Agnes Ozman's experience of glossolalia. In just over a century, it has become a truly global religion, spreading to virtually every country on earth and nearly every Christian denomination through the charismatic movement. Pentecostal churches represent the largest grouping of protestants in the world (Synan, 2002a, p. 553), and the combined pentecostal-charismatic renewal is the second largest branch of Christianity after Roman Catholicism. Accordingly, it is impossible to speak of a singular theology for such a vast movement; one can only speak of various pentecostal theologies.

This study will focus on the theology of the classical period of pentecostalism, 1901–1916, which begins with Ozman's experience and ends with the formation of the Assemblies of God and its sundering by the "oneness" controversy. Land (1993, p. 47) and other authorities recognize this period as "the heart and not the infancy" of the movement, and accordingly it is important for several reasons. First, this period, as well as pentecostalism itself, represents the confluence and climax of the various streams of theological thought of nineteenth century revivalism, not the least of which was the Christology of the fourfold gospel. Second, this period saw the settling of the revival into a proper tradition, complete with denominations and articles of faith. No major changes in the basic tenets of pentecostalism occurred after this time. Third, in consolidating into ministerial fellowships and denominations, the movement experienced several doctrinal controversies that forced it to clarify its theology; study

of these crises helps in understanding both the problems and the potential of pentecostalism as a theological tradition. Finally, it was largely through the famous Los Angeles Azusa Street revival of 1906–1913 that pentecostalism spread to other nations of the world. Hence, the American pentecostal experience was prototypical for that of many others. Although the primary focus is on the theology of early American pentecostalism, later developments and insights from other contexts will be discussed as they help to inform and correct pentecostalism in its classical form.

Other theological views examined will be limited to developments contemporaneous with the rise of pentecostalism along with their immediate antecedents when necessary. The twentieth century saw the birth, rise, and decline of a wide variety of theologies, but two schools of thought stand out above all others as having lasting influence. The first is neo-orthodoxy, which was a non-fundamentalist corrective to aspects of liberal theology. Although its heyday has passed, neo-orthodoxy's importance remains as its long shadow is cast over all theologies before and since. The second is liberation theology, which has come to permeate theological reflection and discourse, catholic and protestant, around the world, particularly as it emerges and thrives in the East and South. These two schools of thought, along with pentecostalism, will be the primary ones examined. The theology of Jürgen Moltmann, who has served in many ways as both a bridge between and an advancer of these movements, will also feature prominently. The ecumenical theologies considered are predominantly Western, both in the sense of Western as European and American and Western as Protestant and Latin catholic. An ear is kept open, however, to important contributions from non-Western contexts and theologies.

This dissertation is in fulfillment of the degree of Master of Theology in systematic theology, and the chosen topic within systematics is Christology. As noted above, Christology is central to all areas of Christian life and thought and touches all the other traditional loci of systematic theology. The focus of the study requires that it avoid becoming sidetracked by issues that more properly belong to New Testament studies, such as historical and textual criticism and certain aspects of the quest for the historical Jesus. These issues will be explored only as they inform and shape the theologies being considered.

Christology is divided commonly, though somewhat artificially, into “person” and “work.” This study is structured around the functional Christology of the pentecostal fourfold gospel, which makes its greatest contribution to the area of “work”; ontological issues traditionally associated with “person” will receive less attention (MacDonald, 1988, p. 481). The areas of work under investigation are not so much the past work of Christ in his passion or theories of the atonement as the present and future effects of his work in the experience of Christians, the church, and the

world. Taken in this sense, the work of Christ is virtually synonymous with soteriology. This branch of Christology also overlaps with pneumatology and eschatology, which will of necessity be examined.

CHAPTER 2

PENTECOSTAL CHRISTOLOGY IN THE CONTEXT OF TWENTIETH CENTURY THEOLOGY

2.1 Streams of Protestant Theology: Evangelical, Ecumenical, and Pentecostal

An exercise in ecumenical theology—ecumenical in the broad sense of worldwide, general, and unitive—in which one critically examines one’s own theology and that of others must be approached with both boldness and caution. Boldness is required because of the importance of the task; any attempt to contribute to the unity among Christians for which Jesus prayed in John 17:21–23 must be undertaken seriously and fearlessly. At the same time, caution is needed because of the ease of misinterpreting or misrepresenting the position of the other and thereby unintentionally causing offense and greater disunity. The researcher agrees with Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen (2004, p. 7) in rejecting the following caricatures and misuses of ecumenical theology:

Some think it is mainly the same as what used to be called “controversial” theology, the purpose of which was to delineate confessional differences. Another less than accurate picture is to imagine that the sole purpose of ecumenism is to try to hide the differences and attempt a cheap consensus. Still another false view is that, with regard to main doctrines of Christianity, an agreement has to be reached as to what is the “right” formulation.

Constructive ecumenical theology proceeds from the belief that, within reasonable but generous limits, all Christian traditions contain truth, and the differences in their theologies arose historically from meditation on specific truths in different contexts. These theologies are ultimately not conflicting but complementary interpretations of transcendent realities that defy reduction into simplistic, once-for-all pronouncements. Different theological traditions may learn from each other without losing their own unique characters, and reflection on the diversity of theologies can itself be doxological and edifying. Doctrinal adjustment may be an outcome of the dialogue but is not the primary goal.

In actually doing ecumenical theology, some generalization and reduction is necessary. As Christianity has a two thousand year history, over two billion living adherents, and a plethora of denominations, it is impossible in any treatment to give full justice to the wide diversity of beliefs and practices of all Christians and their

fellowships. Generalization of these diversities is always a hazardous affair that can easily degenerate into unfair oversimplifications. However, development of categories can be useful in understanding the differences between schools or streams of theology and the issues resulting when those differences are joined. Stereotypically, protestant churches and theologies, the focus of this study, have been divided into two broad categories: evangelical and ecumenical (Vandervelde, 2002, pp. 437–438). Although not all accept the polarization inherent in these two classifications, they are routinely used, especially in the context of missions-receiving nations such as India (Premasagar, 1993, pp. ix–xii).

Both of these terms are loaded with meaning. They are, first and foremost, ecclesiastical and missiological distinctions. “Evangelical” in this usage describes churches, denominations, and theologies associated with the Lausanne movement and the World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF). Such groups place great emphasis on evangelism and conversion as the primary mission of Christianity. “Ecumenical,” on the other hand, describes groups associated with the World Council of Churches (WCC); “mainline” is a synonym for this stereotypical usage of the term ecumenical. As their descriptor indicates, ecumenical groups strive for greater Christian unity, seeing this as essential to the church’s mission on the basis of John 17:21 (Pierson, 2000, p. 300). Historically, the WCC has also stressed the church’s role in the pursuit of world peace and social justice. Again, these are stereotypes, summaries of the priorities of the two bodies for purposes of identification and distinction, not summary judgments of their values. It would be erroneous, therefore, to conclude that WEF members are unconcerned about justice or Christian unity or that WCC members are unconcerned about evangelism. Similarly, the memberships of both the WEF and the WCC represent a great diversity of theological traditions, but again it is possible to identify features common to each grouping. These theological distinctions have relevance for this study and will be examined in greater detail.

2.1.1 Evangelical Theologies

The term “evangelical” has a wide range of meanings depending on context (Synan, 2002b). In the broadest sense, more common to the European continent, it is a synonym for protestant. Although not used thusly in the present study, this connotation suggests that evangelicalism has a relationship with all traditions of protestantism, and that theologies, churches, and Christians cannot simply be classified as either evangelical or ecumenical in a binary reduction. “Evangelical” is also related to “evangelize” and “evangelism,” so evangelical religion came to be associated with the call to a conscious conversion experience as promoted in various revivals; this usage was particularly common in America and Britain (Synan, 2002b,

pp. 613–614). Evangelicalism began to narrow and coalesce as a distinct theological movement in the nineteenth century, primarily in response to the spread of liberalism and higher criticism of the Bible in the mainline protestant churches. In 1846, the Evangelical Alliance was founded to advance unity and fellowship among conservative protestants; this was the first international inter-denominational association (Howard, 1986, pp. 15–16).

Nineteenth century evangelicalism as represented by the Alliance was a diverse group; baptists and presbyterians, methodists and holiness church members could all be considered evangelical. The movement in general and the Alliance in particular were unsuccessful in curtailing the spread of liberalism, leading to a hardening of positions at the turn of the century. Evangelicalism gave way to fundamentalism. Fundamentalists adhered to the same core beliefs of the earlier, more diverse evangelicals but combined their orthodoxy with heightened militancy and separatism. Fundamentalism came to be dominated by apocalyptic dispensationalism, on the one hand, and strict orthodox Calvinism on the other. The holiness and emergent pentecostal revivalists had no place in this new movement (Synan, 2002b, pp. 614–615; 2002c, pp. 656–658). In the United States, the conflict between fundamentalists and modernists climaxed in 1925 in the infamous “Scopes Monkey Trial” over the theory of evolution. The fundamentalists won the trial but lost the battle, leading to further separation and isolation from mainstream American society and broader Christianity (Synan, 2002b, p. 615). As Howard (1986, p. 3) writes:

[I]n the first half of the twentieth century those who were the legitimate offspring of the evangelicals of the previous century narrowed their focus in such a way that their opponents dubbed them as obscurantist, anti-scholarly, schismatic, and anti-social. While such epithets were not wholly justified, there was some basis for the feeling that the fundamentalists had redefined the parameters of evangelicalism.

Evangelicalism ultimately reemerged from its eclipse by fundamentalism as new or neo-evangelicalism; its rebirth manifested in the formation of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) in the United States in 1942 and the WEF in 1951 (Howard, 1986, p. 4), which superseded the older Alliance.² While preserving the beliefs of the older fundamentalism, the new evangelicalism sought to be more inclusive of diverse, albeit still conservative, protestants, including the pentecostals. Objecting to the “tongues groups,” the stricter fundamentalists separated themselves from these attempts at conservative unity, leading to their increased marginalization from the growing neo-evangelical movement (Robeck, 2002, pp. 922–923).

²In 2001, the WEF voted to change its name to the World Evangelical Alliance, effective from January 2002 (Coote, 2002, p. 1243). In this dissertation, the older name is retained to ensure continuity with the cited literature.

Thus, evangelicalism is both the antecedent and descendant of fundamentalism; unless otherwise noted, in this study it is to this later form as neo-evangelicalism that the term “evangelical” refers. Both fundamentalists and evangelicals believe essentially the same things, namely the “fundamentals” of the historic Christian faith: the inerrancy of the Bible; the deity, virgin birth, substitutionary death, and bodily resurrection of Christ; and the historicity of biblical miracles (McIntire, 1984, p. 433). The main difference between the two is the practice of separation; evangelicals are more open to fellowship with non-fundamentalist Christians and ecumenical cooperation (Pierard, 1984, pp. 381–382). For this reason, although fundamentalism is the older movement, it may be considered a subset of evangelicalism: all fundamentalists are evangelicals, but not all evangelicals are fundamentalists. Conservative confessionalists such as the “old Princeton” theologians are also usually included in this grouping, though not without discomfort (Muether, 1988). Pentecostalism is also commonly viewed as a subset of evangelicalism; the propriety of this is explored in further detail below.

The fundamentalist phase left an indelible mark on neo-evangelicalism that should not be underestimated in assessing the movement’s theology and theological grids. This influence is most readily apparent in the evangelical understanding of the inspiration and authority of the Bible, the clearest line separating evangelical theologies from most ecumenical or mainline protestant ones. Evangelicals typically equate the Word of God with the Scriptures in a one-to-one correspondence, following the maxim of Augustine (1999b, Book XIII:44) via Warfield (1948) that “what Scripture says, God says” (“The Chicago statement on biblical inerrancy”, 1978). Accordingly, they affirm the inerrancy of Scripture and reject any form of historical criticism that questions or denies it. It is this essentially pre-critical hermeneutic that keeps evangelical theology in synchronization with classical Reformation theology, and evangelicals proudly see themselves as the heirs of such stalwarts as Luther and Calvin. Although not all evangelicals, particularly those outside of American and American-originated groups, believe in total inerrancy, the exceptions prove the rule, and one can observe a hardening of the evangelical position in the progression from affirmation of the Bible’s “inspiration, authority, and sufficiency” by the Evangelical Alliance in 1846 (Howard, 1986, p. 11) to “infallibility” by the WEF in 1951 (Howard, 1986, pp. 31–34) to the insistence on “inerrancy” by many evangelicals today. Inerrantists stand as both the center and the guardians of evangelicalism, and theologians who do not assent to total inerrancy are considered “postconservative” evangelicals at best (Erickson, 1997). For example, non-inerrantists are not eligible for membership in the Evangelical Theological Society in the United States (Grenz, 2002). The authority and inerrancy of the Bible is

not the only issue keeping most WEF members from joining the WCC, but it is often the first mentioned in conversation between the two bodies (e.g., *An Evangelical response to Confessing the One Faith*, 1993; Moreau, 2000, p. 1024). Most do not hold that acceptance of inerrancy is necessary in order to be a Christian, but many do see it as the *sine qua non* of evangelicalism (e.g., Lindsell, 1976, p. 210). Accordingly, the importance of inerrancy to evangelicalism should not be underestimated when assessing it as a theological stream.

Moving on to the specific doctrines under consideration, with regard to the person of Christ, evangelicals adhere to Chalcedonian Christology, defending and restating it when necessary but not altering it (Erickson, 1991). Most accept the penal substitution view of the atonement as the most biblically correct understanding of Christ's work (Erickson, 1998, pp. 818–840; Dever, 2006). Evangelical soteriology exhibits greater diversity but seeks continuity with the traditions of the Reformation, with special emphasis on solafidianism. Formal Calvinism undeniably dominates evangelical scholastic thought, largely because of the role the “old Princeton” theologians had in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy (cf. Bassett, 2002, pp. 444–445). The modified dispensationalist-baptistic form of Calvinism and conservative Arminianism also hold great influence, especially popularly, though the latter is viewed suspiciously in many evangelical theological circles.

2.1.2 Ecumenical Theologies

Besides the broader usage discussed above in §2.1, “ecumenical theology” is a catch phrase for protestant theologies that do not fit the category of evangelical. As the term “evangelical” can be for “fundamentalist,” “ecumenical” is sometimes a euphemism for liberal theology, but it also includes non-fundamentalist responses to liberalism such as neo-orthodoxy. Collectively, these are the heirs to the modernist side of the fundamentalist-modernist debate. These theologies may also be considered ecumenical in the sense that they are inter-denominational and non-denominational; in general, they have been less closely identified with specific Christian traditions than previous systems of dogmatics.

Ecumenical theologians accept, to greater or lesser extent, the methods and conclusions of the historical-critical approach to the Bible. Although they confess belief in the Bible's inspiration and accept it as the primary norm for the church (Weber, 2002, p. 108), most reject complete equivalence between the Word of God and the Scriptures. They are distinct but not separate: “The word of God is fully attested in scripture... but it cannot be reduced to scripture” (Birmelé, 2002, p. 1214). Very few in the category of ecumenical, if any, would accept the evangelical understanding of inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture as defined by the Chicago

Statement (Thomas, O. C., 1989, pp. 43–50). Again, the exceptions demonstrate the rule; Karl Barth is the most conservative theologian treated in this study who could be considered ecumenical, but he actually straddles the line between the two categories, simultaneously being accepted and rejected by both liberals and conservatives (Grenz & Olson, 1992, p. 76). Barth held an extremely high view of the Scriptures but rejected their inerrancy (Barth, 1956b, pp. 529–530 (CD I.2)), placing him at odds with most contemporary evangelicals.

Ecumenical theologies associated with mainline denominations have a great respect for the traditional formulations of the historic Christian faith. At the same time, because of their different understanding of biblical authority, ecumenical theologians have not always felt the strictures of their evangelical counterparts to adhere to received orthodoxy. They see that their task as theologians can sometimes go beyond restatement to reformulation of doctrine both in service of, and as informed by, human contexts and needs. Indeed, the production of contextual theologies in response to what have been called the “new particularisms” (Marty & Peerman, 1972) has been one of the greatest lasting trends of twentieth century theology, one that has begun recently to attract the attention of more conservative theologians as well.

This freedom naturally leads to a great degree of theological innovation as can be seen by the large number of new Christologies produced by the ecumenical camp. Nearly every decade of the twentieth century saw the rise—and often decline—of a new interpretation of the significance of Jesus Christ. Although by no means exhaustive nor exclusive to ecumenical protestants, the following list summarizes some of the major trends and questions in contemporary non-evangelical Christology and by implication, soteriology:

1. The continued quest for the historical Jesus and the implications of its findings for theology
2. The question of Christology “from above” versus Christology “from below”
3. The existential meaning of faith in Christ and Christ in faith
4. The question of ontological versus functional Christologies
5. The continuing relevance or obsolescence of the Chalcedonian formula
6. The relating of the doctrine of Christ to new or underrepresented contexts and perspectives, e.g., black, feminist, Asian Christologies, etc.
7. The importance and place of the liberation motif in Christology and soteriology
8. The question of the uniqueness of Christ and Christian salvation in the context of religious pluralism

2.1.3 Pentecostal Theologies

Casual observers both within and without the movement often view pentecostalism as just another variety of fundamentalism or “hyperfundamentalism” (Synan, 2002c, pp. 657–658; Cox, 1995, p. 15). The two movements do have several features in common, particularly in their eschatology and approach to the Bible, the latter probably the motivating factor behind Walter J. Hollenweger’s (1972) free usage of the term “fundamentalist” in his authoritative but dated survey of pentecostalism. However, there are many important historical and theological differences between the two, differences significant enough to warrant classifying pentecostalism as a separate stream of protestant theology distinct from both fundamentalism and its broader descendant, evangelicalism. The beginnings of the modern pentecostal movement predate fundamentalism, properly defined (Hollenweger, 1996, p. 6), and thus also neo-evangelicalism. More importantly, as a reactionary movement, fundamentalism rejected pentecostalism nearly as vehemently as it did liberalism. To this date, pentecostal relations with fundamentalists remain more uneasy than their relations with any other Christian grouping, protestant or catholic. Ironically, though both groups bring a literalist, pre-critical hermeneutic to the Scriptures, they arrive at vastly different spiritualities.

Historically, pentecostalism has eschewed formal, academic theology. This does not mean, however, that it has no theology. Harvey Cox (1995, p. 71) sees pentecostal theology as a true narrative theology communicated through testimonies, the sharing of spiritual experiences, the end result of which is

a full-blown religious cosmos, an intricate system of symbols that respond to the perennial questions of human meaning and value. The difference is that, historically, pentecostals have felt more at home singing their theology, or putting it in pamphlets for distribution on street corners. Only recently have they begun writing books about it. (Cox, 1995, p. 15)

From the beginning, pentecostals have produced a vast amount of literature, but as it was published independently, it largely escaped the notice of mainstream, non-charismatic Christianity and professional theologians (Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 69–71). The first pentecostal theological works were in the form of tracts, published sermons, and popular journals, often of a polemical character. Disillusioned by their experiences with organized Christianity, the early pentecostals were reluctant to establish formal denominations and binding articles of faith. Very rapidly, however, doctrinal controversies, particularly regarding sanctification, water baptism, and the Trinity, forced the various pentecostal groupings to commit to theological statements delimiting the boundaries of their ministerial fellowship (Synan, 1971, pp. 147–163; Hollenweger, 1972, p. 425). These statements of faith then served as the nuclei of

systematic theologies of the “Bible doctrines” type (Macchia, 2002, p. 1123; 1999, pp. 8–10) written by denominational authors, for example, Nelson (1981) and Menzies and Horton (1993) in the Assemblies of God. Writers of more independent works not based on official doctrinal statements have borrowed heavily from other conservative traditions, often just adding a chapter or two on the Holy Spirit to a basically baptist, brethren, or reformed system (Nichols, 1984, p. 57). Many of the works focusing more narrowly on specific points of doctrine and practice are written for a wider non-academic audience, though their authors often have advanced theological degrees. More recently, pentecostal theologians have produced more critical, constructive, and contextual theologies, but as Frank D. Macchia (2002, p. 1120; 1999, p. 8) observes, the definitive pentecostal systematic theology is yet to be written. Interestingly, despite the importance of the fourfold gospel and its functional Christology to the foundations of the movement and its popular devotion, professional pentecostal theologians have given Christology comparatively less attention than other theological loci (Kärkkäinen, 2003, p. 110).

2.1.3.1 Origins and Basic Features

Historians usually mark the beginning of modern pentecostalism with Agnes Ozman’s experience of glossolalia on January 1, 1901, in Topeka, Kansas, U.S.A (Synan, 1971, pp. 98–102); most now acknowledge this to be an oversimplification. There were a number of proto-pentecostal movements in the nineteenth century outside of the United States, most notably in the United Kingdom (Christenson, 1975) and India (McGee & Burgess, 2002, pp. 118–119), that also experienced outbreaks of glossolalia, and their contribution to the global growth and development of pentecostalism should be acknowledged. The occurrence of glossolalia at Kansas was not unique; what was unique was the dogmatic linking of speaking in tongues to the baptism in the Holy Spirit as “initial physical evidence,” the answer to a pressing question of nineteenth century revivalism (Synan, 1971, pp. 121–122). The message of the baptism and evidential tongues was carried to Los Angeles via Charles Fox Parham and William J. Seymour, and from there it spread to the rest of the world by foreign visitors to Azusa Street who carried it back to their homelands. Ever since, classical pentecostalism has maintained and defended speaking in tongues as normative proof of the fullness of the Spirit, and this is the movement’s unique contribution to modern Christian belief and practice.

However, just as it is a mistake to view pentecostalism as a type of fundamentalism, it is also a mistake to see it as just a “tongues movement,” as Dayton (1987, pp. 15–17) points out. Pentecostalism represents the confluence of four major themes of nineteenth century American, primarily Wesleyan, revivalism:

1. Crisis experience of salvation, the new birth
2. Crisis experience of entire sanctification (Wesleyan “Christian perfection”) and/or the baptism in the Holy Spirit
3. Divine healing
4. Premillennial eschatology

All four elements are essential to all forms of pentecostalism and are collectively referred to as the “full gospel,” “fourfold gospel,” or “foursquare gospel,”³ a term originally coined by A. B. Simpson, the founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, in 1890 (Nienkirchen, 1992, p. 2). The second point was and continues to be the area of greatest controversy with considerable difference of opinion among revivalists as to the character and purpose of Holy Spirit baptism, its subsequence to salvation, and its relationship to sanctification. (See Table 1 on p. 16.) Initially, only the doctrine of speaking in tongues as normative evidence of Holy Spirit baptism distinguished pentecostalism from the nineteenth century holiness movements (Dayton, 1987, p. 175). Thus, although Spirit baptism accompanied by glossolalia is the *sine qua non* of pentecostalism, it is not its *summa theologiae*.

As its name suggests, pentecostalism is a restorationist movement, seeking to reproduce the book of Acts in modern Christianity. Accordingly, pentecostals believe in the continuation, not cessation, of all the New Testament experiences and gifts of the Spirit, including healing, miracles, prophecy, and revelation. It is this understanding of the ongoing ministry of the Holy Spirit—dogmatized, accepted, and expected—that separates pentecostalism from other conservative protestant movements. At the same time, the theology of pentecostalism is remarkably ecumenical; it did not succeed in skipping unaffected from the twentieth century to the first but absorbed elements from many different periods and traditions within Christian history. Pentecostals freely acknowledge their debts to Luther and Wesley (Land, 1993, p. 118), and the influences of other spiritual movements such as catholic mysticism and pietism can be discerned in the movement’s background. Pentecostal eschatology comes from dispensational fundamentalism and brethrenism (Glass, 1998, p. 126). Although there are no direct connections between the two, much in pentecostalism resonates with the spirituality of Eastern orthodoxy (Karras, 2003, p. 99). The only major Western tradition without a significant presence in the background of pentecostalism is orthodox Calvinism (Synan, 1971, p. 217). Thus, pentecostalism is in a unique position to participate in ecumenical theology. At its heart is the desire to return to the most basic, original form of Christianity, but in its

³In this work, the term “fourfold” is regularly used to describe this construct of pentecostalism, though it should be born in mind that in some traditions, the gospel is actually fivefold. The designation “full gospel” avoids this problem but may be objectionable as exclusionary. See §3.1 and §3.1.3.

formation can be seen the influence of many other theological streams. It is part of the nature of pentecostalism to learn from the best in other theological traditions as well as contribute its own insights from Scripture and experience. This process of development and discovery was not completed once for all during the classical period of the movement but must continue in the future in order to maintain the movement's vitality.

TABLE 1
Types of Classical American Holiness and Pentecostal Movements

	Holiness	Holiness Pentecostal	Baptistic Pentecostal	Oneness Pentecostal
Date of Origin (Approx.)	1867	1901	1910	1913
View of Justification-Regeneration	First stage; by faith; crisis experience	First stage; by faith; crisis experience	First stage; by faith; crisis experience	First stage; by faith but part of larger conversion-initiation complex including water baptism
View of Sanctification	Second stage; crisis experience subsequent to justification	Second stage; crisis experience subsequent to justification	Identical to first stage but experientially progressive	Identical to first stage but experientially progressive
View of Spirit Baptism	Identical to second stage; for the purpose of sanctification	Third stage; subsequent to sanctification; for the purpose of empowerment	Second stage; subsequent to justification; for the purpose of empowerment	Identical to first stage; for the purpose of salvation and empowerment
View of Speaking in Tongues	Rejects tongues as initial evidence; some but not most accept as a spiritual gift	Accepts tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism	Accepts tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism	Requires tongues as initial evidence of salvation/Spirit baptism
Other Comments	Originally arose out of methodism; National Holiness Assoc. formed in 1867 to promote entire sanctification teaching	Most denoms. existed as holiness churches before 1901 & accepted pentecostal doctrine after the Azusa revival.	Began as the "finished work" controversy over sanctification among early pentecostals; by far the largest grouping, especially outside of the U.S.A.	Began as the "new issue" controversy over rebaptism and the Trinity; rejects the Trinity in favor of a monarchy of the Son; baptize in the name of Jesus only
Representative Denominations	Church of the Nazarene; Church of God (Anderson); Christian & Missionary Alliance	Church of God in Christ; Pentecostal Holiness Church; Church of God (Cleveland)	Assemblies of God; Int'l. Church of the Foursquare Gospel	United Pentecostal Church Int'l.; Pentecostal Assemblies of the World

Primary reference: Synan, 1971

2.1.3.2 Pentecostalism and Evangelicalism

As a conservative movement, pentecostalism has much in common with evangelicalism and is usually considered a subset of it (Runia, 1997). As their missiological views are virtually identical, many pentecostal denominations have joined the WEF, NAE, and other evangelical groups. This has led to the “evangelicalization” of pentecostalism, both in theology and social outlook (Robeck, 2002, pp. 924–925). Some pentecostals have welcomed this as a sign of the acceptance of the movement by mainstream evangelicals as a legitimate expression of biblical Christianity. Others, both denominational leaders (Blumhofer & Armstrong, 2002, p. 338) and theologians (Chan, 2004), worry that through the process of evangelicalization, pentecostals may lose more than what they gain, namely their distinctive experience of the Spirit. In a challenging and insightful article, Simon K. H. Chan (2004, pp. 315–317) points out that while pentecostalism has much in common with the older, more ecumenical evangelicalism described above, it has far less so with the more reactionary neo-evangelicalism that was mediated through the fundamentalist-modernist controversy. There are important differences that militate against pentecostalism, particularly in its classical, turn of the century form, being considered just another form of evangelicalism, just as it is not another form of fundamentalism.

The size of global pentecostalism is one significant reason. On a worldwide basis, the broader pentecostal-charismatic renewal movement (which includes non-protestant charismatics) dwarfs non-charismatic evangelical protestantism (Barrett, Kurian & Johnson, 2001, p. 4; Johnstone, Mandryk & Johnstone, 2001, p. 5). In some regions such as Latin America, pentecostals are the only significant protestant, let alone evangelical, grouping, thus rendering the question irrelevant in many parts of the world. Even in the U.S. with its large non-charismatic evangelical population, the Assemblies of God is the largest member of the NAE by a wide margin, and pentecostals form a plurality if not outright majority of the Association (Robeck, 2002, p. 922). This domination occurs despite the fact that only one non-white pentecostal denomination is a member of the NAE (Robeck, 2002, p. 924); the absence of such a significant portion of American pentecostalism belies the notion that the Association speaks with a voice representative of all pentecostals and their theological, social, and political concerns. On the basis of numerical strength alone, one could just as reasonably, though novelly, argue that neo-evangelicalism be classified as a non-charismatic subset of pentecostalism. Similarly, pentecostalism also antedates both fundamentalism and its derivative, neo-evangelicalism (Hollenweger, 1996, p. 6).

The theological differences are also significant enough to justify classifying pentecostalism as a separate theological stream alongside or between evangelicalism and ecumenism (Land, 1993, pp. 29–30). First, while pentecostals affirm the inspiration of the Bible, they do not have exactly the same understanding of it as evangelicals. As noted above, most by no means accept any form of higher criticism, but the word most commonly used in association with the pentecostal understanding of biblical authority is “infallibility,” a somewhat more moderate view than the strict inerrancy affirmed by conservative evangelicalism and fundamentalism (Arrington, 1988, pp. 381–382; Seymour, 2000, p. 49). Rejected by fundamentalists and overlooked by liberals, pentecostals were not a party to the fundamentalist-modernist controversy that had such a great impact on later American evangelicalism (Macchia, 2002, p. 1122; Synan, 1971, pp. 221–222). Consequently, they do not have the level of ideological investment in formal inerrancy as evangelicals, though increased contact between the two in recent years has caused some pentecostals to promote it with the same intensity (Robeck, 2002, p. 924).

Second, and more importantly, pentecostals have a different view of the authority of the Bible in the life of faith. It is the prime but not sole authority. By accepting the continuation in post-biblical times of such spiritual phenomena as speaking in tongues and prophecy, pentecostals have an additional source of revelation beyond the Bible, the present ministry of the Holy Spirit. In dialogue and formal theology, it is always quickly stated that such revelation is wholly subordinate to the Scriptures (Williams, 1988b, pp. 43–44), but in practice, pentecostal spirituality is not completely mediated by the Bible. In relationship with God, the Spirit is more than the letter, and God speaks outside of the Bible (Land, 1993, pp. 100, 118). Likewise, experience is an important hermeneutical tool for pentecostals (Arrington, 1988, pp. 383–384). The meaning of Scripture is not determined through grammatical investigation but existential appropriation. Since the Bible is believed to be eternally true, there is no distance between modern Christians and the events recorded in it. Accordingly, pentecostals expect to experience in their own lives the same activities of God the people of the Bible did, especially in the book of Acts. The experience is sought and received by faith and thereby the interpretation that led to it is demonstrated to be correct. A popular saying among pentecostals, “The man with an experience is never at the mercy of the man with a doctrine,” summarizes this attitude and approach well (Cox, 1995, p. 57).

This view contradicts the historical evangelical perspective. Evangelicalism protects traditional orthodoxy through the doctrine of verbal inspiration; a corollary of this is the rejection of any source of extra-biblical authority. In the majority view, prophecy and other forms of direct revelation ceased with the death of the apostles

and the closing of the New Testament canon. As evangelical-pentecostal contact has increased, evangelicals have gradually opened to the continuation of miraculous spiritual gifts such as healing, but there is still a great deal of wariness, even hostility, towards revelatory gifts such as interpreted glossolalia and prophecy, which many evangelicals view as “adding to the Bible” (e.g., Gaffin, 1996a, pp. 42–54; 1996b, pp. 334–339; cf. Grudem, 1994, pp. 1031–1042). This difference remains a formidable barrier between the two streams. In this area, the conflict between evangelicals and pentecostals closely mirrors that between the magisterial reformers and the “enthusiasts” of the radical Reformation. Cox (1995, pp. 299–320) sees the conflict between fundamentalism and experientialism as a battle for the heart of pentecostalism itself.

Third, pentecostals have a different attitude to theology and doctrine. Evangelicals use inerrancy to maintain historic doctrine, namely that of post-reformation protestant orthodoxy (Chan, 2004, pp. 322–323). Pentecostals, on the other hand, use the Bible to modify, create, and recreate doctrine. The movement has its own form of “hermeneutics of suspicion,” a suspicion of traditional interpretations and historic, institutional Christianity (Land, 1993, pp. 18–19, 60). With the rediscovery of Holy Spirit baptism and speaking in tongues, pentecostals feel prompted to search the Bible to see what other doctrines were forgotten or suppressed by the traditional church during its perceived decline from Acts until Azusa Street. Received orthodoxy is not accepted until it proves itself biblical, and pentecostals have been known to overthrow major doctrines through new inspired interpretations. The greatest and most radical example of this is the rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity by oneness pentecostals (Synan, 1971, pp. 153–163). Claiming to have recovered truth corrupted by the “man-made” councils and creeds, this branch of pentecostalism embraced a form of Sabellianism in a monarchy of the Son, thereby consciously cutting itself off from Trinitarian pentecostalism and the larger church as a whole in the pursuit of original Christian doctrine. To a lesser extent, the same suspicion can be seen in the proliferation of independent, non-denominational pentecostal and charismatic churches with their aversion to denominational hierarchies and binding statements of faith.

In sum, despite the similar views on the inspiration of the Bible and the employment use of literalist, pre-critical hermeneutics, pentecostals and evangelicals do not use the Bible identically. Both claim to use the Bible and the Bible alone in the formation of their theology, but in practice, pentecostals also rely on experience and the revelatory ministry of the Holy Spirit for confirmation of their beliefs. Coupled with a type of “hermeneutics of suspicion” towards all traditional interpretations, pentecostals often come to different conclusions about theological and practical

issues. A clear example of this difference in perspectives is found in the movements' approaches to the issue of women in ministry. For conservative evangelicals, this contentious issue will be decided only by finally determining the correct interpretation of such New Testament passages as 1 Cor. 14:34–35 and 1 Tim. 2:11–15 (e.g., Piper & Grudem, 1991). If either position, for or against, can ultimately be proven to be the singular biblical teaching—in reality, a highly unlikely proposition—the matter will be deemed settled and the opposing position unbiblical.

Within pentecostalism, the issue is more complicated and the route to its resolution less clear. The role of women ministers in the history of pentecostalism is itself “complex and contradictory” (Griffith & Roebuck, 2002, p. 1203). As a restorationist movement, pentecostalism has sought to recover the themes and experiences of the book of Acts. It especially sees itself as a fulfillment of the prophecy by Joel quoted by Peter on the day of Pentecost, which reads in part,

“And in the last days it shall be,” God declares, “that I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy... even on my male and female servants... I will pour out my Spirit....” (Acts 2:17–18)

Women are included among those upon whom God pours his Spirit, and to resist their ministry is to resist the anointing of the Spirit (Griffith & Roebuck, 2002, p. 1204). There were many prominent women evangelists and leaders in both the holiness movement and early pentecostalism. Some, such as Aimee Semple McPherson and Ida Robinson, even founded denominations, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel and Mount Sinai Holy Church of America, respectively; since its founding in 1924, the latter in particular has maintained its tradition of women bishops and pastors (Griffith & Roebuck, 2002, p. 1206). Yet, this recognition and acceptance has not been universal. Within many pentecostal denominations, the ordination of women to the pastorate has been controversial due to biblical concerns—to say nothing of sociological factors—and female ministers have rarely enjoyed complete equality with males. Some have attributed more recent restrictions on women as a by-product of increased contacts with evangelicalism and its biblicist paradigm (Robeck, 1986, pp. 70–71; 2002, p. 925). Given pentecostalism's checkered history in this area, it is unfair to place all of the blame on the influence of evangelicalism; on the other hand, it has certainly been a contributing factor. Interestingly, the overall attitude of the pentecostal movement towards women in ministry can be judged as more open than mainstream evangelicalism but more conservative than mainline ecumenical protestantism (Griffith & Roebuck, 2002, p. 1203), substantiating the case that the movement be viewed as a distinct stream of Christian thought flowing between the other two.

Fourth, pentecostals and evangelicals differ in their appropriation of New Testament theology; the former prioritize Luke, the latter, Paul (Dayton, 1987, p. 23). Protestantism, especially evangelicalism, has been described as the “victory of Paul over Jesus,” a flippant but not inaccurate reduction of protestants’ preference for Paul’s letters over the Gospels as the foundation of their theological systems. Following the example of Luther, they interpret the New Testament through the lens of Paul and make its diversities conform to their image of his teachings. Many of the protocols of conservative evangelical hermeneutics have been formulated to preserve this propensity. In the traditional reformed wing of evangelicalism, this inclination can be seen in the absolute insistence on sola fideism; in the dispensationalist wing, it is visible in the axiomatic relegation of the Gospels and sometimes Acts to the previous or a transitional dispensation. Pentecostals, on the other hand, work through a Lucan theological grid and give priority to Acts and Luke, the “Gospel of the Spirit.” This is a very important difference. Much of evangelical objections to pentecostal theology, particularly to the subsequence of Spirit baptism and glossolalia as the baptism’s initial evidence, is based upon rejection of the narratives of Acts as a legitimate and authoritative source for doctrine. Conversely, pentecostals sometimes criticize non-pentecostals for not accepting what to them is the plain teaching of Acts and the Gospels (Stronstad, 1984, pp. 1–2, 5–9). The Pauline/Lucan tension is likewise seen in the issue of women in ministry discussed above. Without reaching some constructive consensus as to the authority of these two different traditions in the canon, the evangelical and pentecostal streams will continue to take separate paths.

Fifth, the Arminian soteriology of pentecostalism distinguishes it from evangelicalism. Pentecostalism’s theological and spiritual roots, eclectic as they may be, are largely free from the influence of the reformed tradition that so strongly dominates evangelicalism:

The basic premises of the movement’s theology were constructed by John Wesley in the eighteenth century. As a product of Methodism, the holiness-pentecostal movement traces its lineage through the Wesleys to Anglicanism and from thence to Roman Catholicism. This theological heritage places the pentecostals outside the Calvinistic, reformed tradition which culminated in the Baptist and Presbyterian movements in the United States. The basic pentecostal theological position might be described as Arminian, perfectionistic, premillennial, and charismatic. (Synan, 1971, p. 217)

Following and exceeding Wesley, pentecostal soteriology is staunchly Arminian, in practice at times approaching genuine Pelagianism. In pentecostalism, salvation can be, and often is, lost and regained, a belief that is anathema to all forms of Calvinism. This Arminianism is characteristic not only of the “three stage” methodistic pentecostalism but also of the more widespread “two stage” or “baptistic” form. To

distinguish it from the former, the latter is sometimes referred to as “reformed” or “reformed-origin” pentecostalism (e.g., Althouse, 2003, pp. 12–14; cf. Dieter, 1990, pp. 6–7). A prominent example of this type is the Assemblies of God. Study of the denomination’s theology as found in official statements, academic writings, and popular preaching, however, reveals uniform denial of all the five points of Calvinism except possibly the first and closer identification with the Wesleyan *ordo salutis* than the reformed (Pecota, 1995, p. 355). That the Assemblies also denies, not unambiguously (Leggett, 1989), Wesleyan perfectionism does not render it reformed, only non-Wesleyan in this particular area. One would be hard pressed to find a traditional Calvinist assessment that would agree in characterizing the Assemblies as reformed. Some European pentecostal groups more rightly deserve this label (e.g., Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 231–241), but these constitute a very small minority within world pentecostalism.

There is a fundamental conflict between the pentecostal doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit as a crisis subsequent to salvation (justification) and the reformed *ordo salutis*. In reformed theology, there is no provision for “second blessings” experienced after justification, certainly not for ones attained only by some of the elect, not all, through pleading and “tarrying” or other works (Ward, 1975, p. 112); such is an affront to God’s grace in justification and a violation of solafidianism (Bruner, 1970, pp. 114–117). The same position is taken against Wesleyan-holiness “second blessing” sanctification (Berkouwer, 1952, pp. 63–64; Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 328–330). In dialogue between evangelicals of a reformed persuasion and pentecostals and charismatics, great pressure has come from the former to the latter to drop the idea of subsequence and the differentiation of Holy Spirit baptism from regeneration in exchange for recognition of the continuation of the gifts (Williams, 1997). Although this may be viewed as progress to some extent, it is evidence of the great difference between these two streams of protestant thought and the reality that at present, pentecostalism can fully merge with contemporary evangelicalism only by retreat from its foundational belief.

Taken together, these theological differences argue strongly against pentecostalism being considered simply a form of evangelicalism with a few distinctive features. Of course, part of the purpose of ecumenical dialogue is learning how to fellowship with other viewpoints despite points of disagreement, and the increasing cooperation and respect between the two movements should be welcomed. Evangelicals and pentecostals can learn much from each other. That said, for the pentecostal movement as a whole, both historically and theologically, the category of evangelicalism is lacking as a reference point for self-identification (McGee, 2003). Walter Hollenweger’s (1992, p. 8) assessment is particularly relevant here:

As to the qualifications of Pentecostals as arch-evangelicals, it must be said that for a long time Pentecostals tried to present themselves as a kind of “evangelicals plus”, that is to say, evangelicals plus fire, dedication, missionary success, speaking in tongues and gifts of healing. But that will no longer do. Pentecostalism is a denomination *sui generis*. Its roots in the black, oral tradition of the American slaves, in the catholic tradition of Wesley, in the evangelical tradition of the American Holiness movement (with its far-reaching political, social and ecumenical programmes), in the critical tradition of both the Holiness movement and the critical Western theology, in the ecumenical tradition of their beginnings—all this qualifies it as a movement which is not just a sub-division of evangelicalism on fire. It is in itself already an ecumenical movement. So far Pentecostalism has not been able to project itself in this way.

2.1.3.3 Pentecostalism and Ecumenism

Classical pentecostalism has not been known for being ecumenical in practice. In the beginning, it did have a vision for greater Christian unity (Althouse, 2003, p. 28; Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 505–507; Robeck, 1999, pp. 340–344), but it was a unity through ascendance and supersession. Many early pentecostals hoped that all Christian churches would come to accept the new movement’s doctrines and positions. They were soon disabused of this belief and responded by rejecting existing institutions and structures to form their own. A movement that sees itself as the restoration of New Testament Christianity has no need for older, corrupt denominations that the Spirit had passed by (Cox, 1995, pp. 74, 102). In turn, while they were kinder than the fundamentalists, the mainline churches viewed the pentecostals, when they gave them any notice at all, as uneducated enthusiasts. The passing of time and the coming of the charismatic movement softened the polemics of both sides, and today many pentecostal groups, particularly outside of North America, are showing increasing interest in the WCC (Robeck & Sandidge, 2002, pp. 1214–1216).

While pentecostal theologians borrow freely from fundamentalists and evangelicals, less contact has been made with ecumenical theologians who take a critical view of Scripture. Just as there are many points of similarity between pentecostalism and evangelicalism, there are many formidable points of difference with mainline theology. Besides the issues that divide evangelicalism and ecumenism, views commonly accepted in mainline protestantism on issues such as baptism, liturgy, tradition and authority in the church, and theological education for ministers go against the revivalist traditions of pentecostalism. Likewise, ecumenical reformed theologians such as Hollenweger (1972, pp. 322–341) object to pentecostal theology for much the same reasons as reformed evangelicals. Yet, there are points of contact that deserve fuller exploration. Although the two movements developed separately, they pursued many of the same points of theological interest.

First, and perhaps most importantly, pentecostals and more liberal protestants have both stressed the priority of the experience of God over doctrinal orthodoxy. The liberal interest in experience is found in its very foundations by Schleiermacher, who was greatly influenced by pietism (Grenz & Olson, 1992, pp. 40–41), and his emphasis on religious affections. The pentecostal experience of salvation as a personal encounter with God resonates especially with aspects of neo-orthodoxy, such as Kierkegaard's leap of faith and Bultmann's concept of authentic existence. Cox (1995, p. 75) notes:

In some respects, especially in their emphasis on the need for a personal experience of God, [the pentecostals] were closer to some of the Protestant liberals of the day than they were to the fundamentalists. The difference was that while the liberals liked to talk about the importance of religious experience, the pentecostals seemed to generate it.

At the same time as he criticizes pentecostalism's deviations from reformed theology, Hollenweger (1972) commends some of its experiences. He sees both the practice of speaking in tongues (pp. 342–344) and pentecostal liturgy and preaching (pp. 466–467) as potentially therapeutic, the latter sphere being the movement's most important contribution to contemporary Christianity.

Second, both pentecostals and ecumenists show willingness to adapt doctrine and practice to specific contexts. The difference is that pentecostals have been less conscious of this habit (Macchia, 2002, p. 1125); for ecumenists, it is a deliberate principle and goal of the theological process. Nevertheless, the pentecostal "hermeneutic of suspicion" has led to significant innovation and adaptation. Suspicious of traditional dogmas, pentecostals have striven to restore New Testament Christianity. In their attempts to do so, the immediate context inevitably informs the revisioning of doctrine, thus resulting in contextualized beliefs and practices. This can be seen in the religious expressions of the many independent, indigenous pentecostal churches that have arisen throughout the world in regions where traditional, Western Christianity and its theologies are less entrenched. Pentecostal devotion tends to automatically contextualize theology.

Third, both pentecostals and ecumenists see religion as more than merely spiritual (Boff, 1978, p. 56; Volf, 1989). One of the greatest lasting trends of ecumenical theology of the twentieth century has been the discovery and acceptance of the biblical motif of liberation, not just spiritual but also physical and social salvation. Liberation theologians have harvested abundantly from the fertile soil of the biblical accounts of the exodus and the ministry of Jesus, reinterpreting the supernatural miracles in the stories as calls for social and political action on behalf of the oppressed and suffering. Pentecostals also draw from biblical miracle stories,

particularly healings and exorcisms, and seek to replicate them literally in modern-day proclamation of the fourfold gospel, which has unstated social implications. The approaches differ but the goals are the same: the total salvation of individuals spiritually, physically, emotionally, and socially.

By far the greatest context for meetings between ecumenists and pentecostals has been the charismatic movement. The significance of the charismatic movement cannot be stressed enough and is discussed in further detail in the next section. It is important to note, however, that this renewal movement arose and flourished primarily among mainline protestants and Roman Catholics, not evangelicals who otherwise are assumed to be doctrinally closer to pentecostals. As noted above, the liberal-mainline openness to religious experience naturally leads to a more positive view of pentecostal spirituality once initial barriers are overcome (Edwards & Stott, 1988, pp. 25–28). Even beyond the charismatic movement, prospects for further cooperation, theologically and missiologically, between pentecostals and mainline protestants will remain bright as long as shared perspectives rather than differences are emphasized.

2.1.3.4 Pentecostalism and the Charismatic Movement

Pentecostalism received its definitive form during the first two decades of the twentieth century, primarily in the context of American revivalism. The movement, however, did not stagnate after that time, nor is it by any means the sum of all spiritual renewal during the century. Observers of the century's revivals generally recognize three "waves" of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The first wave was the classical pentecostal movement, the primary focus of this study. It was largely separatist, resulting in the formation of many new churches and denominations as the adherents to the new beliefs either left their churches in dissatisfaction or were excommunicated. With this independence, the movement was able to develop its own unique character, and how genuinely "pentecostal" an individual, church, or theology is perceived to be, unfairly or not, is largely determined by comparison to the standards of pentecostalism that arose during this period. Although a typically American revival, classical pentecostalism quickly spread to many other nations through the sending of missionaries and through foreign visitors to Azusa Street that took the new teaching back to their homelands (McGee, 2002, pp. 887–889). In many places, the pentecostal message was quickly indigenized (Hollenweger, 1996, p. 5). During the same time, in other lands renewal movements arose without a clear connection to Azusa Street but still bearing many of the important characteristics of classical pentecostalism.

The second wave, the charismatic renewal, was the entry of pentecostal spirituality and practice into the mainline denominations (Hocken, 1988; Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 3–17). Its beginnings are not as easy to determine as that of the prior movement, but it came to prominence in the late 1950's and spread rapidly in the 1960's. As its name implies, the movement emphasizes the charismata or spiritual gifts. It started, however, with acceptance of the pentecostal doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a subsequent grace after justification and regeneration. Although charismatics typically do not emphasize tongues as strongly as classical pentecostals do (Hocken, 1988, p. 158), the views of many leaders such as Dennis Bennett (1971) and J. Rodman Williams (1990) are virtually identical to the older movement's. For this reason, the charismatic movement was at first called neo-pentecostalism, but this term is not used widely today.

The primary difference between the charismatic movement and pentecostalism is that it began as a renewal movement within the historic denominations such as the methodists, presbyterians, Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Mennonites, many of which are otherwise considered "ecumenical"; this movement had little success among conservative evangelicals. Although the charismatic movement has not arisen entirely without resistance in the mainline denominations, most charismatics have been able to find a place within their own churches and have not been forced to leave as many of the earlier pentecostals were. In many ways, the charismatic movement was a fulfillment of the original ecumenical hopes of the first wave, pentecostalism. Ironically, many pentecostals had serious reservations about the new movement, if not rejecting it entirely (Macchia, 1996). Their ecumenical vision was one of domination, not dialogue (Hollenweger, 1972, p. 103), and they could not believe that Christians who did not hold classical pentecostal views on issues such as baptism, holiness standards, and eschatology could receive Spirit baptism and manifest the same evidences of the Spirit. Some did come around eventually, recognizing God's salvific work in other streams of Christianity, and the older movement is better, the researcher contends, because of its contact with the newer.

Nigel Scotland (2000, p. 29) identifies four broad categories of charismatics:

There are the "Restoration" type who emphasise the kingdom and seek to restore the fivefold New Testament ministry to the contemporary church. The "Positive Confession" charismatics teach guaranteed health, wealth and prosperity. "Signs and Wonders" charismatics stress the importance of "power evangelism" and miraculous occurrences as aids to confirm the preaching of the Christian message. "Historic Denominational" charismatics are those who feel called to remain within their mainline churches and to bring renewal to their life and worship.

Other categorization schemes could be used, but this system reveals some of the

important features of the movement. First, denominational charismatics are only one segment among several; there is more to the movement than mainline renewal. A significant section of the charismatic movement is composed of independent, non-denominational churches and fellowships. Many of these are essentially pentecostal in doctrine but also show the influence of certain aspects of the spirituality more associated with the second wave of renewal. Second, the charismatic movement allows for a great degree of “specialization” in theology and practice. Many charismatics, especially in the independent churches, accept the basic pentecostal fourfold gospel as a starting point. The group then emphasizes more strongly a particular feature of the contemporary renewal, such as healing, prosperity, living apostles, or ecstatic experiences. The area of emphasis then gives the group its basic character.

When these different areas of emphasis are combined with the many different denominational traditions in the renewal, the end result is an incredible amount of diversity that defies anything more than the most basic generalization. The charismatic movement is broader and more diverse than pentecostalism or even the other two streams under discussions, evangelicalism and ecumenism. For this reason, it should not be considered as a separate third or fourth theological stream distinct from the others but rather as the entry of pentecostal spirituality and doctrine into all of them. Charismatics may be considered a subset of pentecostalism, insofar as they agree with the movement, or subsets of their parent traditions, insofar as they do not diverge from them. For example, J. R. Williams’s *Renewal Theology* (1988b; 1990; 1992) is the most developed charismatic systematic theology to date. On the subject of Holy Spirit baptism and speaking in tongues, he is more pentecostal than some classical pentecostals (Land, 1993, p. 27), but in other areas such as eschatology, he agrees more with his reformed background. His theology is thus a synthesis of two streams.

After the second wave was the eponymous third wave movement, also sometimes referred to as the neo-charismatic movement. Emerging in the 1980’s and largely associated with C. Peter Wagner and John Wimber, the founder of the Vineyard Christian Fellowship, it is typified as a charismatic movement among evangelicals who do not wish to be classified as part of the first two waves (Wagner, 2002, p. 1141). The major difference between the third wave and the previous movements is the decisive rejection of the distinctive pentecostal doctrine of subsequent Spirit baptism and its corollary, evidential tongues. The third wave holds to the evangelical view that understands Spirit baptism as part of regeneration, though as Wagner states, there is “expectation of multiple fillings of the Holy Spirit subsequent to the new birth, some of which may closely resemble what others call ‘baptism in the Holy Spirit.’” Third wave Christians accept all spiritual gifts in

ministry, including tongues, but would never suggest that every Christian should expect to receive a particular gift.

The third wave's status as an evangelical charismatic movement is questionable. Although its doctrine of spiritual gifts is ostensibly more acceptable to the reformed *ordo salutis*, the movement's history is characterized by greater levels of emotionalism and radicalism than contemporary pentecostalism (Macchia, 1996, p. 36), and much like early pentecostalism, it has resulted in the establishment of new, independent churches, networks, and denominations. As Vinson Synan says, "When a pentecostal sneezes, the Vineyard catches pneumonia." The movement's lasting influence on traditional evangelicalism is yet to be seen, but it is still highly significant: because of it, no major stream of Christianity remains untouched by the spiritual renewals of the twentieth century that began with pentecostalism.

2.2 Features of Classical Pentecostal Christology

The fourfold gospel is pentecostalism's *summa theologiae*. Dayton (1987) has shown in his study of the theological roots of the movement how the fourfold gospel's points evolved and coalesced to give birth to the movement. The strands of evangelistic revivalism, sanctification, healing, and premillennialism initially arose and developed relatively independently of one another during the nineteenth century. As noted earlier, it was a non-pentecostal holiness leader, A. B. Simpson, the founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, who was the first to bring them together and coin the term "fourfold gospel" in 1890 (Nienkirchen, 1992, p. 2). In many ways, Simpson's belief system foreshadowed that of the early pentecostals (Nienkirchen, 1992, pp. 52–72), most of whom came from holiness backgrounds. The early pentecostals adopted Simpson's term with the modification of distinguishing sanctification from Spirit baptism and assigning tongues as the definitive evidence of the latter experience. Many who joined the movement later dropped sanctification as a discrete crisis experience, but in general, the fourfold gospel may be considered the basic confession of faith of classical pentecostalism. The early pentecostal evangelist Aimee Semple McPherson even incorporated it into the name of the denomination she founded, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. McPherson and Cox (1969, p. 9) provide a useful summary of this symbol of faith, complete with proof texts:

Jesus saves us according to John 3:16. He baptizes us with the Holy Spirit according to Acts 2:4. He heals our bodies according to James 5:14-15. And Jesus Christ is coming again to receive us unto Himself according to I Thessalonians 4:16-17.

The fourfold gospel is the gospel of *Jesus* as savior, healer, sanctifier/baptizer, and coming king; it is a Christological statement. In some ways strangely prefiguring

features of Barth's theology, pentecostalism is thoroughly Christocentric in theology and practice:

The centrality of Christ for all *biblical* theology—and Pentecostal doctrine is nothing if not Bible-based—is expressed in the following thesis: *Every biblical doctrine has Christ as its focal point and radiates his light.* (MacDonald, 1988, p. 483, emphasis original)

This Christocentrism defies the perception of some that the movement is preoccupied with pneumatology. Although the movement's most distinctive feature is its doctrine of Spirit baptism, this as well as all of the other points of the fourfold gospel are mediated through Jesus Christ and based on his work. Pentecostalism successfully integrates its major beliefs into the theological locus of Christology. To do theology that is faithful to the character of the movement is largely to do Christology.

The Christocentric character of pentecostalism is seen most clearly in its greatest controversy, the “new issue” of oneness pentecostalism (Reed, 2002; Synan, 1971, pp. 153–163), which arose primarily among the two-stage baptistic pentecostals, especially the Assemblies of God. The theology of oneness is basically revived modalistic monarchianism. Its founders, in attempting to reconcile the baptismal formula of Matt. 28:19 with such texts as Acts 2:38, equated the name of Jesus with the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This led to a change in baptismal theology and ultimately an abandonment of Trinitarianism. In essence, according to oneness pentecostalism, Jesus *is* the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; distinctions depicted in the New Testament are more properly interpreted as distinctions between his human and divine natures and not indicators of plurality within the united godhead. The majority of pentecostals reject this view as erroneous, but it does illustrate a feature common to all branches of pentecostalism: Jesus Christ is given a very high place, sometimes to the neglect of the other persons of the Trinity. Oneness pentecostalism merely takes this inherent Christocentrism to an extreme but still logical conclusion.

Pentecostals also place great emphasis on the importance of the life of Jesus, including his experience of the Holy Spirit and supernatural power, as a model for Christian living. While their Christology is normally “from above,” stressing Christ's divinity almost to a docetic neglect of his humanity, pentecostals have, at the same time, uniquely emphasized Christ as the prototypical Spirit-filled human (Williams, 1988b, pp. 339–342). As James D. G. Dunn (1989, pp. 137–141) has noted, there are two phases to Jesus' relationship to the Spirit. The first was the period of his earthly life before his exaltation; in this phase, he was the “man of the Spirit,” the one anointed and empowered by the Holy Spirit. This phase itself has two aspects. One aspect of the Spirit's relationship to Christ during his earthly life was in connection

with his messianic vocation as the savior of the world; this aspect of the relationship is continuous from the annunciation to his crucifixion, which Moltmann (1990, pp. 73–94; 1992, pp. 60–65) elaborates. Pentecostals would agree with Moltmann (1990, p. 94) against liberal theology that this aspect of the relationship is not shared by Christians; it is unique to Christ as savior. The second aspect relates to his anointing and empowering by the Spirit for ministry from the time of his baptism forward (Luke 3:22, 4:1, 14, 18), which was not exclusively a function of his status as the divine Son of God. This anointing was unique in terms of its intensity—Jesus was given the Spirit “without measure” according to John 3:34—but not strictly unique in terms of kind or purpose. Williams (1988b, p. 339) writes:

We now emphasize that the ministry of Jesus, in terms of His preaching the Good News, healings, deliverance, and many miraculous deeds, flowed out of His anointing by the Holy Spirit. It would be a mistake, therefore, to assume that Jesus did such mighty works because He was the Son of God. Rather, it was His Spirit-anointed humanity and the power resting on that humanity that lay behind His ministry in word and deed.

Dunn (1975, pp. 87–88) draws similar conclusions that Jesus manifested a power and authority that was not intrinsic to his own person but an endowment from God, the Holy Spirit.

Pentecostals and charismatics take the implications of this further than Dunn, seeing Jesus as a prototype for their own experiences of the Spirit, a model to be imitated (MacDonald, 1988, pp. 486–488). Dunn (1989, p. 148) retreats somewhat from this conclusion by framing the Spirit’s empowerment of Jesus as uniquely eschatological, but this restriction does not hold up as Pentecost was also interpreted eschatologically (Acts 2:17–21). A favorite text of pentecostals is John 14:12, in which Jesus says that those who believe in him will do the same and even greater works than he did; this is interpreted to include the miracles, healings, and other supernatural gifts found in the ministry of Christ. Emil Brunner (1952, pp. 324–325), citing this text, concurs that it is his messianic consciousness, not the working of miracles, that separates Jesus’ experience from that of other human beings. Pentecostals do not limit the promise of this text to Christ’s immediate followers, the apostles, but extend it to all who believe, even those living today (Williams, 1988b, pp. 156–158; 1990, p. 376). The contemporary church should believe and expect to experience the same miraculous works as Jesus. Pentecostals are quick to add the constant reminder that these experiences do not come from one’s own power, virtue, or authority but are done in the name of Jesus, by his authority, and are a continuation of his work (John 14:13–14; cf. Dunn, 1975, pp. 194–195).

2.3 Ecumenical Meeting Points: Functional Spirit Christology from Below

The above discussion reveals potential meeting points between pentecostal Christology and contemporary ecumenical theology. The first is pentecostalism's richest theological construct, the fourfold gospel. Before connecting it to other modern theologies, its approach must first be compared with the methodology of traditional Christology. Traditionally, the locus of Christology is divided into two parts: "person" and "work." The study of the person of Christ involves metaphysical questions about his nature, while theories of the atonement are the primary, but not sole, focus of "work"; the extent of the atonement is also a major problem of "work" in reformed circles. This pattern mirrors the history of the development of Christian doctrine. Questions about the humanity and deity of Christ dominated the conciliar age, whereas serious attention was given to the meaning of atonement only from the time of Anselm onwards. As dogma, the person of Christ was given much greater priority as a test for orthodoxy. The great ecumenical creeds say much about the two natures and the one person of Christ, but the work of Christ is reduced to simple statements about his coming down from heaven and suffering and dying for the salvation of the human race. More elaborate statements about the atonement have no more binding authority than as debatable theories. Similarly, soteriology traditionally succeeds Christology as an application of the work of Christ; it was of course the central point of controversy during the reformation, continuing the theological mirroring of history. Hence, from the approach of systematics, the construction of Christology usually proceeds as follows:

1. Study of and decision about the natures and person of Christ, which leads to
2. study of and decision about the meaning of the atonement, which serves as the basis for
3. study of and decision about human reception of the benefits of the atonement, or salvation.

Because of perceived limitations and problems, both pentecostal and many contemporary ecumenical Christologies diverge from this traditional methodology. Examination of the methodological choices of these diverse Christologies and the concerns they seek to address is essential groundwork for constructing a dialogical Christology.

2.3.1 Functional Christology

Not all recent scholars have agreed with the priority of ontological Christology. Functional Christology, the first potential meeting point, is an approach most commonly associated with the so-called "biblical theology movement" of the mid-twentieth century. The proponents of functional Christology sought to understand

Christ primarily through his work; ontological questions were deemed less important or irrelevant. This was viewed as keeping with the overall perspective of the Bible, specifically in the difference between “Greek” and “Hebrew” mentalities; the former was oriented toward ontology, the latter toward action and relationship (Erickson, 1991, pp. 215–221). The New Testament, although written in Greek, had a Hebrew mind-set. On this basis, Oscar Cullmann (1963, pp. 3–4) was able to claim:

The New Testament hardly ever speaks of the person of Christ without at the same time speaking of his work... When it is asked in the New Testament “Who is Christ?”, the question never means exclusively, or even primarily, “What is his nature?”, but first of all, “What is his function?”

Even the question of the relationship between the Father and the Son was a functional question, not a “problem of nature” (p. 4). The development of ontological Christology in later church history was just that: a later development in church history. Cullmann (1963, p. 326) boldly concluded that, within the confines of the New Testament, “all mere speculation about [Christ’s] natures is an absurdity. Functional Christology is the only kind which exists.”

The views of the biblical theology movement did not win long-lasting acceptance. The publication of *The semantics of biblical language* by James Barr (1961) has been hailed widely as demolishing the movement’s foundation, namely the strict distinction between Greek and Hebrew mind-sets, and few today would defend a purely functional Christology based on this obsolete concept. As is the case with many new movements, the position of pure functionalism represents an extreme, and most now see the question of a functional Christology *versus* an ontological Christology as a false dilemma (Erickson, 1991, pp. 216, 234–236). Besides its weak biblical and linguistic foundations, a purely functional approach creates other theological problems. The danger is that soteriology can supplant Christology, and sight of the person of Christ is lost in pursuit of his benefits. Wolfhart Pannenberg (1977, pp. 47–49) saw this as the driving force behind the trends of modern Christology and criticized Tillich, Bultmann, and others for taking it:

Has one really spoken there about Jesus himself at all? Does it not perhaps rather involve projections onto Jesus’ figure of the human desire for salvation and deification... projections of the idea of perfect religiosity, of perfect morality, of pure personality, of radical trust? Do not the desires of men only become projected upon the figure of Jesus, personified in him? (Pannenberg, 1977, p. 47)

He maintained that Christology must retain priority over soteriology, else “faith in salvation itself loses any real foundation” (p. 48). In this respect, functional Christology can also be seen as an expedient way of avoiding embarrassing metaphysical issues (Schutter, 1979, pp. 83–85), a matter of pragmatism triumphing

over the theologian's responsibility to grapple with difficult questions in the pursuit of truth. Most theologians reject such utilitarianism; Catholic theologian Gerald O'Collins (1977, pp. 35–36) aptly summarized the position of the majority today:

Jesus' value and function for us demand that we examine and recognize his status at the level of his being. His saving work indicates both *who* he was and is—both in himself and in relationship to the Father. There can be no satisfactory account of what Jesus does if we dismiss as unimportant the question who he is. Every soteriological statement has its Christological implications. This point has won wide acceptance and in any case seems obvious enough. To go on insisting that one cannot pursue a functional approach without somehow taking an ontological stand looks like exhuming and beating a thoroughly dead horse.

Cullmann (1962, pp. 42–43) himself clarified that as a New Testament scholar, it was not his intent to negate Chalcedonian Christology, only to not subject “the texts of the New Testament to the questions raised by the later dogmas.” He affirmed that “the dogma formulated by this Council corresponds to what the Christology of the New Testament presupposes.”

Nevertheless, much can be gained from a functional approach to Christology, and a case can be made for loosening the link between the ontological and soteriological questions. The traditional understanding of the person and work of Christ is that God became human so that the perfect God-man could offer a perfect sacrifice that would satisfy God's justice and atone for humanity's sins. Jesus had to be fully God because only God can save the world (Williams, 1988b, pp. 325–327), and fully human because only a human can justly be punished for humanity's sins (Williams, 1988b, pp. 340–341). The work of Christ—the functional/soteriological question—is dependent upon the answer to the ontological questions raised by the person of Christ and derives its meaning from them. This approach has served the Christian faith well, and this researcher does not suggest abandoning its basic conclusions. However, it does present difficulties of its own. First, the dogmatic formulations of historic Christianity, such as the Chalcedonian definition, answer the ontological questions with greater certainty and precision than can be demonstrated from biblical theology. As Donald Guthrie (1981, p. 401) points out, the New Testament teaches both the humanity and the deity of Christ but does not show “any awareness of the tension of the two natures,” let alone provide a conceptual framework for understanding their interrelation. In this Cullmann was correct. Chalcedonian Christology represents a valiant and largely successful attempt at reconciling these biblical teachings, but any recognition of its validity must be tempered with awareness of its inherently speculative character. By comparison, soteriological statements about the functions of Christ can be made with much greater confidence. To say that the New Testament teaches that Jesus saves from sin and heals

the sick is incontrovertible; to maintain that it explicitly teaches Chalcedonian Christology is not.

Second, the traditional approach to Christology that prioritizes ontology results in a closed system that cannot easily and equally accommodate the New Testament's soteriological diversity; it trades dynamism and flexibility for stability. This can be seen in the conceptual tools used to arrive at an orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ, a famous example of which is the statement of Gregory of Nazianzus (1999), "That which He has not assumed He has not healed; but that which is united to His Godhead is also saved." Gregory was probably correct and Apollinarius definitely wrong as the New Testament does clearly teach the full humanity of Christ. As useful as this maxim is, however, it cannot make sense of all the biblical teachings about redemption, reconciliation, and transformation. According to Rom. 8:19–22, creation as a whole will be redeemed, but one cannot easily make the case that it was assumed within the human nature of Christ. Such an assertion is but a step or two removed from pantheism, which is hardly an orthodox position. A similar point can be made about the dominant satisfaction/penal substitution theory of the atonement that localizes Christ's work strictly in his death and understands it as the answer to the question of the incarnation (Anselm, 1926); more is said about this in the following chapter. The salvific mission of Christ has plural, not singular, purposes that should not be judged by filtering them through the relatively speculative criteria of ontological Christology. Accordingly, any Christological model that does not leave room for incorporating the diverse soteriological functions portrayed in the New Testament will be incomplete. Much of twentieth century dissatisfaction with Chalcedonian Christology derives from this (O'Collins, 1977, pp. 1–12).

Emil Brunner (1952, pp. 271–273), drawing inspiration from Melancthon's aphorism, "to know Christ is to know his benefits," adopted this sort of functional approach to Christology. He thought it better to follow the pattern of salvation history in which the benefits of Christ's salvific work are received and experienced before his person is known and understood. He rightly pointed out that in the earliest writings of Paul and the primitive church, unlike the Johannine Christology, far more statements are made about Christ's work than his person, and even in the fourth Gospel, the knowledge of Christ's person is meant to lead to knowledge of salvation (John 20:31; cf. Brunner, 1952, pp. 340–341). "Anything to do with metaphysical being and substance is the background, not the foreground, of the message of the New Testament," he wrote (p. 273). The church's historic concern with understanding the two natures of Christ and how they are united seeks answers to questions that simply go beyond what is humanly possible to comprehend (pp. 357–363). In conclusion, therefore, Brunner supported exploring Christ's work prior to pursuing the

metaphysical quest and did not recommend delving too deeply into the latter beyond simple, faithful acknowledgment of Jesus as truly God and truly man (p. 363).

The fourfold gospel of pentecostalism is clearly a functional Christology with a noticeable relaxing of the link between person and work. The theological undercurrents of the nineteenth century revival movements, delineated above, that coalesced in pentecostalism assumed orthodox Chalcedonian Christology. As with the reformers, it was not an issue of controversy (Hollenweger, 1972, p. 312), although it may be fairly said that in practice pentecostals have often almost docetically neglected the humanity of Christ. The soteriological innovations of the revivalists were not perceived as affecting the metaphysical questions; they were simply the recovering of lost or neglected functions of Christ. Alternative understandings of the atonement and changes or additions to soteriology do not necessarily demand changes in ontological Christology. Within the holiness and pentecostal movements, there is a great diversity in the interpretation of these functions of Christ but overall agreement regarding his person. The exception to this, of course, is the oneness branch of pentecostalism, which rejects Nicene Trinitarianism in favor of a modalistic monarchy of the Son. In this case, a soteriological innovation, specifically a changing of the traditional triune baptismal formula and a collapsing of the normally discrete stages of pentecostal soteriology into a conversion-initiation complex, ultimately led to a metaphysical change in the doctrine of God itself (Reed, 1975, p. 147). Even here, however, the basics of Chalcedonian Christology are preserved by retaining a form of the doctrine of the two natures (Reed, 2002, pp. 941–943). It must be noted that the doctrinal developments of this later movement were not a result of serious theological reflection but an overemphasis on the priority of the Son and an unnuanced misapprehension of certain biblical statements (Synan, 1971, pp. 153–158). The resulting sectarian soteriological exclusiveness of the oneness movement is not typical of mainstream pentecostalism.

The functional Christology of pentecostalism is one example of how the movement unconsciously anticipated later trends in ecumenical theology, specifically those of the biblical theology movement discussed above. Interestingly, while the latter's functional Christologies usually concentrated on Christ's biblical titles such as Messiah, Son of God, and Son of Man, the titles of the fourfold/fivefold gospel are all active verbal nouns, even more so than Brunner's (1952, pp. 272–274) exploration of the more traditional offices of prophet, priest, and king. The pentecostal titles indicate Christ's work in saving, sanctifying, baptizing, healing, and returning as eschatological king. Although several of these are not literally biblical titles, they capture more naturally the dynamism of Christ's activities in the New Testament than the more static traditional titles, which do seem more closely related to the

metaphysical questions. This sort of functional Christology can serve as a vehicle for a fuller ecumenical Christology by integrating new insights into the themes of Christ's mission and work without radically restructuring the doctrine of his person and natures. It provides a structure for exploration of the diverse aspects and meanings of salvation, thus avoiding the myopic composition fallacy—"this, and this only, is the key to understanding Jesus Christ"—all too common in contemporary Christologies. At the same time, this model avoids violating Ockham's razor; functions may be added to Christology without making its overall framework needlessly complex.

2.3.2 "From Below" Christology

The second meeting point between pentecostal and ecumenical Christologies flows naturally from the first: the methodological question of approaching Christology "from above" versus "from below." These concepts are most commonly applied to the ontological questions, but they also have a bearing on a functional Christology. Indeed, this issue within Christology points to the more fundamental methodological question of modern Christian theology, going back at least to Schleiermacher: does the task of theology begin with exploratory presuppositions about the divine and then move downward to address the human situation, or should it start with human experience and from there work upwards? Christology from above, the default pre-critical method used throughout most of church history, takes the former approach; it is "simply an interpretation of the New Testament confession of faith in Christ and an attempt to express it in precise philosophical and theological terms" (Kärkkäinen, 2003, p. 13). It presupposes the divinity of Christ and assumes knowledge of the purposes of God in him. The advent of biblical criticism and the quest for the historical Jesus saw the rise of Christology from below, a representative of the latter theological method. This inductive approach begins with historical investigation of the life and person of the man Jesus and historical faith-responses to him; Christological affirmations are the result of critical examination of the available data. Most contemporary theologians prefer Christology from below as both the best approach to the biblical texts and as the best means of relating Christology to human experience and need. Pannenberg (1977, pp. 33–37) has shown the limitations of the from above methodology, especially in its presupposition of that which it seeks to prove, the divinity of Christ. Pannenberg's Christology also demonstrates that a from below Christology is not necessarily a "low" Christology.

On the other hand, some important contemporary theologians have preferred the from above approach, citing the difficulty of bridging the gap between historical knowledge and present-day experience. The exalted Christ is no longer physically present with his people, and his ongoing activities are not open to historical or

scientific investigation. As the neo-orthodox theologians (Barth, 1956a, p. 320 (IV.1); Brunner, 1947, pp. 156–160) warned, attempts to know him “after the flesh” (κατὰ σάρκα, 2 Cor. 5:16), through historical certitude, will fail to grasp his significance. Speaking on the problem of historicity, Lessing (1956, p. 55) wrote, “What does it matter to me whether the legend is false or true? The fruits are excellent.” A Christology based on reconstruction of the historical Jesus is not necessarily a relevant Christology; many such scholarly endeavors have failed to have any significant impact on the life of the broader Christian church.

Pentecostal Christology is traditionally from above. The deity of Christ is accepted a priori and never questioned; indeed, the greatest controversy within classical pentecostalism, the new issue of oneness, involved whether or not there was any divinity *beyond* Christ in the distinct persons of the Trinity. In transferring the above versus below paradigms to the work of Christ, from above would also seem the most natural approach for a functional Christology that emphasizes Christ’s present work as ascended Lord. There is a sense, however, in which pentecostal Christology should very much be considered from below, particularly in light of what the fourfold gospel contains and what it lacks. As a creedal summation of pentecostal beliefs, it is thoroughly Christocentric, focusing on Jesus as the exalted, divine Son of God. It is, however, a very selective affirmation; as seen in the summary quoted above in §2.2, p. 28, it only contains the functions and titles of Christ that relate specifically to the soteriological experiences of believers. To twist a phrase of Barth’s, pentecostals speak about human beings by speaking about God in a loud voice. The titles of Jesus as savior, healer, and so forth refer not only generally to his messianic work but also specifically to how Jesus saves and heals an individual pentecostal personally. Even the last title, Jesus as coming king, refers to an anticipated future experience.

Notably absent are any functions or titles that do not somehow directly intersect with Christian experience. Pentecostal W. G. MacDonald (1988, p. 481) revealingly states:

The Christ of the Bible had to be experienced before he could really be understood. Direct holy experience with him is cherished above all extra-biblical formal configurations of the knowledge of him. [Not the creeds] but *present experience of the same Jesus* who traversed Galilee doing such wonderful things and rising from the dead, provides that transforming intimate knowledge of the Lord. (emphasis original)

The Bible makes reference to the activity of the Son or the Word in creation (e.g., John 1:1–3, Col. 1:16, Heb. 1:2), but “Jesus as creator” is not a title of the fourfold gospel. No mention is made of the more ontologically oriented titles such as Son of Man or Son of God. No special attention is given to the title of Jesus as Lord, though of course pentecostals confess him as such constantly. One must be cautious about

inferring too much from a slogan, which is essentially what the fourfold gospel is as a statement, but this trend is also apparent in the statements of faith of the early pentecostal associations (Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 513–522; McPherson & Cox, 1969, pp. 271–296). These devote a relatively large percentage of their affirmations to Christian experience; only in reacting to the oneness controversy did the Assemblies of God adopt a more substantial ontological statement about Christ and the Trinity (Carlson, 1977, pp. 124–125). It is highly significant that all the fourfold titles are somehow related to religious experience. In this respect, pentecostal Christology is human-oriented, and thus it is a form of Christology from below. Conscious recognition of this bias and more thorough application of from below methodology can help both with synthesizing prevailing trends in ecumenical Christology and in bringing out some neglected facets of the pentecostal functional Christology.

Once again, this approach is comparable to Brunner's. In *The mediator* (1947), cited above, his approach is essentially from above. In his later *Dogmatics* (1952), however, he adopted a more characteristically from below, functional approach: "The way to the knowledge of Jesus leads from the human Jesus to the Son of God and to the Godhead" (1952, p. 322). He began his Christological section with a study of the question of the historical Jesus and its implications for faith (pp. 239–259). He concluded that the end result of criticism was a portrait of Jesus very similar to that of the Synoptics, which the fourth Gospel did not fundamentally contradict (pp. 246–247). He then consciously applied an inductive approach to Christology, beginning with Christ's work then moving to his person (p. 271). Brunner contended that Christ was known through what he said and did (pp. 275ff.), and he explored his work through the functional vehicle of the traditional offices of prophet, priest, and king. Only after this did he address the ontological questions and that too with constant acknowledgment of the inherently speculative quality of overly precise statements about the nature of Christ (e.g. pp. 357–363). Brunner's work included an important reminder that the order of revelation, early church history, and individual Christian experience shows the way for dogmatics: from saving encounter with the Christ to confession of the eternal, pre-existent Son of God. Inversion of this natural order in theology, as occurs in from above Christology, distorts the meaning of faith as defined in the New Testament and thus moves Christianity away from its foundation (pp. 340–342). A tempered from below approach such as Brunner's is accordingly a good model for a responsible ecumenical pentecostal Christology.

One further matter related to the question of from above or from below is the question of sources (Kärkkäinen, 2003, pp. 13–14). From above Christology usually relies on John and Paul as they provide the clearest pictures of the exalted Christ worshipped and proclaimed by the early church. In contrast, from below Christology

looks toward the synoptic Gospels for a more accurate picture of the historical Jesus; John is deemed historically unreliable, and Paul did not know the earthly Jesus. As noted above, pentecostals have a very high Christology, and ontologically they rely heavily on the fourth Gospel for their understanding of the divine person of Christ. However, the aspects of pentecostal Christology under investigation in this study, the soteriological functions of Christ in the framework of the fourfold Gospel, depend more heavily on the synoptic Gospels and Acts for their more detailed accounts of the works of Jesus. In formulating their theology and practice, pentecostals rely upon narrative more than propositional theology. Indeed, a recurring tension between pentecostal and other protestant theologies is the former's prioritization of Luke-Acts over Paul. Although usually pentecostals do not consciously relate their Lucan preference to this particular methodological question, this common tendency further indicates the compatibility of the movement's thought with a from below approach to Christology.

2.3.3 Spirit Christology

The third meeting point is the place of the Holy Spirit in Christology, or Spirit Christology. In many recent works, theologians have made serious attempts at developing and resolving the issue of the relationship between Christ and the Spirit, a question that has long challenged Christian theology, including that of pentecostalism (Macchia, 1999, pp. 15–16). Spirit Christology is an attempt to answer this question in the framework of a broader Trinitarian or even “post-trinitarian” theology (Del Colle, 1993, pp. 95–96):

The most succinct definition of Spirit-Christology is that the Holy Spirit is attributed a constitutive role in the theological and soteriological reality that we identify as the person and work of Jesus Christ. By this I do not simply mean that the Holy Spirit bears witness to Christ or that the third person of the holy trinity has a role in the work of salvation. Rather I am insisting that who Jesus Christ is and the salvation that he brings proceeds from a basic and foundational pneumatological orientation.

Spirit Christology is a revived, rather than new, theology; traces of it can be seen in many ancient theologies, and the Eastern traditions have always maintained a strong pneumatological emphasis (Doss, 2005, pp. xxi-xxv). Normally, Spirit Christology refers to a type of ontological Christology and is compared and contrasted with *logos* Christology; a conservative Spirit Christology complements *logos* Christology, whereas more radical forms seek to replace it (Habets, 2003).

The perspective of Spirit Christology did not originate in pentecostalism (Del Colle, 1993, p. 95), nor can it be said that the movement has put great energies towards answering this question. Casual observers commonly assume that pentecostalism is primarily occupied theologically and experientially with the third

person of the Trinity; in actuality, this is not the case. Although pentecostals do give great attention to the experience of the Spirit, the movement is inherently Christocentric, even Christomonistic. This point cannot be stressed enough; recognition of this inherent Christocentrism is vital to understanding the movement as a whole. Whenever pentecostal leaders and theologians seek to formally articulate their faith, for example in the dialogue with the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, the centrality of Christ in pentecostal belief is always stressed (“Word and Spirit, church and world”, 2001, p. 48 ¶17). This Christocentrism is also evident in less formal expressions such as music, preaching, and even church decoration; the words “Jesus is Lord” emblazon the front of many pentecostal sanctuaries.

As shown above, the fourfold or fivefold gospel serves as the organizing structure for pentecostal devotion and practice and serves as the movement’s *summa theologiae*. In this framework, Jesus is the subject and performer of all soteriological functions; the Holy Spirit is mentioned directly only in one point, that as the medium of Jesus’ ministry of baptism. Christ therefore becomes the mediator of the Spirit rather than the reverse. Despite claims by some pentecostals to a greater experiential knowledge of the Spirit, the problem of understanding his⁴ person, work, and relationship to Christ remains as great a theological problem as it does for other branches of the Christian church. Indeed, one piercing complaint against the broader pentecostal-charismatic renewal movement is that it has failed to produce a new systematic theology recast from the perspective of a thoroughgoing pneumatology, instead merely adding a charismatic slant to some of the traditional loci (Macchia, 1994, pp. 298, 303–304; Isley, 1994). Interestingly, the oneness branch of pentecostalism has resolved the question of the relationship between Christ and the Spirit (Dayton, 1987, p. 19), but its solution—eliminating ontological distinctions between the Son and the Spirit through modalism (Reed, 2002, pp. 941–942)—is not acceptable for a Trinitarian theology.

Beyond metaphysical applications, the concept of Spirit Christology also has utility within the framework of a functional, soteriologically oriented Christology. As Dunn (1989, pp. 148–149) has noted, there are two phases to the relationship of Christ and the Spirit. The first phase of the relationship, touched upon briefly above in §2.2, pp. 29–30, was during the life and ministry of Christ. Christ was the human being perfectly endowed with and empowered by the Spirit. Because his status as God’s Son

⁴The researcher has chosen to retain masculine pronouns in reference to the Spirit in keeping with pentecostal tradition and in order to emphasize the Spirit’s personhood. Theologians such as the Moltmanns (Moltmann-Wendel & Moltmann, 1983, pp. 100–104; Moltmann, 1990, pp. 83–87) have made a compelling case for understanding the Spirit as feminine. There is not, however, a consensus about this even among feminist theologians (McFague, 1996). The fuller exploration this matter deserves lies outside the scope of this work.

is unique, his experience of the Spirit is not completely analogous to that of Christian believers, but it still is meant to serve as a prototype for Christians' experience of the fullness of the Spirit. After Christ's resurrection and exaltation, his relationship with the Spirit changed. In this phase, he is not the one through whom the Spirit works but the one who now bestows the Spirit (Dunn, 1989, pp. 141–143). The one through whom the Spirit worked is now the one who sends the Spirit to work through, in, and for other human beings. It is this second phase that concerns this present study.

As noted above, from the perspective of the pentecostal fourfold gospel, Christ is the subject and actor at the center of all religious affirmation and expression; he is the mediator of the Spirit's presence and work. From the perspective of an inductive, from below theology it must be asked whether or not this is the best or most appropriate way of communicating the dynamics of the experience of faith. Relevant to this question is the biblical dialectic of the post-ascension real presence and absence of Christ in the individual Christian, the church as a whole, and the world. On the one hand, in texts such as Matt. 28:20b, 18:20, and Acts 18:10, Christ assures his followers of his constant presence and guidance. Paul affirms this repeatedly through the use of phrases such as "Christ in you" and statements about the status of believers "in Christ." "Do you not realize this about yourselves, that Jesus Christ is in you?" he asks in 2 Cor. 13:5. Somehow, Christ is spiritually united with believers in a permanent way, and his presence is a reality in their lives.

On the other hand, however else it may be interpreted, the ascension represents a real parting of the man Jesus Christ from his disciples; he is no longer with them the way he was previously. In this sense, there is a real absence. Paul himself acknowledges this in statements of longing for the *parousia* of Christ and in his desire to "depart" and be with him (2 Cor. 5:1–10, Phil. 1:21–23). Particularly relevant is the eucharistic text of 1 Cor. 11:26. Although not all theological traditions agree with this, the eucharist tacitly acknowledges Christ's absence by looking forward to his coming. However Christ is understood as present in the memorial meal, it is not his full presence, the realization of which is eschatological; otherwise, the cry of longing, "Maranatha!" (1 Cor. 16:22; cf. Rev. 22:20) is without meaning. The early church was obviously aware of this tension between Christ's presence and absence as the fourth Gospel presents a more advanced synthesis: Christ has physically departed, but he has sent the Holy Spirit as another *παράκλητος* like himself to be forever present with his people (John 14:16) and continue his work. Christ, the revealer of God on earth, is revealed and made known after his glorification by the Spirit (14:26, 15:26, 16:13–15; cf. 7:39, 20:17, 22). First John 3:24 summarizes the Johannine synthesis, "Whoever keeps his [Jesus'] commandments abides in him, and he in them. And by this we know that he abides in us, by the Spirit whom he has given us."

Dunn (1989, p. 146), summarizing Paul's understanding, states that it is "abundantly clear that for Paul *no distinction can be detected in the believer's experience between exalted Christ and Spirit of God*" (emphasis original). This conclusion can probably be safely extrapolated to cover the rest of New Testament Christianity, including the Johannine literature, apart from extraordinary occurrences such as Acts 7:55 and 9:3–6, which are in any case not "from below" experiences. Catholic charismatic Del Colle (1993, pp. 103–105) differs, arguing that distinction between the *Christus praesens* and the *Spiritus praesens* in Christian experience is both possible and necessary if one is to avoid a "post-trinitarian" Spirit Christology. What can be more safely concluded is that both the *Christus praesens* and the *Spiritus praesens* coinhere within Christian experience, but to try to split them out into strict categories as Del Colle (1993, pp. 104, 107–108) does is overstating both the biblical evidence and the capabilities of Christian discernment. Certain knowledge of the *Christus praesens* is eschatological. Dunn (1989, pp. 146–147), still speaking from the perspective of Pauline theology, provides further nuance to his conclusion:

[F]or Paul *the Spirit of Christ means the Spirit of Christ past and present...* The exalted Christ and the spirit of God are one and the same so far as the believer's experience is concerned; when attempting to speak of his experience of grace or power Paul evidently could make no distinction between God (as Spirit), Spirit (of Christ) and Christ. ...[But] in Paul's understanding *the exalted Christ is not merely synonymous with the Spirit*, has not been wholly absorbed as it were by the Spirit, so that "exalted Christ" becomes merely a phrase to describe the Spirit (as a phrase like "in Christ" could suggest). The exalted Christ has for Paul a real existence in relation to God; the equivalence between Spirit and Christ is only a function of the believer's limited perception. (emphasis original)

Against Del Colle, a Spirit Christology such as Dunn (1989, pp. 160–161) perceives does not lead away from but towards the Trinity (Dunn, 1989, p. 149).

To return to systematics from this foray into biblical theology, a moderate Spirit Christology does not seek to supplant the Trinity but is ultimately a more thorough application of the doctrine of *perichoresis* to the relationship of the Son and the Holy Spirit (Del Colle, 1993, p. 105). Among contemporary ecumenical theologians, Jürgen Moltmann has done much to revive this ancient concept, touching on it in most of his systematic works. He defines *perichoresis* thusly:

An eternal life process takes place in the triune God through the exchange of energies. The Father exists in the Son, the Son in the Father, and both of them in the Spirit, just as the Spirit exists in both the Father and the Son. By virtue of their eternal love they live in one another to such an extent, and dwell in one another to such an extent, that they are one. (Moltmann, 1981, pp. 174–175)

Once again, *perichoresis* is a concept mostly applied to the ontological aspect of the

intra-trinitarian relationships, but it also has implications for a functional Spirit Christology. If the persons of the Trinity, through their love, so thoroughly interpenetrate one another so as to be utterly indivisible, it logically follows that this unity carries on to their work as well. In speaking of the work of Christ, it is impossible to speak of his work alone without discussing the work of the Father and of the Spirit. Much attention has been given to the relationship between the Father and the Son in both ontological and functional Christology but less to that of the Son and the Spirit. Pentecostals can learn—and are learning—much from Moltmann in this area.

A functional Spirit Christology should redress this neglect of the Spirit's work. Salvation is the work of Christ, but the work of the Spirit coinheres with that salvation. The pentecostal fourfold gospel effectively explores the different dimensions of the present experience of salvation that Christ brings, but it should do more to emphasize the work of the Spirit as it relates to each of those dimensions. Indeed, in light of the discussion above about the paradox of the presence of Christ and the Spirit, the work of the Spirit should be more readily discernible in Christian experience. Jesus saves, but the Spirit regenerates (Titus 3:5). Jesus heals, but the Spirit gives gifts of healings (1 Cor. 12:9). Jesus baptizes and fills believers with the Spirit so that the Spirit may enable them to continue the work of Jesus (Acts 1:8). Christians long for the Lord's return, and the Spirit longs with them (Rom. 8:23ff.) Pentecostals should be at the forefront of explicating this reciprocity within the salvific work of God and the potentialities of Spirit Christology.

It must be noted at this point that a pentecostal Spirit Christology has palpable limits, namely with regard to the operation of the Spirit in the world outside of the Christian church and the witness of its people. It is allowable to probe Christ's work through the Spirit's, as this study intends, and still be considered genuinely pentecostal. However, while study of the Spirit may begin the theological exercise, it cannot end it. For pentecostals, the terminating point must always be Christ. The tension present here is best illustrated by an exchange between Harvey Cox and charismatic theologian J. Rodman Williams at Regent University on April 24, 1995, at a lecture the researcher attended. Cox spoke on pentecostalism as a recovery of primal spirituality, a major theme from his new work, *Fire from heaven* (1995), which draws parallels between the movement and other religious expressions such as Korean shamanism. In his response, Williams questioned Cox about his lack of mention of Jesus Christ in discussing the work of the Spirit. Cox rejoined by raising the issue of the *filioque*. In one sense, his rejoinder was a deflection of Williams's pointed criticism—Williams's question was not really about the *filioque*, which he rejects (Williams, 1990, p. 153), but Christian particularism—but in another, it highlighted

the central theological issue perfectly. For pentecostals, the ministry of the Spirit proceeds from the Father as well as the Son; his work is limited to those tasks that Jesus mentioned in John 14–16 and as described in the rest of the New Testament.

As conservative and soteriologically exclusivist Christians, pentecostals generally do not accept that the Spirit is active among non-Christians in any way other than the evangelistic ministry of calling and conviction (John 16:8-11); Assemblies of God theologian Amos Yong is a notable exception (Olson, 2006). For this reason, pentecostals have criticized much of the agenda of the Canberra assembly of the WCC in 1991, which chose as its theme, “Come, Holy Spirit,” as well as pneumatologies such as Moltmann’s (1992) in which the Holy Spirit is perceived to be recast as an immanent world-spirit less personal than is biblically justifiable (Chan, 1994, pp. 38–40; Stibbe, 1994, pp. 12–16). Moltmann (1994, p. 60) has responded that he is simply balancing out the opposite extremes of the ever-influential Barth, in whose shadow every German theologian works. Part of the tension here arises from the thematic disagreement between conservatives and non-conservatives over salvation as personal and individualistic versus salvation as social and holistic. The former could sometimes be considered guilty of neglecting biblical statements from Gen. 1:2 onwards that express the unqualified universal presence of the Spirit of God; if so, the latter may be equally guilty of using such statements to support too much. There is, in all likelihood, a happy place of meeting between the two extremes, but this will remain a sensitive issue in dialogues between pentecostal and ecumenical theologies.

In conclusion, a truly pentecostal Christology, drawing on both the movement’s history and potential, is a functional Spirit Christology. Functionalism is the essential character of the movement’s traditional symbol of faith, the fourfold or fivefold gospel of Jesus as savior, healer, sanctifier, baptizer with the Holy Spirit, and coming king. All of these functions are related to the present and future experiences of Christian believers; even though pentecostalism has a tendency towards Christocentrism, its interpretation of the gospel of Jesus Christ is strongly human-oriented. Accordingly, the from below approach is appropriate for a pentecostal Christology, particularly as it engages mainline theologies for which this is the normal methodology. This exploration of the work of Christ also uses the concept of Spirit Christology as a tool for reversing the backward mediation in pentecostal and other theologies where the Spirit is known only through Christ and his work. A genuinely pentecostal Christology should have a strong pneumatic flavor that acknowledges the *perichoresis* of the Trinity, which should permeate all aspects of Christian theology. The fourfold gospel of pentecostalism is also called the full gospel. Pentecostals believe that it is only when all its points are included that the gospel, the message of salvation, is fully preached. In parallel, ecumenical theologies have also explored what

full salvation means, including but not limited to the social, economic, and political dimensions. Synthesis of the two can expand the definition of what the full gospel and full salvation mean and lead to what Walter Kasper (1976, pp. 20–21) calls a “universally responsible Christology.”

CHAPTER 3

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL OF THE SAVIOR

3.1 Jesus as Savior: The Gospel of Full Salvation

All of the fourfold gospel may be summarized by the title of Jesus as savior; it is the gospel of full salvation. As savior, Jesus justifies, saving sinners from the penalty of sin. As sanctifier, he cleanses believers from the presence and power of sin. As baptizer, he empowers believers to bring salvation to others. As healer, he saves from sickness, and as coming king, he saves forever. As noted in §2.1.3.1, this expression serves as the theological foundation of all the major branches of pentecostalism. In the fourfold gospel, Christology and soteriology converge; the message is not primarily salvation or sanctification or healing but Jesus Christ, the one who brings these benefits to those who believe. Christ is the subject and center of pentecostal faith, and the themes of the gospel have no existence or meaning outside of their relation to the center (Vondey, 2001, pp. 33–34). In other words, the titles of Christ depict his various functions as the one Lord and savior.

The order of the titles in the fourfold gospel varies somewhat from group to group, usually in deference to the group's interpretation of the function of sanctification. In the original holiness pentecostal branch, the full gospel is actually fivefold; Jesus is savior, sanctifier, baptizer, healer, and coming king. Non-methodistic or "baptistic" pentecostals merge savior and sanctifier, whereas non-pentecostal holiness groups, not treated here, equate sanctifier and baptizer. Oneness pentecostalism, also not treated here in main, collapses the three crises of salvation into one, producing a threefold gospel. As the term "fourfold gospel" is by far the best-known expression due to the numerical superiority of the baptistic branch of pentecostalism, it is the term used in this study, though all five functions are addressed. The functions are examined in the order of savior, healer, baptizer, and coming king, with sanctifier discussed at the end of the chapter as an epilogue, both because of the controversy of the doctrine within pentecostalism itself and because of value of the doctrine of sanctification as a recapitulation of all dimensions of salvation. The order used here is also intended to provide a logical structure for understanding the progress of the experience of the Christ's work and to facilitate synthesis with ecumenical views.

3.1.1 Justification: Solidarity with the Reformation

Justification by faith is, of course, the distinctive and central doctrine of protestantism. Martin Luther called it “the article by which the church stands or falls”; protestants see it as the heart of the Christian message of salvation. Ever since the Reformation, it has figured prominently in all protestant theologies. The neo-orthodox theologians gave it much attention, and it is a prime issue in the ecumenical movement. Emil Brunner (1962, p. 191) concurred with Luther’s judgment, pronouncing the Pauline doctrine of justification “the true centre and climax of the Christian message” and the one doctrine distinguishing Christianity the most from other religions (p. 206). Rudolf Bultmann (1958, p. 84) saw his program of demythologization as “the radical application of the doctrine of justification by faith to the sphere of knowledge and thought.” A very important development for ecumenical theology was the signing in 1999 of the *Joint declaration on the doctrine of justification* by the Lutheran World Federation and Roman Catholic Church in which both ecclesiastical bodies acknowledged common ground in their understanding of the doctrine. Not surprisingly in such an endeavor, there have been voices of objection and dissent (Dorman, 2001), but by any estimation, it represents a monumental step towards the resolution of a major doctrinal controversy and greater Christian unity. The evangelical movement likewise prioritizes justification by faith (Runia, 1997); indeed, along with the authority of the Scriptures, it is the greatest uniter of the various conservative streams.

The pentecostal tradition stands in agreement with these streams. When pentecostals speak of salvation, it refers first to personal experience of justification coupled with regeneration and adoption (Arrington, 1993, pp. 210–227; Pecota, 1995, pp. 364–368), although of these three dimensions, regeneration probably receives the most attention (Macchia, 2003a, pp. 133–134). As it specifically relates to justification, pentecostals have little to contribute to ecumenical discussions in terms of formal theology. This is deliberate, for pentecostals view themselves in continuity with the Reformation, if not with classical reformed theology. In other words, they see themselves as theological and spiritual heirs of Luther (Synan, 1981, p. 39), if not Calvin. Pentecostal soteriology is definitely protestant, affirming the Reformation’s central message of *sola fide* and *sola gratia*. While this was not always evident in the writings of the early movement (e.g., Seymour, 2000, pp. 65–80), the official articles of faith of major pentecostal denominations such as the Assemblies of God (Carlson, 1977, p. 126 §5) and the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel (McPherson & Cox, 1969, pp. 275–277, §IV. & §V.) include language clearly affirming these central teachings of the Reformation. Most pentecostals accept the penal substitution

theory of the atonement as the most biblically correct (Pecota, 1995, pp. 342–343), which in turn colors all of their soteriology. In these aspects, mainstream pentecostal theologies differ little from conservative evangelical ones.

Where pentecostalism differs most from both mainstream evangelical and ecumenical reformed theologies is in the Arminian character of its soteriology. Except for an understanding of depravity, if not inability, that approximates the reformed (Hollenweger, 1972, p. 319), pentecostals as a whole deny the other four points of classical Calvinism. A representative example of pentecostal soteriology is Daniel B. Pecota's (1995) chapter in the systematic theology textbook published by the Assemblies of God, a major denomination that is sometimes erroneously referred to as "reformed pentecostal." Consistent with the common practice of broader modern revivalism, pentecostals rarely if ever preach or teach election and predestination, and when discussed theologically, these concepts are subordinated to God's foreknowledge of human response to his invitation of grace (pp. 355–359). Pentecostals vehemently reject the doctrine of limited atonement (pp. 351–354); the invitation of grace is for all but may be resisted (pp. 359–361). Eternal security or perseverance is not absolutely guaranteed (pp. 368–372), though pentecostals have various ideas about when and how salvation may be lost. What must be recognized, as pentecostals firmly protest, is that their theology is Arminian but not Pelagian (Land, 1993, p. 221). Faith and grace, not human works, are emphasized; the only cooperation humans offer in God's work of salvation is by way of response. A case can be made for leveling charges of Pelagianism at features of some pentecostals' practices and piety after justification but not towards their teaching of the beginnings of salvation and the entry into grace. For instance, no major branch besides the non-trinitarian oneness grouping (Boyd, 1992, pp. 131–146; Reed, 2002, pp. 943–944) holds water baptism, Spirit baptism, or speaking in tongues as absolute preconditions of salvation. Pentecostals contend that Calvinism does not have a monopoly on protestantism and that their Arminian gospel is a genuinely Christian gospel. In the doctrine of salvation, therefore, there is more agreement than disagreement with the major protestant traditions.

Related to justification, there are two questions by which pentecostalism challenges and is challenged by ecumenical theology. The first concerns the language and expression of justification: how is saving grace experienced? This, as will be shown, is a superficial difference of form, not essence, and is accordingly a difference rather than a real disagreement. The second question represents a more serious soteriological problem: what happens after justification? Justification is not the end of salvation, which biblically embraces the entire human person, even all of creation (Rom. 8:19–22). What happens to those who are justified, and to what extent and

dimensions does the saving work of Christ affect their lives and the world around them? Pentecostals answer this question with the doctrine of subsequence, which holds that there are distinct stages to the normal Christian life. It is this doctrine, even more than the movement's general Arminianism, that draws the most criticism from non-pentecostals.

3.1.2 The Language of Salvation: Revivalism and Existentialism

Pentecostalism communicates the message of salvation in revivalistic terms; it is variously described as “getting saved,” “accepting Jesus,” “making a decision for Christ,” or “getting right with God.” Most commonly, it is seen as regeneration, the entrance into a new life. Salvation as regeneration is often portrayed in highly dramatic language:

We believe that the change which takes place in the heart and life at conversion is a very real one; that the sinner is then born again in such a glorious and transforming manner that old things are passed away and all things are become new; insomuch that the things once most desired are now abhorred, Whilst [*sic*] the things once abhorred are now held most sacred and dear; and that now having had imputed to him the righteousness of the Redeemer and having received of the Spirit of Christ,⁵ new desires, new aspirations, new interests, and a new perspective of life, time, and eternity, fills the blood-washed heart so that this desire is now to openly confess and serve the Master, seeking ever those things which are above. (McPherson & Cox, 1969, p. 278 §VII.)

The new birth is an individualistic, deeply personal experience, consciously sought and received. It occurs in a moment when faith is placed in Jesus' atoning work, often in the context of an altar call and a public profession of faith in keeping with revivalist tradition. This expectation of salvation as a crisis experience is by no means exclusive to pentecostalism. Theologically, evangelicalism and pentecostalism stand on different positions on the Calvinist-Arminian continuum, but in practice, there is great similarity between the two movements in this area. Both originated in American revivalism, in which persuasive evangelism and personal decision figure prominently, regardless of theological perspective. One of the textbook characteristics of a neo-evangelical—a term usually defined so as to include pentecostals and exclude fundamentalists—is not having problems with Billy Graham, the epitome of the modern evangelistic altar call (Synan, 2002c, p. 658).

One area of contrast is in the emotion and exuberance of the pentecostal call to salvation. Besides contributing sociological factors, there is a motivating goal behind such fervency, the assurance of the reality of the experience of the new birth. That

⁵According to this statement of faith, the initial reception of the Spirit occurs at regeneration, not Spirit baptism. Many similar statements by other pentecostal groups can be easily found. This refutes the common charge that pentecostals do not believe non-pentecostals have received the Spirit.

one's sins are forgiven is not be merely objectively believed but subjectively known. Salvation is not only a transaction carried out in heaven but must be manifested in a believer's life. If evidence of a transformed life is not forthcoming, a person is judged as not genuinely born again (Arrington, 1993, pp. 218–219). Consequently, preachers and their respondents put extra effort into making sure they “get it right.” As not all Christian traditions place as great an emphasis on outward religious expression, this has sometimes had the unfortunate result of pentecostals not acknowledging God's salvific work among other churches (Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 317–318). Time brings moderation to all new movements, and salvation experiences in the following generations are generally less dramatic than in the initial revival.

More cerebral Christian traditions are typified as playing down or even disdaining the enthusiasm of revivalism and the interpretation of justification-regeneration as a crisis experience. Yet, many of the great theologians of the Enlightenment age and beyond emphasized and even sought that aspect of salvation. The language is different, more intellectual, and often the concept is expressed in existential terms. Gotthold Lessing (1956, p. 55) powerfully laid out the problem of the “ugly, broad ditch” of history separating contemporary human beings from immediate experience of biblical facts. Søren Kierkegaard saw the solution to this problem in an existential “leap of faith” that transcended reason as well as the ditch (Erickson, 1991, p. 126). Kierkegaard's ideas greatly influenced the later neo-orthodox theologians. Brunner (1943) wrote on the objectivity and subjectivity of faith and salvation as the divine-human encounter. This area of concern is particularly evident in the earlier stage of Barth's theology. Commenting on the evangelistically important verses of Romans 10:9–11, he stated:

Set unobservably over against the place where the Church stands with all its possibilities, we encounter—as the impossible possibility of all possibilities, as the abyss into which no man can leap, and yet into which we do all leap—these three: the Lord, Resurrection, and Faith. (Barth, 1933, p. 381)

The result of this leap is an encounter with Jesus Christ himself. Faith in this regard is concerned only with commitment to him and reception of the freedom he gives, without reference to creed, dogma, or even the Bible itself (Barth, 1956a, pp. 759–761 (CD IV.1)). Real saving faith is relational and experiential and not primarily cognitive. With this assessment most pentecostals would have no disagreement.

Bultmann (1984) took this existential perspective further with the understanding of salvation as entrance into “authentic existence,” a concept he borrowed from Martin Heidegger. Inauthentic existence is the life outside of faith, the life encumbered by “the flesh,” which is not the physical body but sin, the pride of achievement, the cares of the world and all that is transient within it (pp. 15–17). A

“genuine human life,” on the other hand, is “life ‘according to the Spirit’ or life ‘in faith’” (p. 17). This life comes about through the grace of God, which is appropriated by faith. Faith itself is a personal decision, something that individuals resolutely choose (p. 20), and requires “radical submission to God” (p. 18). The grace received results in the forgiveness of sin, freeing human beings from their pasts and radically orienting them to the future existence of and with God. The new birth is thus an eschatological new creation (pp. 17–19).

Bultmann’s conception of authentic existence is heavily contextualized, a reflection of and response to the prevailing spirit of the modern era in which he lived. Although he focused much attention on the role of human action and decision (cf. Williams, 1965, pp. 156–157), ultimately the entry into authentic existence was the act of God alone through Christ (Bultmann, 1984, pp. 21–32). In this, his message was authentically a Christian one, not merely philosophical, and his gospel protestant. Despite the intense criticism Bultmann receives in conservative circles, there is much in his thought that resonates with the pentecostal perception of life and salvation. The passages of *New Testament and mythology* referenced in the previous paragraph are a beautiful interpretation of the new birth and could be read without hesitation from a pentecostal pulpit; they would receive a hearty “Amen!” in response as long as the author was not identified. The experiential faith of pentecostalism can draw much support from this surprising source, and its theology can be enriched through dialogue with the thought of Bultmann and other modern theologians. All these expressions such as encounter with God, making a decision, the new birth, entry into authentic existence, entry into grace, and so forth, essentially describe the same salvific work of God. Each expression is appropriate for and makes sense of different contexts, and each brings out a different aspect of New Testament salvation.

On a final note, salvation in pentecostalism is stereotypically emotional while neo-orthodoxy is more intellectual, but between the two there is agreement: the experience is what counts. In this the two streams differ from evangelicalism, which is actually the more rationalistic theology in this area. As noted above, in evangelicalism justification may well occur through an experience of emotional conversion, just as it commonly does in pentecostalism. However, theologically, this stream places special emphasis on the instrumentality of the Word of God in salvation (1 Pet. 1:23–25), which is identical to the Scriptures (“The Chicago statement on biblical inerrancy”, 1978). Accordingly, the Bible is given a prominent place in the evangelical message of salvation, and biblical apologetics feature strongly in the movement’s evangelistic practices. Justification is by faith, trust in the person and work of Christ, but existential involvement is secondary to rational acceptance of biblical facts (cf. Brunner, 1952, pp. 341–342). In evangelical theologies that lean towards

fundamentalism, the idea of a “leap of faith” is often rejected and dismissed as irrational fideism. “God never calls on a person to make a blind leap of faith,” writes apologist Norman L. Geisler (1979, p. 338; cf. Habermas, 1991). Since the Bible is inerrant, it provides a watertight base for belief, leaving no room for doubt, only ignorance. Doubt is a moral problem, not an intellectual one, and ignorance can be removed through further Bible study. Taken to extreme, this view ironically twists the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ alone into justification by knowledge; a clear illustration of this is the fundamentalist tendency to view “liberal” Christians who do not assent to inerrancy as not really Christian or saved (Brunner, 1952, pp. 369–371). This view must be rejected; after all, Bultmann’s work was itself a type of apologetics, and belief in inerrancy is itself a form of fideism contingent upon the arrival of the final harmonization (e.g., Lindsell, 1976, pp. 181–183; cf. Bauman, 1986, pp. 322–324). Pentecostals may disagree with the presuppositions of more liberal traditions, but they can appreciate all attempts to communicate the message of the gospel as a real and personal experience that demands a super-rational faith (Bultmann, 1984, p. 42).

3.1.3 Subsequence: Conflict with the Protestant Majority

Where pentecostalism differs most strongly with traditional protestant theology—and far less so with Roman Catholicism and the Eastern traditions—is in the doctrine of subsequence, the claim of normative and identifiable crisis experiences occurring after justification. Pentecostals see themselves as heirs of Luther and the Reformation, but the restoration of the full, biblical gospel was not completed with the recovery of justification by faith. The second reformation came through Wesley with the recovery of the doctrine of entire sanctification or “Christian perfection.” The pentecostal movement is the third reformation, the recovery of the baptism in the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues and the reclamation of the supernatural gifts of the Spirit (Synan, 1981, pp. 39–40). Just as these reformations succeeded one another in Christian history, so these experiences are to follow one another in the life of every Christian. Salvation begins, not ends, with justification; sanctification, Spirit baptism, and expressions of spiritual gifts should normatively follow. These experiences may be separated by a lengthy period of time, so different Christians may find themselves at different places or stages in the order of salvation. For pentecostals, this series of stages is a good thing; the grace of God in Christ does not provide just the singular blessing of justification, the forgiveness of sins, but second, third, and sometimes even other blessings, each of which should be experienced just as vitally as the first (Land, 1993, pp. 117–119).

3.1.3.1 *The Charge of “Spiritual Elitism”*

The doctrine of subsequence draws immediate criticism from theologies of the reformed and Lutheran persuasions to both the left and right of pentecostalism. Besides specific criticisms of the pentecostal doctrines of sanctification and Spirit baptism that will be addressed later, non-pentecostals commonly raise two principled and related objections to the concept of subsequence in general. One involves theological defense of the supremacy of justification; the other expresses pastoral concerns about spiritual elitism. These concerns will be addressed in tandem.

“Spiritual elitism” is a ubiquitous concern raised in discussions of pentecostal subsequence (e.g., Dunn, 1996, p. 111), whether it be with regard to Spirit baptism or Wesleyan sanctification. Subsequence is perceived as suggesting different categories or levels of Christians, some higher than others. If second-blessing sanctification subsequent to justification is claimed by some, the implication is that they are sanctified Christians and others are not. Similarly, subsequent Spirit baptism implies that some are filled with and empowered by the Spirit and others are not. Non-Pentecostals are disturbed by insinuations that there is some deficiency in their lives as Christians, to say nothing of the faith of the Christian church as a whole prior to 1901. Pentecostals have largely accepted the validity of this perception, and much effort is expended in dialogue with other traditions in assuring that elitism is not their intention.

Rather than automatically moving to eliminate all discomforts arising from this subject, it would behoove all parties concerned to seek greater understanding of this charge and its ramifications. Spiritual elitism is one matter; the identification and rectification of deficiencies is another. Much of Christian preaching, teaching, and dialogue involves the recognition and correction of deficiencies in one’s self and one’s hearers. The pursuit of holiness and entire sanctification did not originate in a desire to be better than others or form an exclusive coterie of spiritual elite but to be better than one’s own present condition. Similarly, the doctrine of Holy Spirit baptism with the evidence of speaking in tongues arose from the recognition by contemporary believers that they personally lacked something the first Christians had. Pentecostals by no means have had a monopoly on the discovery of biblical teachings that demand personal correction. Liberation theologians have done Christianity a great service by recovering the biblical teaching of God’s preferential option for the poor and prophetically calling the church to do better in areas where it has been lacking. Karl Barth sought to correct theologies that instead of God were simply talking about humanity “in a loud voice.” Jesus himself told one that he loved, “You lack one thing” (Mark 10:21). This is why recognition of the value of different theological systems is

so important. The purpose of dialogue is not for victory over the other, leading to theological homogenization, but for mutual edification and correction. Without openness to the possibility that deficiencies in one's own positions may be revealed, one cannot enter dialogue with sincerity.

3.1.3.2 *Subsequence as a Defense of Justification by Faith*

There is a perennial anxiety in some circles of protestant theology that any expanded understanding of salvation, whether it be in the area of sanctification or subsequent Spirit baptism, will undermine the doctrine of justification by faith alone and threaten to roll back the Reformation (e.g., Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 328–330). Often overlooked, however, is the role that subsequence can serve in the defense of the integrity of the doctrine and experience of justification. There are those, pentecostal and non-pentecostal, who are eager to collapse the different experiences promoted by pentecostals as subsequent to justification into the singular event—whether it be a crisis or a process—of justification-regeneration. For example, Chilean pentecostal pastor and scholar Juan Sepúlveda (1996, pp. 105–106) sees the classical, Anglo pentecostal *ordo salutis* with its multiple events as too complex and incongruent with the testimonies of Chilean pentecostals. Most of these instead report a singular transformational encounter using the experiential language discussed above, describing it as becoming a new being, receiving a new life, meeting the Lord, and so forth:

[T]he same experience is seen simultaneously as unconditional acceptance on the part of God (justification), as the beginning of a new life (sanctification), as reception of a new power to sustain new life in a hostile social and cultural environment, and as sharing and communicating this power to others (Baptism in the Holy Spirit?) (Sepúlveda, 1996, p. 106)

While he acknowledges this is more strictly an evangelical than pentecostal schema, Chilean pentecostals still view their experience as thoroughly pentecostal with its accompanying phenomena of tongues, visions, emotional exuberance, and so forth.

Sepúlveda's view resonates with James D. G. Dunn (1996, pp. 112–113), long-time friendly critic of the pentecostal movement. Dunn argues that pentecostals err in separating Spirit baptism from justification and regeneration; he understands all of these soteriological elements as components of the process or event of conversion-initiation. He insightfully points out that various words the New Testament uses in relation to salvation should be understood as metaphors describing the richness of the experience of God's grace, not technical theological terms. When theologians attempt to assign a precise meaning to them, they drain them of their vitality. Pentecostals and others misuse these metaphors when they create restrictive barriers based on a particular understanding or pattern of salvation.

Dunn raises a valid point, but the question remains as to whether or not the initial salvific encounter, whatever it is called, is able to bear the weight of the content of all the New Testament's diverse expressions. If too many other elements are combined with justification-regeneration, *sola fide* and *sola gratia* may become endangered as other conditions are assigned to the experience. Within the pentecostal movement itself, new adherents to the growing movement who did not come from Wesleyan backgrounds quickly rejected the idea of "second blessing" sanctification, collapsing it into justification-regeneration in what was known as the "finished work" controversy discussed later. Although the final result was a more progressive view of sanctification compatible with other protestant traditions, the initial doctrinal formulations of this branch of pentecostalism implied that entire sanctification or Christian perfection occurred at the moment of justification itself (Synan, 1971, p. 148; Leggett, 1989, pp. 113–116), hardly bringing clarity to the issue. Oneness pentecostals went further and collapsed sanctification, water baptism, and Spirit baptism into a singular experience that can very appropriately be described as a "conversion-initiation." The result was not a more tempered pentecostalism with a properly reformed *ordo salutis* but an exclusionary sectarianism that denies salvation to the rest of the Christian church that does not have an identical experience (Reed, 2002, pp. 943–944). This can be dismissed as fanaticism, but it has happened time and time again whenever some criteria is established as evidence of salvation, be it tongues, water baptism, a certain level of outward holiness, or so forth, and it will continue to happen whenever seekers discover facets of salvation in the Bible that do not neatly conform to received theology. Sepúlveda's example has not fallen into this pattern but easily could if theological or popular consensus began to see one aspect of the experience of transformation as its *sine qua non*. By keeping justification as justification, as most conventional pentecostals do, the spirit of the Reformation, *sola fide*, is preserved, while making room for further salvific acts of God in the Christian's life.

3.1.3.3 *The Christian Life Beyond Justification*

Some prominent theologians who do not hold to a doctrine of subsequence acknowledge that the present experience of salvation entails more than justification. Karl Barth emphasized justification but refused to make it the absolute center of soteriology and theology, for which he too has received much criticism in Lutheran circles (Braaten, 1990, pp. 63–79). While he believed that "[t]here never was and there never can be any true Christian Church without the doctrine of justification," he rightly saw that it is not the one "Word of the Gospel" that the church has proclaimed "*semper, ubique et ab omnibus*" (Barth, 1956a, pp. 523–524 (CD IV.1)). Pentecostals,

who have preached a protestant message of salvation but not always emphasized forensic justification (Macchia, 2003a, pp. 133–136, 145–148), can draw comfort from his defense:

The *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* is not the doctrine of justification as such, but its basis and culmination: the confession of Jesus Christ... the knowledge of His being and activity for us and to us and with us. It could probably be shown that this was also the opinion of Luther. If here, as everywhere, we allow Christ to be the centre, the starting-point and the finishing point, we have no reason to fear that there will be any lack of unity and cohesion, and therefore of systematics in the best sense of the word. (Barth, 1956a, pp. 527–528 (CD IV.1))

He warned against the dangers caused by artificially absolutizing justification and giving it a monopoly over soteriology, especially the frequent problem of fusion and confusion with sanctification (p. 528). Instead, Barth viewed justification, along with sanctification and calling, as one aspect of a more comprehensive triune doctrine of reconciliation (Barth, 1956a, pp. 520–521 (CD IV.1); Braaten, 1990, pp. 67–69).

Moltmann (1990, pp. 186–187) likewise agrees that protestant theology errs when it attempts to pack the sum of Christian soteriology into the one doctrine of justification:

Because the raising of Christ shows this added value and surplus over against his death, the justification of sinners initiates a process of exuberant intensification: justification – sanctification – glorification (Rom 8.30). Justifying faith is not yet the goal and end of Christ's history. For every individual believer it is no more than the beginning of a way that leads to the new creation of the world and to the justification of God. That is why those who are justified by faith are the people who "hunger and thirst" for righteousness and justice (Matt. 5.6) and "are persecuted for righteousness' sake" (Matt. 5.10).

Going beyond Barth, he also sees that there is more to salvation than reconciliation, which is not as prominent a biblical theme as Barth made it. The resurrection of Christ has surplus "value" or merit that leads those justified to the transformational future of new creation (Moltmann, 1990, pp. 187–189), which includes regeneration but is more than that (Moltmann, 1992, pp. 152–153). "The full and complete Protestant doctrine of justification is a liberation theology," he contends (Moltmann, 1992, p. 128). Accordingly, Moltmann's theology embraces a more holistic soteriology that expressly makes room for these different aspects.

Where pentecostals differ from Barth, Moltmann, and others is in delineating discrete and discernible stages of the overall salvific process. This belief in subsequence is by no means unique; Dunn (1970) equally criticizes sacramentalists for much the same reasons. Pentecostals have merely been its most vocal and successful proponents. Subsequence is found in the most ancient sacramental

traditions with the distinction between baptism and confirmation and as mentioned above, finds great support within the theology, liturgy, and mystical traditions of both Roman catholicism and Eastern orthodoxy. The methodist, holiness, and Keswick “higher life” movements all contributed to the rise of pentecostalism and its soteriology of stages.

Pentecostal theologian Simon K. H. Chan (1999, pp. 205–211) ably defends the doctrine of subsequence against the charge of spiritual elitism as well as positively offers it as a framework for spiritual development beyond justification. He sees the chronological and experiential distinction between conversion-initiation (justification and regeneration) and Spirit baptism as a theological necessity similar to the distinction between providence and miracles (p. 207). Subsequent experiences of grace are divine interventions that “interrupt the ordinary flow of life,” though they also belong to it. They represent real existential transitions that cannot be viewed as simply intensifications of the preexisting condition established by conversion-initiation, as some such as Dunn and third wave evangelicals would like to interpret them (p. 208). If the different aspects of salvation—justification, regeneration, sanctification, Spirit baptism, and so forth—are collapsed into the single event of conversion-initiation, soteriology loses its connection with spiritual development:

[The charge of spiritual elitism] is misplaced if the theological oneness of conversion-initiation and Spirit-baptism leads to the conclusion that the Christian life is a matter of getting saved and then getting more and more “Christ-like” without any clearly defined stages in spiritual development.... Evangelicals tend to see the Christian life as one big, indistinct blob. One is expected to grow, but what the expected pattern of development is seems always hazy.... It is no wonder that Evangelicals have not produced a spiritual theology that understands Christian progress in terms of some structure of growth. (Chan, 1999, p. 208)

Justification is the beginning, not the end, of the Christian’s experience of God’s plan of salvation. To acknowledge that there are aspects and components of salvation subsequent to it is not to deprecate justification nor to foster spiritual elitism but to acknowledge the many different aspects of biblical salvation. Justification by faith is a vital, central teaching of Pauline theology, but to make justification the sum of soteriology is to make the Reformation truly the victory of Paul over Jesus. It leads to the neglect of teachings by Jesus about sanctification (i.e., to “hunger and thirst” for righteousness) as well as other dimensions of Paul’s teaching. Most protestants, reformed and otherwise, acknowledge the importance of following Jesus’ teachings and intuitively integrate them into their actions, lives, and worldviews. The challenge of pentecostal soteriology to other protestants, as well as to pentecostals themselves, is to integrate these different strands not just ethically and practically but also theologically.

The diversity in unity of protestant soteriology is illustrated by the activities and concerns of the three major streams, evangelical, ecumenical, and pentecostal. All three generally agree about justification; differences are more technical and semantic than essential. Yet, stereotypically, their fellowships concentrate on different interests. In a WEF meeting, the topic of discussion may revolve around evangelism of non-Christian people groups, whereas a WCC conference may focus on peace and justice issues, and a gathering of pentecostals may emphasize the ministry of divine healing. Each group may charge the others of neglecting the central mission of the church, yet all three topics were addressed by Jesus in the gospels. Similarly, evangelicals emphasize the individual, personal aspect of salvation, whereas liberationists stress collective and social salvation (Kärkkäinen, 2003, pp. 228–229, 231); both are correct. Misunderstandings arise when an attempt is made to force the entire contents of biblical teaching about salvation into a single category as is sometimes done with justification. Rather than focusing entirely on one aspect of the gospel, it is better to acknowledge that the Christian mission is multi-dimensional, and that different members of the church are called and gifted to concentrate on different aspects. The fourfold or fivefold gospel of pentecostalism is sometimes called the “full gospel.” By itself, it is not. The full gospel is all the mission Jesus gave the church to do, and no one branch or tradition can do it all on its own. Only when the streams converge and are allowed to become the river of the living water of God’s Spirit is the full gospel present and all the functions of salvation operative.

With regard to the functions of Christ, the doctrine of subsequence acknowledges that not all the work of Christ is accomplished at once. One of the deficiencies of the satisfaction and penal substitution theories of the atonement that have dominated protestant theology, including pentecostalism, is that they do not fully answer the question, “*Cur deus homo?*” Jesus’ salvific work is limited to his death on the cross, and the period between the incarnation and Good Friday, namely the life, teaching, and miracles of Christ, has no real, foundational theological value. This does not accurately reflect the biblical message. The name Jesus means “the Lord is salvation,” and all aspects of the life of Christ are oriented to the salvation of others. He came to “seek and save the lost” (Luke 19:9-10), not only to die for them. While the crucifixion is unquestionably the heart of the Christian doctrine of atonement, the events of the life of Christ before and after it were also salvific; he was thus able to proclaim that salvation had come “today” for Zacchaeus. Likewise, his salvific work continues when his followers carry out his mission (Col. 1:24). A complete soteriology acknowledges that some aspects of salvation were accomplished during Christ’s earthly ministry; others are effected at points in individuals’ lives, and some await the *eschaton*. The pentecostal fourfold gospel explores these different aspects of

soteriology, and the doctrine of subsequence provides a way for individuals to experience salvation as both fulfillment and anticipation.

3.1.4 Justification, Regeneration, and Adoption as Functions of Christ and the Spirit

Justification is rightly esteemed in protestant theology. It represents the culmination of the work of Christ, the outcome of his compassionate sufferings on the cross. Nothing can or should be said to diminish this. Yet, the traditional protestant way of looking at justification and salvation, which is shared by pentecostalism (Studebaker, 2003, pp. 252–253), is not without imperfections. Again, one defect of the generally accepted understanding of the atonement, the satisfaction/penal substitution theory, is that it tends to cause fragmentation in Christology and soteriology. Not only does it isolate the death of Christ from the rest of his life and ministry, ultimately emptying the latter of any universal soteriological significance, it also does not provide any major role for the Holy Spirit in salvation. In a thought-provoking article, pentecostal Steven M. Studebaker (2003, p. 254) explains how the forensic understanding of justification in protestant scholastic thought, which is also accepted by pentecostalism, subordinates the Spirit:

Due to its penal emphasis, justification is linked with Christ's work on the cross. As such, justification is christocentric because the Spirit's work is not constitutive of justification. The Spirit plays only an instrumental role in justification by drawing the person to faith in conjunction with the written and/or declared Word of God.

The New Testament, however, does not hold such a starkly defined view and neither did the church for most of the period before Anselm (Aulén, 1931, pp. 1–7). Even in Paul's thought, the work of Christ on the cross provided justification, but justification is also somehow related to the resurrection (Rom. 4:25, 5:10), which was a work of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 1:4, 8:11). Christ accomplished salvation, yet he could not have done so apart from the Spirit who anointed him as Messiah (Moltmann, 1992, pp. 58–71). The work of the atonement involved not only the payment for sin but also the conquest of death through the life-giving power of the Spirit. In all things, the Trinity is not divided, and the work of one Person cannot be isolated from the other two.

It follows that resurrection can be used as a metaphor for salvation, specifically as regeneration. It is used in this manner especially in the Johannine literature. The words of Jesus in John 5:21–25 can reasonably be interpreted this way, and there is also a connection in 20:22, a passage that pentecostals understand as the giving of the Spirit in regeneration prior to subsequent Spirit baptism. Augustine (1999a, Book XX:6) also interpreted Rev. 20:4–6 in this manner, connecting the first resurrection with justification. In the theology of the reformers, however, regeneration

received little attention other than as an outcome of justification (Moltmann, 1992, pp. 144–145). It was left to pietism, liberalism, and revivalism to embrace regeneration as an image of salvation and develop it further. Regeneration, as a spiritual coming to life or resurrection, represents the more subjective, personal aspect of salvation.

Seen in this light, the role of the Spirit in salvation becomes much more prominent, and the traditional perspective requires some adjustment. Within protestant orthodoxy, justification is normally understood as the objective aspect of salvation, the Christological component, and sanctification is the subjective aspect, the primary pneumatological component (Studebaker, 2003, pp. 253–257). Because of the concern to keep sanctification from becoming conflated with justification and moving away from a *sola fide* position, sanctification is distinguished from and subordinated to justification, and so accordingly is the work of the Spirit. While the intention is laudable, the end result is problematic. As will be shown in §3.5, sanctification cannot be rightly apprehended in any theological system when it is made to be something parallel or subordinate to justification; it is a much broader concept than that. The work of the Spirit is also more than just the application of benefits of Christ's work.

In accord with the model of a functional Spirit Christology, justification and regeneration, not sanctification, are seen as parallel and equally important aspects of the singular work of salvation (Moltmann, 1992, pp. 147–149, 152–153). Justification is the objective, from above aspect of salvation. It represents Christ's work in salvation, from his suffering on the cross to his ascension and mediative session. Forensic justification is the legal proclamation of the righteousness of the sinner, a necessarily non-emotional, non-experiential transaction between Christ and God. Its objective character was naturally attractive to the more cerebral magisterial reformers. Conversely but complementarily, regeneration represents the from below, subjective aspect of salvation. It represents the Spirit's work in salvation, bringing new life to the fallen body of Jesus in the resurrection, and spiritually resurrecting believers to new life in their regeneration. It captures the emotional, experiential aspect of the crisis of salvation. It is not surprising that this image of salvation would appeal more strongly to pietists and revivalists, including pentecostals.

A third image of salvation, adoption, joins justification and regeneration together in synthesis. Adoption normally receives less attention than the other two images, but interestingly, pentecostal systematic theologies typically give it a prominent place in their soteriology sections (e.g., Arrington, 1993, pp. 219–227; Pecota, 1995, pp. 367–68). Adoption beautifully captures the *perichoresis* or reciprocity of the work of Christ and the Spirit in salvation (Rom. 8:14–17, Gal. 4:4–

7). In justification, the work of Christ, the guilt of sinners is remitted (Rom. 4:5–8), and they acquire a new, objective status of right standing before God. In the Spirit’s work of regeneration, they receive life as new creations. In the words of 1 Peter 1:3, believers are “born again to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,” a reality subjectively experienced. In adoption, the two are synthesized. God sends forth the “Spirit of adoption,” who witnesses to believers they are children of God and joint-heirs with Christ. Their status as righteous, new creations of God is confirmed objectively and subjectively. They have parity with Christ, not ontologically, for Christ’s sonship is by generation, not adoption, but relationally and functionally. Christ brought salvation to the world; in the Spirit, Christians are to bear salvation and share it, in all its aspects and richness, in the world.

Studebaker (2003, pp. 266–269), building on the work of Frank D. Macchia, illustrates this threefold experience of salvation as the reciprocal work of Christ and the Spirit using events from the life of Christ; this model is referred to alternatively as redemptive justification or redemptive soteriology. He describes this view of the atonement thusly:

The objective work of Christ is not the satisfaction of a principle of justice, but rather, it is Christ’s assumption of humanity’s alienation from God and his restoration to fellowship with the Father through the resurrection and ascension. As Christ died for sin, was raised to new life, and ascended to the Father, so the believer dies to sin, is raised to new life, and is drawn into the ambit of the trinitarian fellowship. Since the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ occur in the power of the Spirit, the work of the Spirit is constitutive of justification and salvation itself. The work of the Spirit in the soteriological process therefore is not secondary to the work of Christ, but is inextricably united with Christ’s work of redemption. (Studebaker, 2003, p. 268)

In this model, the Spirit reproduces the redemptive work of Christ in the experience of salvation. Justification corresponds to Christ’s death on the cross, regeneration to Christ’s resurrection, and adoption—Studebaker does not employ this term at this point, but it is implied in his phrase, “restoration to fellowship [with God]”—corresponds to the ascension. Understood in this manner, the entirety of salvation is equally the work of Christ and the Spirit. This model of soteriology, if developed further, has great potential as it responsibly includes more biblical dimensions and foci than protestant soteriologies typically do with their singular focus on justification. It also illustrates how pentecostal Christology as a Spirit Christology can contribute to a fuller ecumenical theology.

3.2 Jesus as Healer: Spiritual and Physical Salvation

It is a linguistic, biblical, and theological error to see salvation in terms of justification alone, especially when justification is understood primarily as a post-

death gaining of heaven and escaping of hell. In New Testament Greek, “salvation” (σῶζω, σωτηρία) can be used as a virtual synonym for “healing,” especially in the synoptic Gospels (e.g., Mark 5:34, Luke 17:19). Salvation means wholeness, the well-being of the entire person. Healing and salvation cannot be separated; both encompass the physical as well as the spiritual:

In the healings of Jesus σῶζω never refers to a single member of the body but always to the whole man, and it is especially significant in view of the important phrase “thy faith hath saved thee.” The choice of the word leaves room for the view that the healing power of Jesus and the saving power of faith go beyond physical life (Foerster & Fohrer, 1971, p. 990).

In Latin, the connection is even more obvious. The main word for salvation, *salus*, (e.g., Luke 19:9 in the Vulgate), means “a sound or whole condition, health, welfare, prosperity, preservation, safety, etc.” (Smith, 1855, p. 986), and this sense of well-being or health is preserved in the English words “salubrious,” “salutary,” and so forth. A Christian doctrine of salvation that is not also a doctrine of healing will thus be incomplete, as will be a conception of a savior who is not also a healer. The life and ministry of Jesus and thus Christology are unimaginable and incomprehensible without healings and miracles (Segundo, 1985, pp. 32–33). The sheer quantity of healings attributed to Jesus and their level of integration into Christian belief are unprecedented among the world’s major religions:

In spite of every analogy, the miraculous healings of Jesus thus occupy a unique position in religious history. They are inseparably connected with the uniqueness of Jesus and with His unparalleled sense of mission. (Oepke, 1965, p. 213)

Also unique is the persistence and place of the ministry of healing within Christianity after the departure of its founder. The early church continued Jesus’ ministry of healing in his name; the book of Acts, the writings of the apostle Paul (e.g., 1 Cor. 12:28, Gal. 3:5) and James (5:14–16) all witness to this fact. Reports of healings did not end after the time of the apostles, as Morton T. Kelsey (1973) has documented. The ministry of healing “was practically unbroken for the first thousand years of the church’s life,” he writes (p. 6), though others such as Francis MacNutt (2005) perceive a great decrease from the time of Constantine onwards. At times part of official liturgy, at others mixed with superstition, healing long remained an integral part of the faith. Prayer for healing diminished drastically in the second millennium, hurt by dualism in theological anthropology (Kelsey, 1973, p. 12), the cessationist teaching of the reformers (Kelsey, 1973, pp. 22–23; Ruthven, 1993, pp. 33–35), and Enlightenment materialism and naturalism, but it did not vanish entirely. Outside of the West, cessationism and naturalism did not achieve much popularity, and prayer for

healing persisted. For instance, much has been said about the importance of healing in African Christianity (Kärkkäinen, 2003, pp. 252–254; Shorter, 1982, pp. 136–137).

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries, rather than seeing the victory of the naturalistic modern worldview, saw an explosion of healing movements within and on the periphery of the Christian church. Although the modern healing movement is now practically a synonym for the pentecostal-charismatic movement, it did not start with the classical pentecostal revival; its origins date earlier, finding inspiration in such diverse sources as the Society of Friends, Shakers, Adventists, and Irvingites (Chappell, 1988, pp. 353–355). The experience of Johann Christoph Blumhardt, who influenced many of the leading figures of twentieth century theology, should also not be forgotten (Kelsey, 1973, pp. 236–237). The renewal of the ministry of healing gained momentum in the nineteenth century holiness movement, finding a place in A. B. Simpson's fourfold gospel (Chappell, 1988, pp. 363–364). The revival of healing reached critical mass with Azusa Street and the new pentecostalism, and today healing is prayed for and administered in every branch of the broader renewal movement. The Roman communion, likewise, has recently reemphasized the sacrament of extreme unction as an anointing for healing rather than merely a last rite in preparation for death. Christian witness to healing may be found in extremely diverse times, cultures, and traditions. This witness speaks with a loud voice that should not be silenced on a priori naturalistic grounds; a from below, people's theology must give it a fair hearing.

Independent from the healing revival movements, theological interest in healing has also been renewed in many sectors after centuries of neglect. Some of this may be attributed to the Christocentrism of much of modern theology. If the central concern of twentieth century theology was Jesus, then the unified New Testament witness to his role as healer must be acknowledged and the intimate link between healing and salvation explored. Brunner (1952, p. 273), discussing functional Christology, wrote:

One of the most beautiful and fitting names for Jesus... is the German title of *Heiland*, the one who brings *healing* or salvation, the *Healer* (or Saviour). All this expresses the fact that Jesus is first of all understood by the Church through His work, His function, His significance for salvation. The Christology of the New Testament... is determined throughout by *saving history* (*Heilsgeschichte*) and not by metaphysics. (emphasis original)

Moltmann (1990, pp. 43–46) concurs; Christology, he contends, must not only be apologetic and metaphysical but also soteriological and therapeutic:

Therapeutic christology is soteriological christology. It confronts the misery of the present with the salvation Christ brings, presenting it as a salvation that heals. Healing power belongs to salvation; otherwise it could not save. (p. 44)

He warns against Christologies and soteriologies that only address the metaphysical, transcendent concerns of the divine-human relationship and neglect physical and social realities (p. 45). Salvation, according to Jesus, according to the New Testament, is more than just spiritual, more than the forgiveness of sins and the gaining of heaven. It encompasses the entire person, including the physical, as well as the whole of society. Only from a holistic perspective is the gospel fully preached. Paul Tillich's (1957, pp. 165–168) view was similar.

More concretely, liberation theologians have emphasized the holistic character of salvation, especially its social, economic, and political dimensions. Much as salvation can be used as a synonym for healing, it can also be used as a synonym for liberation or deliverance. Liberation theologians protest against traditional theologies that perpetuate unjust social structures by moving the realization of salvation completely to the realm of individual eschatology, thereby encouraging the poor and oppressed to be content in their present afflictions. Real faith, according to liberation theology, does not merely accept history but transforms it (Boff & Boff, 1984, pp. 16–19). Christ had compassion on, lived with, ministered to, and died for the suffering; accordingly, the followers of Christ today must be concerned about the plight of the needy and actively work for their freedom (Boff & Boff, 1987, pp. 44–45). Part of this liberation involves the alleviation of physical afflictions, or healing, and liberationists look to the healing ministry of Jesus as inspiration for their own theological reflection and praxis (Boff & Boff, 1987, p. 54). In summary, a wide diversity of recent theological movements, among which pentecostalism must also be counted, have shown renewed interest in the ministry of healing and its theological and practical implications. An exercise in ecumenical theology with the goal of arriving at a universally responsible Christology will wisely listen to their contributions in order to better understand the role of Jesus as healer.

3.2.1 The Theological Purposes of Healing in the New Testament

In order to understand the place of healing within contemporary Christian theology, it is necessary to first ascertain its nature and purposes as put forth in the New Testament. Healings are understood as supernatural acts performed by God usually through a human intermediary. The intermediary acknowledges God as the source of the power to heal (Matt. 12:28–32, Mark 5:19, Acts 3:12ff.), though Jesus did not refuse worship given him in response to healing (Luke 17:14–18; John 9:38). Jesus healed by his own authority as God's anointed one (Luke 4:18ff., 7:18–23), but even he attributed the healing power to God and the Spirit of God (Matt. 12:28–32; cf. Luke 11:20). The disciples of Jesus performed healings by the authority of his name as he had instructed them (e.g., John 14:12–13, Acts 3:6, 12–16). Outside of the

invoking of the name of Jesus, there are no significant differences between the healings in Jesus' ministry and those reported in the book of Acts.

The reported healings are meant to be understood literally and physically; the literal, not the figurative usage of ἰάομαι and ἰασις dominates the gospels (Oepke, 1965, p. 204). In the majority of accounts, healing was effected through the laying on of hands or other touch, the speaking of a simple command, or the combination of both. Significantly, healing and prayer are rarely linked. Jesus and his followers were people of prayer, but their practice of prayer was preparatory, distinct from the actual administration of the gift of healing by command. Acts 9:40 and 28:8 are exceptions to this, but even in these accounts, the prayer seems preparatory to the act of healing. Outside of rare cases such as John 9:6ff., healing is not associated with medicine or natural agencies; Jesus and his disciples were not physicians. By comparison, the main treatment of healing in the Epistles, that of James 5:13–18, is incongruous with the healing narratives both in its emphasis on prayer and its advocacy of the use of oil. Jesus is never reported to have anointed the sick with oil, and the practice is mentioned only once in connection with the disciples in Mark 6:13, a mission undertaken before the experience of Pentecost. No mention is made of oil in the more detailed accounts in Acts.

Healings serve two primary purposes in the New Testament. The first purpose is that of signs confirming the message of the gospel and the authority of those who proclaim it (e.g., Matt. 11:1–6, 10:1–8ff., John 10:37–38, Mark 16:17–20, Acts 8:4–13). Along with the exorcisms and other miracles performed by Jesus and his disciples, they are repeatedly referred to as signs (σημεῖα), wonders (τέρατα), miracles or powers (δυνάμεις), and works (ἔργα); all are used essentially as synonyms (Greig, 1993). The healings are put forward as proofs compelling belief in Jesus as the Messiah and the coming of the kingdom of God (Matt. 11:1–24). Even within the biblical record, however, there were limits to the sign purpose of healings and miracles. In one of the most ironic passages in Scripture, Jesus was challenged to perform a sign to prove his message; he refused (Mark 8:11–12 and parallels). In Matthew and Mark, the account comes immediately after the feeding of the four thousand, a dramatic sign and miracle itself. In light of the different signs already performed by Jesus, one wonders what the Jesus' challengers desired him to do. This account illustrates the truth that doubt cannot always be dispelled and belief given birth by compelling signs; the condition of the heart is as important a factor as external proofs.

A deeper analysis of healings reveals they were an integral component of the gospel (Kelsey, 1973, pp. 52–59); healing was a purpose within itself. The gospel of Jesus was the gospel of the kingdom of God (Mark 1:14–15), and his status as the

Christ, the anointed of God, was linked to healing, deliverance, and liberation (Luke 4:14–21 || Isa. 61:1–2a). The works that Jesus performed were linked to his message. Healing was intimately bound to the overall mission of Jesus (Luke 4, Matt. 11:4–6 || Luke 7:18–23), and again, by these statements primarily literal, physical healing is intended. Of course, the salvific work of Jesus also has non-material aspects, and the Gospels occasionally use sickness and healing in analogy to spiritual conditions (e.g., Matt. 13:10–17 || John 12:37–41; Luke 5:29–32 and parallels). However, to read this spiritual meaning back into the healing narratives and make it their primary intent as Scripture, as Martin Luther sometimes did (Volf, 1989, pp. 451–452), is a faulty hermeneutic. Physical healings make up a large portion of the Gospels, and it was undoubtedly an important ministry to both Jesus and the early church.

The kingdom of God was breaking out on earth, and it was known by the power of God bringing full salvation and freedom to those who would receive it (Matt. 9:35, 12:28). Healings were a demonstration of the virtue of the kingdom, the love of God; Jesus performed healings and other miracles because he had compassion on the people (ὄχλος) (e.g., Matt. 14:14, Mark 8:2ff.) He expected his followers to do the same. According to Jesus, the two greatest commandments were to love God and to love one's neighbor (Luke 10:27); the one who best exemplified this love of neighbor was the Samaritan who rescued one in danger and brought about his healing (Kelsey, 1973, pp. 57–58). If healing is understood as not only a sign of the gospel but an integral part of the gospel itself, its abiding importance for the ministry of the Christian church and for theology, especially Christology, is understood:

If Jesus saw himself as the Messiah, then he represented the essential nature of God himself and was his specific messenger, and his healings therefore sprang from the essential nature of God. (Kelsey, 1973, p. 59)

Recognized as such, healing is no longer something incidental to the life and times of Jesus and the early church that can pass away as the church matures, either institutionally or through knowledge of the Scriptures.

The New Testament does not limit such workings to Jesus and the apostles. Besides Paul and the Twelve, the book of Acts also connects healing with Philip the evangelist (8:6–7). Miracles were part of early church life, occurring among the church at Corinth (1 Cor. 12:10) and the recipients of the letter to the Galatians (3:5). In fact, despite his lack of direct teaching on the subject, Romans 15:18–19 suggests that Paul believed the gospel was only fully preached when accompanied by these signs, wonders, miracles and works. Nowhere does the New Testament explicitly state that these components of the gospel would cease prior to the *eschaton*; most professional cessationist theologians have abandoned 1 Cor. 13:8–12 as a decisive proof text vindicating their position (cf. 1 Cor. 1:7).

It is significant to note that in studying healing, the relevant section of the canon is primarily the Gospels, especially the Synoptics, and Acts. James 5:13–18 is also important but somewhat incongruous. Paul, on the other hand, provides little direct treatment of the subject. Paul does not use *θεραπεύω* or *ἰάομαι* or their derivatives outside of the references to spiritual gifts of healing in 1 Cor. 12. He does not use *σφζω* to indicate healing, and *σωτηρία* is something primarily eschatological (Foerster & Fohrer, 1971, pp. 992–994). From his discourse in 1 Cor. 12–14, such statements as Rom. 15:18–19 and 2 Cor. 12:12, and the healings attributed to him in Acts, it is clear that Paul believed in, experienced, and practiced supernatural healings. It was not, however, a topic of vital interest to him or germane to the occasions prompting the writing of his extant letters. Paul’s silence should give pause in formulating a doctrine of healing. It should not, however, be interpreted so as to void healing of any importance to the gospel or the doctrine of salvation, for the teaching and practice of Jesus must always be borne in mind when formulating Christology and soteriology.

3.2.2 The Traditional Protestant Understanding of Healing and Its Impact on Conservative Theology

The New Testament message of physical healing as part of the gospel and as the liberating love of God, however, was not preserved throughout Christian history. Many causes and contributing factors have been posited for this loss. MacNutt (2005, pp. 103–104), for instance, attributes much of the decline to the institutionalization of Christianity from the time of Constantine; the fervor of the persecuted church gave way to the nominalism made possible by the establishment of Christianity as the empire’s official religion. Miracles continued and even flourished with the rise of monasticism (Kelsey, 1973, pp. 163–167), but the growing emphasis on asceticism within Christianity led to a depreciation of the physical and a disdain for the body. As the glory of martyrdom was largely a thing of the past, suffering was seen as a virtue, and thus healing was not to be sought but shunned (MacNutt, 2005, pp. 104–107). Healing and miracles, when they did occur, became increasingly associated with the cult of the saints. Sacramental and charismatic healing were no longer commonplace by the time of medieval catholicism (MacNutt, 2005, pp. 124–131).

3.2.2.1 The Reformers and Contemporary Miracles

The situation within protestantism, more germane to this study, is both clearer and more serious. The reformers and their followers did not recover the biblical ministry of healing but rather lent theological backing to its cessation. As with so many other areas of theology, protestant teaching about healing and miracles was formed in response to the positions and practices of medieval catholicism. The

reformers were challenged by the church hierarchy to produce miracles to prove their new doctrines. They refused, responding that the testimony of the Word of God was sufficient. Ironically, in refuting his opponents, Calvin (1960, pp. 14–18) negated the plain meaning of the New Testament texts supporting the role of signs and wonders in confirming the true preaching of the gospel. The general position of both Luther and Calvin was that the age of the miraculous was for a limited time only, attesting to the gospel until the church was firmly established; this view was not original to the two reformers but dates back to Aquinas (Ruthven, 1993, p. 33) and earlier (Warfield, 1918, pp. 47–48). Once this establishment occurred, around the time of the completion of the New Testament canon, the supernatural signs were withdrawn by God, having been replaced by the surer witness of the Bible, the Word of God.

Although their overall position was that the miraculous gifts had ceased, the reformers were not entirely consistent in their cessationism, especially experientially. While shunning monastic asceticism, Luther, perhaps more than any other, laid the foundation for protestant interpretation of salvation as exclusively nonmaterial (Volf, 1989, pp. 449–452). As Kelsey (1973, p. 221) notes, “Luther rarely missed an opportunity to show that the ‘real miracles’ were not visible ones.” Salvation was strictly an inner matter; the outward, or physical, earthly self was not touched by it. This is not to say that Luther believed that God had no concern for human suffering. Luther himself saw the healing of Philip Melanchthon after prayer and organized healing services based on the instructions in James 5:13–18 (Kelsey, 1973, p. 233). Still, healing and other material blessings were only dispensed as part of God’s gracious providence, not an integral part of salvation, which was only spiritual (Volf, 1989, pp. 451–453). Similarly, it should be noted that Calvin’s views on why supernatural healing ceased were not entirely clear, and some statements suggest he believed human factors such as ingratitude may have contributed to the withdrawal of the miraculous (Williams, 1988b, pp. 158–161). Although formal cessationism finds its strongest backing in reformed theology, it was the majority view of protestantism, including the Arminian side. John Wesley, for example, attributed the cessation of miracles to corruption associated with the institutionalization of Christianity in the Roman Empire rather than the closing of the New Testament, but otherwise his views differed little from Calvin’s (Williams, 1988b, pp. 161–162).

3.2.2.2 *Benjamin B. Warfield and the Formalization of Cessationism*

As a formal doctrine, however, cessationism was not dogmatized by protestants until later, largely in response to the rise of various healing movements. Most of these arose outside the circles of mainstream orthodoxy and were accordingly rejected by conservative protestantism. It was Benjamin B. Warfield, the highly

influential “old Princeton” theologian, who consolidated and elaborated the doctrine of cessationism in his polemical work *Counterfeit miracles* (1918). Warfield surveyed such diverse groups as Roman Catholicism, the Catholic Apostolic Church in Scotland (Irvingites), holiness and pentecostal groups, and Christian Science. He condemned all for making claim to the miraculous, especially healings; he took little effort in distinguishing movements that were otherwise orthodox from groups on the outer margins of Christianity such as Christian Science. Ruthven (1993, p. 53) notes that “the very act of a group’s claiming miraculous powers was, for Warfield, *prima facie* evidence for its heterodoxy.” Warfield (1918, pp. 21–25) limited the performance of genuine Christian miracles to the apostles and persons upon whom the apostles had laid their hands. He dismissed reports of later miracles even from such authorities as Augustine based on their credulous worldview (Warfield, 1918, pp. 75–77). Ironically, Warfield used arguments very similar to those of the skeptics who attacked the biblical miracles that he so vigorously defended.

Warfield had one primary and several secondary theological concerns behind the development of his doctrine of cessation. The primary concern related to the purpose of miracles and healings. In contrast to the above survey of the New Testament, Warfield believed in only a singular purpose, that of accrediting divine revelation (Ruthven, 1993, pp. 75–78). Concurring with many in the reformed tradition, he approvingly cited Abraham Kuyper as to the role and limitations of miracles:

He [God] has given to the world one organically complete revelation, adapted to all, sufficient for all, provided for all, and from this one completed revelation He requires each to draw his whole spiritual sustenance. Therefore it is that the miraculous working which is but the sign of God’s revealing power, cannot be expected to continue, and in point of fact does not continue, after the revelation of which it is the accompaniment has been completed. (Warfield, 1918, pp. 26–27)⁶

Warfield (1918, p. 21) discounted the edification function of the *charismata*, asserting that

the immediate end for which they were given is not left doubtful, and that proves to be not directly the extension of the church, but the authentication of the Apostles as messengers from God. This does not mean, of course, that only the Apostles appear in the New Testament as working miracles, or that they alone are represented as recipients of the *charismata*. But it does mean that the *charismata* belonged, in a true sense, to the Apostles, and constituted one of the signs of an Apostle.

That a student of the Bible of Warfield’s caliber could come to such a conclusion is

⁶It is not clear from Warfield’s attribution if he is quoting Kuyper directly or providing his own paraphrase.

bewildering. As mentioned above, in his extant writings Paul gives little attention to healing, but it is among the *charismata* of 1 Cor. 12–14 given variously to each one in the church as the Spirit wills (1 Cor. 12:10). Paul's entire point in this passage, as well as others such as Rom. 12:3–8, is that different gifts have been given to all in the church, primarily for the edification and benefit of one another (1 Cor. 12:7, 14:3–5, 12, 17, 26). He did not rebuke the Corinthians for manifesting the *charismata* but for abusing them and valuing some more highly than others. Within this lengthy discourse, nothing suggests that the Corinthians' manifold gifts were somehow connected to the unique apostolic ministry of revelation or the enscripturation of the Word of God. They were, rather, normal expressions of everyday church life (1 Cor. 14:26–33). Warfield (1918, pp. 3–5) recognized this fact but failed to see that the edifying character of the gifts argues strongly for their continuation and not their cessation. The *charismata* have value far beyond that of accrediting the gospel and have abiding significance for the life of local congregations.

Beyond restricting the true purpose of healings and miracles to confirmation of the gospel message, Warfield sought to use the doctrine of cessation to guard other concerns. Christologically, he feared that an abiding experience of the miraculous would diminish the uniqueness of Christ (Warfield, 1918, p. 28). Similarly, like Luther and others who had gone before him, Warfield emphasized the greater miracle of justification-regeneration and eternal salvation. While acknowledging that Christian salvation has temporal and physical benefits, these are to be understood as primarily eschatological (Warfield, 1918, pp. 177–180):

Our Lord never permitted it for a moment to be imagined that the salvation he brought was fundamentally for this life. His was emphatically an other-world religion. He constantly pointed to the beyond, and bade men find their true home, to set their hopes, and to place their aspirations, there. (p. 177)

Again, this is a scripturally and theologically dubious proposition: how is the benefit of eternal salvation alone superior to the same eternal salvation with the additional benefit of alleviation of temporal suffering (healing), both of which the early Christian communities possessed? Ruthven (1993, pp. 112–123) criticizes Warfield for holding a deficient pneumatology, a deficient doctrine of the kingdom of God, and a Christology that renders Christ essentially inactive in his present session. A more thorough exploration of the biblical data in these areas, using the hermeneutical approach Warfield normally employed, leads to a much richer theology incompatible with cessationism. Finally, contributing to Warfield's view was a personal factor that cannot be criticized but should nevertheless be noted: the tragedy of the protracted illness and untimely death of his wife (Ruthven, 1993, p. 56). All theologies are influenced by personal experience.

3.2.2.3 *Dispensational Cessationism*

Contemporaneous with Warfield was the rise of dispensational fundamentalism. John Nelson Darby of the Plymouth Brethren was the founder of dispensationalism; in America especially, his teaching gained influence far beyond his denomination and spread to many conservative groups (MacNutt, 2005, pp. 148–151). Dispensationalism, too, denies the continuation of the miraculous as reported in the New Testament, often repeating Warfield's arguments (e.g., MacLeod, 2001, pp. 118–127) but supplying others as well. As a theology, the movement claims its distinctiveness by its supposedly consistent application of a literal hermeneutic to all portions of the Bible (Ryrie, 1995, p. 40). The result of this hermeneutic is a division of religious history into distinct eras, which are referred to as economies or dispensations. In each of these dispensations, God relates to humanity differently, for example through the Mosaic law in the dispensation of law and through grace in the dispensation of grace, the church age. Under most dispensational schemes, the ministry of Christ and his miracles belong to the end of the dispensation of law. The dispensation of grace or the church age began at Pentecost. The period covered in the book of Acts, however, belongs to a transitional age between the two dispensations (MacLeod, 2001, pp. 123–125; cf. Deere, 1993, pp. 111–112). Accordingly, the events recorded in both the Gospels and Acts should not be used for the formation of doctrine or norms for church practice, for supernatural miracles and healings like those recorded therein have ceased (Kelsey, 1973, pp. 24–27). Ironically, a text that explicitly supports this claim when literally interpreted is never supplied in dispensationalist arguments. Further irony is seen in the widespread adoption of the dispensationalist scheme by pentecostals, especially in eschatology.

3.2.2.4 *Contemporary Evangelicalism's Caution*

Reformed confessionalism and dispensationalism represent the two strongest forces within conservative evangelicalism and fundamentalism. As both these streams are dogmatically cessationist, it is not surprising that neo-evangelicalism has resisted the revival of healing as well as other supernatural gifts associated with the pentecostal and charismatic movements. Although tangential to the question of healing, cessationism also protects another key concern of these theological traditions: the integrity of Scripture as the Word of God. If, for the reasons offered, healing and other miracles have been withdrawn from the church, then surely other supernatural manifestations such as prophecy and speaking in tongues with interpretation have ceased as well. As widely interpreted by conservatives, revelatory gifts and utterances necessarily come forth under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in the same manner and intensity as biblical prophecy. For a contemporary Christian to claim revelation from

God and to speak it forth is to add to the Word of God, the Bible, a proposition repugnant to the evangelical theological system (see §2.1.3.2). A formal doctrine of cessationism, with biblical arguments to back it up, staves off any such practices. It should be noted that this is a problem only for theological systems that identify the Bible with the Word of God in a one-to-one correspondence.

Because of the various charismatic movements, evangelicals have become more open to the idea of post-biblical miracles and healings, usually admitting them as a prerogative of God in his sovereignty. The pentecostal doctrine of healing in the atonement is generally rejected (Purdy, 1995, pp. 507–508), as is healing as a discrete spiritual gift given to individuals, contrary to 1 Cor. 12:7–11. This moderation eliminates the tension inherent in the Warfieldian attempt to simultaneously and vigorously defend biblical miracles but deny present-day ones. It does not, however, provide any integration of the biblical teaching about miracles into modern practical theology except for apologetics. Cessationist arguments are still widely used to deny contemporary revelatory gifts and utterances, probably the greatest point of contention between the neo-evangelical and renewal movements. The greatest flaw in the evangelical cessationist argument, however, is its lack of convincing biblical support. When probed using the same approach from which it is proposed, the paradigm of verbal plenary inspiration and a literal hermeneutic, its proof texts and reasonings are found wanting. Ultimately, the conflict between protestant cessationism and the continuationism of pentecostalism is not, as it is often framed, a conflict between doctrine and religious experience or even a conflict between a theology based on the Bible and a theology based on experience. It is a conflict between experience and lack of experience (Deere, 1993, pp. 54–56). From the conservative perspective, neither is suitable as the foundation of a theology; further biblical and theological work is necessary to justify either position.

3.2.3 Healing in Liberal and Ecumenical Theology

Liberal theology was more consistent than Warfield and the dispensationalists, if less scriptural: it largely denied both biblical and present-day miracles. The perspective of liberalism on healing, however, must first be understood not in the light of biblical teaching or protestant orthodoxy but the Enlightenment worldview from which it emerged. A simple cataloguing of Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment philosophies—naturalism, materialism, deism, empiricism, skepticism, positivism, and so forth—immediately reveals the challenges facing modern acceptance of any sort of supernatural healing. Naturalism was, for all practical purposes, a presupposition of the historical criticism of the Bible axiomatic for much of liberal theology. The absence of miracles and healings within both the historical and

contemporary protestant churches made this assumption understandable; it was a prime contributing factor to what Gotthold Lessing (1956) called the “ugly, broad ditch” between the modern age and the biblical world:

If I had actually seen him [Christ] do miracles; if I had had no cause to doubt that these were true miracles; then in a worker of miracles who had been marked out so long before, I would have gained so much confidence that I would willingly have submitted my intellect to his, and I would have believed in all things in which equally indisputable experiences did not tell against him.... .if even now miracles were done by believing Christians which I had to recognize as true miracles: what could prevent me from accepting this proof of the spirit and of power, as the apostle called it? ...[But] I live in the eighteenth century, in which miracles no longer happen.... The problem is that this proof of the spirit and of power no longer has any spirit or power, but has sunk to the level of human testimonies of spirit and power. (Lessing, 1956, p. 52)

Skepticism towards the miraculous had a great impact on Christology, particularly the quest for the historical Jesus. Much of the original quest was inherently biased against the supernatural (Brown, 1992, pp. 326–333). The miracle stories of the Gospels were deemed mythical accretions, obscuring the true Jesus of history. Liberal biographers of the nineteenth century attempted to remove these accretions through either outright elimination or the devising of naturalistic explanations of the phenomena. With the publication of Albert Schweitzer’s (1911) definitive tome, however, the quest was deemed to have failed and the problem of the historical Jesus versus the Christ of faith unresolvable (Bornkamm, 1960, p. 13). Despite its inner contradictions, the original quest and its accompanying naturalism greatly influenced contemporaneous liberal theologians, and their works gave little treatment to this aspect of the ministry of Jesus that comprises a very large percentage of the Christian Gospels.

Critical investigation of the Gospels and the life of Jesus did not end, however, with the end of the original quest. The development of form criticism and refined criteria for assessing historicity has helped twentieth and twenty-first century scholars to avoid some of the excesses of the nineteenth century quest. One hesitates to suggest unanimity in contemporary Jesus studies, but a consensus about healing seems to have been reached within recent critical scholarship. Although no particular pericope can be proven historical, that Jesus was in some capacity a healer and exorcist is accepted as being historical beyond reasonable doubt (Meyer, 1992, pp. 781–782; Perrin, 1967, pp. 136–137). Günther Bornkamm (1960, pp. 130–131) speaks for the majority:

It would be difficult to doubt the physical healing powers which emanated from Jesus, just as he himself interpreted his casting out of demons as a sign of the dawning of the kingdom of God... There can be just as little doubt that precisely in this area of the tradition many stories have taken on legendary traits, and legends have been added.... At the same time there can be no doubt

that the faith which Jesus demands, and which alone he recognises as such, has to do with power and with miracle.

Healing and miracle stories permeate all strata of traditions in the Gospels and feature prominently in Mark, the most primitive of the four. Opinions of course vary as to the cause, mechanism, and nature of the healings and exorcisms, but the fact that Jesus somehow effected cures and deliverances is not widely questioned (Habermas, 1995, pp. 124–125). (The nature miracles are another matter.)

3.2.3.1 *Healing in Neo-Orthodoxy*

As a great pioneer of form criticism, it was Bultmann who helped to advance non-conservative theology in this area; although primarily a New Testament scholar, his influence upon systematic theology is considerable. Bultmann has been widely misunderstood in conservative Christianity as a liberal denier of the Bible's testimony of the miraculous. Bultmann, however, was not a liberal but a reviser of liberalism. He is often characterized as one of the major figures of the neo-orthodox movement, though his thought cannot easily be confined by that category. Bultmann shared the naturalistic worldview of the liberals but proposed a different solution to the problem of the historical Jesus: the alleged myths of the gospel were not to be eliminated but demythologized (Bultmann, 1984). Such stories, while not historical, were nevertheless the Word of God and needed to be reinterpreted for the modern age. In other words, even if not factually true, they had a message and great value. As a preacher, Bultmann sought to recover the message from the mythological form and restore the value to the contemporary church. He perceived that the miracles of Jesus were proofs of his power and authority (Bultmann, 1963, p. 219), the exorcisms in particular confirming him as the Messiah (p. 226). Similarly, the healing miracles of the apostles demonstrated their authority to forgive sins and regulate church life (Bultmann, 1951, p. 61). Two complaints can be raised about Bultmann's work in this area. First, in his interpretive work, he did not expound purposes behind the healings that in any way were an advancement beyond those of protestant orthodoxy; his theological conclusions differ little from Warfield's. Second, Bultmann did not realize the potential of his program of demythologization as it concerns the miracle and healing stories. After recognizing their accrediting significance, all his approach did was cast doubt on their historicity. He did not show how they could be demythologized to have significance for modern life or the church's proclamation. In other words, he gave them more respect as *kerygma* than the liberals (Bultmann, 1984, pp. 11–14), but he followed the liberals in assigning the miracle and healing stories little theological value and no practical significance.

In general, it cannot be said that the greater room granted to the possibility of the historicity of Jesus' healings made much impact on mainstream protestant theology during this era (Kelsey, 1973, pp. 27–32). Even the more supernaturalistic Barth gave it little attention in his many works, concerning which Kelsey (1973, pp. 23–24) notes, “Healing was simply dismissed by neglect rather than by being denied.” In reality, the situation with Barth is more complex than that. For example, in commenting on Rom. 15:17–21, the normally verbose Barth (1933, pp. 531–533) passed over in silence Paul's thematic claim to having preached the gospel fully “through the power of signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God.” On the other hand, few topics escape treatment in his mammoth *Church dogmatics*, and healing is discussed briefly in a broader section on human health and sickness (Barth, 1961a, pp. 356–374 (CD III.4)). Much of the discussion is psychological and sociological in nature, but he made several statements that could be helpful in formulating a practical doctrine of healing. He saw that it was a command of God for humans to will to live and be healthy (Barth, 1961a, pp. 367–368 (CD III.4)). Healing and health are the will of God and manifestations of the kingdom of God. Sickness is an “inevitable encroachment” of death into God's creation; Jesus resisted it in his ministry of miracles. Extremely valuable from a pentecostal perspective is Barth's (1961a, p. 368 (CD III.4)) acknowledgment of a healing purpose in the atonement of Christ:

[God] Himself has already marched against that realm [of death]... and He has overcome and bound its forces and therefore those of sickness in Jesus Christ and His sacrifice, by which the destroyer was himself brought to destruction.

Unfortunately, he did not pursue this thought further outside of an approving recounting of the experience and ministry of Blumhardt (Barth, 1961a, pp. 370–371 (CD III.4)).

As Kelsey suggests, neglect is perhaps the best word to describe Barth's treatment of healing; he did not ignore it entirely but did far less with it than he could have. Many have criticized Barth for neglecting pneumatology and charismatic concerns (Busch, 2004, p. 219). His discussion of Jesus' ministry of healing and exorcism and the early church's experience of the *charismata* is extremely cautious (e.g., Barth, 1961a, p. 370 (CD III.4)). Just as it was for the great reformers before him, for Barth (1956a, p. 646 (CD IV.1)) the miracle of Christian experience was justification. The primary work of the Spirit, about whom he confesses more mystery than knowledge, is to attest to Jesus (Barth, 1956a, pp. 648–650 (CD IV.1)). Barth's tentativeness in pneumatic areas suggests a reluctance to embrace fully the task before him as a systematic theologian, to explore and expound all areas of biblical teaching, even the most experientially challenging, that are relevant to contemporary Christian

belief and practice. Healing has not traditionally been regarded as overly relevant to church life, but trends emerging on the fringe of the church as well as within its center, trends that Barth (1961a, pp. 364–371 (CD III.4)) himself noted, demanded reevaluation of the conclusions of tradition. As the great giant of twentieth century theology, Barth missed an opportunity to start (or, more accurately, magnanimously join and support) another theological revolution as powerful as the one which he launched with *Der Romerbrief*. The answer to the question of the significance of healing, signs and wonders, and the power of the Spirit for modern Christian preaching and ministry is not found within his theology. One can only wonder as to what the outcome might have been had Barth been born a generation later or had pentecostalism sought ecumenical dialogue and theological advancement sooner.

3.2.3.2 *Healing in Liberation Theology*

To find a more useful modern employment of the healing ministry of Jesus, one must cross the Reformation divide to the liberation theologians, although it cannot be said today that liberation theology belongs exclusively to Roman Catholicism any more than it can be said that Martin Luther belongs exclusively to the Lutheran churches. As Juan Luis Segundo (1976, p. 149) writes, “Liberation theology is a profoundly ecumenical theology.” Although they do not agree with all of Bultmann’s contentions (Boff, 1978, pp. 10–12), liberation theologians have used form criticism and demythologization positively. In a similar manner as the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt has been used, the ministry of Jesus to the sick and oppressed has been a major source of insight into the biblical meaning of liberation. His miracles show that the kingdom of God has arrived:

His miracles and healings, besides demonstrating his divinity, are designed to show that his liberating proclamation is already being made history among the oppressed, the special recipients of his teaching and first beneficiaries of his actions. (Boff & Boff, 1987, p. 54)

When Christians engage in liberating works, they are continuing Christ’s ministry and advancing the kingdom of God. Unlike pentecostals, however, liberation theologians usually appropriate these passages through demythologization, not literal imitation. Seeing no distinction between supernatural or spiritual and physical realities (Boff & Boff, 1987, p. 53; 1984, pp. 16–19), the healing, delivering power of God is manifested whenever and however liberation takes place. Rather than depending solely on immediate miraculous intervention in individual cases of sickness, liberationists strive to transform sinful social, political, and economic structures that produce deprivation and unhealthy living conditions. The end result—the alleviation of suffering and the arrival of wholeness—is the same, so both may be considered the work of the healing God (Elizondo, 1996, pp. 54–56).

Although not all sections of Christianity have reacted positively to the message of liberation theology, it represents a valiant attempt to recover further dimensions of the biblical picture of salvation, which is holistic and not limited to only the spiritual dimension of life. Liberation theologians believe that Christianity can address both the eternal and temporal, the spiritual and the social without contradiction:

Liberation theology simply assumes the need for personal conversion and prayer while placing the emphasis on the immediate transformation of society.... Yet deliverance/liberation from sin and the healing which comes through membership of the kingdom continue to be the very core of the Christian community movement and the theologies of liberation. (Elizondo, 1996, p. 55)

Demythologized healing serves as a useful paradigm for the agenda of liberation theology. Indeed, liberationists arguably have implemented the ideals of demythologization—making the Christian message relevant for the modern world—far more successfully than Bultmann himself, the pioneer of demythologization. The challenge of pentecostalism, however, remains: do the biblical accounts of healing have utility only when demythologized, or can they be put more immediately to practical use?

3.2.4 The Holiness-Pentecostal Contribution: Healing in the Atonement

While conservative and liberal theologies separately moved away from supernaturalism, the precursors of pentecostalism moved increasingly towards it, and healing became a common theme in nineteenth century American Wesleyan revivals. As the holiness movement radicalized the methodist message, it placed increasing emphasis on the immediacy of salvation. Realization of Christian hopes became less eschatological and more temporal. According to the leaders of the movement, justification and the forgiveness of sins as well as sanctification and “Christian perfection” could be received in an instant by faith. If this is so, they argued, then there is no reason why physical healing, salvation of the body, should be not immediately receivable as well (Chappell, 1988, pp. 356–357). Holiness leader A. B. Simpson, one of the most important influences on the pentecostal movement, included it as one corner of his fourfold gospel. Simpson took a more moderate approach to healing than some of his contemporaries; he saw it as a vital, indispensable component of the gospel but less important and central than the message of salvation and sanctification-Spirit baptism (Simpson, 1888, pp. 6–7; Sawin, 1986, pp. 11–15). Implicit in this interpretation of the gospel is a denial of the age-old anthropological dualism that devalues the physical aspect of human life. The soul may be more important than the body, but the body and its sufferings are not unimportant:

Man has a two-fold nature. He is both a material and a spiritual being. And both natures have been equally affected by the fall. His body is exposed to

disease; his soul is corrupted by sin. We would, therefore, expect that any complete scheme of redemption would include both natures, and provide for the restoration of his physical as well as the renovation of his spiritual life. Nor are we disappointed. the Redeemer appears among men with both hands stretched out to our misery and need. In the one He holds salvation; in the other, healing. (Simpson, 1888, pp. 9–10)

Besides the Wesleyan-spawned revival movements, healing was also a topic of interest to a group on the outer margins of the Christian church, Mary Baker Eddy's Christian Science. While today Christian Science is a movement in decline and its doctrine is radically different from that of the holiness movement, as will be shown, it has importance for later developments within the broader renewal movement.

Belief in divine healing was present at the birth of pentecostalism and has never been absent from it. Indeed, part of the movement's explosive growth all over the earth is due to the alleviation of suffering and restoration of wholeness that it promises. If the broader renewal movements—classical pentecostals, catholic and protestant charismatics, and third wave participants—can be said to be absolutely united on a single matter, it is belief in the continuation, not cessation, of divine healing. The modern renewal movement is, for all practical purposes, the modern healing movement. Unlike other outbreaks of healing revivals that declined after a few years, as a whole pentecostalism and the charismatic movement have never moved away from it. As Hollenweger (1972, pp. 358–360) notes, individual groups and denominations have experienced a diminishment of healings, but new ministries constantly arise to further the gospel of healing. Specific doctrinal questions about divine healing and the personality and practices of specific healing evangelists continuously spark controversy and division within the movement, but as to the reality of healing there is no doubt.

That these diverse movements, united in testifying to healing, comprise one quarter of all professing Christians should give pause to dogmatic assertions of cessationism, regardless of cessationism's impressive theological pedigree. The pentecostal and charismatic belief in healing is a direct challenge to traditional formulations of soteriology and Christology. This belief brings a physical dimension to salvation, which is often considered only a spiritual matter, and calls for reevaluation of the meaning of Christ's work. It questions the value of suffering in the Christian life and the world generally. Assemblies of God theologian Vernon L. Purdy (1995, p. 515), representative of many pentecostals and charismatics, states, "The will of God, normally, is that the believer be healthy." The pentecostal message of healing has theological and practical ramifications that cannot be ignored by any branch of modern Christianity.

The theological basis of the doctrine of healing common to both pentecostalism and the healing movement within the older holiness groups is not, as might be supposed, the gifts of the Holy Spirit described in 1 Cor. 12 but the death of Christ (Dayton, 1987, pp. 127–130). This doctrine is known as healing in the atonement. Menzies and Horton (1993, p. 195) state the common belief succinctly:

Sin brought with it sickness and death. God by nature is against sin, sickness, and death. His love and grace made a way for deliverance from the penalties of sin. Through the atonement wrought by Christ at Calvary not only was the curse of sin broken, but our deliverance from sickness was also cared for.

Pentecostals understand sin as the root, though not necessarily individual and direct, cause of sickness and suffering (Purdy, 1995, pp. 490–496). In other words, sickness generally is the result of the common fall of humanity and the subsequent corruption of the natural world, not the result of personal sins requiring repentance, though this possibility is not automatically ruled out in every individual case. The remedy for sin and sickness is the same: the vicarious sufferings and death of Christ. Pentecostals extend the theory of penal substitution to include not only payment for humanity's sin but for its major consequence of sickness as well. Just as forgiveness of sins may be received simply by faith in Christ's work, healing may be received in exactly the same manner (Nelson, 1981, pp. 96–99). Pentecostals base the doctrine of healing in the atonement primarily on Isa. 53:4–5, which is also quoted in Matt. 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24. Psalm 103:1–5 and Heb. 13:8 are other important proof texts. For many pentecostals, belief in healing in the atonement is not optional; some classical denominations include an article affirming it in their statements of faith (e.g., Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 515, 517; McPherson & Cox, 1969, pp. 269, 285–286).

3.2.4.1 Criticism and Response

Although simply formulated, the doctrine of healing in the atonement represents a significant advance in the understanding of the work of Christ. With it, a material and temporal dimension is added irrevocably to soteriology (Volf, 1989, pp. 457–458). However it is interpreted and to whatever extent it is applied, affirmation of healing in the atonement negates any sort of anthropological dualism that minimizes the value of physical life (Purdy, 1995, pp. 500–509). If God cared enough to provide remedy to human physical suffering through the suffering of his Son, it is not theologically valid to say that the body has little value and its afflictions are unimportant. Across the theological spectrum, there is growing recognition that the biblical portrayal of salvation is holistic. Differences in opinion arise as to how this should be expressed and executed as part of the Christian mission, but all agree that salvation involves more than the forgiveness of sins and the eschatological gaining of paradise, however important these are (Moltmann, 1990, pp. 107–108). By

placing provision for healing in the atonement, pentecostals secure a place in Christology for expanding the understanding of salvation to include the physical and temporal. In dialogue, pentecostals and other theological streams can use healing in the atonement as a point for synthesis and biblically responsible expansion of salvation to include the totality of life.

As a facet of the fourfold gospel and an outcome of the work of Christ, healing occupies a special place in pentecostal belief and practice. While a vast improvement over cessationism and any form of anthropological dualism that views physical wellbeing as unimportant, the doctrine of healing in the atonement is not without problems of its own, and it has been criticized on biblical, theological, and practical grounds. The criticism comes not only from those outside the movement (e.g., Mayhue, 1995) but also charismatics such as J. Rodman Williams (1988b, pp. 364–365 n. 36) and some recent pentecostals (Warrington, 1998, pp. 169–170). If healing in the atonement is to be upheld as an essential component of the gospel and a basis for expanding understanding of the work of Christ, these critiques must be examined.

The criticism on biblical grounds primarily concerns the interpretation of the proof texts traditionally used by pentecostals to establish the doctrine, Isa. 53:4–5 and its quotations in Matt. 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24. The phrase “with his stripes we are healed” is interpreted as a prophetic reference to Jesus’ torture and crucifixion, his vicarious suffering on behalf of humanity. Pentecostals argue that the healing (רפָּאָה and ἰάομαι) referred to in these passages includes, but is not limited to, physical healing. Others object, asserting that from the context of the verses, the healing should be interpreted figuratively, referring to spiritual salvation only. For example, Richard L. Mayhue (1995, p. 128), argues that every incidence of רפָּאָה within Isaiah—assuming a single author of the book—is figurative, denoting the spiritual “healing from sin.” Similarly, Williams (1988b, pp. 364–365 n. 36) points out that the quotation in Matt. 8:17 connects healing only with Jesus’ life, not death. Likewise, when quoted in full, 1 Peter 2:24 clearly refers to Christ’s vicarious bearing of sin and the believer’s sanctification:

He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness. By his wounds you have been healed.

No clear mention of sickness or bodily healing is made in this context. As a charismatic, Williams affirms contemporary divine healing but maintains that these texts do not support the traditional pentecostal interpretation.

A more serious theological criticism concerns the propriety of sickness as a subject for atonement. On this matter, pentecostal scholar David Petts (quoted in Warrington, 1998, p. 169), states:

It was because of man's *sin* that atonement... was necessary. No atonement was needed for sickness. Sickness is not a misdemeanour which attracts a penalty.

The biblical concept of atonement involves the reconciliation of human beings with God after a breach in their relationship due to sin. Sickness is, among other things, a result of sin; it is not something requiring atonement or forgiveness. Accordingly, the very concept of "healing in the atonement" is an inappropriate confusion of categories. This argument is further strengthened by the penal substitution paradigm, which most pentecostals hold in common with conservative evangelicals. Christ suffered only to obtain pardon for sinful human beings, who otherwise were bound for eternal destruction (Mayhue, 1995, pp. 123–124). To add other, lesser purposes such as physical healing to the work of Christ is perceived by some as a lessening of the value of his sacrifice, which came at such a great cost.

While the above points should give pause to uncritical acceptance of the doctrine of healing in atonement, closer scrutiny reveals that these arguments themselves suffer from grave weaknesses. It is true that most commentators on Isa. 53:4–5 understand and emphasize the healing mentioned therein as spiritual and figurative. It must be considered, however, whether the interpretation of healing as spiritual is based primarily on factors inherent in the text or if it is first an unconscious reading back into the text of centuries of Christian theological reflection, which most of the time has been dualistic and has placed little value on the physical life. Historically, physical relief has not been appreciated as worthy of mention in the same breath as eternal salvation. However, the overall context of this servant song in particular and the latter part of Isaiah/Deutero-Isaiah in general is, even before it is embraced as a Christian prophecy, a promise of God's restoration of Israel after judgment and punishment. Throughout the Hebrew Bible, the Lord's disciplining of Israel involves spiritual and physical affliction of both the individual and the group—in other words, the entire human condition holistically. Healing or restoration after such affliction certainly involves the spiritual and psychological dimensions of life, but it also includes the physical and temporal. Contrary to Mayhue (1995, p. 128) and others, it is in this holistic sense that נָפַךְ is used within the book of Isaiah in such places as 19:22, 30:26, and 57:18–19. Pentecostal Christians, in adopting this theme of Scripture as the foundation of the doctrine of healing in the atonement, are merely accepting at face value the normal meanings of נָפַךְ and *ἰάομαι*. The burden of proof lies with those who do not believe these terms should be interpreted in this normal sense to demonstrate why the restoration promised in these passages cannot include physical healing.

The counterargument is further eroded when the atonement is seen as more than a penal substitution and is expanded to include the defeat of humanity's oppressors as is done in the *Christus victor* paradigm. Under the penal substitution theory, all that need be addressed, indeed all that can be addressed, is the problem of humanity's sin. The Bible's statements concerning the death of Christ, however, do not know this limitation, and the benefits of the atonement need not be limited to what neatly fits that particular theory (Menzies & Menzies, 2000, pp. 160–162). As noted earlier, one of the grave limitations of the satisfaction or penal substitution view of the atonement is that it does not assign any salvific value to the life of Jesus Christ, only his death (Aulén, 1931, pp. 86–89). In the *Christus victor* view, Christ's life from the incarnation to the resurrection involves a cosmic struggle against the forces or tyrants that oppress humanity, usually characterized as the "unholy trinity" of sin, death, and the devil. The death of Christ, of course, is the essential part of Christ's work and the moment in which the victory was won, but every part of his ministry was oriented toward the battle (Aulén, 1931, pp. 18–34). Understood in this manner, seeing healing as part of the atoning work of Christ causes no theological problems. It simply recognizes another dimension to the Christian understanding of salvation, healing, and adds sickness to the list of tyrants. To include freedom from physical afflictions as part of salvation need not detract from justification or even be assigned the same significance (Simpson, 1888, pp. 6–7, 101–104).

Beyond the Isaianic proof texts, when healing is understood as part of Christ's overall salvific ministry, healing in the atonement can readily be seen as part of the theme of all the Gospel witnesses. Healing is part of the Jesus' declaration of his mission, the Nazareth manifesto (Luke 4:16–27). Mark is replete with healing stories. Although the fourth Gospel contains fewer healing accounts than the Synoptics, John makes a significant connection between healing and Christ's death through the allusion of 3:14–15 (Thomas, J. C., 2005). In this passage, Christ's death is likened to the story of Num. 21:4–9, in which Moses erected a bronze serpent upon a pole; the Israelites were to look upon it to be healed of snake bites. The sole purpose of the pole was the saving of physical life through healing. By interpreting this as an analogy for the crucifixion of Christ, John implicitly makes healing one of the benefits of the atonement, interestingly without allusion to the Isaianic servant song. While this theme within the fourth Gospel featured prominently in the writings of the early pentecostals, it is rarely referenced in contemporary discussions of healing in the atonement (Thomas, J. C., 2005, pp. 35–38).

In conclusion, the biblical evidence can be argued to support the doctrine of healing in the atonement. While the pentecostal interpretation of Isa. 53:4–5 presents some difficulties, they are not insurmountable, and this text is not the only basis for

the doctrine. More than any other perspective, the pentecostal view provides a strong rationale for abandoning faulty anthropological dualism and appropriating salvation for all aspects of the human life. Accordingly, the doctrine of healing in the atonement is highly compatible with a from below approach to Christology and soteriology that begins with the human condition and its desperations. All would acknowledge the need for a reckoning of the sin issue in the divine-human relationship, for which the cross of Christ graciously provides a solution. It is not at all inappropriate, however, to raise the subject of other needs and to seek remedy for human suffering, a great portion of which is caused by sickness. Christ, moved by compassion, healed the sick in his earthly life (Matt. 14:14); healing is arguably the most significant facet of his ministry. That he might continue this work in his death in no way diminishes its atoning value. Contemporary Christologies that seek to be relevant to the various contexts of suffering and oppression in the world today can benefit from this expanded view of salvation and the work of Christ.

3.2.4.2 Pentecostal Healing and the Word of Faith Movement

That the Bible supports the healing in the atonement is one matter; how this teaching is appropriated and disseminated practically is another. Theologically, pentecostal discussions of healing tend to lack development and nuance, leading to unfortunate consequences. Two approaches are common. The first (e.g., Arrington, 1993, pp. 253–269; Menzies & Horton, 1993, pp. 190–206) focuses primarily on the provision of healing in the atonement. In this approach, less attention is given to the role of the Holy Spirit in healing or the function of healing within Christ’s ministry as proclaimer and bringer of the kingdom of God. Healing is held in analogy to other provisions of the atonement such as justification and thereby becomes absolutized, disregarding the nuance and warnings of A. B. Simpson. The second approach (e.g., McPherson & Cox, 1969, pp. 145–157) uses an opposite methodology but yields similar results. Every biblical reference to healing, including ones alluding to the atonement, is collected without differentiation. The references are not organized to form a doctrine of healing; rather, their cumulative weight is intended to show how important healing is to God and therefore always his will. Human participation is limited to supplying the faith necessary to receive healing. Both of these approaches—though not necessarily the cited examples—are criticized for their theological naïveté and their failure to address adequately difficult questions such as why healing does not occur with greater frequency. Some of the examples supplied do attempt to address these issues but in the form of an addendum to, not alteration of, their primary line of argument. In practice, the addendum is not always transferred to receivers of the message, and much error and confusion may result.

The best known and widespread example of misappropriation of healing in the atonement is found in the “Word of Faith” branch of the charismatic and independent, non-denominational pentecostal movements; it is also known as the prosperity gospel or “health and wealth” movement. Although it typically eschews all denominationalism and formal theology, the Word of Faith movement is important because it overwhelmingly dominates television pentecostalism and is therefore a source of doctrinal instruction for a vast number of the movement’s adherents. Critic D. R. McConnell (quoted in Abanes, 1997, p. 371), notes that the Word of Faith movement is, for all practical purposes, “no longer just a *part* of the charismatic movement: it *is* the charismatic movement.” The Word of Faith movement is another interesting example of the Christological innovations of the broader pentecostal and charismatic movement, though few theologians or even traditional pentecostals would see these innovations positively (Abanes, 1997, pp. 372–379; Purdy, 1995, pp. 515–517). This present work will examine only the movement’s appropriation of the subject at hand, healing in the atonement, and distortions that result from it. Although an objective observer would find difficulty in justifying all of the criticisms leveled at the movement, its defects in this area must be addressed in order to advance an ecumenical pentecostal theology of healing.

The prime emphasis of the Word of Faith movement is the spoken word or “positive confession” of faith (Lovett, 2002, p. 992). Faith is a spiritual substance or power by which the universe is governed; even God himself uses and is subject to the principle of faith (Abanes, 1997, pp. 372–373, 379–381). Christians have access to the creative power of God through the positive confession of faith, the speaking of faith-filled words to shape reality into what believers want it to be. The manifestation of this confession may be long in coming, but it will eventually come as long as the believer has sufficient faith. Sickness, financial hardship, and other forms of suffering are always due to a lack of faith or “negative confession,” the speaking of non-positive words, however accurate they really may be (Abanes, 1997, pp. 381–382).

Word of Faith teachers also universally accept the doctrine of healing in the atonement (Hollinger, 1988, pp. 132–134). When interpreted using an unnuanced literalistic hermeneutic (Lovett, 2002, p. 993), the promise of healing becomes absolutized; healing is always the will of God in every situation (Abanes, 1997, pp. 383–386; Moo, 1988, p. 192). Passages such as Mark 10:29–30 and 11:22–24 are also taken absolutely so that a lack of faith is the only perceivable barrier to healing. To demonstrate faith, a positive confession must be maintained at all times; nothing should be said that contradicts the Word of God, the Bible:

Every time you confess your doubts and fears, you confess your weakness and your disease, you are openly confessing that the Word of God is not true and

that God has failed to make it good. He declares that, “With His stripes you were healed,” and “Surely He hath borne our sicknesses and carried our diseases.” Instead of confessing that He has borne my [*sic*] diseases and put them away, I confess that I still have them. I take the testimony of my senses instead of the testimony of the Word of God. As long as I hold fast to my confession of weakness, sickness, and pain, I will still have them.... The believer who is always confessing his sins and his weaknesses is building weakness, failure and sin into his consciousness.... Never tell anyone about your weakness or about your past blunders and failures. (Gossett & Kenyon, 1997, pp. 18–19)

Any recognition of negative medical facts or realistic assessments of situations are impermissible. Sickness, poverty, and any other type of suffering are all considered personal flaws resulting from insufficient manipulation of reality by faith. Word of Faith or prosperity theology may be considered the opposite of liberation theology. God’s preferential option is for the faithful, and he shows this by blessing their lives materially as well as spiritually. It is not a sin to be poor and sick, but it may be a sin to remain that way (Abanes, 1997, pp. 382–385). Many critics from within and without the charismatic movement have amply documented statements by Word of Faith preachers to this effect as well as the sad results that have sometimes occurred when healing has not manifested in accordance with the principles of positive confession.

It is this combination with faith teaching that provokes most contemporary criticism of the pentecostal doctrine of healing in the atonement as an unhealthy, absolutized expectation. The Word of Faith teaching, however, can only be interpreted as a recent innovation with little relation to the original formulation within the holiness and early pentecostal movements. Although Word of Faith shares many beliefs with classical pentecostalism, especially with regard to Holy Spirit baptism, speaking in tongues, and eschatology, its beliefs about positive confession and healing do not originate from the stream of Wesleyan revivalism, as do those of pentecostalism, but from other sources. Word of Faith teaching has a striking resemblance and, via one of its key figures, E. W. Kenyon, traceable connections to Christian Science, the teaching of Mary Baker Eddy, and other “mind science” belief systems (Abanes, 1997, p. 386; Hollinger, 1988, pp. 142–145; Lovett, 2002, pp. 992–993). A type of monism, Christian Science goes far beyond the antipathy to the physical found in traditional dualistic Christian anthropology by absolutizing the body-soul dichotomy. The body, along with the rest of the material world, simply does not exist except as an illusion of the mind (e.g., Eddy, 1906, pp. 263ff., 468, 591). Positing ignorance instead of a lack of faith as the source of humanity’s ills, the Christian Science perspective on healing bears more than a slight resemblance to that of positive confession:

Therefore the only reality of sin, sickness, or death is the awful fact that unrealities seem real to human, erring belief, until God strips off their disguise. They are not true, because they are not of God. (Eddy, 1906, p. 472)

When sin or sickness—the reverse of harmony—seems true to material sense, impart without frightening or discouraging the patient the truth and spiritual understanding, which destroy disease. Expose and denounce the claims of evil and disease in all their forms, but realize no reality in them.... The sick are not healed merely by declaring there is no sickness, but by knowing that there is none. (Eddy, 1906, p. 447)

The protest of the theologies of liberation has driven home to the Christian church the importance of addressing the very real problems in human beings' lives and society. Solutions to real problems do not come by denying them or spiritualizing them away through a positive confession or mind-set. Faith and healing are closely connected, but Jesus also delivered those who were imperfect in faith or lacked sufficient strength to help themselves (e.g., Mark 5:35–42, 6:54–56, 9:14–27; cf. Segundo, 1985, pp. 141–144). Biblically, faith is trust in the goodness of God—which is in no way dependent upon the skill of the believer—and hope for a positive future with God. It is never a denial of the present realities of suffering nor an attempt to manipulate reality or God through words and convictions.

3.2.4.3 Toward a More Mature Understanding of Healing in the Atonement

The pentecostal doctrine of healing in the atonement is biblical as well as useful pastorally. Yet, the reality is that not all who have faith are healed, a significant theological and practical problem. As critics rightly point out, Christians believe that the forgiveness of sin is automatic and guaranteed because of the atonement, but healing does not come automatically or in all cases. One may believe that healing is found in the atonement but should also understand that healing is not present in the atonement the same as way as justification is. All theological perspectives acknowledge that justification is not the only benefit gained by the work of Christ. Not all of the benefits are available at the present time; none have yet experienced the resurrection of the body or the renewal of creation. Not even all who believe experience the full benefits available presently; peace is a benefit of salvation, but not all have it yet. Healing, physical and otherwise, may be viewed in a similar light. Most pentecostal theologians who affirm healing in the atonement acknowledge this distinction:

Spiritual healing is primary, but physical healing is also a part of the atoning work of Christ, since He came to redeem the whole person, not just part of us. Still, there is a difference between salvation from sin and physical healing. (Arrington, 1993, p. 260)

Virgil Warren (quoted in Purdy, 1995, p. 518) refers to healing as a “‘non-uniform’

result of salvation.” Healing is a benefit of Christ’s works, but like other aspects of salvation, there are other factors involved such as the sovereign will and purposes of God. More mature reflections on healing and lack of healing take many other factors into account to arrive at a theologically and experiential healthy perspective.

Like Barth, Jürgen Moltmann (1992, pp. 191–192) also acknowledges healing in the atonement, and in his Christology he provides a fruitful discussion of the limitations inherent in the concept of healing itself (Moltmann, 1990, pp. 108–109). Healing is, at the very best, a temporary release from suffering and death. All who are sick and experience healing will at some point in time again become sick and ultimately die. Even the most spectacular miracles of Jesus reported in the Gospels, the raising of the dead, were temporary resuscitations; Lazarus and others still faced death a second time. True and full healing is eschatological, concomitant with the resurrection of the dead. Healing, though part of salvation, is but a sign and foretaste of that future promise. That all healings are temporary and imperfect, however, does not mean that they are without value. That Jesus ministered healing both in his life and through his death shows that this alleviation of human suffering, whatever its limitations, is important to God and therefore should also be important for the Christian church.

3.2.5 Toward a More Holistic View of Salvation

The pentecostal experience of healing serves as a corrective to theologies that neglect the physical and temporal aspects of salvation and as a challenge to the naturalism underlying some aspects of modern Christian thought. That modern, mainstream theology, both conservative and liberal, has done little with healing does not prove that healing is an irrelevant, minor concern of theology but rather demonstrates the widespread and lasting influence of certain categories of Enlightenment thought, views that are no longer self-evidently true in a post-modern, pluralistic world. Of course, the question arises as to the nature of the healings reported by pentecostals and charismatics; empirical verification of them has been notoriously difficult. This is an investigation beyond the scope of this theological work; it is sufficient for the present purpose to merely consider a few possibilities. If the healings are merely psychosomatic or natural spontaneous remissions, they may still be considered the work of God (Moltmann, 1992, pp. 191–192). The rate of healings claimed by pentecostal and charismatic Christians is very high; even if there are naturalistic explanations for the phenomena, the rate is unusual and therefore significant. Conversely, only one reported healing need be proven to have non-naturalistic causes for the worldviews of both materialistic skepticism and Christian cessationism to fall. The present-day ministry of healing is a far greater threat to

philosophical naturalism than any result of scientific investigation is to the Christian faith.

Earlier (§2.1.3.2, p. 18), the ideological investment of evangelicalism in the doctrine of inerrancy was noted. Inerrancy is used to defend the evangelical understanding of the Bible's inspiration and the theology derived from that understanding. Critical study of Scripture is rejected because it threatens the framework from which evangelical theology is derived. Similarly, some forms of ecumenical theology have a considerable investment in the conclusions of historical criticism. While many of those conclusions have merit, it must not be forgotten that much of the pioneering work in biblical criticism was done in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and that the presuppositions and findings of the critics of that era are permeated with philosophical naturalism. If the premise of naturalism is withdrawn, some of the conclusions of the critics now viewed as self-evident quickly become suspect. Reevaluation and correction of faults would be a lengthy and painful process, and hence some resist the proposal of personal supernatural activity by God in the world. Bultmann (1961, p. 120), for example, when confronted with this possibility in the life of the respectable figure of Blumhardt, stated, "The Blumhardt legends are to my mind preposterous." One cannot today prove beyond all doubt whether Blumhardt's experiences were supernatural acts of God, but Bultmann refused to entertain the possibility. It would be too costly for his overall thesis.

Conservatives, including pentecostals, err however when they reject Bultmann's insight *in toto*; he raised a much broader question of worldview that cannot be ignored in the contemporary world. Part of the aversion to Bultmann is a visceral reaction against the connotations of the word "myth"; acceptance of demythologization implies denial of the factual truth of that which is demythologized. Bultmann's point, however, is that *everyone* demythologizes; the question is the extent to which it is done and the transparency involved in the process (Bultmann, 1984, pp. 8–12; cf. Schniewind, 1961, pp. 45–47). Allegorization, for example, is a form of demythologization (Bultmann, 1984, p. 12). Demythologization has positive applications and is at times completely necessary (Kasper, 1976, pp. 46–48). Conservatives, even pentecostals, demythologize to some degree. For example, they too reject a literal interpretation of the three-storied universe that so aroused Bultmann's incredulity. They see it as expressing a spiritual reality in language accommodating the common worldview of biblical times; heaven and hell are perhaps trans-dimensional states of existence rather than geographical locations. Demythologization as a hermeneutical and theological tool needs correction, not wholesale rejection, and that correction is facilitated if modern-day experience of the supernatural is accepted as pentecostals contend. That said, one must not lose sight of

that fact that in comparison to the stories of other ancient religions that are commonly called myths, the Bible is largely free of traditional mythic elements.

Demythologization has its own dangers and limits, not the least of which is the confusion of the abstract with the spiritual (Brunner, 1962, pp. 404–407).

Used constructively, demythologization provides a positive framework for developing a fuller doctrine of healing and salvation. The relevant question that arises from a mediating interpretive position is, must all healings mirror those in the Bible, or does God perform healing works beyond the types of those narrated? The innovation of pentecostalism is the permanent attaching of a physical and temporal soteriological component to the work of Christ through the doctrine of healing in the atonement; salvation can no longer be confined to exclusively spiritual or otherworldly dimensions. This does not in itself, however, automatically yield a complete “full gospel” as it usually stops at the physical and psychological healing of individuals (Kärkkäinen, 2005, p. 45). The pentecostal perspective on healing does not need to be demythologized but given a *sensus plenior* beyond patently and exclusively miraculous categories so that it can concern itself with other dimensions of human affliction beyond individual needs.

Miroslav Volf (1989) drew a connection between liberation theology and pentecostalism that has largely been accepted in the academic theological world, which is their shared belief in the “materiality of salvation.” Although on the surface they are diametric opposites, even competitors in the homeland of liberation theology, largely catholic Latin America, they have natural affinities in their expanded understandings of Christian salvation as having non-spiritual, material dimensions. As Macchia (2002, p. 1135) notes,

The place pentecostals give to healing has implications for an understanding of the gospel that is not restricted to the forgiveness of sins or the reconciliation of the “soul” to God, but extends also to the liberation and redemption of human society and the entire cosmos.

Liberationist Virgil Elizondo (1996, p. 52) affirms the fundamental compatibility between the pentecostal and liberation movements:

In fact, each one has what the other lacks and needs in order truly to accomplish its goals. Both empower the disenfranchised: Pentecostalism through interior deliverance of the individual and the liberation movements by enabling the people to take control of the forces of society which govern their destiny.

As Lucan theologies, both pentecostalism and liberation theology seek to apply the fullness of Christ’s work to every aspect of human existence. Both movements draw inspiration from the Nazareth manifesto of Luke 4:14–21, in which the arrival of the Spirit in liberating power heralds the coming of the Messiah. The challenge for

pentecostals in continuing Christ's mission is to acknowledge the presence and activity of God's Spirit in the healing of social ills, in both miraculous and non-miraculous ways, and not just in the curing of individual afflictions. Likewise, liberationists must resist the temptation to demythologize too extensively and focus exclusively on the naturalistic, political, and social dimensions of liberation (Boff & Boff, 1987, pp. 64–65). Joining the emphases of the two movements can help lead to a universally responsible Christology, a fuller gospel, and a more holistic ministry of healing. Such would not be a new theological innovation but a return to the biblical pattern of signs and wonder accompanying the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom in the power of the Spirit.

Pentecostals are fond of Heb. 13:8, "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever." Jesus the savior is Jesus the healer, and the work of healing he carried out while on earth continues to this day. The relationship between healing and salvation is being increasingly recognized in diverse theological streams to the benefit of all. Not fully developed even within pentecostal theology, however, is the link between Jesus and the Spirit in the ministry of healing. As noted previously, pentecostals have come close to this in seeing Jesus as the prototypical Spirit-filled man and linking his miracles to the operation of the Spirit. Yet, this theme is diluted by focusing on healing as a benefit of the atonement rather than a gift of the Spirit. When healing is held in analogy to justification by faith, the roles of both the Holy Spirit and believers in the mission and ministry of healing becomes marginalized. Healing is treated as a spiritual gift *sui generis*, and thus not all of the detailed teaching of Paul about spiritual gifts in 1 Cor. 12–14 has been brought to bear on the subject. Some of the tension in viewing healing as always provided but not always received arises from this.

This problem reveals further difficulties with interpreting the atoning work of Christ exclusively as a penal substitution detached from his earthly ministry. Jesus saved people and forgave sins before his death; he also healed before his death. His healing power was attributed to the Holy Spirit (Luke 4:14ff., Matt. 12:28, Acts 10:38), and the healing ministry for which he commissioned his followers was not directly connected to or expressed as an extension of his sacrificial work (Luke 9:1–6). Again, this aspect of salvation is better understood through the *perichoresis* and reciprocity of the work of Christ and the Spirit. Healing is objectively provided by the atonement of Christ, but as a foretaste of the eschatological kingdom, it is a new creation by the Spirit. Healing is a gift of the Spirit, and as with other gifts, the Spirit retains sovereignty over it (1 Cor. 12:4–11). Spiritual gifts are diverse, spontaneous, and unpredictable. They are best approached with an attitude of expectation and openness. The ministry of healing continues today, and all Christians are called upon

to participate in it vitally. What God may heal, and how, and when, and through whom needs to be left to his sovereign grace, but Christians may be confident that it is his will to heal the needs of individuals, societies, and the whole creation through human and supernatural means.

3.2.6 Excursus: Healing and the Demonic

Not only healings but exorcisms of evil spirits lie at the irreducible historical core of the Gospels. The two are closely linked; in the ministry of Jesus, healing was often effected through exorcism (e.g., Matt. 9:32–34, 12:22, 17:14–20, Luke 13:10–13), and Jesus as deliverer is an unstated but implicit function of the fourfold gospel. Fuller exploration of the meaning of the demonic is beyond the scope of this study, as is an apologetic for the widespread, sometimes even enthusiastic, belief in demons among pentecostals. However, a study of Jesus as healer cannot be considered complete without some reference to his ministry as an exorcist (Kuemmerlin-McLean & Nelson, 1992, p. 142). The meaning and significance of these accounts in the Gospels provide a much greater challenge for contemporary Christians than supernatural healing by a benevolent God. In the West, belief in a world full of evil spirits was a casualty of the Enlightenment, and today it is difficult to have an intelligent discussion about the demonic without inviting reminders of some of the worst excesses of medieval Christianity. Witch hunts, persecution of the mentally ill, and theological absurdities associated with angelology and demonology are embarrassments most thoughtful Christians would like to leave behind as regrettable mistakes from a superstitious age. Barth (1960, pp. 519–522 (CD III.3)) in particular criticized orthodox theology for giving demons too much respect and recognition by clubbing demonology with other areas of theology. This resulted in giving cause for the dismissal of the entire Christian message in the process of demythologizing the demonic. For much of recent history, it seemed better for Christianity to abandon any concept of the demonic whatsoever.

As the modern age gave way to the postmodern, however, the demonic regained some respectability as a theological category (Tillich, 1963, p. 102). Bultmann (1961, pp. 119–120) completely opposed any attempts to resuscitate belief in literal evil spirits, but he did see symbolized in demonology “the important truth of the trans-subjective reality of evil.” Paul Tillich used the demonic as a symbol with surprising frequency in his *Systematic theology*. For him (Tillich, 1963, pp. 102–106), the demonic was a counterweight to the truly divine; it was that which “distorts self-transcendence by identifying a particular bearer of holiness with the holy itself” (p. 102) and elevates “one element of finitude to infinite power” (p. 103). Although not literal, personified evil spirits, the demonic was for Tillich a real threat to life and true religion.

Barth (1960, pp. 519–531 (CD III.3)) went much further, expounding on the demonic as an implication of his broader doctrine of nothingness. Barth’s work in this area is highly creative and innovative, but it also has been rightly criticized as tortuous and needlessly obscure. Barth acknowledged the demonic but sought to deny it any sort of positive relationship to God’s creation. It is a product of God’s No and opposes all that is good in creation. “They can only hate God and his creation,” he wrote (1960, p. 523 (CD III.3)). Barth seemed to simultaneously affirm and deny the reality and personhood of the demonic, and he echoed the warning of C. S. Lewis (2002, p. 125) to neither completely ignore nor overly obsess about demons. Barth (1961a, pp. 370–371 (CD III.4)) also wrote approvingly of the message and deliverance ministry of Blumhardt. His comments reflect a mature and healthy perspective on this subject:

Blumhardt’s perception may have been mythological (and this is surely better than no perception at all), but he saw in the condition of this girl, and later of many others, the presence of the opposing world of the absolutely abnormal and objectively unseemly, i.e., the satanic darkness in relation to which there must not be adaptation into something willed by God but revolt, protest, and angry negation.

Liberation theologians have also shown interest in the demonic as a symbol. The New Testament’s depictions of demonic “rulers and authorities” (Eph. 6:12, Col. 2:15) are readily transferred to oppressive social and economic structures. Despite full acceptance of the reality of the demonic, many pentecostals have been reluctant to make this connection. Elizondo (1996, p. 53) explains:

The naming of the “idols” of the dominant structures of oppression has been one of the main sources of healing and deliverance within the movements of liberation. One of the critiques of Pentecostalism from within the movements of liberation is that often they perform exorcisms, but do not seek to name the specific demons of society which are producing the illness, thus giving the individual a personal experience of deliverance without seeking to eradicate the demon itself. Unless the roots of the disease are attacked, it will certainly continue to destroy people.

If the satanic is that which seeks to “steal and kill and destroy” (John 10:10), it is myopic to see the activities of evil forces as confined only to individual behaviors and circumstances. Although not all will agree with all of the ideological conclusions of liberation theology, the movement serves as a prophetic reminder that social, economic, and political structures that carry out agendas consonant with the goals of the demonic should also be targeted by the Christian ministry of deliverance. Speaking from the context of Hispanic American pentecostalism, Eldin Villafañe (1993, p. 181) has incorporated this insight into his groundbreaking attempt to formulate a contextual pentecostal social ethic:

It [Hispanic pentecostalism] must realize that sin and evil goes beyond the individual; that we are all enmeshed in a social living that is complex, dynamic and dialectical; and that our spirituality, and the very Gospel that we preach, needs to be as big and ubiquitous as sin and evil.

Most twentieth century exercises in demonology, including the above examples, have involved some form of demythologization. It is difficult to object to this interpretive approach even from a conservative biblical perspective. Much of Christian mythology concerning the demonic, as well as popular perceptions of it, is more patristic and medieval in origin than biblical outside of the edges of the canon. Traditional Christian demonology makes claims far beyond what is biblically sustainable, for Scripture provides little concrete information about the origin and nature of demons. The plain accounts of demonic activity in the Gospels and Acts focus only on their effects on human beings. More vivid descriptions of the demonic and satanic are confined to the apocalyptic portions, and if any of the different genres of biblical literature deserve the descriptor of mythological, it is the apocalyptic. These sections of Scripture deliberately use highly visual language to depict symbolically the truths they wish to communicate, and few from any theological tradition insist on interpreting them literally. Excluding the apocalyptic, the biblical portrayal of the demonic bears closer resemblance to that of Barth, Tillich, and the liberation theologians than to that of medieval speculative angelologies and demonologies and artistic representations. A return to a more biblical demonology requires the purging of foreign preconceptions that have become almost universally associated with this controversial area of study.

The sum of these possible interpretations is that the activities of demons and their expulsion by Christ and his followers should not simply be discarded as mythological accretions with no connection to objective reality. Although the Enlightenment has forever changed the Western world's understanding of the spiritual, it is highly significant that the demonic as a theological category could be safely ignored for only a short span of the modern age before attracting serious attention again. Given that, the more traditional pentecostal understanding of evil spirits should also be given acknowledgment; its distance from the modern reinterpretations discussed above is not as great as it first appears. The term "exorcism" is rarely used in contemporary pentecostalism, "deliverance" and "inner healing" being more popular. The goal of a delivering, healing ministry is to bring liberation to the total person, spiritually, emotionally, physically, and socially. This may involve the eviction of evil presences, but whether they are in reality psychological, metaphorical, or literal matters little. The debate over the demythologization of the demonic is given more importance than it deserves. In many

traditional cultures, the popular worldview has no difficulty in believing in active, personal evil spirits; promoting a more scientific, Enlightenment worldview should not necessarily be a high priority for the Christian mission in such a context. Conversely, in other cultures, firm insistence on belief in literal demons may cause unnecessary alienation; conversion to this viewpoint serves little good. Holistic wellbeing and freedom from oppression are what matter. In this area, perhaps more than any other, a healthy balance is vital but unfortunately difficult to achieve. Part of the temperance needed within pentecostalism may be accomplished through eschatological adjustment; more is said about this in §3.4.3.1, below.

3.3 Jesus as Baptizer: Power for Ministry

As discussed thus far, the soteriology of pentecostalism embodied in the fourfold gospel is comprehensive and holistic. In imitation of the ministry of Christ, it contains the potential to address all aspects of humanity's needs, physical as well as spiritual, individually and corporately. Yet, pentecostalism has been frequently charged with not living up to this potential, focusing too much on individual wellbeing and neglecting social, economic, and political responsibilities. For many segments of the movement, this charge is not unfounded. As Cecil M. Robeck (1987, p. 103) writes:

Yet for the most part, pentecostals... are not widely known for their continuing contribution to the resolution of social justice issues. In many instances, pentecostals have come to question those who question the *status quo*. They have become selective in the way they understand the concerns of evangelism. They have carefully chosen the elements of Jesus' ministry with which they wish to be identified. And this is especially true within the North American context.

This is no small problem. Differences over the importance of social action and over which particular social issues are important are at the root of the conflict between conservative and liberal Christians over ecumenical and missionary cooperation (Hedlund, 1993; Lord, 2003, pp. 281–283). As the debate has heated up in the twentieth century, pentecostals have grown closer to the evangelical position in this area (Robeck, 1987, p. 106). Although they have not totally neglected social action (Kärkkäinen, 1999, pp. 80–81), priority has been given to evangelism, the “saving of souls.”

Addressing this vital issue in a constructive manner, both theologically and practically, is necessary for advancement of unity and cooperation. Acknowledging that other theological traditions have insights that can complement one's own is a considerable distance away from practical implementation. Ecumenical dialogue may lead to greater levels of respect for and fellowship with the other, but it is too easy to leave the ecumenical challenge at the conference table and continue on one's present

trajectory undiverted. For pentecostalism to expand its vision of salvation beyond only the proclamation of spiritual regeneration and healing and recover the full gospel of Jesus, it must find some way of connecting the other ecumenical perspectives on salvation with its own traditions. Likewise, if non-pentecostal ecumenical theologies are to grow from their contact with pentecostalism, more is needed than acknowledgment of the latter's basic orthodoxy and patience with its exuberance. These traditions must find meeting points within the pentecostal fourfold gospel that correspond to and enrich their own sense-making perspectives.

As will be shown, the theological issue underlying this problem within pentecostalism is not found in the movement's Christology, soteriology, or pneumatology; it is more likely a problem with its eschatology (Snell, 1992, pp. 51–53). Indeed, in the movement's pneumatology is found the solution to the problem. Surprisingly, the best place for ecumenical meeting and synthesis lies in pentecostalism's most distinctive—as well as most controversial—doctrine, the baptism in the Holy Spirit. All Christians, of course, believe in Spirit baptism; it is a biblical doctrine. Where they differ, and differ widely, is in its interpretation. Spirit baptism is the *sine qua non* of the pentecostal movement, that which gives it its identity and distinguishes it from other traditions. It is not surprising, therefore, that its interpretation is unique. The pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism differs from both the traditional protestant view, in which Spirit baptism is identified with salvation and regeneration, as well as the non-pentecostal holiness view, in which Spirit baptism is the same as entire sanctification. Pentecostals hold that this experience is most commonly received some time after justification, but some Christians never receive it at all. Most controversially, classical pentecostals maintain that it can only be deemed to have been received when speaking in tongues occurs as it did on the original day of Pentecost.

Although such a novel formulation is seemingly at odds with most of Christian history, the pentecostal interpretation has made major inroads into virtually every denomination via the charismatic renewal, attaining a respectable level of tolerance if not wholesale acceptance. This suggests that there is greater legitimacy to the pentecostal interpretation than is commonly assumed and that it can find resonance and support in a wide range of traditions. Pentecostals rightly perceive the biblical function of Spirit baptism as neither salvation nor sanctification but power for ministry (Snell, 1992, pp. 44–48). Ministry is necessarily directed outward, from the individual to the community and from the community to the world (Acts 1:8). Pentecostals hold that the second blessing of the Spirit is intended to help believers share the fullness of salvation with others by empowering them to replicate the

ministry of Christ (Dempster, 1987, pp. 146–149). The pentecostal distinctive is the call for all Christians to experience their own “personal Pentecost.”

It is the researcher’s contention that the Bible as well as historical and contemporary theological trends lend support to the pentecostal understanding of Spirit baptism and that the doctrine deserves more thoughtful consideration than mere tolerance. As it is properly oriented towards serving others, it can also serve as an energizing point for leveraging the fourfold gospel into a truly fuller gospel in both theology and practice. Just as healing in the atonement provides a firm basis for incorporating non-spiritual dimensions into the complex of salvation, the doctrine of Spirit baptism formalizes subsequence and, when properly apprehended, fosters movement in the Christian life towards greater levels of service. The call to Pentecost is the call to ministry, which is necessarily both social and evangelistic. With regard to Christology, understanding Christ as the baptizer with the Spirit as well as the archetypal one baptized by the Spirit gives greater insight into the purpose and direction of the Christian life. Christians are not only followers of Jesus but are called to continue his ministry of salvation, healing, and liberation in the power of the Holy Spirit.

3.3.1 The Pentecostal *Sine Qua Non*: Origin and Evolution

Historian Vinson Synan (1971, pp. 99–100 n. 12) has often called pentecostalism “a movement without a man.” No single person can be ascribed as its founder, and many different leaders, famous and obscure, both men and women, contributed to its development and growth. As a distinct movement and theological stream, however, it owes more to John Wesley than anyone else (Synan, 1971, p. 13). Pentecostalism is directly descended from methodism and the ensuing holiness movements, and it was Wesley’s teaching of Christian perfection that ultimately led to the pentecostal doctrine of Holy Spirit baptism. More is said about Wesley’s distinctive teaching on sanctification and its relevance for contemporary theology in §3.5. At this time, it will suffice to broadly describe the evolution from methodism to classical pentecostalism.

Although he was not the first to conceive of the idea, Wesley did much to popularize the concept of a higher Christian life, specifically of individual attainment of greater levels of sanctification after justification. Affirming that Christ brought freedom not only from the penalty of sin but from the presence of sin, Wesley believed it possible for a believer to be entirely sanctified in this life, before death, through faith. This interpretation of sanctification differs radically from the reformed tradition, which views sanctification as a never-ending (in this life) process derived ultimately from justification. “Genuine sanctification... stands or falls with this

continued orientation toward justification and the remission of sins,” writes G. C. Berkouwer (1952, p. 78) representing the reformed perspective. Wesley affirmed the progressive nature of sanctification but also contended that a perfection of love could be attained in the present life, even received in a moment by faith:

...I maintained—(1) That Christian perfection is that love of God and our neighbour, which implies deliverance from *all sin*; (2) that this is received merely *by faith*; (3) that it is given *instantaneously*, in one moment; (4) That we are to expect it, not at death, but *every moment*; that *now* is the accepted time, *now* is the day of this salvation. (Wesley, 1968, p. 41, emphasis original)

This perfection in love or entire sanctification is not identical to justification but occurs subsequent to it (p. 24).

Wesley was not, however, a systematic theologian but a preacher, and his teaching on this vital subject was not as clear as many would have liked. He provided ample backing for sanctification as a teleological theme of Scripture but less so for it as a second blessing or crisis experience subsequent to justification. Wesley himself never clearly claimed to have been entirely sanctified (Peters, 1985, pp. 201–215); most interpreters of Wesley understand his famous Aldersgate experience in which his heart was “strangely warmed” as his regeneration (Synan, 1971, pp. 16–17). Additionally, how to confirm objectively that entire sanctification has occurred was not clear for the early movement. To simply claim that one has received entire sanctification and has ceased from sinning has a certain gaucheness and is more likely a clear indicator that one has not been perfected in Christian love and humility. Further development of the doctrine was needed beyond Wesley’s revivalistic preaching.

Accordingly, many methodists and later participants in the holiness movement—largely former methodists who felt the original movement had moved too far away from Wesley’s teaching—sought stronger biblical backing for this second soteriological crisis, especially its instantaneous reception. Many were drawn to the baptism of the Holy Spirit as portrayed in the Gospels and Acts as a synonym for entire sanctification. Wesley himself did not make this connection; his teaching was more Christocentric in orientation (Dayton, 1975, pp. 41–42). His contemporary, John Fletcher, was the first to emphasize Spirit baptism, though his specific understanding of its place in the *ordo salutis* is not entirely clear. Over time, the understanding of Spirit baptism as entire sanctification grew, and there was competition between Wesley’s position and it. Ultimately, the newer view prevailed with the holiness movement’s employment of “pentecostal language” to prop up the doctrine of entire sanctification biblically, especially as a discrete act of grace subsequent to salvation (Dayton, 1987, pp. 90–92). The second soteriological blessing was increasingly

understood as not only a sanctifying but also an empowering experience. By the end of the nineteenth century, virtually all in the holiness movement agreed with this interpretation, and along with the acceptance of divine healing and premillennialism, all of the elements of the pentecostal fourfold gospel were in place save speaking in tongues (Dayton, 1975, pp. 47–53).

As noted in the previous chapter, the modern pentecostal movement began theologically if not phenomenologically when Charles Fox Parham, a American holiness preacher, assigned his students at Bethel Bible School in Topeka, Kansas, to study the Scriptures and determine what was the biblical evidence for the baptism in the Holy Spirit. All of the students apparently independently concluded that it was speaking in tongues, and with Agnes Ozman's experience of glossolalia on January 1, 1901, in response to prayer for Spirit baptism, the classical pentecostal movement was born (Synan, 1971, pp. 99–102). Another preacher, William J. Seymour, connected with Parham and took the new doctrine to Los Angeles, California. Seymour was catalytic in starting the Azusa Street revival in 1906, and after contact with the revival, many of the major holiness denominations in United States quickly accepted the new doctrine (Synan, 1971, p. 137). Most retained their belief in entire sanctification as a second soteriological experience and split out Spirit baptism as a third (Synan, 1971, pp. 115–116). With the further study of Scripture and the experience of tongues came the realization that Spirit baptism could not be identified with entire sanctification; its purpose was not for holiness but power for ministry. The original holiness pentecostals considered entire sanctification a prerequisite for being filled with the Spirit. Others who later joined the movement, not from Wesleyan backgrounds, rejected the teaching of Christian perfection but accepted Spirit baptism as a second work subsequent to salvation. The formalization of subsequence and the catalytic linking of tongues to Spirit baptism makes this the *sine qua non* of pentecostalism and the movement's distinctive contribution to contemporary Christianity⁷ (Synan, 1971, pp. 121–122).

Although they differ on sanctification, the majority of Trinitarian pentecostal groups formed during the classical period have essentially the same understanding of Spirit baptism. Based on a simple but valid harmonization of Acts 1:4–5, 2:4, and 2:38, being filled with the Spirit, receiving the Spirit, and being baptized with the Spirit are roughly synonyms for the same act of the ascended Lord (Arrington, 1994, pp. 52–58; Wyckoff, 1995, pp. 425–427). The author of Acts also refers to the same

⁷Edward Irving (1792-1834), the founder of the Catholic Apostolic Church in Scotland, held a doctrine of Spirit baptism and tongues virtually identical to that of classical pentecostalism. The movement did not have widespread influence, however, and no direct connection has been traced between it and the later pentecostal movement (Dorries, 1991).

experience as the Spirit “falling on,” “coming upon,” or being “poured out on” believers. Some in the broader renewal movement distinguish between the initial experience of being baptized with the Spirit and multiple later fillings as a revitalization of the former experience. Spirit baptism does not occur simultaneously with justifying faith, and it is not to be identified with regeneration (Williams, 1988a, pp. 42–43). Usually it must be actively sought, and it can be delayed for days, months, or years after salvation, although ideally, it can and should be received immediately after the believer’s new birth or water baptism (Wyckoff, 1995, pp. 451–454). Speaking in tongues is classically held as the normative “initial physical evidence” of being baptized with the Holy Spirit, though it is not the sole or even most important sign of the Spirit-filled life.

For various reasons, not all Christians receive the experience of Spirit baptism with speaking in tongues, though it is available to all. Few classical pentecostals would maintain that those who do not speak in tongues do not have the Holy Spirit. Most acknowledge a primary indwelling at regeneration and do not equate Spirit baptism with salvation (e.g., Arrington, 1994, pp. 42–44, 58). After all, the early pentecostal leaders had a considerable delay between their confessions of salvation and their Spirit baptism. Despite the common charge of spiritual elitism, most pentecostal leaders and theologians are apologetic about their doctrine and seek to be sensitive to others’ views and experiences without denying their own. That all do not have the experience is not necessarily because of a personal failing but most probably due to the loss of the doctrine in the church after centuries of historical neglect. The truth was restored in the new revival movement, pentecostals affirm, and all should now seek it and patiently wait until it arrives.

3.3.2 Initial Evidence and Real Evidence: Purposes and Accomplishments of the New Pentecost

Although it is inappropriate to reduce pentecostalism to simply a “tongues movement,” it is not surprising that the early movement was characterized as such. Given the historical milieu, the pentecostal doctrine of subsequent Spirit baptism was not particularly unique or noteworthy; the influential non-pentecostal holiness churches held it as well. What makes the pentecostal perspective unique and the *sine qua non* of the movement is its corollary, the doctrine of initial evidence. This is also the one doctrinal point disputed most by non-pentecostals. Classical pentecostals believe that speaking in other tongues, the phenomenon of glossolalia, is the normative initial physical evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit (Wyckoff, 1995, pp. 439–442). Each of these descriptors is important for the pentecostal understanding. Glossolalia is *normative*, in that it should always occur along with

Spirit baptism. It is *initial*, in that it is the first sign that the baptism has been received, but it should not be the last. It is *physical*, in that other, non-physical evidences, particularly a transformed, emboldened witness, should also accompany the baptism. Finally, it is *evidence*, in that it proves Spirit baptism has occurred, but it is not to be identified with the baptism; it is only a sign, not the sum, of the experience. Again, at the time there was widespread belief in subsequent Spirit baptism but some concernment about how to confirm objectively that it had been received. Speaking in tongues ultimately prevailed as the most biblical and discernible proof of the experience. A century later, this is perhaps a less pressing question.

It may be said that the doctrine of initial physical evidence is the consensus of the broader pentecostal movement. Unless glossolalia occurs, Spirit baptism is not deemed to have been received, and the one seeking the experience should continue to seek it until he or she speaks in tongues. Although officially part of many denominations' statements of faith and a widespread belief among pentecostal ministers, it is by no means a universal belief, particularly in European and Chilean pentecostal churches (Hollenweger, 1972, p. 335). Some denominational charismatics such as J. Rodman Williams (1990, pp. 209–212) and Dennis Bennett (1971, pp. 57–65) have views identical to classical pentecostalism's, but many charismatics are less dogmatic, seeing tongues as a gift that usually or often accompanies Spirit baptism, but not always (Hocken, 1988, p. 158). On the basis of Acts 19:6, some see prophecy in the vernacular language as equally valid evidence. Prominent Foursquare leader Jack Hayford (1996, pp. 96–107), while advocating for the universal availability of tongues, has taken the position that there is no biblical mandate for judging when Spirit baptism has occurred; initial evidence is not a valid subject for dogma. Third wave neo-charismatics deny initial evidence altogether, though many do speak in tongues. In any case, a pentecostal congregation in which all members speak in tongues would be exceptionally rare, if not non-existent.

3.3.2.1 *The Value and Utility of Tongues*

Despite Paul's perceived discouragement in 1 Cor. 14, pentecostals value and promote the experience of speaking in tongues for several reasons apart from its value to the congregation when accompanied by the gift of interpretation. First, as noted above, it is seen as conclusive, objective proof that the baptism of the Spirit has been received. Once it has occurred, an individual need not doubt that he or she has been filled with Spirit (Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 330–332); the experience of glossolalia serves as tangible, personal proof that one has encountered the transcendent. In this vein, Cox (1995, p. 87) has insightfully remarked about the persistence of tongues in pentecostalism:

[I]t represents the core of all pentecostal conviction: that the Spirit of God needs no mediators but is available to anyone in an intense, immediate, indeed interior way.

Second, speaking in tongues is promoted because of its value for personal edification (Williams, 1990, pp. 231–234). Of all the spiritual gifts discussed by Paul in 1 Cor. 12–14, only speaking in tongues strengthens the user of the gift (14:4); all other gifts are for the purpose of ministering to others. Many pentecostals equate speaking in tongues with “praying in the Spirit” on the basis of 1 Cor. 14:14–18. Accordingly, other passages that use this expression such as Rom. 8:26, Eph. 6:18, and Jude 20 are interpreted as referring to praying in other tongues. The faculty is therefore seen as a special aid to intercession and prayer.

Finally, speaking in tongues, as a consequence of being filled with the Spirit, is seen as the gateway to other spiritual gifts (Menzies & Menzies, 2000, pp. 189–199; Wyckoff, 1995, pp. 443–444). This contention is more historical and anecdotal than biblical. Before the pentecostal revival, speaking in tongues was not the only gift deemed to have ceased as the church matured. Healing, prophecy, and other more supernatural gifts were not common or widely sought before the modern renewal movement began, and today their practice is largely associated with its various branches. One reason that many pentecostals oppose a relaxation of the initial evidence doctrine, even if they are not entirely comfortable with it, is the fear of the slippery slope effect. If the experience of speaking tongues is downplayed to avoid discomfort or the appearance of “spiritual elitism,” it may eventually become uncommon again or cease altogether and with it, the other supernatural *charismata* of the Spirit. The “cooling down” experienced in many pentecostal and charismatic churches in the second and subsequent generations shows that this fear is not unfounded. For all these reasons, therefore, pentecostalism still promotes speaking in tongues as a gift available to all Christians, even if other gifts are rightly deemed greater (1 Cor. 14:5).

3.3.2.2 *The Importance and Purpose of Spirit Baptism*

Dwelling at length on the issue of tongues, however, one can lose sight of the real import of the pentecostal doctrine. Glossolalia is considered the initial, physical evidence of Spirit baptism; it is not the only evidence, nor is it the most important evidence. The baptism signifies the full release of the Spirit in the believer’s life, and the experience should therefore produce other results consonant with that belief. Although it is not sanctification, it should lead to an increase of the fruit of the Spirit and greater personal holiness (Wyckoff, 1995, pp. 442–443). Like Paul in 1 Cor. 13, William J. Seymour, the leading figure in the Azusa Street revival, criticized those who emphasized tongues at the expense of the more important things:

Tongues are one of the signs that go with every baptized person, but it is not the real evidence of the baptism in the every day life. Your life must measure up with the fruits of the Spirit. If you get angry, or speak evil, or backbite, I care not how many tongues you may have, you have not the baptism with the Holy Spirit... If you want to live in the Spirit, live in the fruits of the Spirit every day. (quoted in Land, 1993, p. 124)

Seymour became critical of the initial evidence doctrine not because of doubt over the experience but because of a perceived lack of holiness in the lives of some of the early pentecostals. As a holiness pentecostal, he believed that the fullness of the Spirit was only endowed upon those who had been sanctified entirely. He could not believe that people who still exhibited racial hatred were sanctified or filled with the Spirit, regardless of how much they spoke in tongues (Cox, 1995, pp. 62–64).

Seymour's complaint was even more justified because of the great promise shown in the early stages of the revival; any genuinely pentecostal movement will not give room for social prejudices. The story of the original day of Pentecost, as well as the entire book of Acts, is one of the Holy Spirit breaking barriers dividing human beings. Part of the prophecy of Joel fulfilled that day was the Spirit poured out on "all flesh," young and old, male and female, rich and poor (Acts 2:17–21); the apostolic church later learned that this included other races and nationalities too (Acts 10:45, 11:18, 15:6ff.; cf. Gal. 3:28). Many have seen in the occurrence of tongues at Pentecost a reversal of the Tower of Babel, a move of God's Spirit to bring the human race back together. Histories of the beginnings of the Azusa Street revival read like a reconstruction of this aspect of Acts. Women were fully involved and accepted in the early leadership. More remarkable for the time and culture was the free association of different races; as one observer put it, "the color line was washed away by the blood" (Cox, 1995, p. 58). This had not been achieved within the preceding holiness movement. For Seymour, this was the true miracle of Pentecost; the baptism in the Holy Spirit brought the power to realize the vision of liberation and equality. Unfortunately, this holiness and freedom did not last as racism and patriarchy quickly reasserted themselves in the young movement. By the end of the classical period, the various pentecostal denominations were divided largely along racial lines. The role of women in the movement has also been a story of light and shadows, though as mentioned in §2.1.3.2, p. 20, pentecostals have generally been more progressive in this area than other conservative American denominations. Since the 1990's, efforts have been made by many pentecostal leaders to address problems of racism within the movement and recapture the unity and vision of the original revival (Synan, 2001, p. 375).

Along with the new experience of the Spirit came a new ecumenical vision. The renewal of Pentecost was seen as a chance for the church to start afresh and, in

the power of the Spirit, recapture the unity Christ intended it to have (Robeck, 1999, pp. 340–344). Unfortunately, this ecumenical impulse was one-sided. For the most part, pentecostalism was ready to give an experience and a doctrine to the other churches but not open to receiving any correction or changes. There was an anticipation that the revival would spread throughout all denominations and that the movement of the Spirit would wipe away such obsolete, human-made structures. That other Christian traditions might have something to teach the movement was not on the agenda. Even the gift of the Spirit came with conditions, all the beliefs about holiness that pentecostals thought were necessary for receiving the baptism. Not surprisingly, the other churches did not receive this overture the way the pentecostals intended, and so the pentecostal movement largely rejected other denominations and the ecumenical movement as a whole. The Assemblies of God went as far as to issue in 1962 a strong statement condemning the WCC (reproduced in Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 516–517). Although again in this area, the classical pentecostal movement did not live up to its potential, the vision has been fulfilled in unforeseen ways via the subsequent charismatic, third wave, and other renewal movements. Pentecostalism has not converted all other denominations to its doctrine or to the preconditions it set for receiving its core experience, but nonetheless the spirituality and fervor birthed through the movement has had a truly global impact. Beyond the charismatic movement, some pentecostal groups are now actively participating in the ecumenical movement, though many still remain cautiously outside (Hollenweger, 1996, pp. 9–10).

Perhaps most importantly and intrinsically, the baptism in the Holy Spirit contains a call to ministry and missions. The primary purpose of the pentecostal experience is the reception of power for ministry. In Acts 1:8, Jesus said,

[Y]ou will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth.

This verse discloses the theme of the book, the spread of the gospel to all lands and peoples in the power of the Holy Spirit. The earliest pentecostals took this commandment literally and believed that their new experience was a commissioning to missions (McGee, 2002, pp. 887–889; Synan, 1971, pp. 101–103). Specifically, they believed that they had received the gift of “missionary tongues,” also alternately called xenolalia, xenoglossolalia, or xenoglossia, the ability to speak a foreign language without study. Some left America to preach the gospel in other countries based only on this experience. Upon arrival, they learned they were mistaken in their belief, and the movement as a whole eventually changed its interpretation of what speaking in tongues signified. Although cessationist polemics sometimes highlight the

failure of the movement to produce known human languages in order to disqualify the experience (e.g., Hodges, 1963, pp. 231–233), in actuality the phenomenon of “missionary tongues” occurs nowhere in the New Testament. Acts 2:6–12 is the only place where known languages are explicitly recognized, but even here the occurrence of xenolalia was not sufficiently communicative; Peter still had to preach to the assembled crowds in his own language (Williams, 1990, pp. 214–216, 225). Reports of genuine xenolalia are not unknown in the movement but are poorly documented.

Despite this initial misunderstanding, the movement has been enormously successful as a missionary force (Hedlund, 1993, pp. 469–476; Hollenweger, 1996, p. 3). As noted in the previous chapter, the pentecostal movement is traditionally deemed to have begun in 1901 with a handful of members. At the close of the twentieth century, various sources estimate the broader renewal movement to contain upwards of 500 million participants. One would be hard pressed to find in all of human history a religious movement with more spectacular growth. Pentecostals would contend that this success is due to the power provided through Jesus’ work of Spirit baptism, a blessing given only to be shared. The true pentecostal experience is never anything completely personal and individual but the beginning of movement ever outward in the service of the Lord and the service of others, the effort to bring the fullness of salvation to the world. While reflections on growth should be tempered with humility, the rapid spread of the movement does bolster its claims to the importance of its distinctive experience.

Finally, the new Pentecost was seen as an eschatological sign, heralding the soon return of Jesus Christ. The importance of this belief for pentecostalism is discussed in greater detail in §3.4.1.1.

3.3.3 Spirit Baptism and the Tradition: Defense and Synthesis

The above presentation of the pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism with speaking in tongues is mostly positive. As the movement’s *sine qua non* and most distinguishing feature, it is but natural that this unique belief causes conflict with other theological perspectives and that not all share this optimism. From the beginning, pentecostalism has drawn criticism that its core doctrine is unbiblical, is incompatible with traditional protestant theology, and fosters spiritual elitism. Thankfully, the tone of the debate has improved as pentecostalism has gained wider acceptance and as pentecostals have positively received and implemented corrective advice. At the same time, as pentecostalism and other theological traditions have drawn closer, the discussion, though elevated, has intensified in the quest for greater unity, particularly from the side of mainstream evangelicalism. Before relating this point of the fourfold gospel to a wider ecumenical Christology, it is therefore

necessary to examine the biblical case for and against the pentecostal understanding of Spirit baptism and initial evidence. Both sides of the debate have published voluminous works that engage the biblical material in far greater detail than is possible in this necessarily limited survey, which covers only the most relevant points. Some of the more important recent works by pentecostals are that of Robert P. Menzies (1994), Roger Stronstad (1984), and Howard M. Ervin (1984), the last an in-depth response to Dunn's (1970) seminal critique. Similarly, as pentecostalism claims to recover a biblical doctrine long lost by the church, it will also serve the discussion to examine the history of Spirit baptism in the broader Christian tradition.

3.3.3.1 The Experience of Acts Today

It is widely acknowledged that the biblical evidence for the pentecostal understanding of Spirit baptism is confined almost exclusively to the book of Acts, with some adjunct support from the Gospels (Wyckoff, 1995, p. 428), such as John the Baptizer's distinguishing between his baptism for repentance and the coming baptism with the Spirit in Matt. 3:11 and its parallels. Acts provides the only New Testament descriptions of the reception of the Spirit in the early church. As Acts is inspired Scripture, Pentecostals feel that it is proper to seek to reproduce the experiences therein based on the words of Peter at Pentecost:

Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is for you and for your children and for all who are far off, everyone whom the Lord our God calls to himself. (Acts 2:38–39)

The original Christian day of Pentecost was not unique and unrepeatable. From the perspective of authorial intent, it is clear that these words were recorded to communicate to all who read them, regardless of time, place, or group identity, that the same blessing was available to them as well (Stronstad, 1984, pp. 57–58). Within Acts itself, the event of Pentecost recurred at least four times: at Samaria in 8:5–17, with Cornelius and the other Gentiles at Caesarea in 10:44–48, with some disciples of John at Ephesus in 19:1–7, and though not described in detail, with Saul in 9:1–19. After the so-called "Gentile Pentecost," Peter himself several times (e.g., 10:47, 11:15–16, 15:8–9) proclaimed that the gentiles' reception of the Spirit was identical to that of the apostles. Taken severally, these accounts show that Spirit baptism commonly occurs subsequent to belief and regeneration, that it does not happen automatically to all who believe, and that it is normally accompanied by speaking in tongues.

First, subsequence is a feature of many of the accounts. It is most obvious in the experience of the first disciples in Acts 2. On the basis of John 20:22—pentecostals have no methodological difficulties with such a correlation—the first

disciples had already received the Spirit on the day of Christ's resurrection. Pentecostals interpret this as their regeneration and "indwelling" by the Spirit, to use the common evangelical term. Pentecost, occurring some fifty days later, was their baptism in the Spirit or filling with the Spirit, not for the purpose of regeneration but empowerment. Pentecostals deny that the apostles and others present at Pentecost were a special case different from other Christians either in the first century or the twenty-first, instead holding that this first occurrence is intended as a precedent and pattern for a two-stage experience of the Spirit.

The case of the Samaritans in Acts 8 also exhibits this pattern. The Samaritan believers did not receive the Spirit (vv. 14ff.) after being evangelized by Philip; instead, there was a delay until Peter and John came from Jerusalem to minister to them. If, as is commonly held by most Christians, people are saved and regenerated when they believe and are baptized (v. 12), thereby receiving the Spirit (cf. Rom. 8:9), then there must be some explanation for this delay. Dunn's (1970, pp. 63–68) contention that the Samaritan's initial response to the gospel was "defective" is highly speculative and leaves much to be desired (cf. Menzies, R. P., 1994, pp. 207–213). It needlessly complicates the simplicity of the gospel and calls into question Philip's competence as an evangelist. Frederick Bruner (1970, p. 174), Dunn's cobelligerent, himself states:

The problem lies not with the Samaritans. We have no record that it lay with Philip... Indeed, we have no record of subjective lack on the part of any party in this account. The discovery in Acts 8:14–17 of insufficient commitment on the part of any parties or a finding of the imperfect fulfilling of any conditions must be imported into the text, they cannot be exported from it.

Bruner (1970, pp. 175–181) instead argues that God sovereignly and uniquely delayed the gift of the Spirit in order to teach the apostles a lesson in tolerance, but this is equally an importation into the text. The pentecostal interpretation that the fullness of the Spirit is usually received some time after the initial reception at regeneration and involves some seeking and prayer is more faithful to the text in light of the overall context of Acts and the wider Christian understanding of salvation than these forced explanations.

The other relevant narratives in Acts support subsequence only indirectly. With the account of Saul in 9:1–19, the reception of the Spirit is peripheral to the more important report of the conversion of the former persecutor of the church. Insufficient details are provided to overwhelmingly decide for one view or the other, but the gap of three days between his vision and apparent acceptance of the Lord and his baptism by Ananias to be filled with the Spirit does not contradict the pentecostal pattern. The remaining two accounts appear to undermine subsequence, but only at

first glance. In 19:1–6, the Holy Spirit comes upon the disciples of John immediately after their water baptism. More important than the actual experience, however, is the question put to them by Paul in v. 2, “Did you receive the Spirit when you believed?” There were two possible answers: “Yes, we received when we believed,” or “No, we did not receive when we believed.” The question suggests that Paul did not assume that full reception of the Spirit occurred automatically with belief and that he had anticipated the possibility of the second answer in a situation similar to that at Samaria. That the disciples provided a third answer—confusion—shows only that he was wrong in his estimation of them as followers of Jesus. Even the grammar of the question suggests subsequence. “When you believed” is the translation of the active aorist participle πιστεύσαντες, which may also be translated as “believing,” “having believed” or even “since you believed” (KJV). Whether the aorist should be interpreted as an antecedent or a coincident is largely left to the bias of the interpreter (Dunn, 1970, pp. 86–87; Ervin, 1984, pp. 62–63; Williams, 1990, p. 276); the case for the antecedent is at least as strong as for the coincident. Finally, in 10:44–48, there is no delay between hearing the word, believing, and receiving the fullness of the Spirit, complete with glossolalia; not even water baptism intervenes. For pentecostals, this exception proves the rule: being baptized with the Spirit immediately upon believing is ideal but only happens rarely.

Biblically, the case for tongues as initial evidence is more difficult to establish than that for subsequence. Again, support comes primarily from Acts. Of the five narratives discussed above, three mention tongues explicitly: Jerusalem in 2:4, Caesarea in 10:46, and Ephesus in 19:6. With the account of Saul in chapter 10, no mention of tongues is made, but Paul himself states that he speaks in tongues in 1 Cor. 14:18. The crucial account of Samaria also makes no mention of tongues, but the problem with Simon the magician (Acts 8:17ff.) strongly suggests that when the believers received the Spirit at the hands of the apostles, some visible or audible manifestation occurred. From this description, it is quite reasonable to infer that speaking tongues occurred at Samaria as well. Otherwise, Bennett (1971, pp. 57–58) reasonably asks, “How did the apostles Peter and John know immediately that Philip’s converts had not received the Holy Spirit?” Many scholars from different theological perspectives concur with this conclusion; Williams (1990, p. 210 n. 5) cites several, including A. T. Robertson and F. F. Bruce, and Dunn (1975, pp. 189–190) says it is a “fair assumption.” Within Acts, glossolalia appears to have occurred along with Spirit baptism in the majority cases and possibly universally.

The only other place speaking in tongues is addressed outside of the later ending of Mark 16:17 is 1 Cor. 12–14. Here, Paul seems to take with one hand only to give back with the other. The rhetorical question of 12:30, “Do all speak with

tongues?” implies a “no” answer both to itself and to the doctrine of initial evidence. On the other hand, in 14:5 he states, θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις, in which θέλω can be translated naturally as the simple active indicative, “I want you all to speak in tongues,” as in the RSV and ESV (Williams, 1990, p. 397). Likewise, prophecy is similarly limited by a rhetorical question in 12:29, “Are all prophets?”, yet all are allowed to prophesy in 14:31 (Menzies, R. P., 1994, pp. 248–249; Williams, 1990, p. 211 n. 10). The frequent assertion that, “The Bible says not everyone should speak in tongues” itself is disputable; neither Paul nor any other writer of Scripture makes such an explicit statement. At the most, one can say that the biblical evidence is somewhat unclear and granting that, the pentecostal argument is not as unreasonable as it first appears. Pentecostals usually bolster their case with the confession, “and we have experienced it to be so.” Although by no means decisive, this argument from experience should receive equal weight with the argument from lack of experience. The presence or absence of glossolalia in an individual’s life and the Christian church as a whole is more a historical and experiential question than a biblical one.

The biblical debate over the pentecostal doctrine of subsequent Spirit baptism involves more than the exegetical minutiae. Questions of genre and canonical criticism are just as important, if not more so. In the view of many protestants, both conservative and liberal, Acts belongs primarily to the genre of historical narrative and should not be used as a primary source for the formation of doctrine. For example, evangelical leader John R. W. Stott writes in his influential *The baptism and fullness of the Holy Spirit* (quoted here from Stronstad, 1984, p. 6; also cited in Menzies & Menzies, 2000, p. 38; Williams, 1990, p. 182 n. 4):

This revelation of the purpose of God in Scripture should be sought in its *didactic*, rather than its *historical* parts. More precisely, we should look for it in the teaching of Jesus, and in the sermons and writings of the apostles, and not in the purely narrative portions of the Acts.

In other words, regardless of how particular accounts in Acts are exegeted, the perceived Pauline doctrine of the Spirit, coming from the more didactic Epistles, should take precedence.

This perspective has gained some acceptance in those sections of the pentecostal movement that seek further identification with evangelicalism. As pentecostal Robert P. Menzies (1998, p. 1) notes, “The hermeneutic of Evangelicalism has become our hermeneutic.” Prominent Assemblies of God New Testament scholar Gordon Fee has largely taken this position with some additional nuance. For Fee, the details of the accounts of the reception of the Spirit in Acts are incidental to Luke’s primary purpose as a historian and should not be taken as normative (Fee, 1991,

pp. 89–94). Fee’s position is similar to Dunn’s except that he holds that the pentecostal experience is essentially valid and may be separable from conversion, though it need not be. He writes:

[T]here is in fact very little *biblical* support for the traditional Pentecostal position on this matter but... this is of little real consequence to the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, either as to the validity of the experience itself or to its articulation. (Fee, 1985, p. 88)

The more liberal Hollenweger (1972, pp. 324–341) takes a similar position. He acknowledges that:

Luke also makes a distinction between the reception of the Spirit and reception of salvation. According to Luke, one can be a Christian without having received the Holy Spirit. For him the Spirit is something additional to salvation. (Hollenweger, 1972, p. 337)

Instead of forcing a harmonization like conservative evangelicals do, he puts forth a strong, albeit at times condescending, case as to why the Pauline writings must be preferred to the Lucan (pp. 339–41). He also speaks positively of a pentecostal leader who “has begun the process of leading his Association back to a Reformation and Pauline theology” through an articulation of faith “wholly based on the Pauline witness” (p. 341).

Not all are persuaded by this line of reasoning. I. Howard Marshall (1970) and others have argued persuasively that the author of Luke-Acts must be taken seriously as both a historian and a theologian. Pentecostal Roger Stronstad (1984) has thoroughly explored how this theology of Luke is communicated with particular regard to the pentecostal doctrine. Contrary to the insinuation of Hollenweger (1972, p. 341) that Luke is preferred only “by people who are not capable of dialectic thought,” J. Rodman Williams (1990, p. 182 n. 4) argues for the propriety of the opposite methodology:

A proper methodology entails, wherever possible, giving priority to the narrational and descriptive over the didactic.... This is likewise true about the coming of the Holy Spirit. Since Acts is the actual record of this event, its narration is the primary place to gain perspective and understanding.

Acts is the only part of the Bible that describes in any detail the reception of the Spirit. Despite its limitations and problems, it is not possible to formulate a doctrine of the Spirit that is faithful to the different biblical traditions without it.

As it originally developed, the *raison d’être* of the new pentecostalism was that it had recovered something that had been lost, the experience of the fullness of the Spirit as described in the earliest history of the church, the book of Acts. Inherent in the new movement was an informal type of the hermeneutics of ideological suspicion articulated more formally in the later liberation theologies (Segundo, 1976, pp. 7–9).

With the new experience of the Spirit came a distrust of theologies and traditions that had taught it was “not for today” (Land, 1993, pp. 18–19). This is well illustrated by a report from Harvey Cox (1995, p. 252) about pentecostalism in Africa:

The theme of liberation by the power and guidance of the Holy Spirit from European domination is central to many of the African independent churches. In fact, in some the conviction emerged that the Europeans had purposely not told Africans about the Holy Spirit, but had brought them instead a trimmed-down edition of the faith; and it was now the responsibility of the Africans to restore the full Gospel.

Entering sincere dialogue with other theological traditions necessitates a relaxation of suspicion on all fronts, but true ecumenical theology does not require one partner to unilaterally give up its *sine qua non* in order to comply with the other’s hermeneutical model. The rediscovery of Lucan theology and experience is at the heart of the pentecostal contribution to modern theology and cannot be stripped or explained away without causing irreparable harm to the movement (Stronstad, 1984, pp. 82–83). Not all will accept all of pentecostalism’s conclusions, but achieving uniformity is not the primary reason for entering dialogue. Nevertheless, the pentecostal viewpoint deserves a fair hearing in the vital and needed discussion of moving away from a wholly Pauline protestant theology toward a multi-polar approach that better integrates the different biblical witnesses.

3.3.3.2 *Subsequent Spirit Baptism and the Tradition*

Biblical concerns aside, it is incorrect to claim that the pentecostal doctrine of subsequent Spirit baptism is a modern innovation completely discontinuous with the broader Christian tradition. As shown in the historical overview of the development of pentecostalism, it did not arrive fully formed and unheralded on January 1, 1901. Its roots are methodist, going back to Wesley in the eighteenth century, who in turn was influenced by older mystical traditions. The motivation behind the early pentecostal movement was not to start something new but recover something old and through the baptism with the Holy Spirit to reach new levels of holiness, love, and ministerial power. Study reveals that the pentecostal understanding of a two-staged reception of the Spirit for regeneration and power has considerable historical support, not from protestant orthodoxy, but from the older catholic tradition.

In sacramental theologies, regeneration and water baptism are closely linked; this is the first soteriological work of the Spirit. Confirmation symbolizes a further imparting of the Spirit in empowerment for service; this corresponds to biblical Spirit baptism or filling. Numerous authorities make mention of this throughout church history. For example, in AD 416, Pope Innocent I wrote that the act of confirmation or chrismation of infants was reserved for bishops, for they alone have the authority to

confer the Spirit as was done by Peter and John in Acts 8:14–17 (Dupuis & Neuner, 1996, p. 541 §1406). In 1411, the General Council of Florence decreed the following concerning confirmation:

The effect of this sacrament is that in it the Holy Spirit is given for strength, as he was given to the apostles on the day of Pentecost, in order that Christians may courageously confess the name of Christ. (Dupuis & Neuner, 1996, p. 545 §1418)

The present *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (1994) makes the two stages of the reception of the Spirit explicit. Its interpretation of the initial experience of the first Christians is identical to pentecostalism's:

On several occasions Christ promised this outpouring of the Spirit, a promise which he fulfilled first on Easter Sunday and then more strikingly at Pentecost. Filled with the Holy Spirit the apostles began to proclaim “the mighty works of God,” and Peter declared this outpouring of the Spirit to be the sign of the messianic age. Those who believed in the apostolic preaching and were baptized received the gift of the Holy Spirit in their turn. (p. 250 ¶1287)

This “special outpouring” is received through the sacrament of confirmation (p. 253 ¶1302). “Confirmation brings an increase and deepening of baptismal grace,” one sign of which is an increase in the gifts of the Holy Spirit (p. 253 ¶1303).

In surveying the first eight centuries of church history, catholic charismatics Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague (1994, p. 349) conclude that the evidence from tradition points away from Dunn's more reformed interpretation of Spirit baptism as the essence of conversion-initiation and towards the pentecostal understanding of it as a subsequent, contingent empowerment:

Baptism in the Spirit, as the awakening of the full life of the Spirit with the charisms (including the prophetic), does not belong to the essence of Christian initiation. Otherwise there would have been few authentic (valid) baptisms since the early centuries. The essence of Christian initiation has remained intact. Every authentic initiation confers the Holy Spirit. But Christian initiation has been missing a property, which flows from its essence, namely, what today is called the baptism in the Holy Spirit, the full flowering of the sacramental grace. Like the missing right arm, the baptism in the Holy Spirit is not a minor appendage. It belongs to the wholeness of Christian initiation.

The parallels drawn here are not intended to suggest that classical pentecostal theology is sacramental. As a revival movement, pentecostals generally tend to downplay the ordinances of the church and, except for some oneness groups, do not hold to baptismal regeneration. They interpret the development of confirmation as the ritualization of an originally charismatic experience, just as the biblical practice of baptizing believers subsequent to the regenerative profession of faith was transformed into the rite of infant baptism efficacious *ex opere operato*. The point here is that subsequence is not at all alien to the tradition and that there is considerable

precedence for a two-staged experience of the Holy Spirit. In this, pentecostalism is in continuity with the historical faith of the broader Christian church in a way that other protestant and free church traditions are not. The pentecostal approach is an attempt at recovering the biblical and existential reality of what the sacraments symbolize.

Again, it is more difficult to show historical precedent for the doctrine of tongues as initial evidence. While portions of the New Testament may suggest glossolalia was common in the early church, references to it in post-apostolic literature are few. The overall impression is that while the gift did not cease with the apostles, it was neither particularly common nor extraordinarily noteworthy. The *Didache*, for example, does not mention speaking in tongues explicitly. It discusses rather dispassionately prophets who speak “in the spirit” (ἐν πνεύματι) (Willker, 2006, 11:7–12), which could reasonably be construed to include glossolalia but not stretched to support a doctrine of initial evidence. Some of the more explicit references to tongues-speech are found in Tertullian and the Montanists (Kelsey, 1964, pp. 33–39), but again, they have little relevance for the question of the evidence of Spirit baptism. It must be noted that the Montanists were not condemned for their charismatic experiences but for their refusal to submit to church authority. A more serious problem for the pentecostal case is Augustine, who explicitly rejected the idea that in his time tongues should be expected as a sign of the coming of the Spirit (Burgess, 1991, pp. 8–9). Some support does come from John Chrysostom in the late fourth century (McDonnell & Montague, 1994, pp. 286–289). Although Chrysostom sadly admits that the time of the spectacular charisms had passed, he commented on the experience of the early church in a way that suggests tongues as normal initial evidence and, more indirectly, the occasional subsequence of receiving the Spirit:

Whoever was baptized he straightway spake with tongues and not with tongues only, but many also prophesied, and some also performed many other wonderful works. For since on their coming over from idols, without any clear knowledge or training in the ancient Scriptures, they at once on their baptism received the Spirit, yet the Spirit they saw not, for It is invisible; therefore God's grace bestowed some sensible proof of that energy. (Chrysostom, 1999)

Throughout the remainder of church history, glossolalia occurred sporadically and without widespread impact until the revivals of the nineteenth century that lead to the birth of the modern pentecostal movement. In summary, the cumulative historical evidence for normative experience of tongues, unlike the strong parallels between Spirit baptism and the sacrament of confirmation, is quite weak. The pentecostal understanding in this area represents a theological extrapolation from Scripture rather than a recovery of an experience consonant with the broader tradition of the church (Chan, 1999, pp. 195–196).

3.3.3.3 *Ecumenical Contributions*

As noted above, the charismatic movement has served to fulfill, if not in the way anticipated, the original ecumenical vision of the pentecostal movement. There are many individuals and churches from older denominations and traditions that have accepted the pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism either *in toto* or in a modified form. However, ecumenical theology is not a one-sided conversation, and other theological streams have much to contribute to attempts to understand the fullness of the Spirit. Among these voices are the great neo-orthodox theologians who so greatly influenced twentieth century theology. For the most part, they lived and worked before the pentecostal movement found its theological voice and a receptive ear from the wider Christian church, but in their writings there is much that anticipates and resonates with the pentecostal experience. More recently, Jürgen Moltmann and the liberation theologians have exerted similar influence on the direction of modern theology, and they, too, have much to contribute to this conversation.

Charismatic theologian J. R. Williams (1971), who began his career with the study of existential theology, has helpfully surveyed the pneumatologies of the leading neo-orthodox thinkers, Barth, Brunner, Tillich, and Bultmann. As concerns the issues under consideration here, Williams (1971, pp. 65–66) examined their works with the goal of seeing how they apprehended the work of the Spirit in the Christian life beyond regeneration and indwelling, which is useful for the question of subsequence. He also desired to see how they addressed the question of “extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit” from the context of perspectives that do not normatively seek the supernatural or miraculous, which is useful for sharing about tongues and other spiritual gifts with non-charismatic traditions.

As noted earlier in §3.2.3.1, Barth has been criticized for insufficiently developing his pneumatology, at least in comparison to his voluminous writings on other subjects. With regard to the baptism in the Holy Spirit, his precise understanding is not entirely clear or consistent from one part of his *Church dogmatics* to another (Williams, 1971, pp. 67–72). The first section of the final, incomplete volume (Barth, 1969, pp. 3–40 (CD IV.4)) is titled, “Baptism with the Holy Spirit,” which Barth sees as the beginning of the Christian life. It is thus identified with conversion and regeneration. He saw Pentecost as both an experience of forgiveness of sins and empowerment, thereby merging these two works of the Spirit that pentecostals normally separate temporally (Barth, 1969, pp. 30–31 (CD IV.4)).

In some places, however, his earlier writings suggest a twofold operation or experience of the Spirit, not unlike the distinction pentecostals make between the Spirit’s indwelling at regeneration and the fullness received in Spirit baptism. He spoke of Pentecost as

the endowment of those men, so that they became what they had not been before, witnesses of the great acts of God as they had taken place in Jesus Christ, and could do what they had not been able to do before, express their witness in such a way that it could be heard and understood in every secular tongue[.] (Barth, 1958, p. 341 (CD IV.2))

While this statement does not establish a belief in subsequence, it suggests that Barth did not primarily think of the experience at Pentecost as regeneration but empowerment. This is consistent with what he had written earlier, that the New Testament doctrine of the Spirit points

beyond all that the Spirit can mean for the believer in this personal relation with God to that which, in the power of the Spirit, ought to happen in the believer and through the believer for God, i.e., in the service of God[.] (Barth, 1975, pp. 454–455 (CD I.1))

The outpouring of the Spirit—a term he used frequently and differently from baptism with the Spirit—is for empowerment for service, and the primary work of the Spirit is the ability to witness about Christ and the works of God (Barth, 1975, pp. 455–456 (CD I.1); Williams, 1971, p. 70). This outpouring “is still taking place today” (Barth, 1961b, p. 295 (CD IV.3.1)). Although Barth did not put forward a doctrine of subsequent Spirit baptism, pentecostals can agree with him on all of these points.

It is not surprising that Barth does not discuss speaking in tongues as initial evidence of the fullness of the Spirit, but overall, he writes positively of the experience as described in the New Testament (Williams, 1971, pp. 72–75). Solely through study of 1 Corinthians, he communicates and defends what pentecostals believe to be the truth about the experience:

Speaking with tongues lies on the extreme limit of Christian speaking as such. It is an attempt to express the inexpressible in which the tongue rushes past, as it were, the notions and concepts necessary to ordinary speech and utters what can be received only as a groan or sigh, thus needing at once interpretation or exposition (14:7f.). The fact that this is possible seems to show that we are not to think of it as a wholly inarticulate, inhuman and bizarre stuttering and stammering. Certainly there can be no question of purely “emotional eruptions”... otherwise Paul could hardly have described the capacity for them as pneumatic. (Barth, 1958, pp. 829–830 (CD IV.2))

Like Paul, Barth (1958, pp. 828–829 (CD IV.2)) warns not only against any Christian activities, endowments, or works that are lacking in love, but also against communities lapsing into “pride or sloth” so that these “extraordinary capacities” of the Spirit become absent.

Williams (1971, pp. 78–84) next turns to Brunner, who in his *Dogmatics* related the doctrine of the Spirit to the doctrine of the church. Like Barth, Brunner (1962, pp. 15–16) warned that theology was not equipped to fully grasp the significance of the experience of the Spirit, and unbalanced intellectualism could even

hinder it. He perceived that the contemporary church was in need of a revival not just of doctrine but of the power and gifts of the Spirit experienced by the early church. Pointedly, in the context of 1 Cor. 12–14 he stated:

The miracle of Pentecost, and all that is included under the concept of the *charismata*—the gifts of the Spirit—must not be soft-pedalled from motives of theological Puritanism. (Brunner, 1962, p. 16)

At the same time, he pulled back from mysticism and maintained that the experience of the Spirit is mediated through Christ, which is in full agreement with the normal orientation of pentecostalism's functional Christology:

The Holy Spirit *is* immediacy, pure presence, pure personal fellowship, but He is immediacy on the basis of the revelation in the historical Mediator—and thus on the basis of mediacy. (Brunner, 1962, p. 16)

Beyond this, Brunner said little that bears directly on the questions raised by the core doctrine of pentecostalism, but these few statements are encouraging. As Williams (1971, p. 81) exclaims, “The only difference, really, between Brunner and ourselves is that what he calls for, indeed prays for, we affirm to be happening in our midst!”

Paul Tillich's (1963, pp. 114–120) most significant contribution to the area under discussion is in the relationship of the Spirit to structure and ecstasy in the human spirit and in the church. He notes that the coming of the Spirit's presence brings disruptions in existing structures and ecstatic manifestations including tongues, revelatory perceptions, and healings (pp. 114–115). “Ecstasy, in its transcendence of the subject-object structure, is the great liberating power under the dimension of self-awareness,” he writes (p. 119). He recalls how in 1 Corinthians Paul recognized the importance of ecstatic manifestations but sought a balance between them and structure, not allowing spiritual outbreaks to be disruptive. The later church had difficulty keeping this balance, with institutionalization ultimately driving away this dimension of the Spirit's presence (pp. 117–118). Tillich (1951, pp. 111–118) himself cautioned against both abuse of the ecstatic and misapprehension of the meaning of miracles that in any way threaten the integrity of reason and revelation. Williams (1971, p. 91) writes:

Whether one agrees or not with all of [Tillich's] views about human life and the Spirit, it is impressive to behold a theologian (one who is often criticized for being too philosophical, too much the systematician) taking a powerful and impressive stand in support of the “Spirit-movements” and “ecstatic manifestations.” ...Surely all of us (whatever our relation to the “Spirit-movement”) would concur with Tillich's insistence on the necessity of form and order.

As seen earlier, Bultmann's program of demythologization, while representing a direct challenge to the pentecostal worldview, is both correctable and helpful for

understanding the full gospel message. His exegetical work also gives valuable insight into the New Testament church's experience of the Spirit (Williams, 1971, pp. 100–109). Bultmann (1951, pp. 153–164) contends that the Spirit is given to Christians in baptism, a point with which most pentecostals would disagree. The power of the Spirit, however, is latent most of the time; it must be sought after to manifest in miraculous or ecstatic ways, primarily in the context of corporate worship (Bultmann, 1951, p. 161). This view is very similar to that of the “third wave” evangelical renewal movement, which sees Spirit baptism as occurring at regeneration and reactivated through multiple subsequent fillings (Wagner, 2002, p. 1141). The Spirit also gives power for missions, for teaching, and other ministries. Miraculous phenomena were normal in the early church, the eschatological community. In the local congregation, the “chief persons of authority are those endowed with gifts of the Spirit” (Bultmann, 1955, p. 97, italicized in original); it was only later that the church moved away from charismatic leadership to institutionalization.

These four theologians lived and worked before the charismatic movement was fully underway, and how it might have affected their theology had they experienced it is unknown. On the other hand, Jürgen Moltmann, one of the most important theologians of the second half of the twentieth century, has theologized during the time span of the broader renewal movement and has recently engaged it in dialogue. Surprisingly, he makes little mention of pentecostalism in his major work on pneumatology (Moltmann, 1992; cf. Althouse, 2003, pp. 2–3). In the April, 1994, issue of the *Journal of Pentecostal theology* dedicated to this work, he revealed that the movement was “not in my field of vision as I wrote the book” (Moltmann, 1994, p. 66). Interestingly, while he included a small chapter on Wesley and sanctification, no similar treatment is given to the baptism or fullness of the Spirit. In the few references he makes to the renewal movement, his attitude is one of a friendly and appreciative outside observer. His brief discussion of speaking in tongues is positive and reminiscent of Barth's except that his primary reflection is not upon the Corinthian texts but the experience within the contemporary church (Moltmann, 1992, pp. 185–186; 1997, pp. 60–62).

Moltmann's more valuable contribution to the present discussion is in his general integration of pneumatology into all areas of Christian theology; his work in this area is as important as his work in eschatology (Kärkkäinen, 2002, pp. 125–126). To summarize his pneumatology as spread throughout all of his major writings is impossible in a dissertation of this scope, but some of the relevant ideas may be brought to bear. Moltmann (1992, pp. 8–10) sees a serious deficiency in Western theology, both protestant and catholic, where the work of the Spirit has largely been limited to the redemption of individual human beings and their incorporation into the

community of the church; this is an unintended but direct consequence of the *filioque*. In his theology, he calls for recognition of the more universal work of the Spirit in creation, which biblically is established as early as Gen. 1:2 and corroborated in diverse passages. Likewise, the work of redemption is more than the salvation of individual souls; it is the resurrection of the body and the renewal of all creation (Rom. 8:19–23), works that are effected by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of creation is accordingly the Spirit of the new creation, and the redemptive-recreative work of the triune God encompasses the entire cosmos originally brought forth and embraced by the Spirit.

This expanded pneumatology has significant implications for Christian missions. Moltmann encourages Christians to become involved in the complete mission of the Holy Spirit, which goes beyond just propagating the faith or, worse, denominations (Moltmann, 1996b, pp. 129–130). His is a theology of the liberation, preservation, and restoration of all God’s creation undifferentiated. The Spirit is the source of life, and his presence embraces all life on earth, not just human, while resisting all that would threaten life (Moltmann, 1996b, pp. 123–125). Sin, Satan, and death are not the only forces of evil, and the human soul is not their only target. Ecological destruction, the frightening possibility of nuclear annihilation, economic deprivation and injustice, political tyranny, and other global social and environmental problems threaten the life the Spirit gives to creation. Moltmann contends that the struggle for life and against destruction is the essence of the Christian mission. For him, all Christians are charismatic because God has gifted all (Moltmann, 1992, pp. 180–184). He passionately challenges professed pentecostals and charismatics to bring their gifts into the “everyday world” of human reality and movements for peace and liberation (Moltmann, 1992, pp. 185–186).

Although he does not strongly engage the question of subsequence, a type of it is implicit in his work. Moltmann (1992, p. 10) challenges his readers to become more involved in the pressing issues endangering the human race and the entire natural world. Challenge implies change; to accept it requires a shift in the outlook and actions of individuals and Christian fellowships as well as the church universally. To join in this work of the Spirit in new vitality implies a future, contingent empowerment of sorts, a new awareness of needs and the ability to do something about them with God’s help. Moltmann (1992, pp. 186–188) speaks of this as the “awakening of charismatic experience.” Pentecostals would respond to this challenge by stressing that the activation of the *charismata* occurs via the experience of subsequent Spirit baptism, the biblically provisioned anointing for mission. The parameters of that mission may be defined by theological works such as Moltmann’s,

but the church can carry out its mission only after having received “power from on high” (Luke 24:49).

The theologies of liberation may be viewed similarly to Moltmann’s. Due to the nature of liberation theology, a detailed treatment of Spirit baptism is not to be expected within its major works. It is not a system of theology but an outlook and a call to action. It does not rework but assumes many basic features of Christian belief and spirituality (Elizondo, 1996, p. 55). Liberation theology, as originally devised, must be understood inside the context of Latin American Roman Catholicism, and as shown above, the concept of subsequent baptism is highly compatible with catholic tradition. As with Moltmann, liberation theology contains a challenge that implies change. Once a Christian becomes aware of social, political, and economic problems, that knowledge must be acted upon. “We can be Christians, authentic Christians, only by living our faith in a liberating way,” writes Leonardo Boff (Boff & Boff, 1984, p. 13). The conversion to the ministry of liberation is not a conversion of salvation but a missiological reorientation of life; Christian faith is no longer only an inward spirituality but an outward movement to help others. It thus may be viewed in parallel to Spirit baptism as a crisis subsequent to justification. Engaging in the work of liberation may be viewed as a sign of the anointing of the Spirit (cf. Luke 4:16–21).

In summary, all of these leading theologians and theological movements contain much that is compatible with and can contribute to the pentecostal understanding of the fullness of the Holy Spirit. Importantly, none of the insights from these major ecumenical theologies fundamentally contradict the idea of subsequent Spirit baptism or devalue the gift of speaking in tongues. Where they speak most relevantly to pentecostals is in expanding their understanding of the mission of the Holy Spirit, which can help stave off the tendency of some, as Robeck (1987, p. 103) describes, to be individually selective in which aspects of the gospel they will seek to advance. Pentecostals should feel free to learn from these theological systems as to how they can more completely continue the ministry of Christ, which is the true full gospel. Thoughtful consideration of the theologies of liberation can help recover some of the original vision of the movement that faded over time (Hollenweger, 1992). In turn, the pentecostal witness in ecumenical forums about the experience of Spirit baptism is important for reminding the church of the need for the power of the Holy Spirit in carrying out the Christian mission in all of its diverse facets.

3.3.4 The Replication of the Ministry of Christ

Besides the exegetical support for their doctrine from Acts, pentecostals see an analogy between the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of Jesus and the work of the Spirit in Christians (Alexander, 1988, pp. 489–491; Ervin, 1984, pp. 5–11;

MacDonald, 1988, pp. 486–488). Jesus was conceived by the Spirit; Christians are born again by the Spirit. Jesus was anointed and empowered by the Spirit at his baptism; Christians are anointed and empowered for ministry by the baptism in the Holy Spirit. This analogy, which was also seen by pentecostal forerunners A. B. Simpson and Edward Irving (Nienkirchen, 1992, pp. 59–60), provides further support for a normative pattern of a two-staged experience of the Spirit; it is also consonant with the model of salvation as the replication of the life of Christ presented in §3.1.4. Gordon Fee (1991, pp. 94–95) objects to this use of analogy because of the differences in the historical contexts, but his preoccupation with hermeneutical protocols overlooks a more important theological point. Christ came not only to fulfill salvation-history but also to serve as an example of the type of life to be lived by those who receive the benefits of salvation. To be called a “Christian” means to be one like Christ or a “little Christ.” To overlook this aspect of the work of Christ and confine his significance to being the perfect substitutionary sacrifice neglects a significant aspect of New Testament theology.

In John 14:12, Jesus said, “Whoever believes in me will also do the works that I do; and greater works than these will he do, because I am going to the Father.” This statement is made in reference to his future sending of the Spirit after his departure (John 14:16–17, 26, 15:26, 16:7–15). Here the *perichoresis* of the functions of Christ and the Spirit and how they relate to from below Christology can be seen most clearly (cf. Moltmann, 1990, pp. 91–94; 1992, pp. 58–73). The Father sent the Son and anointed him with the Spirit. The Son, upon completing his part of the divine mission, similarly sends the Spirit from the Father and anoints his followers with the same divine presence and power (Moltmann, 1981, pp. 88–90). The atoning work of Christ was unique and unrepeatable, but his anointing by the Spirit was not; as the Christ, it was a property specific to his humanity, not his divinity (Williams, 1988b, pp. 339–340). The Spirit’s presence in his life was necessary for accomplishing his critical part of the divine mission, but it was not limited to only that purpose. It was the beginning of a new era in salvation history when all of God’s people would be similarly, if not perfectly, anointed, and would similarly, if not perfectly, obediently participate in carrying out the mission of the Kingdom in all its diverse aspects (Acts 2:17–21). The presence of Christ, his person and his work, is known through the presence of the Spirit. In this sense, Pentecost becomes a type of the *parousia* of Christ (Barth, 1961b, pp. 293–296 (CD IV.3.1)), but see also §3.4.3.2, p. 140.

Through the coming of the Holy Spirit, the ministry of Christ in the Spirit becomes the ministry of Christians through the Spirit. Where pentecostalism has been unique is in its literal appropriation of John 14:12 and its attempt to replicate not the unique atoning work of Christ but all other aspects of his proclamation and

demonstration of the coming of God's kingdom, such as healing. The key to accomplishing this is the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which biblically assumes that regeneration and the forgiveness of sin have already occurred (Williams, 1990, pp. 177–179). Just as Jesus preached no sermons and performed no miracles in the canonical Gospels before his anointing, so Christians are to seek the fullness of the Spirit and wait until they “receive power from on high” (Luke 24:49). The full power of the Spirit available to believers to carry out Christ's mission is not received automatically; in the Lucan literature, it is contingent upon requesting (Luke 11:13) and obedience (Acts 5:32). As Spirit baptism is essential for reaching one's full potential in the service of God and his creation, the question of whether or not this potentiality has been actualized and one has entered into the “pentecostal reality” (Williams, 1972, pp. 1–9) should not be dismissed lightly. It is for these reasons that pentecostals emphasize the role of Christ as baptizer and uphold the doctrine of subsequent Spirit baptism. Where their core doctrine needs the most adjustment is in the area of the purpose of the Spirit's power, and as discussed in the previous section, ecumenical dialogue can help expand the pentecostal understanding of missions to include all areas of ministry the Spirit's life-giving concern embraces.

Finally, there remains the doctrine of initial evidence, speaking in tongues, one of the greatest stumbling blocks in this area of theological dialogue. Many of the authors discussed above do speak of the gift positively, indeed far more so than non-charismatic evangelicals do. Dunn (1970, p. 229) himself has stated:

...Pentecostal teaching on spiritual gifts, including glossolalia, while still unbalanced, is much more soundly based on the NT than is generally recognized.

The stumbling block comes when the gift is promoted as the singular, normative evidence of the fullness of the Spirit. For the reasons discussed above, it is highly unlikely that classical pentecostals will abandon their distinctive doctrine and the movement's *sine qua non*. It is equally unlikely that in the future they will persuade large segments of other traditions to accept their position. A difference exists and will continue to exist; the real question is, what should be done about it? In a situation of ecumenical dialogue, probably nothing should be done; it is possible for differences to coexist peacefully in an environment of mutual love and respect. As noted above, several mediating positions are available, including Hayford's pastoral advice to pentecostals that the ability to judge whether or not Spirit baptism occurred is neither necessary nor desirable.

Fee, while contesting many of the scriptural arguments used to support the doctrine of initial evidence, wholeheartedly supports the validity of the experience.

For those in basic agreement with his hermeneutical approach, he suggests several positive reasons for greater openness to the experience:

Speaking in tongues, if not normative, was a repeated expression of the charismatic dimension of the coming of the Spirit. ...Pentecostals have much in their favor to argue that this was the *normal* (in the sense of *expected*) experience of believers in the early church....

Since speaking in tongues was a repeated expression of this dynamic, or charismatic, dimension of the coming of the Spirit, the contemporary Christian may expect this, too, as a part of his or her experience in the Spirit. If the Pentecostal may not say one *must* speak in tongues, the Pentecostal may surely say, why *not* speak in tongues? It does have repeated biblical precedent, it did have evidential value at Cornelius' household... [and] it does have value both for the edification of the believer (1 Cor 14:2–4) and, with interpretation, for the edification of the church (1 Cor 14:5, 26–28). (Fee, 1991, p. 99)

Interestingly, tongues is the one gift of the Spirit not clearly evident in the life of Christ (Dunn, 1975, p. 86), and no mention of it is made by him except in the late text of Mark 16:17. Speaking in tongues is unique among the *charismata*. All of the other spiritual gifts are for the benefit of others, not their bearers (1 Cor. 12:7, 14:26, Eph. 4:16). Speaking in tongues, however, edifies the self (1 Cor. 14:4, 14–18, 28). Without interpretation, its value for ministry is limited, but this does not mean that it has no spiritual value. Just as Jesus after ministry needed to retire and pray by himself (Mark 1:35), so too those who seek to continue his work need spiritual refreshment. It is fitting, then, that one of the nine listed *charismata*—not the majority nor even a large minority, but not entirely absent—would be given for this purpose, and accordingly pentecostals believe that it is available and useful to all Christians (Williams, 1990, pp. 232–234). Besides biblical convictions, it is for this reason that pentecostals cling to speaking in tongues as normative evidence of Spirit baptism—not for spiritual hegemony but to universalize a great and unique personal blessing.

3.4 Jesus as Coming King: The Christian Hope

Because of the renewal movements, the twentieth century has been called the century of the Holy Spirit (Synan, 2001). It was also the century of eschatology, when all theological streams returned to the doctrine of last things and revived it as a major theme of theology (Schwarz, 2000, p. 107). Premillennialism returned to vigorous life in the nineteenth century and permeated later fundamentalism, non-confessionalist evangelicalism, and pentecostalism. Schweitzer (1911), in his analysis of the quest for the historical Jesus, shook the foundations of liberal theology and turned the attention of non-conservative theologians to eschatology as well. Two important later New Testament scholars, Bultmann and C. H. Dodd, attempted to recover for the modern world the existential importance of the eschatological theme of the Jesus rediscovered by Schweitzer, the former through demythologization and the latter through realized

eschatology (Schwarz, 2000, pp. 120–133). Jürgen Moltmann, the premier theologian of eschatology, successfully recast all of theology from the perspective of the coming future with God beginning with his groundbreaking *Theology of hope* (1967). Along with the renewal of interest in pneumatology, this return to the study of last things helped to breathe life into the discipline of systematic and dogmatic theology. It can no longer be said that any major locus has been neglected by contemporary reflection. Some object to this emphasis on eschatology, seeing it as speculative and irrelevant to modern living, but few theologians would agree with this sentiment. To the contrary, eschatology is a surprisingly practical field of study. What an individual or church believes about last things tends to have a great impact on how ethical issues are approached (Dempster, 1993, pp. 51–54).

At the same time, while the study of last things is stimulating, it is also arguably one of the most diverse as well as divisive areas of Christian theology. Within any tradition or denomination, it is possible to find several different major eschatological systems with innumerable variations, and the debate over these views has not always remained elevated. Organizing and classifying the myriad schemes is also not a simple task. Conservative theologians usually classify eschatological systems by their view of the millennium of Rev. 20, spoken in terms of the relationship of the *parousia* to it. Premillennialists see Christ returning before the millennium to establish it; it is generally viewed as a pessimistic system, expecting little manifestation of the kingdom of God before the return of Christ to earth. Postmillennialism, on the other hand, is a broadly optimistic system. Postmillennialists foresee a future golden age, the character of which mirrors their religious, political, and social ideals. Christ will return but only after the millennium, which human beings will help to bring about. Amillennialism is in some respects a hybrid of the two. Neither particularly optimistic nor overly pessimistic, it denies a future millennium, identifying it in some manner with the present age. Christ will return at the end of this present age, which is of indeterminate length. Although there are many variations on each of these systems, the three neatly classify the vast majority of conservative eschatological outlooks.

A survey of ecumenical and mainline theologies reveals far less interest in millennial classifications, primarily because of misgivings about the imminence of the *parousia* and sometimes doubts about its occurring at all (Moltmann, 1990, p. 313). The millennial system of classification is still useful, however, because the concept of the millennium, regardless of how it is described or understood, captures the vital substance of Christian eschatology. Moltmann (1996a), in his later work on eschatology, valued certain visions of the millennium as essential. “Christian eschatology—eschatology, that is, which is messianic, healing and saving—is

millenarian eschatology,” he wrote (1996a, p. 202). As Schwarz (2000, p. 322) has stated,

[B]oth Christian and secular utopias, from the hope of an inner-worldly realization of the kingdom of God to the attempt to build an egalitarian society, have received their main impetus from the Christian notion of the community of the faithful which is radically renewed historically and societally visible prior to Judgment Day.

Millennial thinking finds its way into virtually all Christian eschatological schemes, even when not necessarily intended. For example, as concerns the return of Christ, there is little substantive difference between optimistic postmillennial visions of the nineteenth century that predicted the *parousia* would be delayed for possibly hundreds of thousands of years (e.g., Hodge, 1997, pp. 858–859) and liberation theologies that look for an imminent eschatological transformation of society, not through the *parousia* but through revolution. These systems differ greatly in terms of their visions of what the future golden age will look like and how it will be brought to pass, but as eschatologies they are far more similar to one another than what either of them are to, say, dispensational premillennialism. Similarly, an understanding of eschatology like Bultmann’s where there is no great expectation of upheaval or change in the current world system bears resemblance to some forms of amillennialism. The kingdom of God is an inner reality, and the world is expected to continue on much as it is for an indefinite period of time. These identifications are imperfect, but millenarian classification is still useful for handling virtually all eschatological systems.

The employment of millenarian terminology serves another purpose. It highlights the return of Christ, the centerpiece of Christian eschatology. The terms “premillennial” and “postmillennial” especially are chronological modifiers of the second advent; in these schemes, it is the return of Christ that occurs before or after the millennium, respectively. The *parousia*, not the millennium, is the focal point of millenarian eschatology. Christian eschatology is not simply about the future but the future with Jesus Christ, and all Christian eschatologies must address the problems and questions generated by the *parousia* and its delay. Eschatology can be seen as ultimately an outcome of Christology. It is therefore a subject appropriate for Christological contemplation, as it is within the pentecostal fourfold gospel, the final function of which is the role of Jesus as coming king.

As Dayton (1987, pp. 143–171) documents, eschatology was the last current of nineteenth century revivalism leading to the completion of the fourfold gospel and the birth of modern pentecostalism. Some scholars go further, dissenting from Dayton’s overall thesis and seeing the movement as principally an eschatological revival (Macchia, 2002, p. 1124; Althouse, 2003, pp. 21–22). In millennial terms, pentecostal

eschatology is almost universally premillennial, and the majority is also dispensational. Many major pentecostal denominations include the pre-tribulation rapture in their statements of faith, and this position has been transferred from the West to many missions-receiving countries via missionaries, visiting preachers, and literature. Many pentecostals expect the soon return of Christ, perhaps in their lifetimes, and the *parousia* will be heralded by many cataclysmic changes in the world. Though apocalyptic, the movement's eschatology is not wholly pessimistic. Unlike fundamentalist dispensationalists, pentecostals expect a great outpouring of the Spirit and a worldwide revival before the *parousia*. Pentecostalism is unique among major Christian traditions in that it sees within itself a partial fulfillment of end-time prophecy (Wilson, 1988a, p. 264). These characteristics of the movement's eschatology represent its potential contribution to ecumenical theology. In turn, it can gain much from listening to the insights uncovered by ecumenical theologians during the century of eschatology.

3.4.1 Pentecostal Eschatology: From Prophetic to Apocalyptic

Eschatology is undeniably important for both the theology and the life of pentecostalism. The strong eschatological emphasis, however, is not held without some tension. Scholars have distinguished between two basic eschatological types in the Bible and in theology, the prophetic and the apocalyptic (Althouse, 2003, pp. 22–23; Dayton, 1987, pp. 158–160; Hanson, 1979, pp. 8–12; Moltmann, 1996a, pp. 226–235). In simplified form, prophetic eschatology is the revelation of God's plan and how it will be executed within the context of human history. A serious call to repentance and transformation is an integral part of it, but its overall outlook is optimistic. Apocalyptic eschatology is more pessimistic. It abandons hope for the transformation of the human condition within history and instead foresees a cataclysmic divine intervention. Although an apocalyptic eschatology also contains a call to repentance, it does not anticipate that many will respond to it. Divine judgment is imminent and inevitable. Hope is not absent as God's people will be saved in and through the coming tribulation. Within Scripture, prophetic eschatology is characteristic of the earlier, pre-exilic prophets; apocalyptic is found in books such as Daniel, Zechariah, and, of course, Revelation. Within systematic theologies, postmillennial eschatologies are more prophetic, whereas premillennialism tends more towards apocalyptic, especially in dispensational forms.

Both eschatological types can be seen in the background of pentecostalism; the coming glory and judgment were prominent topics of American revival preaching. Earlier eschatological visions were largely optimistic and utopian, a reflection of the rapid improvement in some social indicators in the West. Postmillennialism was

predominant in both the Calvinist and Wesleyan revivals of the nineteenth century (Dayton, 1987, pp. 153–158). On the other hand, clearly not all was well in American society, and utopian dreams were dealt a mortal blow in the 1860's by the brutality of the Civil War and its attendant issues. Premillennialism, revived and reformulated as dispensationalism by John Nelson Darby, gained popularity quickly, first among the nascent fundamentalists and then among many in the holiness movement (Dayton, 1987, pp. 160–167). Dispensationalism is a strongly apocalyptic eschatology. It predicts that the return of Christ could happen at any moment, unheralded by any specific sign other than a general deterioration in world conditions. Most importantly, as generally formulated, it does not look to the future of the world in history with any sort of optimism. Neither social reformation nor evangelistic success by the church is foreseen. For some, it is explicitly precluded as the church age is expected to end in failure and apostasy (e.g., Pentecost, 1958, pp. 154–155; Ice, 2000, pp. 141–144).

Most of the early pentecostals held to some form of premillennialism, usually dispensationalism, but their eschatology contained both prophetic and apocalyptic elements (Wacker, 2001, pp. 251–265). Uniquely, the movement viewed itself as the fulfillment of prophecy, the beginning of the last and greatest revival, called the “latter rain” after Joel 2:23, that would sweep the earth before the return of Jesus Christ (Althouse, 2003, pp. 16–36). The recurrence of tongues was itself interpreted as an eschatological sign, and the new pentecostals also felt empowered to speak prophetically to the church and the world. Over time, however, the apocalyptic began to assert dominance and in wide swathes of the movement almost completely supplanted the prophetic. Today, many classical denominations as well as independent churches dogmatically affirm premillennial, pre-tribulational dispensationalism. A direct import from fundamentalism, which ironically denies an end-time charismatic revival, dispensationalism is the element in pentecostal theology most alien to the otherwise Wesleyan-inspired fourfold gospel.

3.4.1.1 The Latter Rain Restoration: Pentecost as an Eschatological Sign

While modern premillennialism originated and developed outside of Wesleyanism, towards the end of the nineteenth century, it had made great inroads into the holiness movement, and most of the early pentecostals from holiness backgrounds had accepted it before the revival of tongues and the official birth of the movement (Dayton, 1987, pp. 163–167). The restoration of tongues to the church, however, greatly heightened their eschatological expectations. They saw this as the fulfillment of Acts 2:17–21, Peter's quotation of Joel 2:28–32 on the original day of Pentecost. In Acts 2:17, the Old Testament prophecy is altered to refer to the “last days,” which the new pentecostals connected back to Joel 2:23:

Be glad, O children of Zion, and rejoice in the Lord your God, for he has given the early rain for your vindication; he has poured down for you abundant rain, the early and the latter rain, as before.

The outpouring experienced by the early church on the day of Pentecost was the fulfillment of the former or “early rain,” the universalization of the gift of the Spirit among all of God’s people, regardless of age, sex, race, or station. The new Pentecost was the “latter rain,” a similar outpouring of the Spirit before the end of the age and the return of the Lord (Althouse, 2003, pp. 16–18; Dayton, 1987, pp. 26–28). In this way, the followers of the new movement saw themselves as the fulfillment of prophecy and participants in bringing about the *parousia* of Christ. The full gospel, lost because of centuries of neglect, had at last been restored to the church before the end. “Now the prophethood of all believers could be added to the priesthood of all believers,” remarks Steven J. Land (1993, p. 18).

The occurrence of glossolalia and the expectation of the soon return of Christ reinforced one another. If the rapture and *parousia* were imminent, then new and great signs and wonders could be expected. Since the miracle of tongues had recurred universally among the sanctified, pentecostal people, it followed that the second coming was drawing nearer. Unlike some of the earlier adventist movements, however, the expectation of the *parousia* did not prompt a withdrawal from the world or date setting but greater missionary outreach (Land, 1993, p. 80). As mentioned in §3.3.2.2, p. 103, the early outbreaks of glossolalia were assumed to be what is now called xenolalia, the miraculous ability to speak foreign languages without study. God had given “missionary tongues” to hasten global evangelism before the return of the Lord. Field experiences soon disabused the belief in permanent xenolalia, but tongues were still considered an eschatological sign heralding worldwide revival (Althouse, 2003, pp. 35–36). Jesus was coming soon, so it was imperative, indeed the only thing that mattered eternally, to spread the full gospel across this earth. Not only was evangelization of non-Christians necessary, but the rest of the church also needed to receive the restored truths of healing, sanctification, and Spirit baptism (Land, 1993, pp. 53–56). It was this initial missionary impetus that has carried the movement so far and helped it to become the second largest stream of Christianity on earth after only one hundred years.

The latter rain eschatological outlook was both prophetic and apocalyptic. Peter Althouse (2003, pp. 25–36) explores these two themes in early pentecostal eschatology through analysis of the belief systems of Parham and Seymour, the two leaders who come the closest to being the founders of the movement. Parham is important for being the first to dogmatically linking speaking in tongues with Spirit baptism (Synan, 1971, p. 99). Parham’s eschatology was dispensational

premillennialism, but he modified it to accommodate certain pentecostal beliefs. Against standard dispensationalism, he believed that the church age would end the way it began, with a great revival in the power of the Spirit (Althouse, 2003, p. 25). He helped to promote the belief in glossolalia as “missionary tongues,” the key to end-time evangelism (Althouse, 2003, p. 28). Parham’s outlook was radically apocalyptic but did not entirely lack prophetic elements (Althouse, 2003, pp. 28–31). He preached against involvement in worldly culture and politics and was staunchly anti-establishment. He viewed all institutions, social, governmental, and ecclesiastical, as corrupt and beyond redemption before the coming of the end. Essentially a socialist, he found nothing of worth in any form of organization, being both anti-capitalist and anti-union. Conversion and consecration were the only hope for the salvation of individuals. Many of Parham’s sentiments are prevalent in American pentecostal churches today, especially in majority white ones. Interestingly, adjunct to his apocalyptic eschatology, Parham shared two major beliefs with an overlooked root of the pentecostalism, the radical Reformation tradition: pacifism (Wilson, 1988b, p. 658) and conditional immortality (Goff, 1988, p. 153). Few American pentecostals today share these particular beliefs.

Seymour, arguably the more important and, from a contemporary perspective, definitely the more appealing of the two, is the one individual most responsible for popularizing the pentecostal experience. While also containing apocalyptic elements, his eschatology represents the prophetic strand in early pentecostalism. Earlier, in §3.3.2.2, pp. 101–102, it was noted that Seymour saw the real purpose of the renewal of Pentecost as the healing of racial wounds in the church and the liberation of the oppressed before the coming of the Lord. Tongues, as the sign of the reversal of Babel and the division of the races, would bring healing and reconciliation (Althouse, 2003, p. 35). Cox (1995, pp. 111–115) dwells on the importance of the often overlooked contribution of black millennialism to the movement, the influence of which flourished for a time under Seymour’s leadership. Cox notes that, given the historical milieu, large sections of American society were awaiting the coming of the “heavenly Jerusalem,” and Seymour was the right person at the right place to capture this longing and channel it into the greatest revival in the history of Christianity. The prophetic vision of liberation and the original pentecostal vision of Azusa Street were one.

3.4.1.2 The Ascendance of Dispensational Apocalypticism

For a time during the classical period, both strands of pentecostal eschatology, the prophetic and the apocalyptic, flourished together. Virtually all in the early movement, including Seymour, held a dispensational form of premillennialism. This

belief, however, was not a rigid dogma, nor did it conform to standard fundamentalist dispensationalism. The chief eschatological expectation of pentecostalism was the imminent return of Christ. Most also hoped for a pre-tribulation rapture, but beyond that, details were sparse. At the end of the classical period when denominations were being formed, premillennialism and imminence were included in their statements of faith, but none made explicit reference to the timing of the rapture or other distinctive features of dispensationalism.

Not all was well, however, with the new movement. From 1911 to 1916, the end of the classical period, pentecostalism endured three major controversies. The first was the “finished work controversy,” a conflict over sanctification between Wesleyan and non-Wesleyan pentecostals. The second controversy, exclusive to the non-Wesleyan camp, was the “new issue” of oneness pentecostalism and its rejection of the Trinity. The third issue was race. In the beginning, the leadership and fellowship of the Azusa Street revival were interracial, and Seymour’s vision of liberation was partially fulfilled (Synan, 1971, pp. 165–184). However, social prejudices then prevalent in America, particularly in the South, began to exert pressure within the movement, and segregation reared its ugly head. The classical period ended with the formation of the Assemblies of God, today the largest classical pentecostal denomination worldwide. In its founding, the new fellowship rejected three things: Wesleyan sanctification, oneness modalism, and, through deliberate omission, black leadership. The formation of the Assemblies of God in many ways represented the death knell of integrated pentecostalism and with it, its original prophetic vision. Thankfully, in recent years steps have been taken to confront these issues and foster reconciliation within the broader movement.

Over time, especially as various denominations grew closer to evangelicalism and fundamentalism, dispensationalism grew in influence, and pentecostal eschatology was more fully characterized by the apocalyptic. Dispensationalism was appealing for several reasons. It shared with pentecostalism an essentially literalist, pre-critical hermeneutic. It upheld traditional beliefs about core doctrines such as the virgin birth and the divinity of Christ. It also shared a strong longing for the return of Christ and the belief that it is imminent. Importantly, dispensationalist scholars have written extensively on eschatology, and their teachings were readily accessible and more compatible with pentecostalism than more classical reformed or Wesleyan postmillennial eschatologies. Lacking scholarly writings of their own, it was natural that in their interest in eschatology pentecostals would gravitate towards the abundant dispensationalist literature and gradually absorb its teachings. Gerald T. Sheppard (1984) has documented the progression in pentecostal belief from a general affirmation of the imminent, premillennial return of Christ to acceptance of most

features of dispensationalism. Although it was not explicitly mentioned in the early statements of faith, later denominational leaders read the dispensational interpretation back into them, and it became the official dogma of their churches. The Assemblies of God, for example, in the 1930's moved to forbid its ministers from teaching any other position than pre-tribulation premillennialism, though they could hold post-tribulationism privately (Sheppard, 1984, p. 11).

Today, pre-tribulationism is easily the majority position among classical pentecostals, especially those with fundamentalist affinities, but it has not completely supplanted other types. Dayton (1987, p. 146) notes that

the further one moves away from these currents—into the more Holiness branches of Pentecostalism or into black or other ethnic Pentecostal groups—the less the eschatology is expressed in the characteristic forms of dispensational thought. This fact also suggests that we should not too quickly assume that Pentecostal eschatology is merely the assimilation of the themes of emerging dispensationalism.

Dayton's statement, while generally correct, requires some qualification. While full-fledged dispensationalism is most common in denominations like the Assemblies of God, certain aspects of its eschatology are popular among a wider range of groups. In other contexts, many accept the most appealing aspect of dispensational eschatology, the pre-tribulation rapture, while showing indifference to other dispensational teachings.

This illustrates the eclectic nature of pentecostal theology. It has absorbed dispensationalism's unique doctrine of the pre-tribulation rapture, found in no other theological system in church history, without necessarily accepting all of its hermeneutical guidelines or theological conclusions. Other aspects of dispensational theology not directly connected to the return of Christ contradict essential pentecostal beliefs, so even the Assemblies of God, while accepting dispensationalism generally, has modified it in these specific areas. This adaptation, however, cannot take place without creating some tensions. As a system, dispensationalism generally stands or falls as a whole. Its doctrines exhibit a high degree of interdependence, and modifying one affects others. Conversely, acceptance of one aspect naturally leads to acceptance of all. Although pentecostals have tried to be selective in their adoption of dispensationalism and avoid incongruous elements, they have not been completely successful. Unintentionally, dispensationalism has helped to move many sections of the movement away from the prophetic promise it originally exhibited towards a darker apocalyptic outlook incompatible with the holistically transformative soteriology of the fourfold gospel (Sheppard, 1984, p. 26).

As a thoroughly apocalyptic eschatology, the dispensational view of the end-times beyond the rapture is thoroughly pessimistic, lacking the transformative

prophetic optimism present to some extent in early pentecostalism. The result is that several tenets of standard dispensationalism are fundamentally incompatible with pentecostal theology. First, dispensationalism denies the latter rain restoration of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit. As discussed in §3.2.2.3, fundamentalist belief in the cessation of the gifts is based upon a dispensational distinction between the time of Jesus and the early church and the present church age. After the completion of the New Testament canon, the revelatory and miraculous gifts of the Spirit were withdrawn from the church, being replaced by God's perfect Word (1 Cor. 13:8–12). The fundamentalist movement, not experiencing the supernatural manifestations reported by the pentecostals, used this rationale to repudiate the movement and its beliefs and practices (Synan, 1971, pp. 205–206). Despite this rejection, dispensational theology continued to attract pentecostals, probably because of the weakness of this particular argument. Why, from the dispensational perspective, the experiences in the book of Acts belong to a transitional age and not the entire church age as a whole has never been adequately explained exegetically. Accordingly, this was the easiest area of dispensational thought for pentecostalism to reject unaffected.

The second area is more serious. With a denial of the latter rain comes a denial of an end-time revival (Ice, 2000, pp. 141–144). Contrary to Parham's belief, dispensationalism teaches that all ages end in widespread failure of the human race and apostasy (Ryrie, 1995, pp. 34–35, 139–141). The church is destined to fail as well, and no widespread revival will occur before the rapture, though converted Jews will take up the work of evangelism during the tribulation (Pentecost, 1958, pp. 237–238; Fruchtenbaum, 1996, p. 200). The implications of this are staggering. If this belief is correct, then the missionary optimism of the early pentecostal movement was misplaced. If there is to be no end-time revival—and both the early pentecostals and the fundamentalists believed they were living in the end times—then pentecostalism is not a revival sent from God; its origin is from other than the Holy Spirit (Ward, 1975, pp. 102–107). Efforts at greater Christian unity were pointless. The Roman Catholic Church and, later, the ecumenical movement were the Babylon of Rev. 17, the apostate “world super church” that, after the rapture of all true Christians, would implement a global false religious system (Pentecost, 1958, pp. 364–368; Ryrie, 1964, pp. 50–53). Some stricter fundamentalists include the pentecostal and charismatic movements in this identification. Although the pentecostals modified their dispensationalism so that these negative beliefs would not apply to them, many accepted this view of the WCC, the Assemblies of God going so far as to issue a strong condemnation of it in 1962 (Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 42–43, 436–451, 516–517).

Finally, apocalyptic eschatologies such as dispensationalism discourage involvement in social action and reform. This is not an explicit doctrine but rather an unintended consequence of the outlook of the overall theological system. Sheppard (1984, p. 32 n. 77) elaborates on this tendency among apocalyptic dispensationalists:

They tend not to be reformist except in very limited personalistic ways because they remain sojourners in an evil world. Their comfort comes from the hidden signs of a coming kingdom, which lies in the impending future and in which they will find God's final vindication. The vision so exceeds the present reality that only God can bring it about.

This characterization is equally true of pentecostal dispensationalists. Dwight J. Wilson (1988a, p. 267) notes:

Since the end is near, they [pentecostals] are indifferent to social change and have rejected the reformist methods of the optimistic postmillennialists and have concentrated on "snatching brands from the fire" and letting social reforms result from humankind being born again.

Such a longing for the return of Christ, which brings about the end of world, has commendable aspects, but this portrait of the times does not do full justice to Jesus' gospel of the kingdom. As envisioned, the pentecostal fourfold gospel, the good news of Jesus, does not include only eternal salvation of the soul but also temporal healing of the body. Implied in this is deliverance from all oppression, externally and internally, individually and socially. The baptism in the Holy Spirit brings power for ministry, the blessing of others through God's servants. With such potential, the fourfold gospel does not demand retreat from the world before Christ's coming but transformation of it. The pessimism of such a stark apocalypticism does not truly reflect the hope hidden in Christ's coming.

Some leading pentecostal scholars have recognized the problems of integrating fundamentalist theology into pentecostalism and are searching for alternatives (Althouse, 2003, pp. 193–197). J. R. Williams (1992, pp. 421–444), as a charismatic and former premillennialist, has ably defended reformed amillennialism within a general framework of moderate apocalypticism thoroughly compatible with traditional pentecostal beliefs. Other theologians have looked to the transformationist eschatologies of Jürgen Moltmann and the liberation theologians for inspiration (Althouse, 2003, pp. 168–169). How much these alternative eschatologies will influence the movement is uncertain. While they have gained attention in academic and ecumenical circles, formidable barriers remain to teaching in seminaries and churches theologies that conflict with official denominational positions.

3.4.2 The *Parousia* of Christ as the Centerpiece of Eschatology

Eschatology is a vast area of study, particularly in the dispensational form embraced by pentecostalism. To engage even just its most important doctrines

represents a huge undertaking. Within this dissertation, however, the vital question is how eschatology relates to Christology, particularly the functional, from below Christology of the pentecostal gospel. The final point of the fourfold gospel is Jesus as coming king. The *parousia* of Christ is the centerpiece of eschatology and the object of pentecostal hope despite the accompanying apocalyptic dooms. Hope for the *parousia* is hope for reunion with the Lord, the object of Christian love and devotion (Brunner, 1962, pp. 395–396). Christology of any sort is incomplete without some reference to the *parousia*. The second article of the creeds concludes with the belief that he shall come again, bringing eternal life in one hand and judgment in the other. It is in the *parousia* that any doctrine of the person and work of Christ finds its completion. Williams (1992, pp. 302–303) notes that the New Testament uses *παρουσία* mostly in relation to believers, their experience and conduct. It is in the return of Christ that the fullness of salvation promised in the gospel is completely realized.

With the latter rain restoration of the gifts of the Spirit to the church, the pentecostal movement began with the belief that it was the generation of believers that would see the return of the Lord. The message of the full gospel was spread throughout the earth with this expectation. One hundred years later, the twenty-first century movement is facing the same problem the first century church did, namely the delay of the *parousia* (Macchia, 2003b). Fervent expectation of the soon return of Christ can be both a strength and a weakness. It is a manifestation of love for the Lord that can serve as a stimulus for ethical living and action (2 Tim. 4:8). On the other hand, it can also promote withdrawal from the world and avoidance of social responsibilities; if the world is soon to end, there is no reason to try to improve it. With this mind-set, when the apocalypse does not arrive as anticipated, disappointment can result and faith can become endangered. In order to grow, pentecostal theologians must address the problems with its eschatology, eliminating weaknesses but retaining the strengths of this last point of the fourfold gospel. It is in this area that the movement can learn best from other, older theological streams that have addressed this problem as well as newer perspectives on the meaning of the *eschaton*.

3.4.2.1 *The Delay of the Parousia*

The delay of the *parousia* as an issue of modern theology first came up with liberalism and the quest for the historical Jesus; Schweitzer (1911, p. 358) is attributed as the first to use the phrase (Hoekema, 1979, p. 111). Schweitzer was catalytic in wakening liberalism from its slumberous neglect of the last things. He perceived Jesus as essentially an eschatological prophet, and he contended that his

ethical teachings were inseparable from his apocalyptic preaching. To the chagrin of prevailing views, he demonstrated that any reconstruction of the historical Jesus that neglected the latter in favor of the former was flawed (Schwarz, 2000, p. 113). Schweitzer proposed a consistent approach to eschatology. Jesus and his followers believed that the end of history was imminent, but they were mistaken (Schweitzer, 1911, pp. 368–369). The New Testament church continued in this belief but was disappointed when the *parousia* did not materialize. This was the crisis over the delay of the *parousia*, and all of later Christian theology is an attempt to adapt to it.

Conservatives of all varieties reject this interpretation, primarily because it attributes error to Jesus or, at the very least, the writers of the Gospels (Hoekema, 1979, pp. 117–118). The charge of a crisis over the delay is met with reference to verses such as Matt. 25:13 and Acts 1:7, which state that the time of Christ’s return and the end of the age is unknown and unknowable. Accordingly, on the basis of Rom. 13:11–12, Rev. 22:7, and other verses, it is correct to state that the early church believed the return of Christ was soon. However, neither Jesus nor the apostles taught what time or age to which the word “soon” applied. The general teaching of the parables and other relevant passages is that the church must be ever watchful and ready for the Lord’s return. No suggestion is given, however, that any particular generation may have a special insight that it is the last one. (Several viable alternative explanations are given for Matt. 24:34, e.g., Hoekema, 1979, pp. 114–117.)

This response does justice to some of the New Testament’s teaching, but it does not fully address the issue. It may be incorrect to say that the delay of the *parousia* created a “crisis,” but the fact that some adjustment had to be made by the church as the years passed by is virtually self-evident. A passage in a controversial book at the fringe of the New Testament canon, 2 Peter 3:1–13, addresses this very issue. Some, such as G. C. Berkouwer (1972, pp. 78–81) deny that the passage admits to a real problem other than the mockery of skeptics, but this glosses over real issues the letter presents. If any book of the New Testament is pseudonymous, it is this one, but regardless of the author’s identity, the occasion of the Epistle’s writing suggests that real problems over the delay were arising. It is one thing to dismiss doubters of the second coming in the first century—ironically referred to as the “last days”—as unbelieving “scoffers”; nearly two millennia later, the problem of the delay deserves more thoughtful consideration.

The evidence of concern over and adjustment in response to the delay of the *parousia* is found not only in the New Testament but in the development of Christian theology through the ages. The development of a church hierarchy is one indicator. If the end is coming soon, then there is no need for complex governing structures, but if the church is to endure for long ages, organization is needed. More direct adjustments

are seen in the evolution of eschatology. The New Testament and the early fathers had no clear teaching of the intermediate state between death and the general resurrection—Parham did not believe in conditional immortality without some justification—for this state is unimportant if the resurrection is less than a generation away (H. Bavinck, cited in Berkouwer, 1972, pp. 54–55). As one generation passes to the next, the question becomes much more important. Likewise, the move away from chiliasm to other millennial schemes also underscores this concern over the delay. It is reasonable to believe in a future transitional age before the eternal kingdom when the church is only a few generations old; it is less so after several centuries or a millennium or two of the present age, which is the real transition. All of these developments, which should not be viewed as errors, may be interpreted as attempts to adjust to the delay of the *parousia*.

Despite these adjustments, Christian perspectives on eschatology, especially since the Reformation, remain constantly in flux. One reason for the periodic rebirth of adventist movements—not just pentecostalism—is the application of the hermeneutics of suspicion (Cox, 1995, pp. 115–121; Dayton, 1987, pp. 164–167; Moltmann, 1996a, pp. 157–159). New revivals invigorate interest in the Scriptures generally, and in revisiting prophetic passages, revivalists contemplate them afresh in the light of their experiences. Many begin to wonder why, when the New Testament clearly teaches the soon return of Christ, their churches rarely speak about the issue (Moltmann, 1990, pp. 313–314). The basis for the development of traditional eschatology is not considered; the conclusion that biblical truth is being suppressed is reached. In the fervent anticipation of the second advent, new denominations and traditions are formed. As the generations pass, the issue of the delay in the *parousia* resurfaces and adjustments are made. The cycle thus continues.

More mature conservative theologies attempt to reach a mediating position that accommodates both the belief that Jesus is coming soon and also the fact that the church has been waiting for nearly two thousand years. Again, the emphasis is usually placed on the unknowability of Christ's coming; Christians should live in constant preparation but not be disappointed if theirs is not the chosen generation. This perspective is similar to that of 2 Peter, which is useful in that it attempts to extract theological meaning and ethical value from the delay. Contemporary Christians may even be grateful that the end has not yet come for the simple reason that if it had, none who now live would have ever existed (Matt. 22:30). Yet, something is still lacking in this perspective. As is demonstrated in the historical shifts in Christian eschatology, a balance between constant anticipation of the *parousia* and recognition that its timing is unknowable is difficult to achieve. It also does not completely face the reality of the delay. All of the past generations of Christians who believed that they would live to

see the return of the Lord were mistaken; it is most probable that the present generation is mistaken as well. A biblically and historically responsible revisioning of eschatology is needed, one that fully accepts both the promise of the *parousia* and the implications caused by its delay.

3.4.2.2 *Ecumenical Insights: Eschatological Liberation and Hope*

Two important, closely related twentieth century theologies can help in revisioning pentecostal eschatology so as to both retain adventist expectations and realistically face the delay of the *parousia*. These are the theologies of liberation and Jürgen Moltmann's theology of hope. From one perspective, liberation theology may be viewed as an adjustment to the delay of the *parousia*; from another perspective, it is a protest against the church's general handling of the crisis of the delay. Liberation theology objects to the deferment of the fulfillment of Christian hope to the *eschaton*, either as the intermediate state or the distant apocalyptic future. Specifically, liberation theology contends that by focusing on the joy and healing to come in the afterlife, the church has fostered passivity in the present and resignation in the face of suffering (Gutiérrez, 1983, p. 39). Unjust social structures and conditions are perpetuated or even encouraged when individuals are told not to act against them but to contentedly endure until they die and go to heaven. Accordingly, the response of liberation theology to the delay of the *parousia* is to attempt to bring to realization in the present, historical world the values and conditions associated with the promise of the establishment of God's kingdom.

Although other schools of thought such as dispensationalism might not recognize it as such, liberation theology is permeated with eschatological themes. Gutiérrez (1973, pp. 160–168) has discussed how the Bible has a continual orientation towards the future through the theme of promise. The very concept of promise contains hope for a future outcome of blessing, and even when it begins to be fulfilled, it is not exhausted of content. The great promises of Scripture should not be emptied of their temporal import through excessive spiritualization, for fulfillment must begin historically if the promise is to come into complete fulfillment in the future:

[I]t is only *in* the temporal, earthly, historical event that we can open up to the future of complete fulfillment.... Its presence [i.e., the eschatological] is an intrahistorical reality. The grace-sin conflict, the coming of the Kingdom, and the expectation of the *parousia* are also necessarily and inevitably historical, temporal, earthly, social, and material realities.... A poorly understood spiritualization has often made us forget the human consequences of the eschatological promises and the power to transform unjust social structures which they imply. (Gutiérrez, 1973, p. 167)

Accordingly, human action in the present cause of liberation helps to bring about the

fulfillment of the promised kingdom of God, and Christians should not wait until death or the apocalypse for betterment. In summary, liberation theology looks for the establishment of the kingdom on earth historically and prior to the end, the coming of the kingdom and its virtues the main focus rather than the *parousia* (Schwarz, 2000, p. 156). The eschatology of liberation theology is thus the twentieth century's version of postmillennialism, differing from the older view primarily in that it has a more realistic view of current human social and political conditions.

A kindred spirit to the liberation theologies is Moltmann's theology of hope. Moltmann is widely recognized as one of the foremost ecumenical theologians of eschatology. He has not merely advocated for the value of its inclusion in modern systematic theology; rather, he has successfully recast all of Christian theology from the perspective of the eschatological. His interpretation of the last things is best described as transformational; rather than looking for a cataclysmic destruction of the present world, he emphasizes the new creation of all things (Moltmann, 1996a, p. xi). Moltmann has written extensively on the subject in his long career and in turn inspired many other writings. Althouse (2003, pp. 168–169), for one, has shown how various critical pentecostal theologians have interacted with Moltmann's transformationist eschatology in order to move away from destructive apocalyptic visions towards more constructive prophetic eschatologies. This present discussion will be limited to bring Moltmann's thought to bear on the Christological question of eschatology, the importance of the *parousia* and its delay.

Moltmann's (1990) *Christology* concludes with a chapter on the *parousia*. For him, the *parousia* is not simply a component of eschatology but the completion of Christology, the doctrines of both the person and the work of Christ (p. 316). In contrast with sectarian apocalyptic expectations, his goal is to move away from a vindictive view of the coming of Christ as a destructive judgment ending the world (pp. 313–315). At the same time, he does not wish to demythologize or spiritualize the expectation of the *parousia* and thus empty eschatology of content or turn it into mysticism (pp. 315–318). The *parousia* is not the end of the world but the fulfillment of salvation history; it is the beginning of the eternal kingdom (pp. 319–321). Moltmann (2003, p. viii) provides the best summary of his perspective in his foreword to Althouse's work:

The expectation of Jesus' *return* is therefore misleading in that it presupposes that Jesus is not here now, but will come again one day. In this way the present is emptied. But if Jesus is "coming", then he steps each day out of his future into the present and each present has to open itself up to his arrival.... If Jesus is embraced "coming" there is no problem of the "delay of Christ's return". The kingdom of God is then so "near" that we can experience its healing and liberating effect.

The practical conclusions of Moltmann's doctrine are similar to those of the liberation theologians. Anticipation of the *parousia* prompts one to go through life in "expectant creativity" and work for the establishment of the values of the kingdom in the present world (Moltmann, 1990, pp. 338–341).

3.4.3 Synthesis and Adjustment

At the close of the twentieth century and the opening of the twenty-first, some sections within pentecostalism are quietly experiencing a crisis similar to that of the first century (Hollenweger, 2001, pp. 42–43). For eschatologically-minded pentecostals, the start of the new millennium prompted more excitement than it did for other dispensational premillennialists looking for signs of the return of the Lord. January 1, 2001, also represented the completion of one hundred years of the latter rain outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Well into the first decade of the third Christian millennium, the *parousia* appears no closer, and conditions interpreted in the previous decade as heralding its imminence need reevaluation. The modern pentecostal movement may be correct in interpreting the revival of tongues and other spiritual gifts as an important eschatological sign; as a sign that time is near its end, it is more doubtful. It is clear that pentecostalism and the broader renewal movement represent a highly significant development in modern Christianity. Unlike many other previous revival movements, their impact seems permanent and unlikely to fade into history as time passes. This makes the need for theological maturity all the more acute.

Eschatology influences ethics and behavior. "Tell me what you hope for, and I will tell you who you are!" exclaims Moltmann (2003, p. vii). Hope for the *parousia* produces great energies that can be channeled into action. As a whole, the pentecostal movement has been motivated by the prophecies of Matt. 24 more than the prophecies of Matt. 25. In terms of evangelism and propagation, it can be said that pentecostalism has used its century of expectation well. Its numeric growth has been far more successful than any outside observer of the Azusa Street revival would have predicted. In terms of other aspects the gospel such as social concern, the movement's accomplishments are much more modest. Apocalyptic eschatologies, like those of pentecostalism, that are oriented towards the imminent rapture or return of Christ can easily encourage adoption of a truncated view of life. Historically, they have motivated Christians to live their lives in preparation for the afterlife and its judgment. They have not encouraged preparation for this life or preparation of the world for the coming generations. If one believes that Jesus will inevitably come in a year or decade or at the latest within one's lifetime, one will likely concentrate on "snatching brands from the fire" but neglect efforts to put out the fire before it burns down the house. Valuable lessons need to be learned from the history of the delay of the *parousia* and disappointments that have resulted because of it.

Christian eschatology is ultimately about the new creation; study of the original creation and its history can provide insights about the coming world. During the modern age, much has been learned about the vastness of God's creation. It is far larger and older than what was once believed. According to Gal. 4:4, God sent Jesus in "the fullness of time," and again in the fullness of time, all things will be united in him (Eph. 1:10). Unlike many in the first century undoubtedly believed, the interim age between the two has stretched beyond a generation or even a thousand years to two millennia and more. During that time, countless millions have placed faith in him. Just as the vastness of creation and the span of the ages were for long unknown, no one can know the vastness of God's plan. A greater eschatological vision is required. One can be ready and watchful for the *parousia*, but it is not an event for which one can plan lest, as Moltmann (2003, p. viii) reminds, the present become emptied of meaning. It is better, as the ecumenical eschatologies show, to live life in light of the coming kingdom and take steps to transform the world in consonance with that hope. The promise of the *parousia* will be fulfilled in God's sovereign timing alone.

That said, eschatologies of imminence such as dispensationalism do constantly remind Christians of one important truth that should never fall out of sight: the Christian hope is ultimately Jesus Christ and his coming (Titus 2:11–14). A transformational, prophetic eschatology is valuable to both Christians and the world around them. Just as it is dangerous to lose sight of the world for the heavenly, it is equally dangerous to lose sight of the future for the present. Both Cox (1995, p. 318) and Hollenweger (2001, pp. 42–43) observe that the loss of eschatological expectation leads to stagnation in religious movements, and Brunner (1962, pp. 401–407) has shown the danger of excessive demythologization of eschatology. To work for transformation is important, but more important still is to remember why and for whom the work is undertaken. As Moltmann (1990, p. 340) concludes,

The hope for the *parousia* is not a flight from the world. Nor does it provide any foundation for hostility towards the body. On the contrary, it makes people prepared to remain true to the earth, and to honour the body. Life in hope for the *parousia* is not a matter of mere "waiting," guarding oneself, and holding fast to the faith. It is *life in anticipation* of the Coming One, life in "expectant creativity."

3.4.3.1 Millennial Revisioning

For pentecostalism to move towards a transformational, prophetic eschatology entails moving away from dispensational premillennialism. Transformational eschatologies such as that seen in liberation theology tend to lean towards postmillennialism. Moltmann's thought is difficult to classify, but his more recent works show signs of gravitation towards a future transitional age and misgivings

about historical identifications of the millennium (Moltmann, 1996a, pp. 192–202). Nevertheless, the researcher feels that a form of amillennialism such as that promoted by J. Rodman Williams (1992, pp. 421–444) is a better solution biblically and theologically for pentecostalism’s millennial problem. It is generally unwise to allow a single, difficult passage such as Rev. 20:1–10 to control a wide area of theology. Amillennialism, which would better be named present or historic millennialism because it identifies the millennium with the present interim church age, corresponds more closely to the eschatology of the rest of the Bible as well as the major creeds. Although historic premillennialism overcomes some of the problems of dispensationalism and would likely be received better by traditional pentecostals, all forms of premillennialism have serious defects as has been explored by Arthur H. Lewis (1980).

Amillennial eschatology stands as a mediating perspective between premillennialism and postmillennialism. It combines the strengths of both positions while retaining few of their drawbacks. Eschatologically, it refrains from both the doomsday pessimism of premillennialism and the utopian optimism of postmillennialism. It corresponds well to one of Jesus’ parables of the kingdom, the wheat and the tares (Matt. 13:24–30, 36–43) by recognizing that good and evil will coexist until the end. When the thousand years are understood symbolically, amillennialism provides a partial explanation for the delay of the *parousia*; so understood, Rev. 20 provides biblical support for an interim age lacking in chiliasm. On the other hand, it does not rule out the *possibility* of the imminence of the *parousia* as is inevitable with postmillennialism.

Amillennialism also has significant benefits for Christology, specifically in the area of the work of Christ. Throughout this work, some of the problems with the prevailing penal substitution theory of the atonement have been discussed. The *Christus victor* view seems almost custom-made for pentecostalism, yet it has received little formal attention within the movement. One reason for this is that premillennialism rules it out a priori. The *Christus victor* perspective emphasizes Christ’s defeat of the powers through the cross (John 12:31–32, Heb. 2:14–15). The millennium begins with the binding of Satan (Rev. 20:1–3), which in the premillennial scheme is still in the future. With that assumption in place, it is more difficult to recognize the decisive defeat of Satan and the demonic as an aspect of the work of Christ. Conversely, in the amillennial scheme, the binding of Satan is explicitly recognized as occurring through the death and resurrection of Christ. Evil has not been completely eliminated, but with the coming of Jesus, it has been limited, and the liberating power of the kingdom of God has begun to manifest in the world. As doctrines, amillennialism and the *Christus victor* view of the atonement exhibit

natural compatibility. Movement towards an amillennial perspective can also help moderate pentecostal perceptions of the demonic, which as mentioned in §3.2.6 can sometimes tend towards excess, by recognizing the extent of Christ's victory over the powers that would enslave humanity.

3.4.3.2 *The Parousia of the Holy Spirit*

Closely related to the *parousia* of Christ and its delay is the meaning of the coming of the Holy Spirit. Through the ages, some theologians have interpreted the coming of the Spirit as a fulfillment, at least partially, of the promise of the *parousia*. Karl Barth (1961b, pp. 294–296 (CD IV.3.1)) held this view. He divided the *parousia* into three aspects. Christ has “come again” in his resurrection and in the descent of the Spirit and will come again at the end. “The impartation of the Holy Spirit is the coming of Jesus Christ in the last time which still remains,” he wrote (p. 295). This interpretation is another way of overcoming the problem of the delay. The *parousia* becomes eternalized (Moltmann, 1990, pp. 317–318), an ever-occurring event already partially realized, and thus apprehensions over its delay are misplaced. Among other reasons, this identification of the coming of the Spirit with the coming of Christ has led some to accuse Barth of modalism. Interestingly, the modalistic oneness branch of pentecostalism holds a similar understanding.

The findings of Schweitzer and others, however, seem to rule out this identification or any other form of preterism. Moltmann (1990, p. 318) disagrees with Barth and others who take this direction and eternalize the *parousia* because through it “the eschatological orientation of the Christian faith is lost.” Although because of the *perichoresis* of the Persons of the Trinity Christ is also present in the coming of the Spirit (Barth, 1961b, p. 296 (CD IV.3.1)), nowhere does the New Testament appear to attempt to solve the problem of the delay of the *parousia* in this manner. After all, in 2 Peter 3:4 the scoffers mock by asking, “Where is the promise of his coming?” The author of the Epistle responds by offering a reason for the delay; he does point his readers back to the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost. The outlook of hope is always forward looking; the New Testament closes with the Spirit and the bride still crying, “Come, Lord Jesus!” (Rev. 22:17, 20).

Section 2.3.3 introduced some of the issues connected with the concept of Spirit Christology. One of these was the New Testament dialectic of the real presence and absence of Christ. The time between the first and second comings of Christ is for the church a time of expectation, longing, and hope. Christ is present with his people but not fully or immediately. It was for this reason that he promised to send in his place another *παράκλητος* like himself, the Spirit of truth (John 14:16–17). The descent of the Spirit was not the *parousia* of Christ but the *parousia* of the Spirit who

continues the work of Christ. Pentecost was the inauguration of the interim age before the end, which is the era of the Spirit (Acts 2:17–21), recognized in many traditions as the third and final dispensation (Cox, 1995, pp. 115–116; Moltmann, 1996a, pp. 143–144). To live as people of Pentecost is to recall this message: a new age has begun; the Spirit and prophetic anointing have been given universally, without discrimination (cf. Num. 11:29); and the time of full salvation has come for everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord.

3.5 Jesus as Sanctifier: The Forgotten Fifth Point

Sanctification was an essential doctrine in the development of pentecostalism. As already discussed, pentecostalism arose directly out of methodism and the succeeding holiness movement; although it has several theological roots, Wesleyan perfectionism is by far the most important. If justification was the chief doctrine of interest and controversy in the sixteenth century, then sanctification held that position in the nineteenth century. Holiness was spoken of everywhere in Anglo-American protestantism even outside of the Wesleyan-Arminian stream, for example, in the influential Keswick movement in England (Menziez, W. W., 1975, pp. 85–90). The first pentecostals assumed the basic tenets of the holiness movement. Their full gospel was fivefold, and Jesus as sanctifier was an indispensable function of their Christology. They simply separated out Spirit baptism for empowerment with the evidence of speaking in tongues as an additional crisis experience, a gift of God poured out on a sanctified life. It was assumed that through the three successive reformations of Luther, Wesley, and the latter rain of pentecostalism that New Testament Christianity had been fully restored to the end-time church (Land, 1993, pp. 18, 95–96). That pentecostalism could have any other valid configuration was not conceived, for it was impossible to be filled with the Spirit without first being cleansed from all sin.

A century later, the situation is vastly different. In comparison to the nineteenth century, sanctification is a neglected doctrine in all protestant theological streams, including pentecostalism. Personal holiness is not as frequent a topic in formal or informal theological discussions. The rise of fundamentalism and neo-evangelicalism reinvigorated traditional Calvinism, reasserting the Reformation's priority of justification over sanctification among conservative protestants. Mainline and ecumenical theologies pursued agendas other than individualistic perfectionism. Most stunningly, the development and success of pentecostalism's distinctive doctrine, the baptism in the Holy Spirit, undermined its holiness beliefs. Non-Wesleyan forms of pentecostalism that rejected entire sanctification as a crisis experience soon arose and quickly surpassed the older system in adherents and

influence. Likewise, the charismatic movement developed largely without any reference to Wesleyan theology. Compared to the previous era of revivals, today the function of Jesus as sanctifier is a largely forgotten point.

Of course, this does not mean that sanctification has been left wholly untreated in pentecostal and other theologies. It is still a standard topic within soteriology, and various contemporary theologians have explored it productively if not as passionately as in the nineteenth century. In studying contemporary reflections on sanctification, one is struck by three points. First, different theological traditions, even across the Reformation divide, agree more than they disagree on many aspects of sanctification (“Foreword”, 1987, p. 7), and the differences that exist are not nearly as fundamental as those concerning justification. Virtually all would agree that sanctification is a necessary and desired goal of the Christian life; that it is experienced progressively; and that while human participation and cooperation are necessary, ultimately it is God’s gracious work wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit. Second, the greatest area of controversy—though no longer a particularly heated one—is about *when* the primary expression of sanctification takes place in the *ordo salutis*. In Roman Catholicism, sanctification is a part of justification as the infusion of righteousness, while in protestant thought, justification and sanctification must be clearly distinguished. Sanctification flows from justification and is dependent upon it, but justification and sanctification should not be conflated. Holiness pentecostals appreciate sanctification as progressive but also expect a sanctifying crisis experience subsequent to regeneration. Non-Wesleyan classical pentecostals, on the other hand, locate this experience within justification-regeneration (see next section). Third, the Wesleyan understanding of sanctification, not as expressed by Wesley or early methodism but by the later holiness movement and early pentecostalism, stands in the greatest contrast with other views on sanctification. Although it is arguably the most developed reflection on sanctification, it also contains inherent problems and self-contradictions. The very fact that it has declined in influence even within sections of the Wesleyan tradition shows that it requires revision. A truly pentecostal Christology and soteriology will not leave out the function of Jesus as sanctifier but must improve upon previous models.

3.5.1 Evolution, Controversy, and Stagnation within the Pentecostal Traditions

Section 3.3.1 traces the evolution of the doctrine of entire sanctification from John Wesley to the beginnings of the pentecostal movement. Wesley, the founder of methodism, taught that entire sanctification, which he called “Christian perfection” but distinguished from an absolutely sinless eschatological perfection, could be received by faith prior to death through a crisis experience (Wesley, 1968, p. 41;

Lindström, 1980, pp. 140–154). He did not deny that sanctification had a gradual or progressive aspect (Lindström, 1980, pp. 123–124). Indeed, entire sanctification could not be received at justification but only some time later when the Christian became dissatisfied with the continuing presence of sin in his or her life. Spiritual growth also did not cease after this experience. Thus, Wesley saw growth in holiness as progress–point–progress. There was gradual growth in holiness subsequent to justification. At any point prior to death, the Christian could seek and expect to receive a transformative experience of grace in which the struggle against sin ceased with a decisive victory. Growth in this new state of holiness would then continue until the *eschaton*.

Wesley used many passages from the New Testament to support his teaching of entire sanctification, and as a teleological theme of Scripture, it is undeniable. The phrase “entire sanctification” comes from the benediction of 1 Thess. 5:23. Hebrews 12:14 warns that without holiness, “no one will see the Lord,” and the Lord himself said in Matt. 5:48, “You therefore must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.” Proof texts aside, clear biblical support for entire sanctification as an instantaneous crisis experience receivable during earthly life is much more difficult to demonstrate. Although Wesley himself did not do so, others within the methodist and holiness movements searched for more support for the experience and believed to find it in the baptism in the Holy Spirit. By the end of the nineteenth century, most in the holiness movement employed pentecostal terminology to describe the experience. As discussed in §3.3.1, ultimately it was realized by C. F. Parham, W. J. Seymour, and others that Spirit baptism was different from entire sanctification; it was an experience given for empowerment, not holiness, and was normatively accompanied by speaking in tongues. Seeking Spirit baptism with that understanding, many who testified to a previous sanctifying experience subsequently received a third soteriological experience and manifested glossolalia. Thus was the modern pentecostal movement born out of Wesleyan revivalism.

Seymour, Parham, and the first pentecostals retained belief in both subsequent experiences, as did the oldest pentecostal denominations such as the Church of God (Cleveland), the Church of God in Christ, and the Pentecostal Holiness Church. They simply made a clearer distinction between the subsequent experiences of sanctification and empowerment than the non-glossolalic holiness groups did. Among these early pentecostal preachers and denominations, entire sanctification was a necessary prerequisite for receiving the fullness of the Spirit, which they frequently described as the gift of God “upon the sanctified life” (Land, 1993, p. 90). Their full gospel was fivefold; Jesus was understood as savior, sanctifier, baptizer, healer, and coming king. This version may rightly be understood as the original configuration of

classical pentecostalism and the one most in continuity with the larger Wesleyan tradition. That other forms of pentecostalism would later arise or even be possible was not envisioned at the beginning of the movement.

Nevertheless, theological and practical problems with this new *ordo salutis* surfaced almost at once. By separating Spirit baptism from entire sanctification—which, as will be shown below, is more correct biblically—the holiness pentecostals undermined the biblical structure erected in the nineteenth century to defend crisis sanctification. Diverging from Wesley, the holiness movement had identified Spirit baptism or filling with entire sanctification to give it support as a subsequent soteriological experience (Bassett & Greathouse, 1985, pp. 302–318). With the reinterpretation of Spirit baptism as empowerment—in the end the logical conclusion of the holiness movement’s line of thought—the bulk of the biblical support for the second blessing was transferred to the third, and much of the case for crisis sanctification evaporated. Practically, establishing entire sanctification as a prerequisite for Spirit baptism is problematic. Seymour’s views on this subject have been presented in §3.3.2.2. One reason he eventually rejected the doctrine of initial evidence was the racism among some of the white pentecostals. He reasoned that because they were not entirely sanctified, they could not be filled with the Spirit; accordingly, their manifestation of glossolalia was not a demonstration of the Spirit. While Seymour’s admonition was prophetic and needed, his approach was also not without problems. Another reason he rejected evidential tongues was because Parham spoke in tongues yet believed in conditional immortality. Seymour (2000, pp. 87–88) saw this as error and therefore concluded that Parham could not be sanctified or Spirit-baptized. This degree of perfectionism opened a Pandora’s box of judgment in the early movement when any disagreement about virtually any action or belief disqualified an opponent’s spiritual experience or testimony. Some pentecostals similarly criticized the charismatic movement in the mainline denominations (e.g., Hughes, 1976, pp. 173–174, 178–179).

Within the classical period in the United States, even greater dissent arose when, after the rapid conversion of several of the older holiness denominations, the movement began gaining many new adherents not from Wesleyan backgrounds. The new converts claimed the experience of Holy Spirit baptism and evidential tongues without a prior experience of entire sanctification, which was unacceptable to the holiness camp (Horton, 1987, pp. 106–109). With this development, pentecostalism as a movement faced its first major crisis, the “finished work controversy” (Synan, 1971, pp. 147–153). Popularized by William H. Durham, this perspective emphasized the positional sanctification that occurs at justification as a result of Christ’s work on the cross. Similar in many respects to the more reformed understanding of sanctification

as progressive and gradual, it denied a subsequent crisis experience, though in actuality it is not entirely free from Wesleyan influences (Leggett, 1989). A sizable faction of pentecostal leaders accepted Durham's position and reduced the fivefold gospel to the four points of Jesus as savior, baptizer, healer, and coming king only. This led to further schism and ultimately the formation of the Assemblies of God, the first non-Wesleyan pentecostal denomination. Other new denominations formed after that time, such as the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, generally followed the new fourfold pattern.

Within the United States, both five- and four-point pentecostal denominations continued to coexist in nearly equal proportions (Synan, 1971, pp. 162–163). However, when pentecostalism entered other nations without large preexisting Wesleyan movements, the fourfold version was more successful. Today, the non-methodistic, "baptistic," or "two works" pentecostals are by far the majority globally, outnumbering the holiness branch by nearly ten to one (Barrett, Kurian, *et al.*, 2001, p. 16). The charismatic movement has been largely non-Wesleyan in orientation; indeed, the non-methodist, non-pentecostal Wesleyan traditions have been among the most resistant to this wave of renewal (Synan, 2001, p. 203). Even within some segments of the holiness branch, second blessing sanctification is promoted less fervently than in the past. For example, French L. Arrington of the Church of God devotes more than twice the space in his systematic theology to Spirit baptism (1994, pp. 51–95) than to sanctification (1993, pp. 229–247), with the case for the latter as a discrete crisis made only indirectly as an implication of the overall presentation. The success of the non-perfectionist movements and the warming ties between the two branches have contributed to the de-emphasis of the distinctive Wesleyan doctrine most responsible for the birth of the movement.

3.5.2 Salvation as Sanctification: A Full Ecumenical Synthesis

As noted earlier, today sanctification does not hold as prominent a place in Christian theology as it did during the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. Of course, it has not been totally neglected. Periodically, interest in sanctification has revived, and all of the great systematic theologies of recent times address it to some extent. Yet, doctrines of sanctification tend to lack some of the cohesion and decisiveness found in other areas such as election, justification, or Spirit baptism. There is also some disagreement over how sanctification relates to other aspects of salvation and its proper place in the *ordo salutis*. In part, the difficulty in formulating a doctrine of sanctification reflects the lack of a systematic teaching in the New Testament. Unlike justification or even Spirit baptism, no particular book or passage discusses sanctification in great detail. References to holiness are made in passing, interspersed with many other topics.

In light of the broadness of the New Testament teaching, it may be helpful to reframe how sanctification is understood. Sanctification is not simply a part of the *ordo salutis* but the sum of salvation itself. In Rom. 8:28–30, the closest the New Testament comes to formally delineating the steps of salvation, sanctification is not mentioned at all. Sanctification is not, as sometimes proposed, the subjective work of the Spirit corresponding to justification (see §3.1.4); it is much broader than that. Emil Brunner (1962, pp. 290–291) writes:

In this sense, in the New Testament, “sanctification” can be used as the concept which embraces all God’s action, in which also justification, regeneration and conversion are included.... The whole of Christian existence as such is the work of the Holy Spirit and, as such, is sanctification.

Wesley also affirmed such a comprehensive understanding of sanctification (Kärkkäinen, 2004, p. 76). Seen in this light, the variances in doctrines of sanctification, protestant and catholic, reformed and Wesleyan, liberal and conservative, can be brought together. Salvation and sanctification are not separate but one. The work of salvation—the work of rescuing and delivering—belongs to Christ, the work of sanctification—separation and purification—to the Spirit. To assign sanctification as one function of Christ within the fourfold/fivefold gospel is to limit the work of Christ and the Spirit in a way that is neither biblically justifiable nor true to the theological riches embedded in each of the different Christian perspectives. Accordingly, this discussion of the forgotten point of the full gospel is a recapitulation of the entire functional gospel of Jesus from this perspective of the distinctive work of the Spirit.

3.5.2.1 Sanctification and Justification

In some ways, the conflict of the Reformation over the doctrine of justification was also a conflict over sanctification. Essentially, the protestants separated sanctification from justification. Justification, as the declaration of the righteousness of the sinner based wholly on the merits of Christ, is forensic, positional, and objective and therefore detached from the actual condition of the one who believes: *simul justus et peccator*. Although sanctification is related to justification, it is in no way the basis for justification. Conversely, the Council of Trent (Sess. VI, Chap. VII) declared that justification is

not only the remission of sins but also the sanctification and renewal of the interior person through the voluntary reception of grace and of the gifts, whereby from unjust the person becomes just, and from enemy a friend, that one may be “an heir in hope of eternal life.” (Dupuis & Neuner, 1996, p. 751 §1932)

In the Tridentine view, at justification the sinner is infused with the righteousness of

Christ and in reality is purified. The reception of this holiness—still stemming from the grace of God—is the basis for justification. In this question over the relationship between justification and sanctification was the heart of the conflict.

Even without conscious ecumenical reflection, the classical pentecostal understanding of the relationship between justification and sanctification contains elements of both the protestant and Roman Catholic views. Pentecostal Frank D. Macchia (2003a, p. 135) states, “When I first read Trent’s description of justification, my heart was ‘strangely warmed.’” In the Council’s declarations were statements that resonated with the pentecostal understanding of the Spirit’s work of sanctification at the beginning of salvation. In actuality, the pentecostal position is closer to Wittenberg than it is to Trent (see §3.1.1), but it still varies somewhat from the traditional Lutheran and Calvinist perspectives. Hollenweger (1972, p. 129) notes that *simul justus et peccator* is “completely incomprehensible” to pentecostal preachers. Although they understand that salvation is only by the grace of God and cannot be earned by works, they also know that it is a real, not just legal, transformation. It is a natural consequence of the Spirit’s work in regeneration, the coming into being of a new life of holiness. Though a Christian may still struggle with sin after justification, his or her life has been changed and the process of sanctification has decisively begun once the hallowing Spirit has entered.

It should be noted that ecumenical developments have blunted some of the sharpness in the conflict over justification and sanctification. The issuance of the *Joint declaration* (1999), while not resolving all outstanding differences, shows that the gulf between the Lutheran and Roman Catholic positions is not as insurmountable as once thought. Although its conclusions differ from the Wesleyan tradition, the reformed tradition has never neglected questions of holiness, and some recent protestant theologies have not hesitated to expand their understanding of the beginnings of salvation to include aspects of sanctification. To recall §3.1.3.3, Karl Barth (1956a, pp. 520–521 (CD IV.1)) combined justification, sanctification, and calling in a more comprehensive doctrine of reconciliation. As quoted above, Brunner perceived how, in a sense, sanctification encompasses justification. Conversely, justification is a form of “positional” sanctification effected by God’s declaration of righteousness (1 Cor. 1:30, 6:11). This aspect is emphasized in the baptistic pentecostal “finished work” teaching (Horton, 1987, pp. 113–114).

3.5.2.2 *Sanctification and Healing*

Healing may also be viewed as a type of sanctification, the hallowing and energizing of physical life (Moltmann, 1992, pp. 171–174; 1997, pp. 50–52). When implored by a leper for help, the response of Jesus was, “I will; be clean” (Mark 1:40–

42). At the time, such diseases not only caused physical pain but also cut off the afflicted from the holy covenant people. In his ministry of healing, Jesus cured both aspects of the problem; his mission was one of restoration of the entire human person. The inclusion of the provision for healing in the atoning work of Christ permanently expanded salvation to include material dimensions, and divine healing shows that the body, not just the spirit, is also sacred to God. The Holy Spirit, the one who dispenses gifts of healing, brings wholeness of life even as he sanctifies.

As shown previously, healing does not encompass just individual physical wellbeing but also social and corporate dimensions. The methodist and holiness movements inspired by Wesley have a long tradition of social involvement, understanding it as an indispensable component of their mission to spread “Scriptural holiness throughout the land” (Melvin Dieter, quoted in Land, 1993, pp. 50–51). Liberation theology has also realized the connection between social healing and sanctification. It recognizes that structures and institutions, not just individuals, may be sinful and oppressive (Gutiérrez, 1973, pp. 175–176) and that they too require exorcism and sanctification. In this, liberation theology is an improvement over the older social gospel movement in that it does acknowledge sin, not just ignorance, at the root of society’s problems. Brunner (1962, pp. 300–302) emphasized that the two greatest threats to true sanctification are moralism and quietism. Any movement of holiness, including pentecostalism, has an incomplete doctrine of sanctification if its focus is exclusively on personal piety. The Spirit’s sanctifying work is never wholly private but encompasses all aspects of life.

3.5.2.3 Sanctification and Spirit Baptism

The relationship between Spirit baptism and sanctification is the area of greatest disagreement between the holiness and pentecostal movements. In the non-pentecostal holiness groups, Spirit baptism is identified with entire sanctification. Though the purpose of empowerment is also acknowledged, the movement questions how it is possible for one to be filled with the Spirit completely and yet be imperfectly purified (Dieter, 1987, p. 138). The holiness pentecostal movement accepts entire sanctification as a subsequent crisis experience but contends that it is a prerequisite for Spirit baptism and not the result of it (Hughes, 1976, pp. 173–174). These pentecostals agree that one must be purified in order to be filled with the Spirit but note that biblically, Spirit baptism is associated almost exclusively with empowerment and not purification. Two-work or baptistic pentecostals, finally, disavow an experience of instantaneous sanctification as unscriptural. Like the holiness pentecostals, they see Spirit baptism as primarily for the purpose of empowerment. Since sanctification is always progressive, however, they realize that the experience

can also bring greater, though not entire or final, holiness. These positions were fixed by the end of the classical period of pentecostalism, and though relations between the groups have improved since then, these fundamental areas of disagreement remain.

All three positions have strengths as well as weaknesses. The pentecostal understanding of Spirit baptism as empowerment is biblically sounder. Nowhere in the New Testament is Spirit baptism identified with what Wesleyans understand as entire sanctification, and significantly, John Wesley himself and other early methodists did not make this association. Holiness writings that equate the two use the same proofs for subsequence as pentecostals, but explicit Scriptural evidence as to why Spirit baptism and Christian perfection are one is lacking in their discussions (e.g., Taylor, 1985, pp. 158–159; Grider, 1980, pp. 44–57). On the other hand, the purpose of empowerment is explicitly mentioned in Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:8. As a subsequent work, Spirit baptism is analogous to Christ's anointing for ministry at his baptism. If interpreted as a secondary cleansing from sin, the analogy falters. Similarly, history and experience seem to bear out the two-work pentecostal position that entire sanctification cannot be mandated as a prerequisite for Spirit baptism. Even within the New Testament, there are accounts of apostles who had been filled with the Spirit and spoke in tongues and yet acted in ways inconsistent with perfection in love (e.g., Acts 15:37–40, Gal. 2:11–14), to say nothing of more recent history. The warning of 1 John 1:5–10 against falsely claiming permanent and entire sanctification should give pause to overly dogmatic assertions in this area, one which by definition must be tread with humility.

Yet, the Wesleyan holiness view is not without merit. While Spirit baptism should not be equated with entire sanctification, any encounter with the Holy Spirit should increase holiness. The common sentiment, “No believer can ever truly say he is free from sin” (Jenney, 1995, p. 417), is a very sad one. First John 1:5–10 must be interpreted in the light of what follows in 2:1, “so that you may not sin,” and the rest of the Epistle. To refrain from claiming that one will never sin is biblically mandated, but to turn this around so that one may never experience a moment of freedom from sin even after regeneration misses the point of Jesus' mission, the entire transformation of the human person. The ultimate fulfillment of this mission is eschatological, but its realization begins in this world. Wesley and his followers were not mistaken on this point. Freedom from sin and oppression, whether individual or corporate, is the will of God, and it can occur even in a moment. There are moments when God's liberating grace breaks through, and that which has been gradually progressed towards suddenly appears in full. Refrainment from judgment, however, remains wise. Wesley himself never claimed that he had been entirely sanctified, and Paul never claimed that he was perfect (Phil. 3:12–16); their attitudes and humility are

healthy to emulate. Sanctification is not progress-point or even progress-point-progress; it is progress-point-progress-point-progress and so on as it occurs in Christians and through them to the world around them. Spirit baptism may be an important point on this journey but not the end of it, which no one can see prior to the *eschaton*.

3.5.2.4 Sanctification and Eschatology

In any theology, even Wesleyan perfectionism, final sanctification is eschatological. The prayer for entire sanctification in 1 Thess. 5:23 is oriented towards the coming of the Lord, for anticipation of the second coming of Christ inspires faithfulness so as to be found ready and holy when he returns (Williams, 1981, p. 57). The return of Christ is itself a sanctifying event. The wheat will be separated from the chaff (Matt. 3:11–12), the sheep from the goats (Matt. 25:31–46). With judgment comes purification (1 Cor. 3:13–15). Beyond whatever degree of sanctification is received in life, all will be made perfect when Christ returns. First John 3:2–3 expresses the Christian hope well:

Beloved, we are God's children now, and what we will be has not yet appeared; but we know that when he appears we shall be like him, because we shall see him as he is. And everyone who thus hopes in him purifies himself as he is pure.

Holiness connotes separation and purity, but in the *eschaton*, separation ceases to be. The promise of the coming of Christ, after judgment, is the new creation (Rev. 21:1). In Moltmann's (1985, pp. 86–93) view, God withdrew himself into himself in order to create the heavens and the earth. For there to be a *nihil* for the work of *creatio ex nihilo*, he restricted his omnipresence and glory and provided a space for the other. Throughout the life of this creation, God's holiness has been defined in part by this separation from the creation. In the new creation, God's glory and presence will be de-restricted (Moltmann, 1985, pp. 212–214), and God will be "all in all" (1 Cor. 15:28). In that day, the work of Christ, accomplished in the Spirit, will at last be completed.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

4.1 Summary and Evaluation of the Research Findings

This dissertation began with the thesis that pentecostalism has a significant contribution to make to contemporary Christology. While outside observers commonly assume that pentecostalism is pneumatocentric, in reality it is a strongly Christocentric tradition. The common symbol of faith of the classical pentecostal movement, in all its variations, is the fourfold gospel: Jesus as savior, healer, baptizer with the Holy Spirit, and coming king. This symbol is in fact a Christological statement that conveys the heart and mind of pentecostal devotion, belief, and practice. The fourfold gospel succinctly but richly expresses the relationship between Christ and the believer and the holistic work of salvation he performs in those who will receive it. Lack of a large body of formal theological works has hindered the movement from adequately communicating its belief system to other Christian traditions, but recent pentecostal theologians have made efforts to engage other systems of thought and bring greater clarity and maturity to the movement's unique insights. In that spirit, the researcher entered into conversation with prominent twentieth century ecumenical theologies in order to explore how they and pentecostalism might enhance each other's understanding of the Christian faith, specifically in the area of Christology. Many places where early pentecostalism had unconsciously anticipated later trends in modern theology were shown. These include functional Christology, the existential theology of neo-orthodoxy, and many of the concerns of the theologies of liberation. The research findings also demonstrated that pentecostalism cannot be viewed as just another type of fundamentalism but is a full theological tradition in its own right. It is more correctly seen as a third stream of protestantism flowing between conservative evangelicalism on the one hand and ecumenical, mainline protestantism on the other. With these findings, the thesis has been demonstrated and the objectives of the dissertation achieved.

4.1.1 The Fourfold Gospel as a Contemporary Christology

The Christology of the fourfold gospel is a functional, from below Christology. Classical pentecostalism arose directly out of methodism and the

holiness movement, and as a conservative movement, it automatically assumed Chalcedonian Christology. The traditional understanding of the Trinity was questioned and rejected by a small branch of the movement, oneness pentecostalism, but as a whole the pentecostal view of the person of Christ is consistent with that of historic Christianity. The pentecostal innovation in Christology, as reflected in the fourfold gospel, is in the area of the work of Christ, specifically the present ministry of the ascended Lord. It is thus a functional Christology. Although it is couched in typically “from above” language, it is actually a “from below” Christology. Its focus is not on the functions and roles of Christ generally, as is seen in the traditional offices of prophet, priest, and king, but with specific reference to the experience of believers of the ministry of Christ in salvation, sanctification, healing, and so forth. The movement also derives its understanding of the work of Christ from those sections of the New Testament more favored in formal from below Christologies, the synoptic Gospels, plus the book of Acts. Although it has not typically used this paradigm, the Christology of pentecostalism can also be viewed as a Spirit Christology. The present work of Christ may be best understood through the work of the Holy Spirit.

Not all aspects of the fourfold gospel contribute to contemporary theology equally. In the function of Jesus as savior, pentecostals consciously do not seek to alter the historic protestant understanding of justification and regeneration. Although classical pentecostal soteriology is thoroughly Arminian, with orthodox Calvinism figuring little in its historical development, its doctrine in this locus is more in agreement than disagreement with the Reformation traditions. The greatest pentecostal contribution lies in the expansion of salvation beyond justification, which is what the other statements of the fourfold gospel express. Pentecostals believe that justification and regeneration are the beginning, not the sum, of the Christian life. Through the doctrine of subsequence, discrete, discernible salvific experiences can and should be received after justification. The belief in subsequence is based primarily on the narratives of the reception of the Spirit in Acts in which some delay occurs between belief and water baptism and the coming of the Spirit in power. In this affirmation of subsequence lies the greatest conflict with traditional protestant theology, but the pentecostal perspective should not be ruled out simply because of that conflict.

Two aspects of the common fourfold gospel convey subsequence, one informally and the other formally as a step in the *ordo salutis*. The first is healing. Pentecostals affirm that Jesus, as ascended Lord, still heals today and that the gift of healing did not cease from the church with the close of the apostolic age. Healing is more than a gift of the Spirit; it is a result of the atoning work of Christ. On the basis of Isa. 53:4–5, most pentecostals believe that Jesus bore not only sin but also sickness

on the cross, and through faith healing can be received just the same way as salvation. It is thus a recurring, subsequent blessing of salvation. Although this interpretation is not without difficulties, the doctrine of healing in the atonement has great significance for Christology and soteriology. Christologically, it affirms that the ministry of healing, so vital in Jesus' earthly life, continues as part of his present work. Soteriologically, it expands the Christian understanding of salvation beyond exclusively spiritual categories to include physical and material aspects of life. This is of great benefit to ecumenical theology. Recent trends in various traditions such as liberation theology have emphasized the holistic characteristic of salvation. The doctrine of healing in the atonement provides a means for this expanded perspective to be firmly rooted in the work of Christ. In turn, through dialogue with other streams of Christian thought, pentecostalism can enlarge its vision of healing to include social and collective dimensions of human life.

The next function, Jesus as baptizer with the Holy Spirit, most embodies the pentecostal belief in subsequence. Although the doctrine of subsequent Spirit baptism conflicts with much of traditional protestant theology, the broader catholic tradition actually contains strong precedents for the belief; the rite of confirmation stands as the sacramental equivalent of the charismatic experience of being baptized or filled with the Spirit. More controversially, pentecostals hold that speaking in tongues serves as the normative initial physical evidence of the baptism; it is the decisive biblical sign that the fullness of the Spirit has been received. Together, speaking in tongues and subsequent Spirit baptism form the pentecostal *sine qua non*. A narrow focus on the issue of tongues, however, diverts attention from the real purpose of the experience. Spirit baptism is not a saving or sanctifying experience but an empowerment for ministry (Acts 1:8). This two-staged understanding of the Christian life stands in analogy to Jesus' miraculous conception by the Spirit and later anointing for ministry, also by the Spirit, at his baptism. Pentecostals believe that Christians are to imitate the life of Christ, not just morally, but also in ministry and power. The fullness of the Spirit enables them to carry out this ministry, which is necessarily directed outwards from the self to others. The ability to speak in tongues is given because it edifies the self (1 Cor. 14:4–5), refreshing the life of service after the burdens of ministry. Together, healing and Spirit baptism constitute the strongest, most positive contributions of the pentecostal full gospel. It is these two beliefs that have received the widest reception in other Christian traditions via the charismatic movement; on the other hand, they are also the areas that cause the most conflict with conservative evangelicalism and fundamentalism.

The contributions of the other functions of the pentecostal full gospel are more mixed, with both pronounced strengths and weaknesses. The role of Jesus as coming

king communicates the joy and fulfillment of hope that will occur when Christ returns. Originally, pentecostal eschatology was prophetic in outlook. The movement interpreted itself as a sign of the end, the last and greatest revival before the Lord's return. Over time, through the influence of fundamentalism, dispensational apocalypticism overshadowed the original eschatological vision in many sections of the movement. A pessimistic outlook caused some to withdraw from society and take an overly critical stand against the wider church and world. The signs of the imminent rapture of the church before the tribulation became more important to some than attempting to transform the world in the light of the coming kingdom of God. As time passes, the issue of the delay of the *parousia* affects all new movements, and some pentecostal theologians are exploring other eschatological systems in order to recapture the original vision of the movement and mitigate some of the fundamentalist tendencies emerging within pentecostalism. In all likelihood, this will necessitate abandonment of dispensational premillennialism in favor of a more moderate, transformationist perspective, which may be difficult for some sections of the movement.

Finally, sanctification remains as a forgotten fifth function within the pentecostal gospel. Although the movement owes its existence to the holiness preaching of John Wesley and his followers, the theological evolutions within pentecostalism inevitably undermined the understanding of sanctification it had inherited from its forerunners. Wesley's "Christian perfection" was identified with Spirit baptism by the holiness movement. The emerging pentecostal movement, in turn, separated Spirit baptism from sanctification, the former becoming a third crisis experience of empowerment as discussed above. During the latter part of the classical period, non-Wesleyan forms of pentecostalism arose that disavowed a sanctifying crisis experience, affirming a more traditional progressive view; this perspective ultimately became the dominant form of pentecostalism globally. Under these pressures, the emphasis on entire sanctification faded, and Wesleyan perfectionism is no longer a prominent emphasis of the pentecostal movement. The role of Jesus as sanctifier contains some inherent difficulties; sanctification may be better understood as the work of the Spirit. Additionally, biblically sanctification is not just a step or process within the *ordo salutis* but the entire work of salvation from a different perspective. Understood this way, it becomes possible to integrate and synthesize the various Christian perspective on sanctification, which hold more in common than in difference.

In sum, the Christology of the pentecostal fourfold gospel has many contributions to make to contemporary theology. It is definitely the most innovative Christology to emerge in the twentieth century from a conservative perspective. The

pentecostal movement has even been creative in its Christological “heresies,” namely the modalistic monarchy of the Son in oneness pentecostalism and the Jesus of the prosperity gospel of the Word of Faith movement. Moreover, classical pentecostal Christological thought resonates with later twentieth century theological movements such as neo-orthodoxy, liberation theology, and Jürgen Moltmann’s theology of hope. As a third stream of theology between evangelicalism and ecumenical-mainline protestantism, pentecostalism is well positioned to incorporate the best insights from each stream with its own unique insights in the quest for a more inclusive, universally responsible Christology.

That said, the fourfold gospel also has clear limitations. Essentially a slogan, it is neither a complete creed nor a comprehensive structure for a pentecostal systematic theology. It addresses only Christology, soteriology, pneumatology, and eschatology, the latter two loci only partially. Importantly, it lacks a clear doctrine of creation and has no ecclesiology. These limitations are well known, and in formulating statements of faith for their denominations and fellowships, the early pentecostals borrowed freely from other traditions to make up the deficiencies. A thoroughly pentecostal structure for systematic theology has yet to emerge. Through openness to other theological systems and traditions, it can develop its own belief system more thoroughly and in turn, contribute a fuller theology of renewal to the wider church.

4.1.2 Emergent Issues

During the research process, several important issues indirectly related to the thesis emerged. One problem encountered repeatedly, mentioned first in §2.1.3.2, p. 21, was some of the inherent limitations in the traditional protestant approach to doing theology, namely the Pauline priority. It was seen that the core of protestant theology, especially its soteriology and pneumatology, is based upon the teachings of Paul’s Epistles. Soteriological statements from other sections of the New Testament, even the words of Jesus in the Gospels, are interpreted so as to conform with the foundational propositions derived from Paul’s writings. This bias in theological formulation emerged as early as the sixteenth century with the development of solafidianism and Martin Luther’s famous evaluation of James as an “Epistle of straw.” While most later theologians are more circumspect, this bias is virtually axiomatic, though unstated, and evident in both conservative and liberal reformed theologies.

In theological conversation, pentecostalism is at a disadvantage when this paradigm is accepted as the standard and right method for doing theology. Although biblical, the distinctive pentecostal doctrines are not primarily Pauline in origin but Lucan. As a new movement in which scholarship has not always been emphasized or

even valued, much foundational theological work remains to be done to establish it as a serious theological tradition. In dialogue with older, more established traditions, pentecostal theologians must spend a considerable amount of effort in striving against an unspoken canon within the canon and demonstrating why a Lucan soteriology has legitimacy. The friction here is most evident in discussions of sanctification and Spirit baptism. When all the exegetical minutiae are cleared away, the objection to the pentecostal understanding is essentially, “It is not Pauline.” A case has been made in §3.3.3.1 as to why the pentecostal perspective deserves full and equal consideration, but this issue remains at the forefront of current theological discussions in these areas of concern.

This impasse will be complicated to resolve, and further probing lies beyond the scope of this work. This problem is symptomatic of the wider issue of the relationship between biblical theology and systematic theology. Just as ecumenical dialogue has come to value theologies arising from different contexts and perspectives, there is also a need for a multi-polar theological approach to the different traditions within the Bible itself. Biblical scholars have brought to attention the great diversity among the different inspired authors. The challenge remains for systematic theologians, especially in the protestant traditions, to be able to maintain multiple foci in their formulations and produce theologies that are more comprehensive and faithful to the diversity of biblical witnesses.

A related but initially surprising development in the course of research was the discovery of the importance of the various theories of the atonement to the thesis of this dissertation. As the researcher wished to focus on the pentecostal fourfold gospel as a model for understanding the present work of Christ, he assumed that there would be no need to explore the more traditional questions of theories of the atonement, which concern how to understand Christ’s past work in death. However, it quickly became apparent that the interpretation of the present was dependent on the interpretation of the past, and each theology’s soteriology is shaped by whatever theory of the atonement it accepts. In the work of Christ, pentecostalism has largely followed the evangelical understanding of the death of Christ as primarily a penal substitution, but some aspects of its soteriology contradict this paradigm.

The *Christus victor* view of the atonement, revived in modern theology by Aulén (1931), seems a more natural and better fit for the overall pentecostal soteriological system. This classical theory emphasizes Christ’s conquest through the cross of the powers that keep humanity enslaved, the “unholy trinity” of sin, death, and the devil. Faithful to both the New Testament and the early traditions of the church, this perspective exhibits compatibility with the fourfold gospel and can serve to strengthen it. For example, the *Christus victor* view strengthens the case for healing

in the atonement. If the sacrifice of Christ is primarily a punishment for sin, as evangelicals assert, then there is little basis for the doctrine as sickness is not a moral evil that requires atonement (§3.2.4.1, p. 80). On the other hand, if the atonement is primarily a ransom rescuing the oppressed from their captors, then it is perfectly fitting that Christ would overcome disease, one of the great scourges of humanity, in his saving work. At the same time, if adopted the *Christus victor* view would help to bring moderation to pentecostal demonology and prepare the way for acceptance of an alternative eschatology to apocalyptic dispensationalism (§3.4.3.1). Perhaps the greatest strength of this theory is that it recognizes soteriological value not only in the death of Christ but also in his life, the overlooking of which is the greatest deficiency of Anselm's view and its derivatives. In spreading the gospel of full salvation in the world, pentecostals seek to replicate the ministry of Christ. The *Christus victor* view recognizes that Christ began the freeing of humanity from the moment of the incarnation onwards. A scholarly pentecostal updating and elaboration of this ancient theory, yet to be done, would constitute a significant contribution to modern theology.

4.2 Present Trajectories of Pentecostal Theology

At present, pentecostal theology is in a state of flux. Given the character of the movement, no other state is possible. With over 500 million participants in the broader renewal movement and no centralized authority, uniformity of theology and spirituality is neither possible nor desirable. Responsibility comes with maturity and growth, however, and pentecostal theologians are beginning to take up the necessary tasks before them. As the movement seeks to find its theological voice, it is being pulled in different, sometimes contradictory, directions. Sober reflection upon what it means to be a Christian and to be pentecostal can help steer the movement through some of the difficult choices it faces.

4.2.1 Evangelical or Ecumenical?

Chapter Two elaborated at great length the relationship between pentecostalism and evangelical and ecumenical protestantism. It was shown how pentecostalism is a theological tradition in its own right and should be viewed as an important third stream of protestant thought. In a reversal of the more usual approach, the commonalities with the ecumenical movement and differences with evangelicalism were highlighted. The entire dissertation centered around the beliefs and feelings pentecostalism shares with more liberal theologies not normally engaged by conservative, biblicist movements. Many sometimes surprising mutualities were discovered and explored. It must be remembered that it is among mainline protestantism that pentecostal spirituality has had the warmest reception via the charismatic movement. Not strongly emphasized were the differences between

pentecostalism and the more liberal tendencies of many traditions associated with the World Council of Churches. While the areas of disagreement are not insignificant, it is hoped that the common ground uncovered will help to cultivate ecumenical fellowship more than these differences will cause further division. Whatever its other flaws, liberal theology is not hegemonic, and the WCC and its membership are very open to closer ties with pentecostalism.

A deeper question, however, is whether these categorizations are necessary, and whether pentecostalism has to reach a decision to draw closer either to evangelicalism or ecumenism. In hope, such a choice does not have to be made. Moving away from its historical separatist tendencies, some sections of the pentecostal movement have drawn closer to evangelical bodies. In the same way, some groups, admittedly fewer, have gravitated towards the WCC. Ideally, both are possible, and pentecostalism will emerge as a mediating evangelical-ecumenical movement. With the growing trend towards post-denominationalism in many parts of the world, greater Christian unity among all streams is a possibility that should be strongly encouraged.

This study took the approach it did because of the growing influence of evangelicalism and its paradigms upon pentecostalism. Especially within the United States, issues of social and ethical concern common to conservative Christians have fostered increased cooperation. While in general this is a positive trend, there are also risks accompanying it. Many of these have already been highlighted. In all areas where pentecostal theology conflicts with traditional protestant interpretations, the conflict is greater the more conservative and fundamentalist the theology engaged. Despite their commonalities, in joint theological forums pentecostalism is rarely treated as a full and equal partner with evangelicalism (Cross, 2002, pp. 46–49). For pentecostalism to identify more closely with evangelicalism and gain greater acceptance without sacrificing some of its defining beliefs will be difficult.

In §1.3, the study was described as a deliberate leaping of the wall of inerrancy in order for pentecostalism, a movement that affirms the verbal inspiration of the Bible, to dialogue with theologies that accept, to varying extents, the historical-critical approach. Commonalities with ecumenical theologies such as neo-orthodoxy and liberation theology were explored to show how pentecostalism can both contribute to and learn from these schools of thought. Much can be gained from such an approach, but it is only possible if the issue of inerrancy is not allowed to become a dividing wall. Unfortunately, within the paradigm of American evangelicalism, this is precisely what the issue has become. Inerrancy is practically the *sine qua non* of evangelicalism, and it is used as a litmus test for theological fellowship. This is not an exaggeration as non-inerrantists are not allowed to join the Evangelical Theological Society. Under

this paradigm, the creativity of Moltmann, the passion of Barth, the eloquent logic of Brunner, and the righteousness of the liberation theologians become devalued and lost (cf. Hollenweger, 1972, pp. 40–41). The researcher strongly feels that pentecostalism will only suffer loss by distancing itself from these important contemporary theologies. A better paradigm is needed.

4.2.2 Pentecostalism and Roman Catholicism

This work has been ecumenically oriented in that it has tried to bring together two major streams of protestant theological thought. It did not actively seek to engage Roman Catholic theology beyond the theologies of liberation, which in any case are not exclusively and dogmatically Roman Catholic theologies. It would be quite possible, however, in a future work to expand the dialogue to include both classical and modern Roman Catholic theology. Indeed, such a conversation is well underway. One of the quiet successes of the ecumenical movement has been the long-standing dialogue between the pentecostal movement and the church of Rome (Hocken, 2002). The growth and success of the charismatic movement has changed contemporary catholicism arguably as much as Vatican II. In turn, catholic scholarship has made great inputs to pentecostal thought, and there are several prominent catholic members of the Society for Pentecostal Studies. Theologically, pentecostalism is protestant, standing closer to Wittenberg and Dordt than Trent, but as a generally Arminian-Wesleyan movement, it is closer to Trent than other protestant systems of belief. Besides liberation theology and the charismatic movement, there are numerous other meeting points between pentecostal and Roman Catholic theology that deserve much further exploration; these however lie outside of the scope of this dissertation.

4.2.3 Salvation as *Theosis* and Christification

Pentecostalism has had much less contact with the Eastern churches, and sadly that contact has often been less cordial and productive than that with the Latin church. Even here, however, there are many points of meeting. Orthodox scholar Valerie A. Karras (2003, p. 99), in commenting on the Lutheran-Roman Catholic *Joint declaration* (1999), commented that the orthodox understanding of salvation and spirituality is actually closer to that of pentecostalism than the other Western streams. In orthodoxy, salvation is understood as *theosis* or deification. Although protestants have often expressed reservations about the concept of *theosis*, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen (2004) has explored points of meeting between orthodox thought and protestant soteriology, including that of pentecostalism. Exploration of this theme of salvation is again beyond the scope of the work. Included in the orthodox vision, however, is the more modest metaphor of Christification, the replication of the image of Christ in believers. This is virtually a restatement of the pentecostal understanding of the role of

Christ as baptizer with the Holy Spirit, the function by which he reproduces his ministry in his followers. Again, the renewal movement shows resonance with the themes of all streams of Christianity, even those outside of its normal perception and experience.

4.3 Toward an All-Inclusive Christology for Human Needs

A problem commonly observed in contemporary Christologies is the composition fallacy—“This aspect, and this aspect only, is the key to understanding Jesus and the Christian faith.” The Christocentric focus of modern theology resulted in a plethora of new Christologies and valued insights into the historic Jesus and the person and work of Christ. It is all too easy, however, to pick up one theme, such as the forgiveness of sins, healing, or liberation, and promote it as the sum and center of Christology when in reality it is but one strand of a much larger whole. As John of the Cross wrote,

There is much concerning Christ that can be made more profound, since he is such an abundant mine with many caverns full of rich veins, and no matter how much we tunnel we never arrive at the end, nor does it ever run out; on the contrary, we go on finding in each cavern new veins and new riches, here and there. (quoted in Boff, 1978, pp. 47–48)

The functional Christology found in the pentecostal fourfold gospel maintains focus on Christ but explores multiple aspects of his present work in saving, healing, sanctifying, endowing the Spirit, and coming again in fulfillment of hope. These functions are dimensions of a fuller understanding of salvation including but going beyond justification and life after death. Speaking of pentecostal spirituality, Land (1993, p. 23) rightly states that “Jesus Christ is the center and the Holy Spirit is the circumference.” Yet, this spirituality is not a circle but a multi-dimensional sphere. The embrace of the Spirit is inward and outward and upward; it encompasses the individual and the group, the personal and the social, the church and the kingdom and the world, even the entire cosmos. On its own, the pentecostal gospel does not exhaust all the dimensions of salvation. Ecumenical theologies, such as the theologies of liberation and hope, have explored other aspects and dimensions. Through dialogue and synthesis, they can contribute to a fuller, more inclusive and “universally responsible” (Kasper, 1976, pp. 20–21) Christology addressing humanity’s needs today.

WORKS CITED

- Abanes, R. (1997) The Word Faith movement [Appendix B] (G. Passantino, ed.) In H. Hanegraaff (gen. ed.), Martin, Walter R., *The kingdom of the cults* (4th ed., pp. 371–387). Minneapolis, Minnesota: Bethany House Publishers.
- Alexander, P. H. (1988) Jesus Christ and the Spirit. In S. M. Burgess, G. B. McGee & P. H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 488–491). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Althouse, P. (2003) *Spirit of the last days: Pentecostal eschatology in conversation with Jürgen Moltmann*. Journal of Pentecostal theology supplement series, 25. London: T&T Clark International.
- Anselm. (1926) *Cur Deus homo*. (S. N. Deane, trans.) Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co. (Electronic ed., Calvin College: <http://www.ccel.org>)
- Arrington, F. L. (1988) Hermeneutics, historical perspectives on Pentecostal and charismatic. In S. M. Burgess, G. B. McGee & P. H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 376–389). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Arrington, F. L. (1993) *Christian doctrine: A pentecostal perspective*. (Vol. 2). Cleveland, Tennessee: Pathway Press.
- Arrington, F. L. (1994) *Christian doctrine: A pentecostal perspective*. (Vol. 3). Cleveland, Tennessee: Pathway Press.
- Augustine. (1999a) The city of God. In P. Schaff (ed.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers series I*. (Vol. 2). Edinburgh: T & T Clark. (Electronic ed., Calvin College: <http://www.ccel.org>)
- Augustine. (1999b) The confessions of St. Augustin. In P. Schaff (ed.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers series I*. (Vol. 1). Edinburgh: T & T Clark. (Electronic ed., Calvin College: <http://www.ccel.org>)
- Aulén, G. (1931) *Christus victor: An historical study of the three main types of the idea of atonement*. (A. Herbert, trans.) S.I.: SPCK.
- Barr, J. (1961) *The semantics of biblical language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barrett, D. B., Kurian, G. T., & Johnson, T. M. (2001) *World Christian encyclopedia: A comparative survey of churches and religions in the modern world: Vol. 1. The world by countries: religionists, churches, ministries*. (2nd ed.) New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barth, K. (1933) *The epistle to the Romans*. (E. C. Hoskyns, trans.) New York: Oxford University Press.

- Barth, K. (1956a) *Church dogmatics: Vol. IV.1. The doctrine of reconciliation* (G. W. Bromiley, ed. & trans., T. F. Torrance, ed.) London: T&T Clark International.
- Barth, K. (1956b) *Church dogmatics: Vol. I.2. The doctrine of the word of God* (G. W. Bromiley & T. F. Torrance, eds., G. T. Thomson & H. Knight, trans.) London: T&T Clark International.
- Barth, K. (1958) *Church dogmatics: Vol. IV.2. The doctrine of reconciliation* (G. W. Bromiley, ed. & trans., T. F. Torrance, ed.) London: T&T Clark International.
- Barth, K. (1960) *Church dogmatics: Vol. III.3. The doctrine of creation* (G. W. Bromiley, ed. & trans., T. F. Torrance, ed., R. J. Ehrlich, trans.) London: T&T Clark International.
- Barth, K. (1961a) *Church dogmatics: Vol. III.4. The doctrine of creation* (G. W. Bromiley & T. F. Torrance, eds., A. T. MacKay, T. H. L. Parker, H. Knight, H. A. Kennedy, & J. Marks, trans.) London: T&T Clark International.
- Barth, K. (1961b) *Church dogmatics: Vol. IV.3.1. The doctrine of reconciliation* (G. W. Bromiley, ed. & trans., T. F. Torrance, ed.) London: T&T Clark International.
- Barth, K. (1969) *Church dogmatics: Vol. IV.4. The doctrine of reconciliation* (G. W. Bromiley, ed. & trans., T. F. Torrance, ed.) London: T&T Clark International.
- Barth, K. (1975) *Church dogmatics: Vol. I.1. The doctrine of the word of God* (G. W. Bromiley, ed. & trans., T. F. Torrance, ed.) (2nd ed.) London: T&T Clark International.
- Bassett, P. M. (2002) Evangelicals. In N. Lossky, J. M. Bonino, J. Pobee, T. F. Stransky, G. Wainwright & P. Webb (eds.), *Dictionary of the ecumenical movement* (pp. 443–445). Geneva: WCC Publications.
- Bassett, P. M., & Greathouse, W. M. (1985) *Exploring Christian holiness: Vol. 2. The historical development*. Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City.
- Bauman, M. (1986, September) Why the noninerrantists are not listening: Six tactical errors evangelicals commit. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 29(3), 317–324. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Bennett, D., & Bennett, R. (1971) *The Holy Spirit and you: A study-guide to the Spirit-filled life* (rev. ed.) South Plainfield, U. K.: Bridge Publishing.
- Berkouwer, G. C. (1952) *Faith and sanctification*. (J. Vriend, trans.) Studies in dogmatics. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Berkouwer, G. C. (1972) *The return of Christ* (M. J. Van Elderen, Ed., J. Van Oosterom, trans.) Studies in dogmatics. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Birmelé, A. (2002) Word of God. In N. Lossky, J. M. Bonino, J. Pobee, T. F. Stransky, G. Wainwright & P. Webb (eds.), *Dictionary of the ecumenical movement* (pp. 1212–1215). Geneva: WCC Publications.

- Blumhofer, E. L., & Armstrong, C. R. (2002) Assemblies of God. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 333–340). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Boff, L. (1978) *Jesus Christ liberator: A critical Christology for our time*. (P. Hughes, trans.) Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Boff, L., & Boff, C. (1984) *Salvation and liberation: In search of a balance between faith and politics*. (R. R. Barr, trans.) Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Boff, L., & Boff, C. (1987) *Introducing liberation theology*. (P. Burns, trans.) Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Bornkamm, G. (1960) *Jesus of Nazareth*. (I. McLuskey, F. McLuskey, & J. M. Robinson, trans.) New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Boyd, G. A. (1992) *Oneness Pentecostals & the Trinity*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Braaten, C. E. (1990) *Justification: The article by which the church stands or falls*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Fortress.
- Brown, C. (1992) Historical Jesus, Quest of. In J. B. Green, S. McKnight & I. H. Marshall (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (pp. 326–341). Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. (Electronic ed., Logos Research Systems)
- Bruner, F. D. (1970) *A theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal experience and the New Testament witness*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Brunner, E. (1943) *The divine–human encounter*. (A. W. Loos, trans.) Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Brunner, E. (1947) *The mediator: A study of the central doctrine of the Christian faith*. (O. Wyon, trans.) Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Brunner, E. (1952) *Dogmatics: Vol. 2. The Christian doctrine of creation and redemption*. (O. Wyon, trans.) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Brunner, E. (1962) *Dogmatics: Vol. 3. The Christian doctrine of the church, faith, and the consummation*. (D. Cairns & T. H. L. Parker, trans.) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Bultmann, R. (1951) *Theology of the New Testament*. (K. Grobel, trans.) (Vol. 1). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Bultmann, R. (1955) *Theology of the New Testament*. (K. Grobel, trans.) (Vol. 2). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Bultmann, R. (1958) *Jesus Christ and mythology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Bultmann, R. (1961) A reply to the theses of J. Schniewind. In H. W. Bartsch (ed.), R. Bultmann, E. Lohmeyer, J. Schniewind, H. Thielicke & A. Farrer, R. H. Fuller (trans.), *Kerygma and myth: A theological debate* (pp. 102–123). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers. (Original work published 1953)

- Bultmann, R. (1963) *The history of the synoptic tradition* (J. Marsh, trans.) (rev. ed.) Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Bultmann, R. (1984) New Testament and mythology: The problem of deymthologizing the new testament proclamation. In S. M. Ogden (ed. & trans.), *New Testament and mythology and other basic writings* (pp. 1–43). Philadelphia: Fortress Press. (Original work published 1941)
- Burgess, S. M. (1991) Evidence of the Spirit: The ancient and Eastern churches (chap. 1). In G. B. McGee (ed.), *Initial evidence: Historical and biblical perspectives on the Pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism* (pp. 3–19). Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Busch, E. (2004) *The great passion: An introduction to Karl Barth's theology* (D. L. Guder & J. J. Guder, eds., G. W. Bromiley, trans.) Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Calvin, J. (1960) *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (J. T. McNeill, ed., F. L. Battles, trans.) (Vol. 1). The Library of Christian Classics Vol. XX. Philadelphia and London: Westminster Press and SCM Press.
- Carlson, G. R. (1977) *Our faith and fellowship: A study of the Assemblies of God history and beliefs*. Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. (1994) New Delhi, India: Theological Publications in India.
- Chan, S. K. H. (1994) An Asian review [of J. Moltmann's *The Spirit of life*]. *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 4, 35–40.
- Chan, S. K. H. (1999, July) Evidential glossolalia and the doctrine of subsequence. *Asian journal of Pentecostal studies*, 2(2), 195–211. (<http://www.ajps.edu/ajps/99-2/99-2-schan.pdf> [Accessed May 5, 2006])
- Chan, S. K. H. (2004, July) The renewal of Pentecostalism: A response to John Carpenter. *Asian journal of pentecostal studies*, 7(2), 315–325. (<http://www.ajps.edu/ajps/04-2/04-2-Schan.pdf> [Accessed May 23, 2006])
- Chappell, P. G. (1988) Healing movements. In S. M. Burgess, G. B. McGee & P. H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 353–374). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- The Chicago statement on biblical inerrancy. (1978, December) *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 21(4), 289–296. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Christenson, L. (1975) Pentecostalism's forgotten forerunner. In V. Synan (ed.), *Aspects of pentecostal-charismatic origins* (pp. 15–37). Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International.
- Chrysostom, J. (1999) Homily XXIX [on 1 Corinthians]. In P. Schaff (ed.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers series I*. (Vol. 12). Edinburgh: T & T Clark. (Electronic ed., Calvin College: <http://www.ccel.org>)
- Coote, R. T. (2002) World Evangelical Fellowship. In N. Lossky, J. M. Bonino, J. Pobe, T. F. Stransky, G. Wainwright & P. Webb (eds.), *Dictionary of the ecumenical movement* (pp. 1243–1244). Geneva: WCC Publications.

- Cox, H. (1995) *Fire from heaven: The rise of Pentecostal spirituality and the reshaping of religion in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Da Capo Press.
- Cross, T. L. (2002) A proposal to break the ice: What can Pentecostal theology offer evangelical theology? *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 10(2), 44–73.
- Cullmann, O. (1962, March) The reply of Professor Cullmann to Roman Catholic critics. *Scottish journal of theology*, 15, 36–43.
- Cullmann, O. (1963) *The Christology of the New Testament* (S. C. Guthrie & C. A. M. Hall, trans.) (2nd ed.) New Testament library. London: SCM Press.
- Dayton, D. W. (1975) From “Christian perfection” to the “baptism of the Holy Ghost”. In V. Synan (ed.), *Aspects of pentecostal-charismatic origins* (pp. 39–54). Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International.
- Dayton, D. W. (1987) *Theological roots of Pentecostalism*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Deere, J. (1993) *Surprised by the power of the Spirit: Discovering how God speaks and heals today*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Del Colle, R. (1993) Spirit-Christology: Dogmatic foundations for pentecostal-charismatic spirituality. *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 3, 91–112.
- Dempster, M. W. (1987, Fall) Pentecostal social concern and the biblical mandate of social justice. *PNEUMA*, 9(2), 129–153.
- Dempster, M. W. (1993) Christian social concern in Pentecostal perspective: Reformulating Pentecostal eschatology. *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 2, 51–64.
- Dever, M. (2006, May) Nothing but the blood. *Christianity today*, pp. 28–33.
- Dieter, M. E. (1987) Response to Horton [“The Pentecostal perspective”]. In M. E. Dieter, A. A. Hoekema, S. M. Horton, J. R. McQuilkin & J. F. Walvoord, *Five views on sanctification* (pp. 136–138). Counterpoints. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Dieter, M. E. (1990, Spring) The Wesleyan/holiness and Pentecostal movements: Commonalities, confrontation, and dialouge. *PNEUMA*, 12(1), 4–13.
- Dorman, T. M. (2001, September) The joint declaration on the doctrine of justification: Retrospect and prospects. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 44(3), 421–434. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Dorries, D. W. (1991) Edward Irving and the “standing sign” of Spirit baptism (chap. 3). In G. B. McGee (ed.), *Initial evidence: Historical and biblical perspectives on the Pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism* (pp. 41–56). Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Doss, M. (2005) *Christ in the Spirit: Contemporary Spirit Christologies*. Delhi: ISPCK.

- Dunn, J. D. G. (1970) *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A re-examination of the New Testament teaching on the gift of the Spirit in relation to Pentecostalism today*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Dunn, J. D. G. (1975) *Jesus and the Spirit: A study of the religious and charismatic experience of Jesus and the first Christians as reflected in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press.
- Dunn, J. D. G. (1989) *Christology in the making: A New Testament inquiry into the origins of the doctrine of the incarnation* (2nd ed.) London: SCM Press.
- Dunn, J. D. G. (1996) Born again: Baptism and the Spirit—a protestant response. *Concilium: Pentecostal movements as an ecumenical challenge*, 3, 109–115.
- Dupuis, J., & Neuner, J. (1996) *The Christian faith in the documents of the Catholic church* (6th ed.) Bangalore, India: Theological Publications in India.
- Eddy, M. B. (1906) *Science and health with key to the Scriptures*. Boston: The Christian Science board of directors. (Original work published 1875)
- Edwards, D. L., & Stott, J. R. W. (1988) *Evangelical essentials: A liberal-evangelical dialogue*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Elizondo, V. (1996) Healing and deliverance: The response of liberation theology. *Concilium: Pentecostal movements as an ecumenical challenge*, 3, 51–56.
- Erickson, M. J. (1991) *The Word became flesh*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Erickson, M. J. (1997) *The Evangelical left: Encountering postconservative Evangelical theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Erickson, M. J. (1998) *Christian theology* (2nd ed.) Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Ervin, H. M. (1984) *Conversion-initiation and the baptism in the Holy Spirit: A critique of James D. G. Dunn*, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- An Evangelical response to Confessing the One Faith*. (1993) Outreach and identity: Evangelical theological monographs no. 6. Seoul: WEF Theological Commission. (Electronic ed., Logos Research Systems)
- Fee, G. D. (1985, Fall) Baptism in the Holy Spirit: The issue of separability and subsequence. *PNEUMA*, 7(2), 87–99.
- Fee, G. D. (1991) *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament hermeneutics*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Foerster, W., & Fohrer, G. (1971) σώζω, σωτηρία, σωτήρ, σωτήριος. In G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), G. W. Bromiley (trans.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament* (Vol. 7, pp. 965–1024). Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Foreword. (1987) In M. E. Dieter, A. A. Hoekema, S. M. Horton, J. R. McQuilkin & J. F. Walvoord, *Five views on sanctification* (pp. 7–8). Counterpoints. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

- Fruchtenbaum, A. G. (1996) Israelology, doctrine of. In M. Couch (gen. ed.), *Dictionary of premillennial theology* (pp. 197–203). Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.
- Gaffin, R. B., Jr. (1996a) A cessationist view. In W. A. Grudem (gen. ed.), R. B. Gaffin, Jr., R. L. Saucy, C. S. Storms & D. A. Oss, *Are miraculous gifts for today? Four views* (pp. 23–64). Counterpoints. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Gaffin, R. B., Jr. (1996b) Concluding statement (cessationist view). In W. A. Grudem (gen. ed.), R. B. Gaffin, Jr., R. L. Saucy, C. S. Storms & D. A. Oss, *Are miraculous gifts for today? Four views* (pp. 334–340). Counterpoints. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Geisler, N. L. (1979, October) Johannine apologetics. *Bibliotheca sacra*, 136(544), 333–343. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Glass, J. J. (1998) Eschatology: A clear and present danger—a sure and certain hope. In K. Warrington (ed.), *Pentecostal perspectives* (pp. 120–146). Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press.
- Goff, J. R., Jr. (1988) *Fields white unto harvest: Charles F. Parham and the missionary origins of Pentecostalism*. Fayetteville, Arkansas: University of Arkansas Press.
- Gossett, D., & Kenyon, E. W. (1997) *The power of your words* (rev. ed.) Secunderabad, India: Ben Publishing.
- Gregory of Nazianzus. (1999) To Cledonius the priest against Apollinarius (Ep. CI). In P. Schaff & H. Wace (eds.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene fathers series II*. (Vol. 7). Edinburgh: T & T Clark. (Electronic ed., Calvin College: <http://www.ccel.org>)
- Greig, G. S. (1993) The purpose of signs and wonders in the New Testament: What terms for miraculous power denote and their relationship to the gospel (chap. 4). In G. S. Greig & K. Springer (eds.), *The kingdom and the power: Are healing and the spiritual gifts used by Jesus and the early church meant for the church today?* (pp. 133–174). Ventura, California: Regal Books.
- Grenz, S. J., & Olson, R. E. (1992) *20th century theology: God & the world in a transitional age*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Grenz, S. J. (2002, June) Die begrenzte Gemeinschaft (“The Boundaried People”) and the character of evangelical theology. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 45(2), n.p. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Grider, J. K. (1980) *Entire sanctification: The distinctive doctrine of Wesleyanism*. Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City.
- Griffith, R. M., & Roebuck, D. G. (2002) Women, role of. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 1203–1209). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Grudem, W. (1994) *Systematic theology: An introduction to biblical doctrine*. Grand Rapids and Leicester: Zondervan and InterVarsity Press.
- Guthrie, D. (1981) *New Testament theology*. England: InterVarsity Press.

- Gutiérrez, G. (1973) *A theology of liberation: History, politics and salvation*. (C. Ina & J. Eagleson, trans.) Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Gutiérrez, G. (1983) *The power of the poor in history*. (R. R. Barr, trans.) Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Habermas, G. R. (1991, Spring) An appraisal of the leap of faith. *Michigan journal of theology*, 2(1), 82–96. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Habermas, G. R. (1995) Did Jesus perform miracles? (chap. 5). In M. J. Wilkins & J. P. Moreland (eds.), *Jesus under fire: Modern scholarship reinvents the historical Jesus* (pp. 117–140). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Habets, M. (2003) Spirit Christology: Seeing in stereo. *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 11(2), 199–234.
- Hanson, P. D. (1979) *The dawn of apocalyptic: The historical and sociological roots of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology* (rev. ed.) Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Hayford, J. (1996) *The beauty of spiritual language: Unveiling the mystery of speaking in tongues*. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Hedlund, R. E. (1993) *Roots of the great debate in mission: Mission in historical and theological perspective* (2nd ed.) Bangalore, India: Theological Book Trust.
- Hocken, P. (1988) Charismatic movement. In S. M. Burgess, G. B. McGee & P. H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 130–160). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Hocken, P. (2002) Pentecostal-Roman Catholic dialogue. In N. Lossky, J. M. Bonino, J. Pobee, T. F. Stransky, G. Wainwright & P. Webb (eds.), *Dictionary of the ecumenical movement* (pp. 899–900). Geneva: WCC Publications.
- Hodge, C. (1997) *Systematic theology*. (Vol. 3). Oak Harbor, Washington: Logos Research Systems. (Electronic ed.)
- Hodges, Z. C. (1963, July) A symposium on the tongues movement, part I: The purpose of tongues. *Bibliotheca sacra*, 120(479), 226–233. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Hoekema, A. A. (1979) *The Bible and the future*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Hollenweger, W. J. (1972) *The Pentecostals: The charismatic movement in the churches*. (R. A. Wilson, trans.) London: SCM Press.
- Hollenweger, W. J. (1992) The critical tradition of Pentecostalism. *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 1, 7–17.
- Hollenweger, W. J. (1996) From Azusa Street to the Toronto phenomenon: Historical roots of the pentecostal movement. *Concilium: Pentecostal movements as an ecumenical challenge*, 3, 3–14.
- Hollenweger, W. J. (2001) Pentecostalism, past, present and future (N. Hudson, interviewer). *Journal of the European Pentecostal Association*, 21, 41–48.

- Hollinger, D. (1988, Fall) Enjoying God forever: An historical/sociological profile of the health and wealth gospel. *Trinity journal*, 9(2), 131–149. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Horton, S. M. (1987) The Pentecostal perspective. In M. E. Dieter, A. A. Hoekema, S. M. Horton, J. R. McQuilkin & J. F. Walvoord, *Five views on sanctification* (pp. 103–135). Counterpoints. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Howard, D. M. (1986) *The dream that would not die: The birth and growth of the World Evangelical Fellowship, 1846–1986*. Exeter: Paternoster Press. (Electronic ed., Logos Research Systems)
- Hughes, R. H. (1976) The new Pentecostalism: Perspective of a classical Pentecostal administrator. In R. P. Spittler (ed.), *Perspectives on the new Pentecostalism* (pp. 166–180). Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Ice, T. (2000, August) The Calvinistic heritage of dispensationalism. *Conservative theological journal*, 4(12), 128–147. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Isley, W. L., Jr. (1994, Winter) Review of *Renewal theology: The church, the kingdom, and last things* by J. Rodman Williams. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 37(4), 612–613. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Jenney, T. P. (1995) The Holy Spirit and sanctification (chap. 12). In S. M. Horton (ed.), *Systematic theology* (rev. ed., pp. 397–421). Springfield, Missouri: Logion Press.
- Johnstone, P., Mandryk, J., & Johnstone, R. J. (2001) *Operation world: 21st century edition*. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Publishing.
- The joint declaration on the doctrine of justification by the Lutheran World Federation and the Catholic Church*. (1999) (http://www.lutheranworld.org/Special_Events/EN/jd97e.pdf [Accessed May 25, 2006])
- Karras, V. A. (2003) Beyond justification: An Orthodox perspective (chap. 8). In W. G. Rusch (ed.), *Justification and the future of the ecumenical movement: The joint declaration on the doctrine of justification* (pp. 99–131). Unitas books. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press.
- Kasper, W. (1976) *Jesus the Christ*. (V. Green, trans.) Kent, England, and Mahwah, New Jersey: Burnes & Oates and Paulist Press.
- Kärkkäinen, V.-M. (1999) Mission, Spirit and eschatology: An outline of a Pentecostal-charismatic theology of mission. *Mission studies*, 16(1), 73–94.
- Kärkkäinen, V.-M. (2002) *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in ecumenical, international, and contextual perspective*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Kärkkäinen, V.-M. (2003) *Christology: A global introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Kärkkäinen, V.-M. (2004) *One with God: Salvation as deification and justification*. Unitas books. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press.

- Kärkkäinen, V.-M. (2005, January) Spirit, reconciliation and healing in the community: Missiological insights from Pentecostals. *International review of mission*, 94(372), 43–50.
- Kelsey, M. T. (1964) *Tongue speaking: An experiment in spiritual experience*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company.
- Kelsey, M. T. (1973) *Healing and Christianity: In ancient thought and modern times*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Kuemmerlin-McLean, J. K., & Nelson, R. D. (1992) Demons. In D. N. Freedman, G. A. Herion, D. F. Graf, J. D. Pleins & A. B. Beck (eds.), *The Anchor Bible dictionary: Vol. 2. D–G* (pp. 138–142). New York: Double Day.
- Land, S. J. (1993) *Pentecostal spirituality: A passion for the kingdom*. Journal of Pentecostal theology supplement series, 1. London: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Leggett, D. (1989, Fall) The Assemblies of God statement on sanctification (a brief review by Calvin and Wesley). *PNEUMA*, 11(2), 113–122.
- Lessing, G. (1956) On the proof of the Spirit and of power. In G. Lessing & H. Chadwick (trans.), *Lessing's Theological Writings* (pp. 51–56). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lewis, A. H. (1980) *The dark side of the millennium: The problem of evil in Rev. 20:1–10*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Lewis, C. S. (2002) *The Screwtape letters*. In *The complete C. S. Lewis signature classics* (pp. 121–203). San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco. (Original work published 1942)
- Lindsell, H. (1976) *The battle for the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Lindström, H. (1980) *Wesley and sanctification*. Nappanee, Indiana: Evangel Publishing House. (Original work published 1946)
- Lord, A. (2003) The Pentecostal–Moltmann dialogue: Implications for mission. *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 11(2), 271–287.
- Lovett, L. (2002) Positive confession theology. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 992–994). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Macchia, F. D. (1994, Fall) Revitalizing theological categories: A classical Pentecostal response to J. Rodman Williams's *Renewal Theology*. *PNEUMA*, 16(2), 293–304.
- Macchia, F. D. (1996, Spring) God present in a confused situation: The mixed influence of the charismatic movement on classical Pentecostalism in the United States. *PNEUMA*, 18(1), 33–54.
- Macchia, F. D. (1999) The struggle for global witness: Shifting paradigms in Pentecostal theology (chap. 1). In M. W. Dempster, B. D. Klaus & D. Petersen (eds.), *The globalization of pentecostalism: A religion made to travel* (pp. 8–29). Carlisle, Cumbria: Regnum Books International.

- Macchia, F. D. (2002) Theology, Pentecostal. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 1120–1141). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Macchia, F. D. (2003a) Justification and the Spirit of life: A Pentecostal response to the joint declaration (chap. 9). In W. G. Rusch (ed.), *Justification and the future of the ecumenical movement: The joint declaration on the doctrine of justification* (pp. 133–149). Unitas books. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press.
- Macchia, F. D. (2003b, Fall) The time is near! Or, is it? Dare we abandon our eschatological expectation? *PNEUMA*, 25(2), 161–163.
- MacDonald, W. G. (1988) Jesus Christ. In S. M. Burgess, G. B. McGee & P. H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 480–488). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- MacLeod, D. J. (2001, Summer) *Surprised by the power of the Spirit: A review article*. *Emmaus journal*, 10(1), 115–151. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- MacNutt, F. (2005) *The nearly perfect crime: How the church almost killed the ministry of healing*. Grand Rapids: Chosen Books.
- Marshall, I. H. (1970) *Luke: Historian & theologian*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Marty, M. E., & Peerman, D. G. (1972) Peoplehood and particularism. In M. E. Marty & D. G. Peerman (eds.), *New theology no. 9* (pp. 7–23). New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Mayhue, R. L. (1995, Fall) For what did Christ atone in Isa. 53:4–5? *Master's Seminary journal*, 6(2), 121–141. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- McDonnell, K., & Montague, G. T. (1994) *Christian initiation and baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the first eight centuries* (2nd ed.) Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.
- McFague, S. (1996) Holy Spirit. In L. M. Russell & J. S. Clarkson (eds.), *Dictionary of feminist theologies* (pp. 146–147). Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- McGee, G. B. (2002) Missions, overseas (N. American Pentecostal). In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 885–901). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- McGee, G. B. (2003, Fall) “More than evangelical”: The challenge of the evolving theological identity of the Assemblies of God. *PNEUMA*, 25(2), 289–300.
- McGee, G. B., & Burgess, S. M. (2002) India. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 118–126). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- McIntire, C. T. (1984) Fundamentalism. In W. A. Elwell (Ed.), *Evangelical dictionary of theology* (pp. 433–435). Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- McPherson, A. S., Cox, R. L. (comp.) (1969) *The Foursquare Gospel*. Los Angeles: Foursquare Publications.

- Menzies, R. P. (1994) *Empowered for witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. London: T&T Clark International. (Original work published 1991)
- Menzies, R. P. (1998, August) Evidential tongues: An essay on theological method. *Asian journal of Pentecostal studies*, 1(2), n. p. (<http://www.pts.edu/ajps/98-2/98-2-menzies.pdf> [Accessed May 5, 2006])
- Menzies, W. W. (1975) The non-Wesleyan origins of the pentecostal movement. In V. Synan (Ed.), *Aspects of pentecostal-charismatic origins* (pp. 81–98). Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International.
- Menzies, W. W., & Horton, S. M. (1993) *Bible doctrines: A Pentecostal perspective*. Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House.
- Menzies, W. W., & Menzies, R. P. (2000) *Spirit and power: Foundations of Pentecostal experience*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Meyer, B. F. (1992) Jesus Christ. In D. N. Freedman, G. A. Herion, D. F. Graf, J. D. Pleins & A. B. Beck (eds.), *The Anchor Bible dictionary: Vol. 3. H–J* (pp. 773–796). New York: Double Day.
- Moltmann, J. (1967) *Theology of hope: On the ground and implications of a Christian eschatology*. (J. W. Leitch, trans.) London: SCM Press.
- Moltmann, J. (1981) *The Trinity and the kingdom: The doctrine of God*. (M. Kohl, trans.) London: SCM Press.
- Moltmann, J. (1985) *God in creation: A new theology of creation and the Spirit of God*. (M. Kohl, trans.) The Gifford lectures 1984–1985. London: SCM Press.
- Moltmann, J. (1990) *The way of Jesus Christ: Christology in messianic dimensions*. (M. Kohl, trans.) London: SCM Press.
- Moltmann, J. (1992) *The Spirit of life: A universal affirmation*. (M. Kohl, trans.) Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Moltmann, J. (1994) A response to my Pentecostal dialogue partners. *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 4, 59–70.
- Moltmann, J. (1996a) *The coming of God: Christian eschatology*. (M. Kohl, trans.) London: SCM Press.
- Moltmann, J. (1996b) Pentecost and the theology of life. *Concilium: Pentecostal movements as an ecumenical challenge*, 3, 123–134.
- Moltmann, J. (1997) *The source of life: The Holy Spirit and the theology of life*. (M. Kohl, trans.) Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Moltmann, J. (2003) Foreword. In P. Althouse, *Spirit of the last days: Pentecostal eschatology in conversation with Jürgen Moltmann*. Journal of Pentecostal theology supplement series, 25. London: T&T Clark International.
- Moltmann-Wendel, E., & Moltmann, J. (1983) *Humanity in God*. Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim Press.
- Moo, D. (1988, Fall) Divine healing in the health and wealth gospel. *Trinity journal*, 9(2), 191–209. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)

- Moreau, A. S. (2000) World Council of Churches. In A. S. Moreau (gen. ed.), H. Netland & C. Van Engen (eds.), *Evangelical dictionary of world missions* (p. 1024). Grand Rapids: Baker Books and Paternoster Press.
- Muether, J. R. (1988, Fall) Contemporary evangelicalism and the triumph of the new school. *Westminster theological journal*, 50(2), 339–347. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Nelson, P. C. (1981) *Bible doctrines: A series of studies based on the fundamental beliefs of the Assemblies of God* (rev. ed.) Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House.
- Newbigin. (1953) *The household of God*. New York: Friendship Press.
- Nichols, D. R. (1984, Fall) The search for a pentecostal structure in systematic theology. *PNEUMA*, 6(2), 57–76.
- Nienkirchen, C. W. (1992) *A. B. Simpson and the Pentecostal movement: A study in continuity, crisis, and change*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- O'Collins, G. (1977) *What are they saying about Jesus?*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Oepke, A. (1965) ἰάομαι, ἰασις, ἰαμα, ἰατρός. In G. Kittel (ed.), G. W. Bromiley (trans.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament* (Vol. 3, pp. 194–215). Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Olson, R. E. (2006, March) A wind that swirls everywhere. *Christianity today*, pp. 52–54.
- Pannenberg, W. (1977) *Jesus—God and Man* (L. L. Wilkins & D. A. Priebe, trans.) (2nd ed.) Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Pecota, D. B. (1995) The saving work of Christ (chap. 10). In S. M. Horton (ed.), *Systematic theology* (rev. ed., pp. 325–373). Springfield, Missouri: Logion Press.
- Pentecost, J. D. (1958) *Things to come: A study in biblical eschatology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Perrin, N. (1967) *Rediscovering the teachings of Jesus*. New Testament library. London: SCM Press.
- Peters, J. L. (1985) *Christian perfection and American Methodism*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan. (Original work published 1956)
- Pierard, R. V. (1984) Evangelicalism. In W. A. Elwell (ed.), *Evangelical dictionary of theology* (pp. 379–382). Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Pierson, P. E. (2000) Ecumenical movement. In A. S. Moreau (gen. ed.), H. Netland & C. Van Engen (eds.), *Evangelical dictionary of world missions* (pp. 300–303). Grand Rapids: Baker Books and Paternoster Press.
- Piper, J., & Grudem, W. (1991) Charity, clarity, and hope: The controversy and the cause of Christ (chap. 26). In J. Piper & W. Grudem (eds.), *Recovering biblical manhood & womanhood: A response to evangelical feminism* (pp. 403–422). Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books.

- Premasagar, V. (1993) Foreword. In R. E. Hedlund, *Roots of the great debate in mission: Mission in historical and theological perspective*. (2nd ed.) Bangalore: Theological Book Trust.
- Purdy, V. L. (1995) Divine healing (chap. 15). In S. M. Horton (ed.), *Systematic theology* (rev. ed., pp. 489–523). Springfield, Missouri: Logion Press.
- Reed, D. A. (1975) Aspects of the origins of oneness pentecostalism. In V. Synan (ed.), *Aspects of pentecostal-charismatic origins* (pp. 143–168). Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International.
- Reed, D. A. (2002) Oneness Pentecostalism. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 936–944). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Robeck, C. M., Jr. (1986, Fall) Pentecostals and the apostolic faith: Implications for ecumenism. *PNEUMA*, 9(2), 61–84.
- Robeck, C. M., Jr. (1987, Fall) Pentecostals and social ethics. *PNEUMA*, 9(2), 103–107.
- Robeck, C. M., Jr. (1999) Pentecostals and ecumenism in a pluralistic world (chap. 15). In M. W. Dempster, B. D. Klaus & D. Petersen (eds.), *The globalization of pentecostalism: A religion made to travel* (pp. 338–362). Carlisle, Cumbria: Regnum Books International.
- Robeck, C. M., Jr. (2002) National Association of Evangelicals. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 922–925). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Robeck, C. M., Jr., & Sandidge, J. L. (2002) World Council of Churches. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 1213–1217). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Runia, K. (1997, October) What is evangelical theology? *Evangelical review of theology*, 21(4), n.p. (Electronic ed., Logos Research Systems)
- Ruthven, J. (1993) *On the cessation of the charismata: The Protestant polemic on postbiblical miracles*. Journal of Pentecostal theology supplement series, 3. London: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Ryrie, C. C. (1964, January) Apostasy in the church. *Bibliotheca sacra*, 121(481), 44–53. (Electronic ed., Galaxie Software)
- Ryrie, C. C. (1995) *Dispensationalism* (rev. ed.) Secunderabad: OM Books (reprint).
- Sawin, J. (1986) The fourfold gospel. In D. F. Hartzfeld & C. Nienkirchen (eds.), *The birth of a vision: Essays on the ministry and thought of Albert B. Simpson, founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance* (pp. 1–28). Camp Hill, Pennsylvania: Christian Publications.
- Schniewind, J. (1961) A reply to Bultmann: Theses on the emancipation of the kerygma from mythology. In H. W. Bartsch (ed.), R. Bultmann, E. Lohmeyer, J. Schniewind, H. Thielicke & A. Farrer, R. H. Fuller (trans.), *Kerygma and myth: A theological debate* (pp. 45–101). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers. (Original work published 1953)

- Schutter, W. L. (1979, Winter) A continuing crisis for incarnational doctrine. *Reformed review*, 32, 76–91.
- Schwarz, H. (2000) *Eschatology*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Schweitzer, A. (1911) *The quest of the historical Jesus: A critical study of its progress from Reimarus to Wrede* (W. Montgomery, trans.) (2nd ed.) London: Adam and Charles Black.
- Scotland, N. (2000) *Charismatics and the new millennium: The impact of charismatic Christianity from 1960 into the new millennium*. U.K.: Inter. Publishing Service. (Original work published 1995)
- Segundo, J. L. (1976) *The liberation of theology*. (J. Drury, trans.) Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Segundo, J. L. (1985) *Jesus of Nazareth, yesterday and today: Vol. 2. The historical Jesus of the synoptics*. (J. Drury, trans.) Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Sepúlveda, J. (1996) Born again: Baptism and the Spirit—a Pentecostal perspective. *Concilium: Pentecostal movements as an ecumenical challenge*, 3, 104–109.
- Seymour, W. J. (2000) *The doctrines and discipline of the Azusa Street Apostolic Faith Mission of Los Angeles, California* (L. Martin, ed.) The complete Azusa Street library. Joplin, Missouri: Christian Life Books. (Original work published 1915)
- Sheppard, G. T. (1984, Fall) Pentecostalism and the hermeneutics of dispensationalism: The anatomy of an uneasy relationship. *PNEUMA*, 6(2), 5–33.
- Shorter, A. (1982) Folk Christianity and functional Christology. *AFER*, 24, 133–137.
- Simpson, A. B. (1888) *The gospel of healing*. Astor Place, New York: J. J. Little & Company.
- Smith, W. (1855) *A Latin-English dictionary based upon the works of Forcellini and Freund*. London: John Murray.
- Snell, J. T. (1992, Spring) Beyond the individual and into the world: A call to participation in the larger purposes of the Spirit on the basis of Pentecostal theology. *PNEUMA*, 14(1), 43–57.
- Stibbe, M. W. G. (1994) A British appraisal [of J. Moltmann's *The Spirit of life*]. *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 4, 5–16.
- Stronstad, R. (1984) *The charismatic theology of St. Luke*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrikson Publishers.
- Studebaker, S. M. (2003) Pentecostal soteriology and pneumatology. *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 11(2), 248–270.
- Synan, V. (1971) *The Holiness-Pentecostal movement in the United States*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

- Synan, V. (1981) Theological boundaries: The Arminian tradition. *PNEUMA*, 3, 38–53.
- Synan, V. (2001) *The century of the Holy Spirit: 100 years of Pentecostal and charismatic renewal, 1901–2001*. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson.
- Synan, V. (2002a) Classical pentecostalism. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 553–555). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Synan, V. (2002b) Evangelicalism. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 613–616). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Synan, V. (2002c) Fundamentalism. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 655–658). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Taylor, R. S. (1985) *Exploring Christian holiness: Vol. 3. The theological formulation*. Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City.
- Thomas, J. C. (2005) Healing in the atonement: A Johannine perspective. *Journal of Pentecostal theology*, 14(1), 23–39.
- Thomas, O. C. (1989) *Introduction to theology* (rev. ed.) Delhi: ISPCK. (Original work published 1982)
- Tillich, P. (1951) *Systematic theology: Vol. 1. Reason and revelation, being and God*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tillich, P. (1957) *Systematic theology: Vol. 2. Existence and the Christ*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tillich, P. (1963) *Systematic theology: Vol. 3. Life and the Spirit, history and the kingdom of God*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vandervelde, G. (2002) Evangelical ecumenical concerns. In N. Lossky, J. M. Bonino, J. Pobee, T. F. Stransky, G. Wainwright & P. Webb (eds.), *Dictionary of the ecumenical movement* (pp. 437–440). Geneva: WCC Publications.
- Villafaña, E. (1993) *The liberating Spirit: Toward an Hispanic American Pentecostal social ethic*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Volf, M. (1989, Summer) Materiality of salvation: An investigation in the soteriologies of liberation and pentecostal theologies. *Journal of ecumenical studies*, 26(3), 447–467.
- Vondey, W. (2001, January) Christian amnesia: Who in the world are Pentecostals? *Asian journal of Pentecostal studies*, 4(1), 21–39. (<http://www.ajps.edu/ajps/01-1/01-1-wvondey.pdf> [Accessed May 10, 2006])
- Wacker, G. (2001) *Heaven below: Pentecostals and American culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Wagner, C. P. (2002) Third wave. In S. M. Burgess & E. M. van der Maas (eds.), *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (p. 1141). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Ward, H. S., Jr. (1975) The anti-pentecostal argument. In V. Synan (ed.), *Aspects of pentecostal-charismatic origins* (pp. 99–122). Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International.
- Warfield, B. B. (1918) *Counterfeit miracles*. Edinburgh and Carlisle, Pennsylvania: The Banner of Truth Trust.
- Warfield, B. B. (1948) “It says:” “Scripture says:” “God says”. In S. G. Craig (ed.), B. B. Warfield, *The inspiration and authority of the Bible* (pp. 297–348). Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company. (Original work published 1899)
- Warrington, K. (1998) Healing and exorcism: The path to wholeness. In K. Warrington (ed.), *Pentecostal perspectives* (pp. 147–176). Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press.
- Weber, H.-R. (2002) Bible, its role in the ecumenical movement. In N. Lossky, J. M. Bonino, J. Pobee, T. F. Stransky, G. Wainwright & P. Webb (eds.), *Dictionary of the ecumenical movement* (pp. 108–112). Geneva: WCC Publications.
- Wesley, J. (1968) *A plain account of Christian perfection*. London: Epworth Press.
- Williams, J. R. (1965) *Contemporary existentialism and Christian faith*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Williams, J. R. (1971) *The era of the Spirit*. Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International.
- Williams, J. R. (1972) *The Pentecostal reality*. Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International.
- Williams, J. R. (1981, Fall) The Holy Spirit and eschatology. *PNEUMA*, 3, 54–58.
- Williams, J. R. (1988a) Baptism in the Holy Spirit. In S. M. Burgess, G. B. McGee & P. H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 40–48). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Williams, J. R. (1988b) *Renewal Theology: Vol. 1. God, the world and redemption*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Williams, J. R. (1990) *Renewal Theology: Vol. 2. Salvation, the Holy Spirit, and Christian living*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Williams, J. R. (1992) *Renewal Theology: Vol. 3. The church, the kingdom, and last things*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Williams, J. R. (1997) *Empowered evangelicals: A book review*. (<http://home.regent.edu/rodmwil/empow.htm> [Accessed September 26, 2005])
- Willker, W. (2006) *Didache—Greek*. (<http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/texteapo/didache-greek.html> [Accessed September 25, 2006])

- Wilson, D. J. (1988a) Eschatology, Pentecostal perspectives on. In S. M. Burgess, G. B. McGee & P. H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 264–268). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Wilson, D. J. (1988b) Pacifism. In S. M. Burgess, G. B. McGee & P. H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and charismatic movements* (pp. 658–660). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Word and Spirit, church and world: The final report of the international dialogue between representatives of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and some classical Pentecostal churches and leaders 1996–2000. (2001, January) *Asian journal of Pentecostal studies*, 4(1), 41–72.
(<http://www.aps.edu/ajps/01-1/01-1-warc.pdf> [Accessed May 9, 2006])
- Wyckoff, J. W. (1995) The baptism in the Holy Spirit (chap.13). In S. M. Horton (ed.), *Systematic theology* (Rev. ed., pp. 423–455). Springfield, Missouri: Logion Press.

Unless otherwise noted, English Bible quotations are from *The Holy Bible: English standard version*. (2001). Wheaton, Illinois: Good News Publishers.