

- **The Charismatic Movement and the Church – Conflict or Renewal?**<sup>1</sup>
- *Le mouvement charismatique et l'Eglise—Conflit ou renouveau ?*
- *Die charismatische Bewegung und die Kirche—Konflikt oder Erneuerung?*
- Max Turner, London

## RÉSUMÉ

La première partie décrit le contexte et relève : (a) la croissance exponentielle du mouvement au cours du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle—mouvement qui représente aujourd'hui presque un tiers de l'ensemble de l'Eglise ; (b) la diversité énorme du mouvement ; et (c) l'émergence d'une réflexion théologique pentecôtiste-charismatique, capable d'autocritique et invitant le mouvement évangélique plus traditionnel au dialogue.

Dans la deuxième partie, on cherchera une caractéristique commune permettant de définir ce mouvement hétérogène. On la trouvera dans la volonté de permettre à l'Eglise d'aujourd'hui de retrouver la présence dynamique et puissante de l'Esprit telle qu'elle était décrite dans les Actes et sous-entendue dans les Epîtres—en particulier (mais pas exclusivement) en 1 Corinthiens 12-14 et Romains 12. Il est à noter que la seconde bénédiction que représente le « baptême dans le Saint-Esprit » n'est plus une position « consensuelle » dans le mouvement ; elle est au contraire largement débattue en différents endroits.

Dans la troisième partie, nous examinerons l'apport positif du mouvement charismatique au renouveau de l'Eglise, et nous soulignerons cinq points forts : (1) dans le monde entier, le mouvement charismatique a mis sur le devant de la scène la guérison, le parler en langues, la prophétie et d'autres dons du même ordre ; (2)

il a permis qu'une pneumatologie et une spiritualité caractérisées par l'expérience—correspondant directement à la situation et à la description du N.T.—soient placées à nouveau au centre de la réflexion théologique ; (3) il a profondément renouvelé ce qu'on pourrait appeler la conception « somatique / communautaire » de l'Eglise : chaque croyant est supposé être impliqué dans les différents aspects du ministère de l'Eglise et dans l'Eglise ; (4) il a fortement renouvelé l'engagement missionnaire ; et (5) il a proposé un modèle d'ouverture à d'autres traditions, de partage d'expériences spirituelles, affranchi de la sensibilité institutionnelle au sujet de la reconnaissance des ministères et du statut des personnes en dialogue.

La quatrième partie analyse le potentiel de conflit restant dans le mouvement charismatique. Elle montre que ni le cessationnisme ni la conception pentecôtiste classique du « baptême dans le Saint-Esprit » ne doivent nécessairement occuper le devant de la scène : d'autres options sont possibles. L'évangile de la prospérité, les prophètes de Kansas City, la bénédiction de Toronto, etc., sont déjà fortement critiqués au sein du mouvement charismatique. Mais plus généralement la tendance au triomphalisme, l'insistance sur le surnaturel et le spectaculaire risquent de provoquer des conflits persistants.

## ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

*Der erste Teil beschreibt den Kontext der Studie, indem drei Aspekte dargestellt werden: (a) das explosive Wachstum der Bewegung im letzten Jahrhundert (fast ein Drittel der Christenheit gehört der Bewegung an), (b) die enorme Vielfalt der Bewegung, und (c) das Aufkommen pfingstlerisch / charismatischer theologischer Forschung, die ein selbstkritisches Bewußtsein zeigt und zum Dialog mit eher traditionellem Evangelikalismus einlädt.*

*Der zweite Teil versucht, einen gemeinsamen charakteristischen Nenner dieser vielschichtigen Bewegung zu finden und macht ihn in dem Versuch aus, die dynamische und kraftgebende Präsenz des Geistes Gottes, von der in der Apostelgeschichte erzählt wird und die in den Briefen impliziert ist (besonders, aber nicht ausschließlich, in 1 Korinther 12-14 und Römer 12), für die heutige Gemeinde wiederzuentdecken. Es wird festgestellt, daß 'Taufe im Heiligen Geist' als 'zweite Segnung' nicht länger eine einmütige Position in der gesamten Bewegung darstellt, sondern in verschiedenen Bereichen diskutiert wird.*

*Der dritte Teil untersucht den positiven Beitrag der charismatischen Bewegung zur Erneuerung der Kirche und verweist auf fünf Stärken: (1) die charismatische Bewegung hat die Erwartung von weitverbreiteten Heilungen, Zungenrede, Prophetie und ähnlichen Gaben globalisiert; (2) sie hat eine tiefe*

*erfahrungsbetonte Pneumatologie und Spiritualität, die in Beziehung zu neutestamentlichen Erwartungen und Beschreibungen steht, in die theologische Diskussion zurückgebracht; (3) sie hat einen tiefgreifenden Erneuerungseffekt auf die 'somatische' oder 'korporative' Konzeption von Kirche ausgeübt: von jedem Gläubigen wird erwartet, sich in die verschiedenen Aspekte des Dienstes der und an der Kirche einzubringen; (4) sie hat eine bedeutende Erneuerung der Verpflichtung zur Mission gebracht, und (5) sie hat ein Modell der Offenheit für andere Traditionen bereitgestellt, sowie ein Modell des Austausches geistlicher Erfahrungen, größtenteils unbelastet von institutionellen Empfindlichkeiten über klerikale Anerkennungen.*

*Der vierte Teil analysiert das Potential der Bewegung für andauernde Konflikte. Es wird argumentiert, daß weder 'cessationism' (Lehre von der Beschränkung verschiedener Geistesgaben auf die apostolische Zeit) noch die klassische pfingstlerische Anschauung von der 'Taufe im Heiligen Geist' notwendigerweise die Szene beherrschen muß, da sich bereits andere Themen anbieten. Das Wohlstandsevangelium, die Kansas City Propheten, der Toronto-Segen etc. werden bereits innerhalb der charismatischen Bewegung stark kritisiert. Die mehr allgemeinen Tendenzen zum Triumphalismus, Supernaturalismus und Phänomenalismus scheinen eher andauernden Konfliktstoff bereitzustellen.*

## I. The Setting

Who, watching the very humble beginnings of Pentecostalism in America in 1905-1906, could possibly have imagined the way the movement would flourish? By 1990, the Pentecostal churches, together with their spiritual children in the various Charismatic Renewal movements, and New Church movements, formed 23.4% of the totality of the world's church-member Christians (and an estimated 31% in

2000).<sup>2</sup> As Prof Walter Hollenweger has observed, to expand to a total of nearly 500 million members in just ninety years shows a rate of growth unparalleled in any period of church history, including that of the apostolic age.<sup>3</sup>

But assessing its contribution (in other than numerical terms) — its potential as a source of conflict and/or renewal in the church — is no easy task. This is primarily because the CM is not a uniform entity. Unlike the great churches of the

Reformation,<sup>4</sup> Pentecostals have no profound deep-thinking founding fathers, to give them a stamp of identity and theological direction; no prayer book to bring them uniformity; not even a common socio-cultural ethos.<sup>5</sup> The diversity of Pentecostalism was no doubt increased by its lack of formal theological education, and its tendency to give priority to narrative (especially Acts), and to testimony, rather than to exposition of the epistles (with notable exception of 1 Cor 12-14!). But undoubtedly the most important diversifying factor was its highly adaptable invasion of other 'cultures', whether we are speaking of its expansion into Latin America, Africa, Europe, and Asia, or whether we are speaking of its importation into existing churches of different traditions. The 'charismatic movement' wears somewhat different faces depending on whether we are talking about the traditional Pentecostal denominations or whether we are speaking of its presence in Catholicism, Protestantism, or Orthodoxy. While one may speak of Pentecostalism as 'a religion made to travel' and even of its 'globalization', the charismatic movement has become so multi-cultural that it is possible to ask serious questions about the extent to which it has preserved a recognisable 'core' for us to assess.<sup>6</sup>

A particularly significant development in this respect has been its penetration into the arena of academic theology. In its earliest days, the Pentecostal/charismatic movement was a largely popular one, and any talk of 'pentecostal scholarship' might have been lightly dismissed as nothing more than an amusing oxymoron. But the spread of Pentecostal fire to the traditional churches — through the various Charismatic Renewal Movements of the 60s — gave it powerful theological expositors, even if the Pentecostal doctrinal vessel often shipped a good deal of water in the passage.<sup>7</sup> More significant than this, however, has been the rise (since the 70s) of questioning and critical scholarship from *within* the traditional Pentecostal movement, and a corresponding dedication to disseminating it through their denominational Colleges, societies for Pentecostal

studies, and in international journals and monographs of academic research.<sup>8</sup> The academic standard of the teaching in the AoG and Elim Colleges in the UK, for example, would now be comparable with that in some University Departments in the country (and is validated by such bodies) or with the well-known independent Colleges/Seminaries in Europe. Their teachers complete the same strenuous PhD workouts with the Academy's best athletes. The main Pentecostal journals such as *JPT*, *JEPTA*, *PNEUMA*, *AJPS*, regularly engage in open and friendly dialogue with critics of traditional Pentecostal views, and show a mature and creative willingness to rethink older positions. It may all be very exciting, but the sheer ferment makes attempts to assess the 'charismatic movement' especially challenging. But then, what is a challenge for, but to be taken up?

## II. The Common Defining Characteristic of the CM

I suggest that the one, single, uniting factor in this highly diverse 'movement' is some variation of this objective: *the attempt to recover, for the church today, that dynamic and empowering presence of the Spirit narrated in Acts and implied in the epistles, especially (but not exclusively) 1 Corinthians 12-14 and Rom 12.*<sup>9</sup>

To this we may add three clarifications (but they are no more than that):

1. The CM attempts to appropriate for the church today such 'charismatic' gifts as prophecy, healing, tongues, revelation and guidance, charismatic wisdom, and the like, and seeks to replicate in the church today, as far as possible, the place they perceive such gifts held in the dynamic of NT worship, service and mission.

2. The CM emphasises the potential, indeed normative, participation of *all* believers in at least some of the above 'charismata'.

3. The overarching and core concern is not to be located in a facile restorationist programme but in the search for deepening experiential encounter with God, and his empowering for service. We need to

remember the roots of the movement were in the Higher Life and Holiness movements of the nineteenth century (it may even be true that the focus on initial glossolalia was the *only* distinctive of the Pentecostal movement).<sup>10</sup>

It is not easy to identify anything else that is on the agenda of *all* participants in the CM. But perhaps one important qualification is necessary. Undoubtedly a large majority of *members* hold the view that the core objective can only be realised by a 'second blessing' grace of 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' (henceforth 'bhs') *subsequent* to and theologically *separable* from conversion and discipleship to Christ. A great many would add that bhs should always be confirmed by some 'initial evidence', usually 'tongues'. But such a view of bhs is rejected (on a variety of grounds) by most of the influential theological thinkers of the CRenM, and is even coming under serious question amongst theologians in the traditional Pentecostal denominations.<sup>11</sup> And the subsidiary doctrine of 'initial evidence' of *tongues* is in widespread dispute.<sup>12</sup> So neither 'bhs' nor 'initial evidence' can be considered as a core (even if these remain a major potential area of conflict, to be addressed below).

### III. The Charismatic Movement and the Church's Renewal?

Excepting the small minority who think the CM is largely self-delusion (or worse), the CM has been widely acknowledged as a significant renewal movement, albeit — like any renewal movement — in varying degrees a flawed one. The Pentecostal movement and many of its leaders are now widely respected, and, in the UK, its denominations belong to the Evangelical Alliance. The CRenM, especially through Fountain Trust, won respect even from its inception (if not always agreement), and has drawn more from the Anglican Church than any other denomination.<sup>13</sup> One of the most effective organs of church renewal in Britain since the 80s has been the massively attended interdenominational annual convention (cum holiday camp), meeting in several locations in the coun-

try under the name 'Spring Harvest'.<sup>14</sup> Here Pentecostal, Charismatic and traditional Evangelicals regularly shared the worship platforms and seminar podiums, and the tenor of the main meetings has been decidedly influenced by the patterns of worship native to the CM. In Continental Europe, the story has not always been so cosy. The most radical *rejection* of the Pentecostal movement was probably that of the infamous *Berliner Erklärung* of 1909, which essentially demonized the whole movement, and has sown the seeds of sharp suspicion between Evangelicals and Pentecostals/Charismatics ever since.<sup>15</sup> But this, I gather, has recently been revoked in favour of a more positive appraisal.

To evaluate the real and still-potential contribution to the renewal of the church, sympathetic observers may emphasise the following strengths (each, of course, also a point of potential conflict, cf. Part IV, below):

1. The CM has globalized the expectation of widespread healing, tongues, prophecy and related gifts. The oft-heard claim that the Pentecostal movement brought about the *restoration* of these gifts (otherwise lost to the church), is, of course, at best generous overstatement. The fact is that eighteenth and nineteenth century pietism had a widespread experience of such charisms, especially in the sizeable Holiness movements of the end of the nineteenth century,<sup>16</sup> and they have been known in many other parts of the church too.<sup>17</sup> But it was the Pentecostal movement that (a) championed the potentially *universal* availability of such gifts in their confessional statements, (b) exported that expectation worldwide in its missionary movement, and (c), later, especially in the 60s, exported this spirituality (now as the CRenM) to the traditional churches, who had hitherto embraced either some form of cessationism (see Part IV, 1), or had come to expect the operation of such gifts to be rare and to be associated only with the heroes of the faith.

These gifts have on the whole not been treated in isolation — as stark supernatural phenomena to be contemplated for their own sake — but have regularly been

subordinated to soteriology, missiology and ecclesiology. That is, healings, exorcisms, and other forms of liberation have been interpreted as part and parcel of the salvation won by Christ, as *concrete expressions of the inbreaking kingdom of God*, and so as acts of God's power that intrinsically tend to confirm the message of the good news, which announces a holistic salvation in history, not merely forgiveness of sins now and *post-mortem* bliss. Tongues were at first misunderstood (chiefly by Parham's circle) as part of the Spirit's empowering for mission, and so as xenolalia for evangelisation (a role they never have in the NT outside Acts 2, if even there). But the realities on the mission field failed to confirm such an interpretation, and the CM came to understand tongues primarily as (a) 'initial evidence' of Spirit-baptism; (b) a form of private prayer/doxology, advocated by Paul in 1 Cor 12-14, and (c) an occasional phenomenon of charismatic praise or other utterance of mystery, appropriate to the congregational setting if matched with the gift of interpretation (in accord with Paul's advice in 1 Cor 14). Prophecy and various other types of revelatory gift have normally been interpreted as charisms for the upbuilding of the congregation (cf. 1 Cor 14:3) or for personal situations (providing particularistic guidance or insight), whether in pastoral or evangelistic contexts. Only occasionally has the subject matter of prophecy been regarded as having more catholic import, and only very rarely as providing new theological revelation of any kind that might be taken as challenge to the supreme authority of Scripture. Such moves have normally been regarded as pathological by the rest of the CM, and have usually been subject to correction.

In sum, observers (unless they have found reasons for substantially rejecting the *authenticity* of these charismata) have tended to see the CM as having made significant steps toward the renewal of some important aspects of NT spirituality.

2. More important than the renewal of particular charisms in the church, the CM has brought back to theological focus a deeply *experiential* pneumatology and spir-

ituality. Malony and Lovekin perceptively classify the movements in Weber's third sociological category: not 'church'; not 'sect', but 'mysticism' — that is, a movement primarily structured in search of individual and corporate *encounter* with God.<sup>18</sup> In more usual (but perhaps less helpful) terminology, Hollenweger and Middlemiss may be correct to classify it as a form of Enthusiasm.<sup>19</sup> Either categorisation clearly reflects the CM's origins in the Pietism of the Holiness/Higher Life and Revival movements of the nineteenth century. More to the point, however, is the apparent congruity between NT descriptions of life in the Spirit and the contours of CM spiritualities. In Acts and in the epistles, reception of the Spirit is a matter of immediate perception (i.e., people know whether or not they have received: cf. Acts 2; 8:14-19; 10:45-46; 19:1-6; Gal 3:3,5; 1 Thes 1:5, etc.). More important, the Spirit is God's self-revealing, empowering and transforming presence in the *whole* of Christian life (1 Thes 1:5-6; 4.8; 1 Cor 6:11; 2 Cor 3:17-18; Titus 3:5-7, etc.), flooding the heart with the love of God (Rom 5:3), inspiring spontaneous joy, worship and praise, even in difficult circumstances (Lk 10:21; Acts 2:4; 10:45-46; 13:52; 1 Thes 1:6; Rom 14:17; 15:13, Col 3:16-17; Eph 5:18-20, etc.), interceding through the believer in charismatic prayer (Rom 8:26-27; 1 Cor 14:14-15), bringing the believer to deep and liberating existential understanding of the truths of the kerygma (cf. Eph 1:17-23; 3:16-19; John 14-16); actively leading the Christian in the fight against sin and 'the flesh' (Gal 5; 2 Cor 3; Rom 8), and so forth.

Of course, one must not pretend that all this was unknown before the CM came on the scene! As Hocken and others have observed, *Evangelicalism has itself been a powerful renewal movement*<sup>20</sup> — one which has, nevertheless, inadvertently transferred some of the divine workings described above to the risen Christ, where the NT preferred to speak of the Spirit. Thus the Evangelical spirituality of 'receiving Christ' and 'fellowship with him' is — to judge by the testimonies — often profoundly 'experiential'.<sup>21</sup> And yet, tradi-

tional Evangelicalism has not other than exceptionally generated the lively and regular expectation of divine intervention, encounter, leading and empowering such as characterises the pneumatology of Acts and of the epistles. Nor has it often entered the resultant spontaneous and exuberant worship that has characterised the CM. In these respect Pentecostal/charismatic spiritualities are more fundamentally and practically trinitarian, and arguably closer to the pattern of the NT witness. It is not by accident that the doctrine of the Spirit has been confessed the Cinderella of modern (traditional Protestant) theology, and it is largely the effect of the CM that she has been invited (back?) to the ball. Again, it would be wrong to suggest that this has led away from Christ into a theologically vacuous fixation with 'phenomena'. It is the overall testimony of the CRenMs that their experience of the Spirit brought fundamental renewal *first and foremost* to believers' *communion with and worship of* the Father and the Son.<sup>22</sup> It is precisely in that broader context that the 'recovery' of charismata, such as tongues and prophecy, should be viewed.<sup>23</sup>

3. The CM has also had a most profound renewing effect on what might be called the 'somatic/corporate' conception of the church. In terms of origins, it is difficult to sort out chickens from eggs. The profoundly egalitarian spirit of the quest for the 'higher life' in the 1860s onwards, the 'universal' experience of bhs in the early Pentecostal revival, the widespread experience of a diversification of charismata and ministries in the movements that followed, combined with a regular ecclesial reading of 1 Cor 12-14, highlighted, for the CM, the essential nature of the church as a charismatic body in which each has an immediate but varied Spirit-inspired role to play, and in which the whole body was dependent on the contributions of each 'organ' or 'part'. The challenge this presented to a traditional church that has all too often surrendered the ecclesial functions to the professionals, and to the ordained, cannot be overestimated.<sup>24</sup> While key initiatives in the CRenM were indeed made by recognised ministers, like David du Plessis,

Dennis Bennett, Michael Harper and others, the majority of local developments were sparked by, and sustained by, charismatic leader/speakers and 'prophets' from what would traditionally be identified as the 'laity'. Indeed, perhaps the *greatest* strength of the CM has been the way it has effectively mobilised and empowered the large majority of its constituency under such banners as 'the prophethood of all believers', 'the diverse ministries of all for the growth of the body', etc. The CM's focus on the multiple and varied Spirit-led 'input' of all (through different gifts) to the communal worship, including not merely glossolalia and prophecy, but testimonies, spontaneous prayer/praise and spiritual songs, and its dramatic use of 'ritual space', including the widespread practice of 'prayer ministry' at the front of the church, has been incorporated well beyond the core of the CM itself.<sup>26</sup>

If anyone wishes to dismiss all this as modern 'democratic' novelty, she will need to reconsider the NT evidence. The case of the CM to be rooted in the NT vision of ecclesial life is transparent. It could not find more impressive, substantial, and eloquent scholarly NT basis than in part III of James Dunn's *Jesus and the Spirit*.<sup>27</sup> Interestingly, Dunn even uses his original and perceptive analysis of the NT's view of the 'charismatic body' to mount an attack on continued Pentecostal support of an ordained ministry!<sup>28</sup>

4. A self-evident contribution of the CM towards the church's renewal has been the commitment to mission. At a time when many European traditional denominations are shrinking, the PM has grown explosively. This evangelistic growth has perhaps been stronger in the PM than in the CRenMs. Traditional Pentecostals have looked above all to Luke-Acts as the canon within the canon, and here they discover the Spirit as the 'Spirit of prophecy' promised by Joel and given by the ascended Lord as 'power from on high' to take the apostolic witness to the ends of the earth (Luke 24:47-49; Acts 1:5-8). For Pentecostals, this points to the very *essence* of the gift of the Spirit for all by Peter at Pentecost (Acts 2:38-39). It is not primarily soteri-

ological, but missiological. Baptism in the Holy Spirit is given to the already 'saved' community, and it is given first and foremost as empowering for service. In this respect, Jesus' own reception of the Spirit at the Jordan becomes paradigmatic. The carefully crafted parallels between Jesus' experience in Luke and that of the disciples in Acts — and the further parallels between these and Stephen, Philip, the Samaritans, Paul, Cornelius' household, and the Ephesian 12 — are taken to confirm the picture. Charismatics like Stephen and Philip are seen, not as the occasional heroes of Luke's narrative, but as the very prototype for discipleship today. The Pentecostal interpretation of the Spirit in Luke-Acts as charismatic empowering actually represents the almost *universal* position of NT scholarship. Since Hans von Baer's magisterial analysis in 1926, which concluded that for Luke the Spirit is primarily (but not exclusively) empowering for mission, virtually all subsequent analysis of Luke's pneumatology has essentially agreed the Spirit is some version of the Spirit of prophecy' (including major works by E. Schweizer, G.W.H. Lampe, G. Hays-Prats, R.P. Menzies, etc.), even if suggesting that is not the whole story.<sup>29</sup>

5. Finally, we may point to the ecumenicity of the CM, the most obvious evidence of which is the gigantic and highly variegated CRenM itself. The CM has in some ways provided a model of openness to other traditions, and sharing of spiritual experience, largely unencumbered by institutional prickliness over ministerial recognition and concomitant status.<sup>30</sup>

#### IV. The Charismatic Movement and Potential for Conflict

It is said that if you put two Baptists together you will have three opinions. Put two Pentecostals together and you may perhaps get five, including a vision and prophecy! The possibilities for conflict between the church and its 500 million CM members would then appear to be considerable. In order to keep within the limits of the paper we shall need to confine ourselves largely to the 'central' areas of potential

disagreement, i.e. to controversial positions that are held by the great majority of the CM, not to those such as (for example) the Health and Wealth Gospel, Kansas City Prophets, or the Toronto Blessing, which are already heavily criticised from within the CM itself. The major areas of potential conflict are probably three: (1) the two stage pneumatology advocated by Pentecostal and neo-Pentecostal interpretations of bhs, with its attendant soteriology, missiology and doctrine of 'initial evidence'; (2) the triumphalism of the movement, and its associated tendencies to hype, and authoritarian leadership; (3) the supernaturalism and attendant phenomenalism of the movement. Before we turn to these individually, however, we must briefly face one more generic source of conflict, this time from outside the CM, namely 'cessationism'

#### 1. Cessationism(s) and the Charismatic Movement

For some Protestants, the *whole* CM is deeply problematic for its central claim that the Spirit still today gives healings, prophecies, tongues, and the like. For hard-line cessationists (there are other types: see below), *all* such gifts were restricted broadly to the apostolic period, because their function was essentially to attest the divinely appointed bearers of revelation (Jesus and the apostles), and to guide the church, until the Scriptures were complete. With the completion of the canon, the whole purpose of the gifts was exhausted, and they ceased. The phenomena in the CM (and elsewhere in church history) are then dismissed as 'counterfeit miracles'<sup>31</sup>—a mixture of legend, exaggeration, self-delusion, and the workings of other unexplained powers of nature, including (possibly) demonic ones.

If there were good grounds to accept this dogmatic reading strategy, there could clearly be little hope of reconciliation with the CM. But this hard-line cessationist case is itself fundamentally flawed.<sup>32</sup> Its way of reading the NT is indefensible by the canons of any critical NT scholarship.

Such claims as that (1) Paul (in 1 Cor 13:10) anticipates the completion of a canon of Scripture which will make gifts of the Spirit redundant;<sup>33</sup> (2) Ephesians 2:20 shows that all NT prophecy was concerned with providing the foundational doctrine that would become Scripture;<sup>34</sup> (3) the healing miracles and exorcisms were given merely to bear witness to those who delivered the gospel (Heb 2:4), etc.,<sup>35</sup> would simply be rejected as exegetical and methodological curiosities.

The Charismatic Movement's reading of the purpose(s) and significance of healings, tongues and prophecy are much more in tune with mainline NT scholarship on these issues than are hard-line cessationist interpretations. The latter's reading of Church History is equally questionable. Claims to gifts of the Spirit certainly did not cease with the apostles and their entourage,<sup>36</sup> and historical research has not got the tools with which to brand all subsequent claims as 'counterfeit'. The illusion that one can do so rests largely on Warfield's dualistic reading of the evidence, which might be summed up in the rule 'Trust all NT stories about miracles completely; Reject by all means available the authenticity of claims subsequent to the apostolic period, if necessary attributing well-attested dramatic healings to inexplicable powers in creation'. This is clearly not the exercise of any recognisable kind of historical method, but simply dogmatic reading. And the latter 'explanation', of course, demonstrates the fundamental incoherence in Warfield's whole Common Sense epistemology. For Warfield, genuine miracles were crucially supposed to be purely and transparently *God's* work (not merely that of created powers, or of God's sovereign use of them). But there could be no *possibly* way of distinguishing *phenomenologically* between a genuine 'miracle' of the healing of a lame man, after prayer, and the 'counterfeit' case of a working of 'inexplicable powers' in the same circumstances. By the same token it is impossible on *other than a priori* grounds to say that all healings in the CM are merely the working of 'unexplained powers', not of

God's Spirit. As the '*a priori*' in question is the biblically indefensible view that genuine miracles are only given to provide and to witness to revelation, the hard cessationist view should probably be shelved.

There are a variety of softer forms of cessationism, however, that are much less problematic. They seek to maintain the uniqueness of Jesus, the apostles, and Scripture, without requiring Warfield's *a priori* negative judgment on all forms of the charismatic tradition since the second century.<sup>37</sup> Vern Poythress — presently a reformed Professor of NT at Westminster Theological Seminary — has offered one of the more sophisticated proposals under the unexpected(?) title 'Modern Spiritual Gifts as Analogous to Apostolic Gifts: Affirming Extraordinary Works of the Spirit within Cessationist Theology'.<sup>38</sup> In essence his case is that while Jesus and the apostolic circle may have received a fulness and infallibility of charismatic gifting — one that secures the unique authority of Scripture — this does not preclude the possibility of analogous but weaker and fallible gifts elsewhere in the NT church and/or in the church thereafter. To be more precise, Poythress envisages a standing pyramid of 'prophetic', 'kingly/ruling' and 'priestly' functions, divided horizontally into four sections. Jesus occupies the apex segment, with the apostolic circle just below — these persons working in the plenitude of the Spirit. At the base of the pyramid is a section corresponding to the exercise of the functions possible to 'all/any believers'. Pastors, teachers, elders and deacons (etc.) then occupy the slice above these last and below the apostolic circle. *All* the functions of, say, pastors (whether teaching, pastoring, 'ruling', or whatever) are weaker and fallible, *but analogous*, versions of those performed by Jesus and the apostles. The same applies to charismatic giftings like prophecy. By appealing to the quite widespread experience of prophetic charismata (and full recognition of their limits!) by such orthodox characters as Samuel Rutherford, John Flavel, George Wishart, John Welch, Cotton Mather and C.H. Spurgeon, Poythress is then able to build a bridge towards similar experiences in the

CM. His overall position is well summarised in the opening paragraph.

I maintain that modern spiritual gifts are analogous to but not identical with the divinely authoritative gifts exercised by the apostles. Since there is no strict identity, apostolic teaching and the Biblical canon have exclusive divine authority. On the other hand, since there is analogy, modern spiritual gifts are still genuine and useful to the Church. Hence there is a middle way between blanket approval and blanket rejection of modern charismatic gifts.<sup>39</sup>

Where hard-line cessationism only envisages two possibilities, the perfect work of the Spirit or 'counterfeit', this model additionally allows for many degrees of the Spirit's working, above, alongside or within natural gifting (one might usefully consider the complex 'mix' involved in most preaching!). There should thus be no *necessary* conflict between cessationism and the CM, where the latter fully recognises the mixed quality, and potential fallibility, of their charismata. Accordingly, we may now return to the other main areas of potential conflict.

## 2. Potential for Conflict over 'Baptism in Holy Spirit' and Related Issues

Pentecostals have usually held a two-stage pneumatology. According to this model, the Spirit is seen first to be given in justification, regeneration and incorporation into the body of Christ (this triad often being referred to as 'salvation'). At some subsequent point, as at Pentecost for the disciples of Jesus, the Spirit is given in a quite distinct new way as 'empowering for mission', bringing supernatural charismata. This is baptism in/with the Holy Spirit, and it is normally accompanied by some 'initial evidence' such as speaking in tongues.

It is not surprising that such a view is a major source of potential conflict with traditional churches. The older churches have willingly recognised that the Spirit empowers mission, and varieties of gifts for the benefit of the church. But they have not usually understood these as coming with

a distinctly subsequent and theologically separate gift of the Spirit from that received in conversion-initiation (even though some of their ordination liturgies of invocation of the Spirit might confusingly be read that way).

In Britain, Professor Geoffrey Lampe had defended the traditional view over against competing confirmationist and associated clericalist claims.<sup>40</sup> More important, James Dunn in 1970 notably challenged PM interpretations (ignored by Lampe) and was able to show:<sup>41</sup>

(a) Paul and John regarded receiving Christ and receiving the (normally 'deeply experiential/charismatic') Spirit as a unitary event.

(b) Luke too only spoke of *one* gift of the Spirit, and this was very closely integrated with conversion-initiation. The occasional temporal separation of 'belief' (of whatever kind) from 'reception' of the Spirit being regarded *even by Luke* as 'anomalous' and of very short duration.

What needs recognition, however, in the context of this essay, is that the classical Pentecostal, sharply two-stage, pneumatology, is not dominant for the majority of the senior academic/theological expositors of the CM, as Lederle's authoritative survey has shown.<sup>42</sup>

Most of the problems of the classical two-stage Pentecostal pneumatology are readily identified:<sup>43</sup>

(1) No NT writer expresses a (post-ascension) two-stage pneumatology—*not even Luke*, for whom there is only one gift of the Spirit. For him, the disciples' Pentecost experience of bhs and their reception of the gift of the Spirit are *one and the same*.<sup>44</sup> So two-stage pneumatology can only be arrived by a questionable synthetic reading, which assumes that all the soteriological functions of the Spirit in Paul and John are made present in conversion, even though Luke fails to attribute them to the Spirit because of his exclusive interest in the Spirit as empowering for mission. On such a view one might just be able to distinguish receiving 'salvation' from the 'subsequent' and 'separable' gift of the Spirit of prophecy.

(2) But this attempted separation of

salvation from Spirit threatens to make Luke's soteriology incomprehensible. For Luke, present 'salvation' means much more than the triad of initial justification, regeneration and incorporation into the church.<sup>45</sup> It means (roughly) the dynamic self-revealing, reconciling, and transforming presence of God (= kingdom of God), and of the risen Lord, in the 'restored' Israel-of-fulfilment.<sup>46</sup> In so far as this 'salvation'/reign of God began to be experienced within the ministry of Jesus, *it was by the work of the Spirit through him* (Luke 4:18-21, etc.). But with the removal of Jesus in the ascension, how can such 'salvation' continue to be experienced by men and women? For Paul, of course, the answer is obvious. As had been anticipated in Ezek 36-37, Isa 32:15-20, 44:3-5, etc., *it is precisely the Spirit that brings the continuous dynamic self-revealing and transforming grace of God and Christ to his people*.<sup>47</sup> For John, too, it is the Paraclete that brings the indwelling of the Father and the Son — and enables that rich communion with God that is 'eternal life' (John 17:3; 1 John 1:3b).<sup>48</sup> But anyone who wishes to assert that Luke believed that people (after the ascension) could experience these graces — could receive 'salvation', *before* receiving the Spirit — will need to explain how he thought God and Christ could be dynamically present to the community, and to the individual, *other* than by the Spirit. (Or, like Conzelmann, they will need to portray the period of the church as one of the substantial *loss* of salvation. But this is precisely the opposite of what Luke means. He thinks that the salvation promised in Luke 1-2, at last become palpable reality in the church!)<sup>49</sup> Critical study of Acts fails to disclose any such 'other' regular means of the dynamic presence of God, independent of the Spirit. Indeed, were there such a means, then the gift of the Spirit would become entirely unnecessary, for God could guide the missionary, give him prophetic gifts, and empower his words, by that 'other' divine means.

(3) The attempted separation of the experience of 'salvation' from the ('subsequent') gift of the Spirit also threatens to render his pneumatology incompetent. Let

us assume (with most Lucan scholarship) that the Spirit (for Luke) is a Christian and eschatological version of the traditional OT and Jewish 'Spirit of prophecy', who brings the presence of God in revelation, in all manner of spiritual wisdom and understanding, and in inspired speech and doxology, and in acts of power. If Luke believes this, why should he need, or posit, any *other* means of God's self-communicating and transforming presence, in order to explain the believers' experience of 'salvation': that is, their experience of joy, assurance of forgiveness, abounding grace, the pouring out of the love of God in the heart, the warm ongoing communion with the Father and the Son, the outflowing of praise, etc? Surely, it is precisely the 'Spirit of prophecy' which one would expect to enable these things! And if Luke knew Paul — as most aver — he must have known that that was exactly how Paul explained matters. What then would have induced him turn his back on Paul's explanation? What would have brought him to make the strange division that says God's revelation of himself to the believer, his gifts to her of divine wisdom, spiritual understanding, joy and praise, derive from the Spirit *only* when those functions are *missiologically* orientated, not when the same gifts are granted to enable and to enrich her own communion and life in God? Then they must be attributed to 'the name', or the Shekinah, or whatever, instead? Did Luke think Paul (and the rest of the church) was wrong, and, if so, for what *possible* reason? Or, if he agreed with Paul that the soteriological graces did indeed derive from the Spirit, was his apparent restriction of the Spirit to missiological tasks just his rhetorical way of expressing his distinctive emphasis? One might then posit that he *wished* to say there are two distinct givings of the Spirit, one for 'salvation', then, later, a second for empowering for service. But in that case, he has bungled very badly indeed, for he has given no hint of the first, and theologically more significant gift of the Spirit. Indeed, the way he tells the story in Acts 8 and 19 implies that the respective groups did not in any sense 'have' the Spirit before they received the

Spirit as the Spirit of prophecy. All the difficulties above disappear, however, if we make one simple assumption: that for Luke the one gift of the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ enabled the church’s ‘life of salvation’ as much as her ‘mission’ — and does so by the same prototypical gifts of revelation, wisdom, etc.

(4) Against the classical Pentecostal interpretation is also the fact that there is actually no substantial chronological ‘subsequence’ in Acts,<sup>50</sup> after the initial giving of the Spirit at Pentecost. Luke expects the gift of the Spirit to be given in close relation to conversion-initiation (so 2:38-39; 10:45-47). Even in Acts 8 and Acts 19 it is assumed that conversional *baptism* would normally be accompanied by the Spirit. Hence when Paul discovers the Ephesian disciples have not received the Spirit he asks what manner of baptism it was, then, that they had received (19:2-3). And the cumbrous ‘explanation’ in 8:16 assumes the reader would otherwise have expected the Spirit to have been given to the Samaritan baptizands. Their lack is an anomaly to be corrected as soon as possible. This much is now substantially conceded by scholarly Pentecostals, who prefer to speak of ‘logical’, rather than necessarily *chronological*, subsequence.<sup>51</sup> But the tight connection with conversion-initiation supports the view that the Spirit is soteriological as much as missiological. After all (contra Penney), Luke does not suggest converts are immediately impelled out to mission. That leads to the next point.

(5) Luke is far more reticent about the role of ordinary believers in mission than many of his interpreters.<sup>52</sup> And, conversely, he has much more to say about the Spirit’s contribution to the life of the *church*, than some of his commentators are prone to admit!<sup>53</sup> This (with the observations above) suggests that titles such as ‘Empowered for Mission’ may offer somewhat lop-sided ways of heading what are intended as comprehensive accounts of Luke’s pneumatology.

Interestingly, the most thorough critiques of the classical two-stage model have been made from within the CM itself—notably by Gordon Fee, himself an avowed

Pentecostal.<sup>54</sup> Almost as interesting is the Pentecostal acceptance into its prestigious monograph series — JPTS — of several volumes providing what are probably the most substantial *opposition* (to date!) of Pentecostal two-stage interpretation of Luke’s pneumatology — and that, again, by authors writing from *within* the more general CM.<sup>55</sup>

More important is the fact that the CRenM, ‘New Church’ and ‘Third Wave’ movements have produced a variety of sophisticated, ‘integrative’, one-stage, pneumatologies that embrace and enfold the charismatic experiences of the older PMs.<sup>56</sup> Indeed, the confessional stance of the Vineyard movement as a whole (not merely the individualistic tendencies of some of its theological leaders) falls within this category.

The two-stage interpretation of NT pneumatology will probably remain an area of conflict for some time. New more nuanced two-stage models are also emerging, based either in Aquinas’ concept of multiple divine missions (so Sullivan),<sup>57</sup> or in the Catholic and mystical distinction between the agonistic and unitive levels of spiritual life (so Simon Chan).<sup>58</sup> These have yet to be tested. But conflict in the church over two-stage pneumatologies is not one purely generated for the rest of the church by the CM, it is also within it (and outside it, in Sacramentalist/Confirmationist circles). Even within the CM it is clear that the issues are not purely about the most appropriate NT exegesis, or the most satisfying ST model, but increasingly about how to nurture and promote a charismatic expectation and experience in the church.

### 3. Potential Conflict over Triumphalism and Associated Tendencies

If the CM has been characterised by a recovery of great confidence in liberating, leading and inspiring power of the Spirit, it has to be admitted that sections of the movement have regularly camped in the fields of triumphalism. This has been particularly obvious in the Health & Wealth Gospel, and related ‘faith-healing’ move-

ments.<sup>59</sup> The failure has not simply been the considerable gulf between the rhetoric/claims of the preachers and the relative paucity of results. The more serious and root problem has been the failure to come to terms with NT theology of suffering and death, and with the eschatological tension between the 'already' and the 'not yet' of Christian life. The CM has too often identified purely with the resurrection, rather than with the cross and resurrection (*contrast* Paul in e.g. 1 Cor 4:9-13; 2 Cor 4:10-12, Col 1:24, and especially 2 Cor 11:16-12:10)—sometimes with disastrous and cruel pastoral results. It should be noted, however, that these faults are largely to be traced to popular preachers of a previous generation, lacking the thoughtful theological training available in the seminaries of the CM today. And, once again, the most perceptive criticisms are coming from inside the CM, not from outside.<sup>60</sup>

Another aspect of the triumphalism that has often dogged the CM has been the failure of discernment and of self-criticism. Overconfidence in one's ability to 'hear the voice of the Spirit' is partly due to the 'supernaturalism' that we will look at below, but also due to a failure to allow for the pervasive influence of the demonic, and for the capacity with which evil can masquerade as angels of light. Ancient Catholic spirituality demands a much more robust 'discerning of spirits', from which the CM could learn much. This overconfidence easily extends to extravagant 'charismatic' Scripture interpretation, which all too often ignores the hard tests of exegesis, and corporate discernment, for poorly constructed thematic sketches, caricatures and other distortions. Of course, this is not a complaint that can be levelled at the CM alone. (The same problem is found all too easily in traditional Evangelical quarters too; but one has to admit that the CM has produced more than its fair share of colourful characters and exotic interpretations.) And there are models of Pentecostal hermeneutics that are thoroughly informed by careful exegesis, and yet show a corporate and responsible 'listening to the Spirit' and 'discerning of spirits' that is often lost in

other traditions.<sup>61</sup>

#### 4. Potential Conflict over the Supernaturalism and Attendant Phenomenalism of the Movement

Parts of the CM have had an unfortunate tendency to recognise the Spirit's work only in the more spectacular charisms, such as prophecy, 'words of knowledge' and tongues, healings and exorcisms. This has encouraged the sort of strident supernaturalism one hears in the impatient question sometimes posed to the traditional churches: 'If the Spirit were to withdraw from your church, would anyone notice any difference?'. The CM can so strongly emphasise the immediacy and interventionist nature of God, that they fail to recognise his working in the more 'ordinary', and see little need for the traditional spiritual disciplines. But Paul himself specifically identifies as *God's* gifts (*charismata*) the chaste celibacy that enables fuller service to God (1 Cor 7:7); the 'helps' and 'administrations' of 1 Cor 12:28; the serving, teaching, exhorting, generous giving, performing of acts of mercy, etc., of Rom 12:6-8. Every area of the believer's life and service for Christ is sustained by the Spirit. And if the NT almost seems to restrict the Spirit to believers,<sup>62</sup> a broader biblical picture would claim God's S/spirit as the sustainer of *all* life, all work, and all activity that enhances creation.<sup>63</sup> Once again, we must beware of tarring the whole CM with the same brush. Indeed, some of the best critiques of supernaturalism have been written from within the CM,<sup>64</sup> and it is recognised that even the 'tongues' and 'words of knowledge' experienced by the CM may often be 'natural' phenomena, that only *become* 'spiritual gifts' when placed in the service of God.<sup>65</sup>

The tendency to supernaturalism, we have noted, can lead to neglect of the Spirit's work in and through our 'natural' abilities, ecclesial structures, traditions, liturgies and disciplines. But supernaturalism can also lead to three other failures, which we can now only mention briefly:

(1) The failure to recognise the 'mixed' character of 'revelatory' manifestations,

such as prophecy, words of knowledge, interpretation of tongues, etc., often leads to an over-confidence in them and over-emphasis on them. Such triumphalism was certainly widespread in the early days of the CM. Fortunately, most writings now show an awareness that such gifts are fallible (as in the NT period too).<sup>66</sup> Even at its best, like any other event of God's 'speaking' to/leading a person, prophecy may be prone to corruption by the 'receiver's' own human misunderstanding, or partial discernment; corruption by other spiritual influences (including that of the corporate psyche of the congregation, and/or factors in the psyche of the receiver), and so forth. Careful discernment is the need of the hour.

(2) Supernaturalism can lead to a distorted evaluation of the contribution of those who exercise such gifts. Where prophecies and words of knowledge are felt to be direct words from the Lord, these gifts and their practitioners may be valued more highly than, say, teaching or preachers (and that in turn may lead to the misuse of such gifts for self-aggrandizement and other power games). It is of course true that one reading of 1 Cor 12-14 could suggest that Paul himself puts prophesying above all other gifts. But it may be noted that he addresses his churches not with strings of prophetic oracles, but precisely with authoritative spiritual *teaching*.

(3) Supernaturalism can and sometimes does lead to a distorted interest in spectacular 'manifestations' for their own sake, rather than for the role they play in liberating, challenging and building up the people of God, and empowering them for service. It can also lead to defective, manistic pneumatologies, that depersonalise the Spirit into a fluid electricity-like power, available on tap. Both tendencies have been observed most recently in the 'Toronto Blessing' phenomenon, and were part of the reason why John Wimber removed the Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship from the Vineyard register.<sup>67</sup>

## Conclusion

The title, 'The Charismatic Movement and

the Church—Conflict or Renewal?' poses a false choice. The drift of this paper has suggested it is rather a matter of 'Conflict and Renewal?'. And one of the most encouraging features of the CM has been its recent ability to criticise its own weaknesses, and point itself and others back to the source of its strengths.

## Notes

- 1 GLOSSARY and ABBREVIATIONS. I am using the label 'Charismatic Movement' (henceforth CM) in the broadest way to include:
  - (1) the classical Pentecostal movement (henceforth PM) and its major denominations—including COGIC; COG; AOG; Elim, etc., totalling some 205 million members
  - (2) the Charismatic Renewal Movements (henceforth CRenM) within the traditional denominations, totalling some 250 million
  - (3) the Apostolic Restorationist and other 'New Church' groups, originally known as the House Church Movement, and
  - (4) so-called 'third wave' churches, e.g. Vineyard churches pioneered by John Wimber, now totalling 600,000 members. I use bhs as an abbreviation for baptism in/with the Holy Spirit.
- 2 See D.B. Barrett, 'Statistics, Global', in S.M. Burgess and G.B. McGee (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 811-30, and Vinson Synan, 'The Role of Tongues as Initial Evidence', in *Spirit and Renewal: Essays in Honor of J. Rodman Williams* (ed. Mark W. Wilson; Sheffield: SAP, 1994), 67-82. Barrett's estimate may be over generously inclusive at points, and see the comments of Michael Welker, *God the Spirit* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 8 (but even Welker agrees the CM 'is the largest religious movement in history, period').
- 3 W. Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism: Origins and Development Worldwide* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997), 1. Cf. also M.W. Dempster, B.D. Klaus and D. Peterson (eds.), *The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made to Travel*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999.
- 4 Of course, 'the church' is no uniform entity either, and a paper of this length could not possibly address the issues of the potential renewal and conflict the CM might bring to all sectors. I shall concentrate mainly on the churchmanship primarily

- relevant to this conference: various forms of Evangelical Protestantism. For a more wideranging sympathetic (yet perceptive) account of engagement with Catholicism and Orthodoxy, as well as Protestantism, see Peter Hocken, *The Strategy of the Spirit?*, Guildford: Eagle, 1996.
- 5 Although both of the initial leaders were nurtured in the Holiness/Higher Life movements, William Seymour, the leader of the Azusa Street revival in Los Angeles, was an Afro-American, anti-racist, holiness preacher, deeply moulded by the spiritual traditions of the earlier negro slavery, and radically committed to the priesthood of all believers. By contrast, Frank Parham, at the Topeka centre of the revival in Kansas, was more decidedly 'white' in his priorities, and exercised more direct leadership. The leaders that followed were theologically, socially and culturally disparate. For the culturally diverse roots see especially Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism*, *passim*.
  - 6 This is not least true in Europe. See the perceptive essay by J.-D. Plüss in Dempster et al. (eds.), *Globalization*, 170-182.
  - 7 See H.I. Lederle, *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of 'Spirit-Baptism' in the Charismatic Renewal Movement*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988.
  - 8 See Wonsuk Ma, 'Biblical Studies in the Pentecostal Tradition: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow' in Dempster et al. (eds), *Globalization*, 52-69; Keith Warrington (ed.), *Pentecostal Perspectives* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), *passim*.
  - 9 Pentecostals are puzzled by the claim of cessationists that 2 Tim 3.16-17 establishes the sufficiency of Scripture and renders charismata superfluous. *Per contra*, it is precisely the *Scriptures* that point to our need of the Spirit in the character of the NT experience!
  - 10 As Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987) claims, 175-176.
  - 11 For views in the CRenM, see especially Lederle, *Treasures*, chs 3-5. Amongst Pentecostals, Gordon Fee, the world's acknowledged expert on NT pneumatology, is one of the keenest opponents of the classical Pentecostal view of bhs (see below).
  - 12 See especially G.B. McGee, ed., *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991. But note also *two whole issues* of *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* devoted to the subject of 'Initial Evidence' (*AJPS* 1/2 (1998) and 'Initial Evidence, Again' (*AJPS* 2/2 (1999)).
  - 13 For a positive account of the CRenM in Baptist Churches, see the account written by a former General Superintendent, Douglas McBain, *Fire over the Water: Renewal Among Baptist and Others from 1960s to the 1990s*, London: DLT, 1997.
  - 14 Spring Harvest began in 1979, with 2700 attending at Prestatyn (North Wales). By the 1990s the figure at the major sites (Minehead and Skegness) had grown to more than 70,000 per year. Of these about one third are Anglican, one third Baptist, and the rest from the variety of other churches. For the influence of SH, which McBain assessed as 'possibly. . .the greatest single influence on the church life of all evangelical Churches of any translocal body', see McBain, *Fire*, 134-40 (here quoting 135).
  - 15 This was published by some fifty-six leaders of the Pietist-Holiness current in German evangelical protestantism. It essentially maintained that the Pentecostal Movement was 'not from on high, but from below', and that demons were at work in it. For the legacy of division it left, see L. Eisenlöffel, . . . *bis alle eins werden: Siebzig Jahre Berliner Erklärung und ihre Folgen*, Erzhausen: Leuchten, 1979.
  - 16 On the widespread proliferation of 'healing-by-faith-in-Jesus' movements before the Pentecostal movement, see Dayton, *Roots*, chap.5. Of particular significance, perhaps, were those of Johann Christoph Blumhardt, and the Bad Boll centre in the 1850s; Dorothea Trudel at Männendorf (Switzerland) in the same period; Charles Cullis, of Boston, who was to become a major leader of the post-1850s revival Holiness movement in New England; W.E. Boardman who exported Cullis's views to London in the 80s; and Orchard Simpson and Kelso Carter in New York (one of the earlier expositors of 'healing in the atonement' views). By 1895, W.B. Godbey could claim that 'since the rise of the holiness movement divine healing has become so common as to be no longer a matter of controversy. . . .' (as cited by Dayton, *Roots*, 134). For experience of 'tongues' in the pre-Pentecostal Holiness movements, see Dayton, *Roots*; Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970); William Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of*

- the Assemblies of God*, Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1971.
- 17 Cf Barrett in *DPCM*, 821-22.
- 18 H.N. Malony and A.A. Lovekin, *Glossolalia: Behavioural Science Perspectives on Speaking in Tongues* (Oxford: OUP, 1985), ch. 14.
- 19 David Middlemiss, *Interpreting Charismatic Experience*, London: SCM, 1996.
- 20 Hocken, *Strategy*, ch. 2.
- 21 Cf. Hocken, *Streams*, 68-69.
- 22 P. Hocken notes: 'The quasi-definition of baptism in the Spirit in terms of empowerment for ministry does not in fact do justice to all the data described in countless testimonies. In particular, it makes no reference to the element that is so central in many testimonies, namely a new level of knowledge of Jesus Christ, and some awareness of the love of the Father and the distinctiveness of the Holy Spirit', *Streams of Renewal: Origins and Early Development of the Charismatic Movement in Great Britain* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1986), 167.
- 23 This has been noted by standard non-CM pneumatologies such as Y.J.M. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, Vols 1-3 (London: Chapman, 1983); John McIntyre, *The Shape of Pneumatology: Studies in the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), chs. 8-9; Gary D. Badcock, *Light of Truth and Fire of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 136-38; Welker, *God*, 7-15.
- 24 There have, of course, been partial parallels to the CM emphasis in other pietistic and enthusiastic circles, e.g. Anabaptists, early Baptists and Congregationals, Brethren movements, etc.
- 25 Cf. Hocken, *Streams*, 184-85.
- 26 D.E. Albrecht, *Rites in the Spirit: A Ritual Approach to Pentecostal/Charismatic Spirituality*, Sheffield: SAP, 1999.
- 27 Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, London: SCM, 1975.
- 28 J.D.G. Dunn, 'Ministry and the Ministry: The Charismatic Renewal's Challenge to Traditional Ecclesiology', in *Charismatic Experiences in History*, ed. C.M. Robeck (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1985), 81-101.
- 29 H. von Baer, *Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926; E. Schweizer (1956) 'Pneuma, ktl' *TDNT* VI, 389-455; G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, London: SPCK, 1951 and 1967, *idem*, 'The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Saint Luke', in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*, ed. D.E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 159-200; G. Haya-Prats, *L'Esprit Force de l'Église*, Paris: Cerf, 1975; O. Mainville, *L'Esprit dans l'Oeuvre de Luc*, Montreal: Fides, 1991; Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology With Special Reference to Luke-Acts*, Sheffield: SAP, 1991; *idem*, *Empowered*; Hee-Seong Kim, *Die Geisttaufe des Messias: Eine kompositionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu einem Leitmotiv des lukanischen Doppelwerks* (Berlin: Lang, 1993); Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: SAP, 1996); John Michael Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology*, Sheffield: SAP, 1997; R. Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers: A study of Luke's Charismatic Theology* (Sheffield: SAP, 1999); M. Wenk, *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: SAP, 2000).
- 30 By no means all have shown this openness: by and large those sectors of the CM that prefer to speak of 'restoration' rather than 'renewal', have tended to regard the older church structures as irredeemable and so 'renewal' as impracticable. Cf. Hocken, *Streams*, 207-11.
- 31 Cf. B.B. Warfield, *Counterfeit Miracles*, London: Banner of Truth, 1972.
- 32 See Jon Ruthven, *On the Cessation of the Charismata: The Protestant Polemic on Postbiblical Miracles* (Sheffield: SAP, 1993). Cf. Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), ch. 16.
- 33 Cautious cessationists (such as Farnell and Gaffin) have themselves rejected such a claim, while still attempting to find a more plausible referent for *to teleion*, that places it in history before the Parousia. For the overwhelming majority of commentators, however, *to teleion* can only refer to the End itself. For details see Turner, *Spirit*, 285-90.
- 34 Surprisingly, Gaffin has attempted to defend this. But it is a notable failure of method: for details and criticism see Turner, *Spirit*, 212-13, and ch. 12 more generally.
- 35 For an account the significance of healings in the NT, and their relationship to the Kingdom of God, see Turner, *Spirit*, ch. 14.
- 36 See Turner, *Spirit*, 290-93 for review and

- literature.
- 37 Cf W. Grudem, ed., *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today? Four Views*, Leicester: IVP, 1996.
- 38 *JETS* 39 (1996) 71-101.
- 39 Poythress, 'Gifts', 71. I have offered a similar argument in more detail in *Spirit*, part II.
- 40 G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, London: SPCK, 19672.
- 41 J.D.G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*, London: SCM, 1970.
- 42 Lederle, *Treasures*, chs 3-4.
- 43 For fuller treatment see Lederle, *Treasures*, 55-73, and chs 3-5; Turner, *Spirit*, chs. 10 and 20.
- 44 Similarly, with Cornelius: compare 10:45, 45-47; 11:15-16. This is *not* to say the meaning of bhs is exhausted by these initial moments: see Turner, *Power*, chs. 7 and 13. The point is fully agreed by Menzies.
- 45 Pentecostal scholars regularly define salvation this way, and that makes it easy to see a 'subsequent' gift of the Spirit is needed! See Turner *contra* Stronstad, forthcoming in *JEPTA*.
- 46 For justification of this, and for the relation of the Spirit to 'salvation' in Luke-Acts: see Turner, *Power*, 433-38, and ch. 13. Also R.W. Wall, 'Purity and Power' According to the Acts of the Apostles' *Pneuma* 21 (1999) 215-31, which arrives at similar conclusions independently.
- 47 See G.D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), *passim*; Turner, *Spirit*, chs. 7-8.
- 48 See Turner, *Spirit*, chs. 4-5.
- 49 Cf. Max Turner, 'The Spirit in Luke-Acts: A Support or a Challenge to Classical Pentecostal Paradigms?', *VoxEv* 27 (1997), 75-101; *idem*, *Power*, chs 10-14; Wenk, *Power*, *passim*.
- 50 See Turner, *Power*, ch. 12, for detailed argument.
- 51 Menzies, *Empowered*, 233.
- 52 Max Turner, 'Every Believer as a Witness in Acts?—in Dialogue with John Michael Penney', *Ashland Theological Journal* 30 (1998), 57-71.
- 53 Turner, *Power*, ch. 13.
- 54 G.D. Fee, 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit: The Issue of Separability and Subsequence', *Pneuma* 7 (1985) 87-99. Cf. W.J. Hollenweger, 'Rethinking Spirit Baptism: the Natural and the Supernatural' in (eds.) A.H. Anderson and W.J. Hollenweger, *Pentecostals after a Century* (Sheffield: SAP, 1999), 164-72.
- 55 I refer to the work of the Pentecostal scholar, Wenk (*Power*) and my own *Power*. The editor, Dr John Christopher Thomas, Professor of NT in the Church of God Seminary, has shown amazing scholarly grace.
- 56 See Lederle, *Treasures*, chs. 3-5; Turner, *Spirit*, chs. 10, 20.
- 57 F.A. Sullivan, *Charisms and Charismatic Renewal*, Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1982.
- 58 S. Chan, *Spiritual Theology*, Downers Grove: IVP, 1998.
- 59 See Turner, *Spirit*, chs. 14 and (esp.) 19 for review and literature.
- 60 Cf. Thomas Smail, Andrew Walker, and Nigel Wright, 'Revelation Knowledge' and Knowledge of Revelation: The Faith Movement and the Question of Heresy', *JPT* 5 (1994): 57-77; Tom Smail, Andrew Walker, and Nigel Wright, *Charismatic Renewal: The Search for a Theology*, London: SPCK, 1993; D. McConnell, *The Promise of Health and Wealth: A Historical and Biblical Analysis of the Modern Faith Movement*, London: Hodder, 1990; John Christopher Thomas, *The Devil, Disease and Deliverance: Origins of Illness in New Testament Thought*, Sheffield: SAP, 1998.
- 61 See the essay by J.C. Thomas in Joel B. Green and Max Turner, eds., *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies and Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 108-22. Footnote 8, p.111, provides a useful survey of works on Pentecostal hermeneutics.
- 62 M.A. Chevallier, 'Sur un Silence du Nouveau Testament: L'Esprit de Dieu à l'Oeuvre dans le Cosmos et l'Humanité', *NTS* 33 (1987): 344-69.
- 63 Gen 1.2; 6.3; Job 32.8; 34.14; Ps 104.30; Acts 17.28.
- 64 Cf. Miroslav Volf, *Work in the Spirit: Towards a Theology of Work* (New York: OUP, 1991); D. Gelpi, *The Spirit in the World* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1988); Clark H. Pinnock, *Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1996), ch. 2; Chan, *Spiritual Theology*.
- 65 See Turner, *Spirit*, ch. 17. Hollenweger, 'Rethinking', even pushes this to the point where his respondent in the volume (Richard Massey) may be right to suspect reductionism (175).
- 66 See Turner, *Spirit*, chs. 12 and 18, for

review and literature.

67 It is perhaps not surprising that some of the sharpest criticisms of the Toronto movement have come from leading charismatics and Pentecostals. See, e.g., Bill Randles, *Weighed and Found Wanting: The Toronto Experience in the Light of the Bible* (Cambridge: St Matthew Publications, 1995); David Noakes, 'A Personal and Biblical Perspective of Renewal', in C. Hill (et al.), *Blessing the Church? A Review of the History and Direction of the Charismatic Movement* (Guildford: Eagle, 1995), 141-83; Peter Fenwick, 'The Roots of the Toronto Blessing', in Hill (et al.), *Blessing*, 40-61. More cautious are David Pawson, *Is the 'Blessing' Biblical? Thinking Through the Toronto Phenomenon* (London: Hodder, 1995) and R.A. Kydd, 'A Retrospectus/Prospectus on Physical Phenomena Centred on the 'Toronto Blessing'', *JPT* 12 (1998), 73-81. Kydd notes that the phenomena like 'holy laughter', shaking, etc., have been common to the revivalist tradition, and

usually fade away: in his view they are only potentially harmful when privileged. This can distort spirituality, which becomes focused on the moment of experience (and on those who can deliver it), while marginalising Christ and the ordinary means of grace in the church. Like many, Kydd argues that the test of a phenomenon/movement must be whether it leads to Christ, to service, to worship and to mission. Interestingly, by the far the most detailed and comprehensive analysis of the movement gives the Toronto Blessing a positive report on those issues: see Margaret Poloma, *The Toronto Report: A Preliminary Sociological Assessment of the Toronto Blessing* (Bradford-on-Avon: Terra Nova, 1996), and the follow-up survey (1997), the results of which are being published in a variety of articles, most usefully in 'Inspecting the fruit of the 'Toronto Blessing': a sociological perspective', *Pneuma* 20 (1998) 43-70.

## THE GOLDSWORTHY TRILOGY

Graeme Goldsworthy

### Gospel and Kingdom

In an engaging and straightforward style, Goldsworthy explains the nature and contents of the Old Testament as seen within the Bible as a whole, and sets out clear principles for interpreting it accurately for today.

### Gospel and Wisdom

Neglected in today's climate, wisdom is a significant concept in both the Old and New Testaments. Applying the method of biblical theology, the author aims to place wisdom literature in its Christian context, firm in his conviction that wisdom is a key dimension of the Christian life and finds its centre in the person of Christ.

### The Gospel in Revelation

In his characteristically pithy and lucid style, Goldsworthy offers here a fresh understanding of the purpose and contemporary relevance of Revelation, arguing that the gospel is the key to unlocking its meaning. This exemplary study is further informed by the author's knowledge of Old Testament literary idiom and structure

**Graeme Goldsworthy**, formerly Lecturer in O.T.Studies at Moore Theological College Sydney, is now Associate Minister of St Stephen's, Coorparoo, Brisbane

ISBN 84227-036-2 / 197x130mm / p/b / £7.99

**Paternoster Press, PO Box 300, Carlisle, Cumbria CA3 0QS, UK**