

# PNEUMA

THE JOURNAL OF THE

## SOCIETY FOR PENTECOSTAL STUDIES

□ An International Organization  
□ of Scholars Working Within  
the Charismatic Tradition

**\*Inaugural Issue\***

VOLUME 1 NUMBER 1

SPRING 1979



**PNEUMA: THE JOURNAL OF THE  
SOCIETY FOR PENTECOSTAL STUDIES**

**Volume 1, Number 1**

**Spring, 1979**

An International Organization of Scholars  
Working Within the Charismatic Tradition. Established 1970.

**OFFICERS . . .**

**OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR  
PENTECOSTAL STUDIES FOR 1979**

*President:* James Beaty, Ph.D.

*First-Vice-President:*  
Stanley Horton, Th.D.

*Second Vice-President:*  
Rev. Ithiel Clemmons

*Executive Secretary:*  
Horace S. Ward, Ph.D.

*Immediate Past President:*  
Anthony Palma, Th.D.

*Editors:*

*The Newsletter:*  
Vinson Synan, Ph.D.

*Pneuma:*  
William W. Menzies, Ph.D.

**PNEUMA: *The Journal of the  
Society for Pentecostal Studies.***

Published semi-annually at Springfield, Missouri.  
Address correspondence concerning articles,  
book reviews, and other editorial matters to the  
editor, 1111 North Glenstone, Springfield, Mis-  
souri, 65802. Address all subscription corre-  
spondence to the Executive Secretary, 6901  
North Maple Avenue, Fresno, California 93710.  
Subscription price for non-members: \$15.00  
per year; \$5.00 for students. See membership  
application on back cover.

**DOCTRINAL STATEMENT.**

1. We believe the Bible to be the in-  
spired, the only infallible authoritative  
Word of God.

2. We believe that there is one God,  
eternally existent in three persons: Fa-  
ther, Son and Holy Ghost.

3. We believe in the deity of our  
Lord Jesus Christ, in His virgin birth, in  
His sinless life, in His miracles, in His vic-  
tious and atoning sacrifice through  
His shed blood, in His bodily resurrec-  
tion, in His ascension to the right hand  
of the Father, and in His personal return  
in power and glory.

4. We believe that for the salvation  
of lost and sinful men regeneration by  
the Holy Spirit is absolutely essential.

5. We believe that the full gospel in-  
cludes holiness of heart and life, healing  
for the body and the baptism in the  
Holy Spirit with the initial evidence of  
speaking in other tongues as the Spirit  
gives utterance.

6. We believe in the present ministry  
of the Holy Spirit by whose indwelling  
the Christian is enabled to live a godly  
life.

7. We believe in the resurrection of  
both the saved and the lost; they that  
are saved unto the resurrection of life  
and they that are lost unto the resurrec-  
tion of damnation.

8. We believe in the spiritual unity  
of believers in our Lord Jesus Christ.

*For David Roelback  
gift of James M. Beaty  
Feb 15, 2010*

# PNEUMA

THE JOURNAL OF THE

## SOCIETY FOR PENTECOSTAL STUDIES

□ An International Organization  
□ of Scholars Working Within  
the Charismatic Tradition

### CONTENTS

Editorial	3-5
The "Overcoming" Life: A Study in the Reformed Evangelical Contribution to Pentecostalism Edith L. Waldvogel	7-9
Old Testament Foundations of the Pentecostal Faith Stanley Monroe Horton	21-30
Origins and Development of the Theology of Oneness Pentecostalism in the United States David Arthur Reed	31-37
Temple Theology William MacDonald	39-48
He's Not One of Us—Yet: Research in a Neo- Pentecostal Group Cecil D. Bradfield	49-57
BOOK REVIEWS	59-60



# PRELIMINARY

## SOCIETY FOR FEMINIST STUDIES

### CONTENTS

1-10	The "Compassionate" and the "Stupid" in the History of the Woman's Movement	William McDougall
11-20	The "Compassionate" and the "Stupid" in the History of the Woman's Movement	William McDougall
21-30	The "Compassionate" and the "Stupid" in the History of the Woman's Movement	William McDougall
31-40	The "Compassionate" and the "Stupid" in the History of the Woman's Movement	William McDougall
41-50	The "Compassionate" and the "Stupid" in the History of the Woman's Movement	William McDougall
51-60	The "Compassionate" and the "Stupid" in the History of the Woman's Movement	William McDougall
61-70	The "Compassionate" and the "Stupid" in the History of the Woman's Movement	William McDougall
71-80	The "Compassionate" and the "Stupid" in the History of the Woman's Movement	William McDougall
81-90	The "Compassionate" and the "Stupid" in the History of the Woman's Movement	William McDougall
91-100	The "Compassionate" and the "Stupid" in the History of the Woman's Movement	William McDougall



## EDITORIAL

With this issue, a new journal comes into being. PNEUMA: THE JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PENTECOSTAL STUDIES is designed to be a platform for exchanging information, ideas, opinions, and concerns related to spiritual renewal in the church. There are other voices articulating a variety of aspects of church renewal. This journal seeks to find its identity as a forum for those with scholarly interests who take seriously that form of church renewal which accepts the need, the possibility, and the reality of the manifestations of the Holy Spirit in today's world corresponding to the description of the life of the early church.

At the beginning of this century, a spiritual awakening occurred in various parts of the world, virtually simultaneously, that developed into what became known as the Pentecostal movement. That movement found its theological identity in making a connection between the experience called "baptism in the Spirit," and glossolalia (speaking in tongues) as the Biblical accompanying sign. Charismatic worship gifts were expected and experienced as a normal part of the life of local Pentecostal congregations. This movement, in some countries now is the largest single segment of Protestant Christianity. In others it is the fastest growing movement. By conservative estimate the Pentecostal movement worldwide numbers twenty million adherents.

To this cluster of denominations and fellowships known as the "classical" Pentecostal tradition, one must add another constellation of Christians. Since the middle of the century, large numbers of Christians in traditional church families have experienced phenomena reminiscent of Pentecostal Spirit-baptism and associated "gifts of the Spirit." What is new is that many of these are remaining in fellowship with parent churches, but developing cells of Pentecostal worship and practice *within* the mainline Protestant bodies and, even more dramatically, within the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches. The theologies of this "charismatic renewal" or "neo-Pentecostalism" are somewhat various. This has produced a need for means to aid in understanding the points of view being expressed within the charismatic world, and for aiding in dialogue between classical Pentecostalism and the charismatic renewal.

The Society for Pentecostal Studies came into being in 1970 to meet such needs. It provides a forum for discussing issues of scholarly interest, particularly in the areas of theology, Bible, and



history, to aid in Pentecostal self-understanding, and in assisting in better understanding of charismatic counterparts in traditional church bodies. The Society was born in the mind of Vinson Synan of the Pentecostal Holiness Church early in that year. During the months that followed, Horace Ward of the Church of God and William Menzies of the Assemblies of God joined him to form an ad hoc committee. That original committee called for an organizational meeting to take place at the triennial World Pentecostal Conference. So it was that in November, 1970, in Dallas, Texas, that the Society for Pentecostal Studies came into being. Menzies was named the first president. Vinson Synan became the editor of the Society's newsletter, and Horace Ward later was named executive secretary to furnish continuity to the Society. Annual meetings have been held by the Society since its inception. Two volumes of edited papers of the Society have been published (Vinson Synan, ed., *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*. Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos, 1975 and Russell P. Spittler, ed., *Perspectives on the New Pentecostalism*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976). Two monographs have also been published under the auspices of the Society. *These are The American Pentecostal Movement: A Bibliographic Essay*, by David W Faupel, 1972, and *Speaking in Tongues, a Classified Bibliography*, by Watson E. Mills, 1974.

It was in the December, 1977, meeting of the Society held in Springfield, Missouri, that authorization was given for the institution of a journal. There was general feeling that the Society had matured sufficiently to warrant this step.

What is to be the character of this journal? It is hoped that articles of substantial quality, well-documented and of more than passing popular interest, may be marshaled in these pages. The editor has established an intention of arranging the contents over a period of time that will disclose a fair distribution of articles of five types: 1) exegetical, 2) historical, 3) theological, 4) related areas (psychology, sociology, anthropology, music), 5) practical. This last is understood to include such topics as worship, missions, evangelism and church growth. Book reviews of published material having particular interest to pentecostal thinking will be included. Book review editors have been named: Philip O'Mara of the Word of God Community, Ann Arbor, and David Faupel of Asbury Seminary.

Just as the Society itself is composed of individual scholars who represent no official ecclesiastical position, so too the Journal will seek to maintain that posture. In the interest of a spirit of



open inquiry characteristic of a true academic forum, a variety of points of view on critical issues will be presented in these pages. The Journal is intended to stimulate thought. Reactions from the readership are invited. Out of the crucible of debate and inquiry, in a setting of freedom and openness, truth claims are to be tested and weighed.

The objective, then, of this new journal, is to furnish resources to a relatively new, burgeoning, and vital movement. In that process, a larger academic community may find useful material, as well.

The pentecostal movement has vigorously evangelized. It has not really enjoyed the leisure to reflect substantially on its own nature and being. Scholarship is not yet a major feature of this vibrant segment of the church. For that reason, the editor wishes to appeal for two things at the outset: 1) sympathetic support for this fledgling enterprise by constructive criticism written to the editor, and 2) a flow of articles for possible inclusion in future issues of the journal.

—William W Menzies





## THE "OVERCOMING" LIFE: A STUDY IN THE REFORMED EVANGELICAL CONTRIBUTION TO PENTECOSTALISM

by Edith L. Waldvogel

Early-twentieth-century American Pentecostalism has been perceived as part of a world-wide awakening which, in turn, became an international phenomenon.<sup>1</sup> More specifically, American Pentecostalism emerged in Topeka, Kansas at the end of 1900 when a small, interdenominational group of evangelicals agreed among themselves that glossolalia was the scriptural evidence of an experience of baptism with the Holy Spirit.

There have been two traditional approaches to the study of American Pentecostalism. The first cites the Wesleyan Holiness revival as the movement's primary source: the second focuses on Pentecostalism's distinctive emphasis on glossolalia and therefore suggests the movement's continuity with an idealized and presumably continuous stream of Christianity in which glossolalia consistently reappeared. Neither perspective takes into account

---

*Edith Waldvogel* is the wife of a pastor in metropolitan New York. She earned the Ph.D. degree in American Church History at Harvard University. This article is a summary of her dissertation which was done under the direction of George H. Williams.

the emergence during the late nineteenth century of a strongly doctrinal emphasis on the Holy Spirit among non-Wesleyan evangelicals and outside the context of the Holiness associations. One can only do justice to Pentecostalism's multiple, involved relationships within American evangelicalism if one recognizes that its heritage has both a broader base than the Holiness movement and a more mainstream theological context than continuity with the appearances of glossolalia in church history would imply.

The non-Wesleyan emphases in the quest for holiness and spiritual power differed significantly from those of the Holiness movement in at least three general areas. Most importantly, the context in which Reformed evangelicals expressed their teaching was strongly doctrinal and primarily premillennialist: the conviction that Christ might return at any time provided these believers with both a powerful incentive for holiness and an awareness of an urgent need for effectiveness in evangelism. Secondly, their emphasis on holiness and the Holy Spirit rejected the central Holiness concept of a "second blessing" and focused rather on an "overcoming" life. They further objected to the contemporary Wesleyan terminology which sometimes described the "second blessing" as Spirit baptism, claiming that the baptism with the Holy Spirit was not a cleansing experience but rather a special "endowment with power for service." Thirdly, they, more than their Wesleyan contemporaries, incorporated into their evangelical faith a practical emphasis on divine healing. They contributed most directly to the heritage of the largest Pentecostal denomination—the Assemblies of God.

Probably the most prominent among those whose premillennialist persuasion made them contemporary advocates of a "walk in the Spirit" and an experience of "endowment with power for service" was Dwight L. Moody. His interest in these subjects became important to the emerging interest in the Holy Spirit among certain of his premillennialist contemporaries who systematized his understanding of the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the believer.

Several prominent contemporaries with roots in the major Reformed denominations shared Moody's persuasion that evangelicals too often neglected to cultivate a relationship with the Holy Spirit—R. A. Torrey, a Congregationalist who became the first Supervisor of Moody's Chicago Training Institute in 1889 and pastor of the Chicago Avenue Church in 1894; A. J. Gordon, Boston Baptist pastor; A. T. Pierson, a Presbyterian minister; and A. B. Simpson, who left the Presbyterian church to found the



Christian and Missionary Alliance. Though these men did not function as a formal group or espouse a well-defined program, their remarkably similar spiritual odysseys formed a basis for a distinct understanding of the evangelical message: each ultimately accepted baptism by immersion, became convinced of Christ's premillennial advent, espoused divine healing and, for a time, "faith" living, became associated with foreign missionary efforts, and stressed the necessity of a close relationship between the believer and the Holy Spirit. The conservative evangelical doctrinal framework into which they incorporated their particular emphases was similar to that which would later characterize the Assemblies of God.

In direct response to Moody's urging, Torrey's ministry particularly emphasized the person and work of the Holy Spirit.<sup>2</sup> He claimed that the Christian could find the true source of spiritual power in a definite experience of baptism with the Holy Spirit. He regarded this baptism as distinct from the progressive experience of sanctification but closely related to it. The subject of sanctification became a focus of disharmony among those whose desire for holiness made them participants in the various contemporary quests for the "fulness" of salvation.

These evangelicals rejected two central tenets of the contemporary Holiness message: (1) they denied that sanctification was instantaneous, and (2) they contended that sanctification was not the baptism with the Holy Spirit. Torrey focused on the subjugation rather than on the eradication of the sinful nature: only as long as the believer consciously permitted the Holy Spirit to subdue his will could he be assured of constant inward victory over sin.<sup>3</sup> A. B. Simpson agreed: sanctification was not a "work of grace," but a "gift of faith:" not "the extinction of evil" but "the putting off, the laying aside of evil."<sup>4</sup>

Among their fellow Reformed evangelicals, the principal objections to this emphasis on "overcoming" included rejection of the suggestion that the believer could either determine to any extent his participation in the process of sanctification or be conscious of its progress. The response to the concomitant proposition that believers should experience a definite, post-conversion baptism with the Holy Spirit, moreover, demonstrated a potential for serious disunity on the subject within that tradition.

Like Moody, Torrey believed that the primary purpose of Spirit baptism was enduement with power for service.<sup>5</sup> In addition, Spirit baptism was the "short cut to holiness." The Holy Spirit revealed Christ, and the "quickest way of getting the world



out," Moody admonished, was "to get Christ in."<sup>6</sup> Simpson—more fully than the others—stressed the "allsufficiency" of Christ as a truth the believer could only apprehend by the Holy Spirit's revelation. He noted that even in the special experience of "endowment with power" Christ figures prominently:

Jesus only is our Power,  
His the gift of Pentecost;  
Jesus, breathe Thy power upon us;  
Fill us with the Holy Ghost.<sup>7</sup>

These evangelicals refused to specify any single uniform evidence of baptism with the Holy Spirit. "You shouldn't be looking for any token," Moody cautioned. "Just keep asking and waiting for power. And . . . if you get filled . . . it is no sign that you are going to have it always. The fact is, we are very leaky vessels. We need to keep right under the fountain all the time."<sup>8</sup> They believed the experience was essential to effective service: "If I *may* be baptized with the Holy Spirit," Torrey affirmed, "I *must* be."<sup>9</sup>

Reformed objections to these emphases appeared in reviews and articles. Talbot Chambers, reviewing Torrey's *The Baptism with the Holy Spirit* for the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* maintained, for example, that the pentecostal "upper room" experience should not be expected to recur.<sup>10</sup> Presbyterians noted erroneous implications in some of A. J. Gordon's writings on these subjects: they dismissed as "self-surrender fiction" the teaching of "constant victory over self," and claimed that there was little actual difference between his emphasis on holiness and "the most pronounced sinless perfection."<sup>11</sup> There was, furthermore, objection to the tendency to make premillennial teaching "the mountaintop from which the whole landscape of the gospel" was to be understood.<sup>12</sup>

Of the several conference ministries which these men used to present their emphasis, that which Moody sponsored at Northfield from 1880 became particularly important to the presentation of teaching on the Holy Spirit. From 1881 when Scottish Free Church leader Andrew Bonar served as the Northfield Conference's principal speaker, British visitors often addressed the gatherings. Simpson's independent conventions in Old Orchard Beach, Maine from 1886 developed his own interpretation of related teaching and frequently featured the same speakers. During the 1890's, incorporating as they did the particular emphasis on the Holy Spirit which characterized their founders, Moody's



Northfield Conferences and Simpson's Old Orchard Beach Conventions were influenced by a British conferences ministry, centered at Keswick, with roots in an earlier phase of American evangelicalism, that also stressed "overcoming" and "endowment." The last decade of the century was a period of increasingly frequent interchange between American and European evangelicals who shared these emphases in non-Wesleyan contexts.

The roots of the Keswick movement were diverse, but its most immediate source was the British ministry from 1873 to 1875 of two American "higher life" exponents, William E. Boardman and R. Pearsall Smith. Their emphasis was simple, stressing constant cleansing: "Expect Jesus to save you moment by moment from your greatest enemy in all the universe—Satan. . . Assume the conquering position—it is yours in Christ."<sup>13</sup>

Despite Boardman's seniority, Smith dominated their combined efforts. Early in June, 1875, his brief but impressive leadership terminated amid discrediting rumors of "dangerous doctrines" and immoral conduct. Smith returned to America, and his followers, to whom he had had little time to give permanent structure, faced strong opposition. Several weeks after Smith's departure, Thomas Harford-Battersby, Vicar of St. John's Keswick, convened a gathering at which some of those who had accepted Smith's message assembled.

Controversy surrounded their teaching. Opponents cited persistent reports that the Keswick meeting had endorsed a perfectionist doctrine of entire sanctification.<sup>14</sup> In fact, the meetings concentrated on the "quality" of the believer's experience. The leaders conscientiously stressed the reign of Christ within the soul rather than the instantaneous eradication of the sinful nature. "A belief in sinless perfection is not only foreign to, but diametrically opposite of, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ as our deliverer from the dominion of sin, and sustainer in a practical walk with our God," they asserted.<sup>15</sup>

Theological debate over holiness and sanctification continued from months in the pages of the *Church Record*. The movement had its critics in America as well. Princeton's prolific Benjamin Warfield noted tendencies in the "higher life" ideology that would continue to prove troublesome throughout its history. He found its source in the "dissolution" and "Pelagianizing" of hereditary Calvinism. Without denying the guilt of sin, he asserted, "higher life" proponents detracted from the basic concept of sin by focusing attention on "the practice of sinning" rather than on sin itself. In addition, Warfield maintained that the terminology



of the movement reflected a subtle emphasis on personal ease: "Men grow weary of serving the Lord; they do not wish to fight to win the prize; they prefer to be carried to the skies on flowery beds of ease."<sup>16</sup>

The premillennialism which motivated some of Moody's associates to stress "endowment with power for service" was not so prominent at Keswick: the Keswick message stressed aspects of the "overcoming" life which Moody thought would complement the practical American view."<sup>17</sup> After 1892, when Moody attended briefly part of the Keswick Convention, F. B. Meyer, Hammer William Webb-Peploe, Evan Hopkins, Andrew Murray and others brought to Northfield the Keswick understanding of victorious Christian living.<sup>18</sup>

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, some of those evangelicals whose biblical literalism motivated them to both premillennialism and a stress on "overcoming" and "endowment" incorporated into their evangelical faith a doctrine of physical healing which later became part of the Pentecostal heritage. Their concern over the unorthodox theologies and sensational aspects of various healing methods of their day reinforced their conviction that God healed not only through means but also by direct intervention. Gordon and Simpson articulated understandings of healing which summarized the basic teaching on the subject: healing was both "in the atonement," and related to the "fullness" of salvation. Their belief in healing was rooted in their biblical literalism and related to both their understanding of the "overcoming" life and their premillennialism.<sup>19</sup>

A shared emphasis on the Holy Spirit, on a specific endowment with power and on "overcoming" inward sin had fostered considerable harmony among those evangelicals who gathered at Northfield and Keswick during the 1890's and had motivated them to pray earnestly for revival. By 1904, their prayers seemed about to be answered. From 1902 until 1905, Torrey conducted evangelistic campaigns around the world. Keswick leaders supported his extensive ministry in Britain during 1904 and 1905, and in 1904, he addressed the Keswick Convention. During these years, a British observer noted, Torrey's "logical presentation" of Spirit baptism as an experience of endowment for service "did much to establish the doctrine."<sup>20</sup>

During Torrey's British ministry, a revival emerged in Wales which, in spite of an utter lack of promotion or program, seemed to contemporary observers to move across the country "with the order of an attacking force." Its slogan became "bend the church



and save the world.”<sup>21</sup>

To the extent that any individual led the revival, Evan Roberts, a young miner, was its recognized spokesman. Roberts expressed his conviction that the revival would spread from Wales around the world. It seemed to some that a pervasive “sense,” which they described as “the spirit of expectation,” increased.<sup>22</sup> “When that remarkable revival broke out in Wales,” wrote one American, “our hearts, like those of all Christendom, were greatly stirred. The power of God working so mightily, the absence of human machinery, the tremendous results in the salvation of souls, made us very hungry to know God in His fulness.”<sup>23</sup>

Among the foreigners who visited Wales to observe the revival was the pastor of the First Baptist Church in Los Angeles, Joseph Smale. On his return, Smale instituted daily prayer meetings for revival in city. When opposition among his members prompted his resignation, he organized the First New Testament Church. Smale’s firsthand reports from Wales and the circulation of a pamphlet by G. Campbell Morgan about the revival helped nourish the longing for revival that many local evangelicals, Wesleyan and non-Wesleyan, shared: “Businessmen’s groups, Bible class groups, holiness groups and people from different churches met to pray. Denomination made little difference. Christian workers, laymen and ministers alike, felt a need for more spiritual power in their lives.”<sup>24</sup>

Such unanimity was short-lived, however. In April, 1906, the *Los Angeles Times* included a first-page account of strange phenomena that had appeared among a small Holiness group in the city:

Breathing strange utterances and mouthing a creed which it would seem no sane mortal could understand, the newest religious sect has started in Los Angeles. Meetings are held in a tumble-down shack on Azusa Street, and the devotees of the weird doctrines practice the most fanatical rites, preach the wildest theories, and work themselves into a state of made excitement in their peculiar zeal.<sup>25</sup>

The Azusa Street meetings stressed glossolalia as the uniform initial evidence of Spirit baptism. This claim, derived from the teaching of an obscure, mid-western Holiness evangelist, Charles Parham, would ultimately disrupt the measure of unity that a



shared concern for revival had fostered among many local evangelicals.

The meetings on Azusa Street continued throughout the summer of 1906 under the general direction of a black Holiness preacher, William Seymour. By September, the reports that had reached other parts of the country had begun to draw visitors of various theological persuasions from a distance. Missionaries and ministers went out from Seymour's mission, convinced that the New Testament Pentecost had been restored. Several Holiness groups accepted the teaching that glossolalia was the biblical evidence of Spirit baptism and ultimately became Pentecostal fellowships. Many of those who were inspired by the Los Angeles meetings to a Pentecostal persuasion, however, were rejected by their former churches and gathered in homes and missions to worship. The congregations lacked organization and discipline, and the short history of the movement had already demonstrated many weaknesses. Before long, the theological differences that had seemed unimportant in the enthusiasm of the revival threatened the future of the spreading movement. The two major traditions which had contributed to the movement's emergence and growth made disagreement over the doctrine of a "second blessing" inevitable and also helped assure the persistence within the nascent movement of the recognition of the diversity of its evangelical heritage.

Florence Crawford was among the outspoken Pentecostal defenders of the Wesleyan doctrine of sanctification. She claimed to have received both sanctification and Spirit baptism under Seymour's ministry in Los Angeles in 1906 and later established an independent, loosely organized fellowship in Portland, Oregon. "Entire sanctification is the act of God's grace by which one is made holy," she maintained. "It is the *second, definite* work wrought by the Blood of Jesus through faith, and subsequent to salvation and regeneration."<sup>26</sup> The baptism with the Holy Spirit could only be experienced after one had received this "second work": it was "endowment with power" upon "the clean, sanctified life." In her zeal to protect the "purity" of the movement, Crawford launched a scathing attack on those within the Pentecostal groups who failed to stress the "second definite work of grace."

This faction was ably led by William H. Durham, pastor of the North Avenue Mission in Chicago. Whereas Holiness advocates insisted that two distinct "works of grace" were required to save and to cleanse, Durham maintained that God "dealt with



the nature of sin" at conversion. The initial experience of salvation included the "crucifixion" of the "old nature". "We are not saved simply because we are forgiven our sins," he taught. "We are saved through out identification with our Savior Substitute, Jesus Christ."<sup>27</sup> Some Holiness Pentecostals went so far as to suggest that, unless one received the "second blessing", enough sin remained in him to damn him: this, Durham's followers claimed, "nullified the work of regeneration."<sup>28</sup>

This controversy not only began to define clear lines of separation among the small Pentecostal groups; it also identified them with major evangelical traditions and contributed to the emerging sense that some formal organization of the movement was desirable.

In April, 1914 a loose association called "The General Council of the Assemblies of God" was organized to "recognize scriptural methods and rules of unity, fellowship, work, and business for God" and to disapprove all unscriptural methods and conduct."<sup>29</sup> Two years later, in response to serious theological disunity over the "oneness" of the Godhead, the Assemblies of God adopted a "Statement of Fundamental Truth."

The "Statement" is largely an expression of Reformed evangelical theology, affirming the verbal inspiration of scripture; the triune Godhead; justification by faith; sanctification as a process to be "earnestly pursued by walking in obedience to God's Word (this was later restated to describe a process initiated by "identification with Christ in his death and resurrection" and accomplished by "reckoning daily upon the fact of that union"); divine healing; and the imminent premillennial return of Christ. In addition, it included two articles affirming that all believers "are entitled to, and should ardently expect, and earnestly seek" the baptism with the Holy Spirit. "The full consummation of the baptism of believers in the Holy Ghost and fire is indicated by the initial sign of speaking in tongues," it maintained.<sup>30</sup>

The most nearly unique feature of the Pentecostal movement, as far as outsiders were concerned, was this association of glossolalia with Spirit baptism. The reaction of both Wesleyan and non-Wesleyan evangelicals was generally hostile. Those in the non-Wesleyan tradition who had objected to Torrey's and Simpson's focus on the "walk in the Spirit" and Spirit baptism repudiated even more emphatically the Pentecostal claim of uniform initial evidence. More significantly, Torrey, Simpson, and other of their evangelical colleagues disassociated themselves from the movement.



Years before the formulation of the Pentecostal teaching, Torrey had decided against accepting glossolalia as the uniform initial evidence of Spirit baptism.<sup>31</sup> Torrey's specific objections to Pentecostalism focused on its concept and use of glossolalia which, Torrey maintained, were untenable: he concluded that "the 'Tongues Movement' is a movement upon which God has set the stamp of his disapproval in a most unmistakable way in his Word, and also in what He has permitted to develop in connection with it."<sup>32</sup>

Arthur Pierson shared Torrey's concern over an emphasis on glossolalia: in two articles in the *Missionary Review of the World*, he cautioned readers against unduly coveting this gift. Tongues speakers seemed to him to be too often unsuccessful in separating the genuine from the spurious. He noted a tendency among Christians to become too absorbed in "Holy Spirit manifestations," and warned that overemphasis on the Spirit might "hinder His revelation of Christ."<sup>33</sup>

Torrey and Pierson also shared reservations about tendencies they observed in some aspects of the Pentecostal proclamation of healing, particularly in the convening of healing rallies. Torrey noted with concern the subtle tendency toward a shift in emphasis from salvation to physical well-being that the healing movement reflected. He objected also to the "techniques" that he observed in some healing ministries—"the mesmeric atmosphere . . . where there is skillfully planned, highly emotional music, and swaying of the body and passings of the hand and shouts of hallelujahs, that excite the imagination and thrill the body."<sup>34</sup>

In spite of their shared evangelical orthodoxy, their espousal of glossolalia and divine healing made Pentecostals particularly unwelcome in cooperative fundamentalist efforts. The sympathy of the Assemblies of God with the fundamentalist tenets and the stress on premillennialism and the Holy Spirit presented at Northfield and Keswick in the preceding generation was demonstrated not only in avowals of allegiance to the conservative faith but also by the enthusiastic recommendation of many books by Torrey, Gordon, Pierson, Simpson, Meyer, Murray, and their colleagues in the *Pentecostal Evangel*. Of the many evangelical authors editor Stanely Frodsham endorsed, he recommended none more highly than A. B. Simpson. Assemblies of God leaders considered that Simpson, probably more than any other single evangelical, had anticipated their movement. Simpson was unable to accept the doctrine of uniform initial evidence, however, and, although the Alliance officially adopted a policy of "seek not,



forbid not" with regard to glossolalia, its leaders effectively excluded the Pentecostal stress from their churches.<sup>35</sup>

In order to understand opposition to the movement, one must recognize the fanaticism that accompanied its emergence. Distinctions made by Pentecostals between "authentic" and "counterfeit" operations of the Holy Spirit often seemed meaningless to outsiders but became crucial to the self-image of the movement. "There is a so-called 'Free Pentecost' over the country," wrote Assemblies of God leader J. R. Flower, "and you can find most any kind of doctrine or practice in the 'Free Pentecost' assemblies. There is also a well ordered Pentecostal Movement."<sup>36</sup>

From its inception in 1914, the Assemblies of God recognized the non-Wesleyan contributions to its heritage. The story of this late-nineteenth-century non-Wesleyan emphasis on the Holy Spirit, when combined with the related story of the Wesleyan Holiness revival, provides a neglected perspective on conservative evangelical interrelationships. The doctrinal perspective which distinguished the Reformed emphasis from the Wesleyan stress survived in Pentecostalism. And the continuity Assemblies of God leaders perceived between late-nineteenth-century evangelicalism and their own movement (at least as demonstrated by the books and articles recommended in early Pentecostal publications) focused on the ministries of Torrey, Gordon, Simpson, Meyer, Murray, G. Campbell Morgan and their non-Wesleyan colleagues. By 1941, when Pentecostals were invited to join the National Association of Evangelicals, the emphases within Reformed evangelicalism which had made it a contributor to the Pentecostal context were no longer so prominent: only Simpson had devised a formal framework in which to stress and to perpetuate systematically his own emphases. Much of the conception of the ministry of the Holy Spirit, with the emphasis on Spirit baptism, together with the practical understanding of the doctrine of divine healing which had been expressed in these non-Wesleyan as well as in Wesleyan-Holiness contexts at the end of the nineteenth century had become the province of the Pentecostals.

## ENDNOTES

- 1J. Edwin Orr, *The Flaming Tongue* (Chicago, 1973), pp. 178-185.
- 2R. A. Torrey, "D. L. Moody, the Unity of His Life," *Institute Tie*, 1 (March, 1901), 203; R. A. Torrey, *Why God Used D. L. Moody* (New York, 1923).
- 3R. A. Torrey, *What the Bible Teaches* (Chicago, 1898), pp. 249-250.
- 4A. B. Simpson, *A Larger Christian Life* (Harrisburg, n.d.), p. 40; A. B. Simpson, *Wholly Sanctified* (Harrisburg, 1925), p. 14.
- 5R. A. Torrey, *The Baptism with the Holy Spirit* (Chicago, 1895).
- 6D. L. Moody, "Christ and the Holy Spirit," in *College Students at Northfield*, ed. T. J. Shanks (New York, 1888), p. 170ff; D. L. Moody in E. M. Fitt's Scrapbook, Moodyana Collection, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.
- 7A. B. Simpson, "Jesus Only," *Songs of the Spirit* (New York, 1920), p. 36.
- 8D. L. Moody, "Question Drawer," in *Northfield*, ed. Shanks, pp. 204-205.
- 9Torrey, *Baptism*, p. 28.
- 10Talbot W. Chambers, Review of R. A. Torrey, *The Baptism with the Holy Spirit*, *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, 6 (October, 1895), 789-790.
- 11Review of A. J. Gordon, *The Ministry of the Spirit*, *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, 9 (April, 1895), 346.
- 12D. N. McLauchlin, Review of A. J. Gordon, *How Christ Came to Church*, *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, 10 (October, 1896), 530.
- 13Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness (London, 1874), p. 41.
- 14"The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents," *The London Quarterly Review*, 45 (October, 1875), 84-128; Thomas Smith, "Means and Measure of Holiness," *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, 25 (April, 1876), 251-280.
- 15*The Christian's Pathway of Power*, 3 (February, 1876), 21.
- 16Benjamin Warfield, *Perfectionism* (Philadelphia, 1958), pp. 245, 264ff.
- 17Moody had, one contemporary Northfield historian reported, determined to make Northfield "the American Keswick." Hamlin, "Evolution of Northfield," *Northfield Echoes*, 3 (1896), 23.
- 18This unofficial but cordial relationship between the two conferences terminated soon after Moody's death in 1899 primarily because of changes in the administration at Northfield.
- 19A. J. Gordon, *The Ministry of Healing* (New York, 1882); A. B. Simpson, *The Gospel of Healing* (New York, 1915).
- 20Donald Gee, *The Pentecostal Movement* (London, 1941), pp. 4-5.
- 21Evan Hopkins, "The Teaching of the Revival," in *The Story of the Welsh Revival* (New York, 1905), p. 73.
- 22"A Call to Prayer," Historical Collection, M.B.I.; Ethel Goss, *The Winds of God* (New York, 1958), pp. 21-22.
- 23E. V. Baker, "Chronicles of a Faith Life," *Trust*, 15 (May - June, 1916), 3.
- 24*A Historical Account of the Apostolic Faith* (Portland, Oregon, 1965), p. 43.
- 25*Los Angeles Times*, 18 April 1906, p. 1.
- 26*The Apostolic Faith*, p. 48.
- 27William Durham, "The Finished Work of Calvary," *Pentecostal Testimony*, 2 (1912), 6.
- 28*Way of Faith*, 4 December 1913; *Word and Witness*, 9 (20 December 1913), 2.
- 29Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God," 1914, p. 4.
- 30"Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God," 1916, pp. 10-11.



Assemblies of God leader W. I. Evans later explained sanctification in terms reminiscent of Torrey, Simpson, or Meyer in *This River Must Flow* (Springfield, Missouri, 1954).

<sup>31</sup>R. A. Torrey, *The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids, 1974), p. 158.

<sup>32</sup>R. A. Torrey, *Is the Present Tongues Movement of God?* (Los Angeles, 1913), p. 8. Torrey's opposition to Pentecostalism must be considered in the context of his insistence that it was essentially a tongues movement. It was precisely because Torrey and the leaders of the Assemblies of God regarded Pentecostalism so differently that the latter were ultimately able to assert their appreciation of Torrey's writings and ministry. After Torrey's death, some of his students tried to disassociate his teaching on Spirit baptism from Pentecostalism, claiming that he had been careless and inconsistent in his use of key terms. Mrs. Torrey denied such reports, claiming that his views on the subject had never changed despite his rejection of glossolalia as uniform initial evidence. Clara Torrey to Paul W. Sawtell, 4 January 1941, Moodyana Collection, M.B.I.; Ernest Wadsworth, "Did Torrey Mean Baptism or Filling?" Moodyana Collection, M.B.I.

<sup>33</sup>Arthur T. Pierson, "Speaking with Tongues," *Missionary Review of the World*, 20 (July, 1907), 487-492, 682-684.

<sup>34</sup>R. A. Torrey, *Divine Healing* (New York, 1925), p. 13.

<sup>35</sup>William W. Menzies, *Anointed to Serve* (Springfield, Missouri, 1971), p. 72.

<sup>36</sup>J. R. Flower, "The Present Position of Pentecost," *Pentecostal Evangel*, 13 June 1925, p. 7

- Association of God (London: W. J. Gifford, 1911). (Quoted in *Journal of Theology*, 1911, p. 101.)
1. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
2. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
3. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
4. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
5. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
6. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
7. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
8. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
9. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
10. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
11. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
12. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
13. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
14. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
15. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
16. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
17. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
18. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
19. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
20. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
21. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
22. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
23. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
24. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
25. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
26. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
27. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
28. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
29. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
30. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
31. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
32. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
33. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
34. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
35. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
36. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
37. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
38. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
39. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
40. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
41. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
42. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
43. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
44. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
45. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
46. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
47. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
48. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
49. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
50. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
51. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
52. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
53. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
54. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
55. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
56. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
57. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
58. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
59. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
60. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
61. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
62. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
63. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
64. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
65. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
66. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
67. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
68. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
69. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
70. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
71. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
72. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
73. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
74. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
75. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
76. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
77. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
78. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
79. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
80. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
81. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
82. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
83. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
84. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
85. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
86. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
87. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
88. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
89. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
90. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
91. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
92. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
93. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
94. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
95. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
96. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
97. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
98. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
99. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.
100. *The Bible*, 1911, p. 101.



## OLD TESTAMENT FOUNDATIONS OF THE PENTECOSTAL FAITH

by Stanley Monroe Horton

Was the Holy Spirit a New Testament discovery? Some people seem to think so. Thus I am always happy for an opportunity to discuss the work of the Spirit in the Old Testament. On one such occasion in Brussels most of those present were wives of American business executives. The ladies, who represented several denominations, were surprised and blessed by how much the Old Testament has to say about the Spirit of God. One said afterward that always before the very mention of the Spirit caused her to be afraid. But after hearing how the Spirit hovered gently in creation; how He helped, filled, inspired, and won victories for God's people; how He brought God's message, and how future outpourings were promised, all that fear was gone.

### I. THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CREATION

---

*Stanley Monroe Horton* is professor of Biblical Studies at the Assemblies of God Graduate School, Springfield, Missouri. He earned the Th.D. degree at Central Baptist Seminary in Kansas City.

Creation was, of course, the cooperative work of the entire Trinity. The mention of the Spirit of God draws attention to the Spirit's power and concern and to His gentle activity. I reject the NEB translation of a "mighty wind" in Genesis 1:2 which Vriezen compares to a tornado.<sup>1</sup> God is the subject of most of the verbs in Genesis 1. Moreover, the Hebrew verb (*merahepheth*) is used elsewhere in the Old Testament only of a mother bird hovering over her young in a vibrant, protective way (Deut. 32:11). The Holy Spirit in the beginning was the same gentle but powerful Spirit we have come to know today. The Psalmist also recognizes the work of the Spirit in creation as he says, "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, and they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth" (Psalm 104:30). The Spirit is thus seen as active in both creation and through God's continuing providence.

Though nothing further is said about the Spirit in connection with the creation of man, the Bible makes it clear that the image and likeness of God in man have to do with our spiritual and moral nature. Paul prays that the believers be "strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man," and goes on to urge us to "put on the new man, which after God (that is, in the image and likeness of God) is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Ephesians 3:15; 4:24). We may consider it reasonable therefore to believe that the Holy Spirit was indeed active in our original creation.

## II. THE HOLY SPIRIT HELPING GOD'S PEOPLE

As we go on we find the Holy Spirit judging among men before the flood, striving "to restrain them from their evil ways" (Genesis 6:3).<sup>2</sup> But as we go on after the flood little is said about the Spirit dealing with mankind as a whole. Rather, the Bible shows Him helping God's people. He did this primarily through individuals whom the Spirit came upon or filled. This is clear enough for William Barclay to say, "The story of the Bible is the story of Spirit-filled men."<sup>3</sup>

Abraham, the man of faith, was also a man of the Spirit. God identified him as a prophet (Genesis 20:7), one of those "holy men of God" who spoke as they were moved (led along) by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1:21). Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph are also identified as prophets and as God's anointed (Psalm 105:15).



## BUILDING THE TEMPLE

After Israel was brought out of Egypt God gave them an opportunity to build a Tabernacle where He would manifest His glory and presence in their midst. It was an opportunity also for the people to learn to work together in giving of their possession and using their skills (Exodus 25:1-9; 35:5-26). But in every situation there are always people who do not have anything and cannot do anything. What do you do with them? You get them together and teach them. God, therefore, promised to fill Bezelel and Aholiab with the Spirit, not only to sharpen their own skills, but to enable them to teach others also (Exodus 31:2, 3; 35:30, 31).

## HELPING MOSES

Moses, however, was the prophet whom God was using in a special way at that time. The Spirit of God was upon him. Nevertheless, when the pressures of the people's murmuring became too great, he told God that He might as well kill him as make him carry the load of taking care of all those spiritual babies. God's answer was a gentle rebuke. Let Moses select 70 elders. Then the Lord would take of the Spirit which was on Moses and put the same Spirit on them. They would help Moses bear the burden of the people (Numbers 11:17). In other words, what made Moses think he had to carry all the burden in his own strength? The Spirit of God was able to carry all the load.

When these elders prophesied they soon ceased and did not do it again (*welo' yasafu*, "and they added no more" (Numbers 11:25); note how the same verb is translated in Deut. 5:22). Thus, the experience of these elders was temporary. But the Spirit came upon Eldad and Medad out in the camp and they continued to prophesy. Joshua then rushed to Moses and demanded that he make them stop. Moses had no jealousy, however. In fact, he not only did not make them stop, he said, "Would that all the Lord's people were prophets and the Lord would put His Spirit upon them" (Num. 11:29). The people were living below what the normal level of God's people ought to be. They all ought to be speakers for God with the Spirit of God continually resting on them. Later on, Jeremiah 31:31-34 and Ezekiel 36:25-27 predict that such a time will indeed come for Israel. Joel also prophesied it for all flesh (Joel 2:28, 29). But for Moses and the prophets this was only a desire they never saw fulfilled.

## FILLING JUDGES, ANOINTING KINGS

Most of those who were filled with the Spirit in the times following Moses were leaders of the people. An exception was Balaam. The Spirit of God came upon him temporarily in a very real way (Numbers 23: 24). But greed for money later caused him to sell his services to the Midianites and he died fighting Israel (Numbers 31:8). In contrast to him, Joshua was a man "in whom was the Spirit" (Numbers 27:19). He was probably not one of the 70, for he is distinguished from them in Numbers 11:28. But somewhere during the 40 years of wilderness journeyings, he was filled with the Spirit of God and wisdom (Deut. 34:9). Not only so, he remained full of the Spirit and, except for occasional lapses, learned to depend on the Spirit for wisdom, insight, and ability to carry out God's purposes.

During the period of the Judges, the Bible again draws special attention to the work of the Spirit. Most of the people God used were not entirely free from the failings of the times, and it seems that the Spirit of God worked in spite of the people He used. In fact, I get the impression that God chose people who were unimportant and undistinguished in themselves so that He could show that the power was of God and not of man (1 Cor. 1: 27, 29). But when the Spirit aroused, moved, and filled these men and women, they turned the hearts of the people to God, led them to victory, and inspired them to serve the Lord.

Some suppose that the only work of the Spirit in the time of the Judges was a sort of ecstasy or enthusiasm. We do not see this in Deborah's case. People came to her as a judge and prophetess because they recognized she was in touch with God. They brought their problems, disputes and questions. The Spirit of God gave her the wisdom to exhort, comfort, and challenge the people as well as to settle their differences.

Nor was the experience of Gideon mere enthusiasm. "The Spirit of the Lord came upon (*lavashah*) Gideon" (Judges 6:34) is better translated, "clothed Himself with Gideon." Cassel in Lange's Commentary correctly recognizes that the Hebrew can only mean that the Spirit filled Gideon.<sup>4</sup> As Oehler also points out, Gideon was just the clothes, "the covering of the Spirit, which rules, speaks, and testified in him."<sup>5</sup>

A superficial look at Samson causes some liberals to call his visitations of the Spirit demonic, excesses, or at least, abnormal.<sup>6</sup> Rather, the Bible uses Samson as an object lesson of patience of God and of the grace and power of the Spirit in a difficult time.



The Bible does use a word of the Spirit's moving that means to rush upon or break in upon (*tsalah*). Just when Samson needed it, the Spirit brought him an enduement of mighty power and strength. But this was not against his will. Judges 16:20 tells us that when his lack of inner consecration caught up with him, he said, "I will go out as at other times before, and shake myself." That is, in previous times he simply took a step of faith and expected the Spirit of God to move with him, and up to that time he was not disappointed. In other words, it was Samson's cooperation with the Spirit that was the real secret of his strength. He failed after his hair was cut because "the Lord was departed from him" (Judges 16:20).

Samuel, the last judge, became an anointer of kings. For this he was prepared by God. But, more important for us to notice is the fact that the symbolic action was followed by a real outpouring of the Spirit. In the case of Saul, an inner change came as soon as he left Samuel. God gave him another heart (1 Samuel 10:9). Then as he met a band of prophets who were prophesied with them, and became another man (1 Samuel 10:6).

In David's case, however, when Samuel anointed him, the Spirit of the Lord came upon him (*tsalah*, rushed in with mighty power) from that day forward (1 Samuel 16:13). The same verb is used of the Spirit's coming as is used of His coming on Samson and Saul. But there is a difference. The Spirit came *upon* Samson and Saul. Their experiences were temporary and intermittent. The Spirit came to or into David. In David's case also there was no immediate outward reaction as there had been in theirs. This mighty surge of power filled David's inner being and began a preparation for the future from that day forward, literally, upward (*'alah*). It was a rising, growing experience. Even when he sinned the Holy Spirit was still with him and he cried out in his repentance, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me" (Psalm 51:11).

This recognition of the Spirit of God as the Holy Spirit is significant. David probably does not use the name with the full recognition of the Spirit's distinct personality. But he does see that the Spirit is personally active in relation to his needs. In Psalm 51 also we see that through the Spirit David was made aware of God's presence and that he wanted the Spirit's help, not merely to keep him from falling again, but to help him teach others and bring sinners to the Lord.



### III. SPEAKERS FOR GOD

Most of the remaining references to the Spirit in the Old Testament are found in connection with the prophets. In fact, the kings are often little more than framework for the history. Prophets carried on the real work of God and laid the foundation for the future.

All true prophets were, of course, inspired and moved by the Spirit. So much was Elijah characterized by the Spirit, for example, that Elisha asked for a double portion of his Spirit (2 Kings 2:9). By this he did not mean Elijah's human spirit or enthusiasm, but the Spirit of God which was upon him. By a double portion, however, he was not asking for twice as much. He meant the portion of the heir. He wanted to be Elijah's successor in his ministry and in his leadership of the schools of the prophets.

Other examples include the martyr Zechariah with whom the Spirit "clothed Himself" and rebuked a backsliding Joash (2 Chronicles 24:20), and Micah, who said, "I am full of power by (rather with or even, Hebrew *'eth*) the Spirit of the Lord"—filled to come to grips with sin (Micah 3:8). Ezekiel also speaks frequently of the Spirit moving upon him personally (2:2; 3:12, 14, 24; 8:3; 11:1, 5, 24; 37:1; 43:5). We read, for example, that the Spirit entered into him and caused him to stand on his feet or lifted him up that he might hear God's message or see the vision God had for him.

### IV THE SPIRIT IN THE FUTURE

Isaiah sees also that the ministry of the Spirit through the Messiah will continue. Isaiah 11:6-9 jumps to millennial condictions. Like the other prophets, he did not see the time gap between the first and second comings of Christ. But he does see that the ideal conditions of the age to come will be the work of the Spirit. Isaiah 28:5, 6 adds that in that day "shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory and for a diadem of beauty, unto the residue of his people, and for a spirit of justice to him that sitteth in judgment, and for courageous strength to them that turn the battle to the gate." Clearly, the same sevenfold Spirit that rests on the Messiah is made available to the people also. More than that, Isaiah 32:15 speaks of a future outpouring of the Spirit from heaven which will make the desert a fruitful field, implying transformation of both land and people. The Spirit is further pictured in 44:3 as poured out like floods on a dry ground.



Outward restoration of the people and the land is then linked directly with salvation and spiritual renewal (Isaiah 44:5, 6).

Ezekiel also emphasizes the importance of the Spirit in the time of Israel's future restoration (11:19, 20; 11:31, 32; 36:26, 27; 37:14; 39:29). Again and again he speaks of a new heart and spirit that God puts in His people, and that is followed by God's putting His Spirit in them. This is dramatically pictured in the vision of the valley of dry bones (chapter 37).

Joel's prophecy is another that looks ahead to the end of the age (2:30, 31). In view of Moses' desire that all the Lord's people would be prophets and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them (Numbers 11:29), the promise that God would pour out His Spirit on all flesh and that "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy" (2:28) is especially significant. It gave important assurance that God's promises will finally be realized and that the people would indeed be God's people. As a result some say that Joel's prophecy of the Spirit has only a future fulfillment and can be fulfilled only in relation to the Jews on the Day of the Lord.<sup>7</sup>

Gabelein goes so far as to say that Peter did not really mean "This is that." What he meant was "This is something like that."<sup>8</sup> Closer examination of what Joel has to say shows, however, that though Joel himself may not have understood the full scope of God's promises here, we cannot limit it to the Jews. Like the other prophets, Joel did not see the time gap between the first and second comings of Christ. "All flesh" clearly means all mankind, as the use of the phrase in many other passages indicates.<sup>9</sup>

Nor does "your sons and your daughters" restrict the outpouring to Israel. It simply shows there are no restrictions with regard to age or sex. As Keil indicates, the phrase is part of a removal of limitations, and there is no intention of restricting the meaning to the Jews.<sup>10</sup>

Old men dreaming prophetic dreams and young men seeing prophetic visions is a further emphasis on the removal of limitations. Social restrictions would also be removed as the Spirit is poured out in the same rich abundance on male and female servants or slaves. The abundant outpouring of the Spirit is thus available for all, Jew or Gentile, rich or poor, young or old, male or female, educated or uneducated, regardless of race, color, or national origin. Nor would this outpouring be a one-time event. The Hebrew (*'eshpok*) indicates progressive or repeated action, making the outpouring of the Spirit available to generation after



generation.<sup>11</sup>

*Afterward* in Joel 2:28 may mean after repentance and restoration. It may also refer back to verse 23 which speaks of the former and latter rain. The latter half of this verse may be translated, "For he will give you the Teacher for righteousness (*hammoreh litsdakah*) and will cause to come down for you rainfall, early rain, and latter rain first of all." Thus, "afterward" makes the overflowing supply of the Spirit to be, as Keil says, a "second and later consequence of the gift of the Teacher of righteousness."<sup>12</sup>

From this we can say that the sending of the literal rain in Joel's day not only fulfilled his prophecy of restoration after their repentance, it guaranteed the further promise that God would pour out His Spirit after the Teacher of righteousness, the Messiah, came. The only limit would be our willingness to receive.

In line with this also it is striking that Hosea promises that God will "come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain upon the earth" (Hosea 6:3). "Former rain" here is best taken as a verb form meaning "saturating." That is, God will come as the latter rain, saturating the earth. The context here is possibly connected also with the death and resurrection of Christ (Hosea 6:1, 2). At least, it is immediately preceded by restoration to the knowledge of God and to personal fellowship with Him. It thus gives grounds for characterizing the outpouring of the Spirit following Christ's death and resurrection as *latter rain*.

One more passage is very significant. Zechariah 4 emphasizes the Spirit as the Giver of power. The message is the fifth vision of a series of eight, all given to encourage those who were rebuilding the temple after its destruction by the Babylonians. All eight visions have the work and times of the Messiah in view as well. God wanted Zerubbabel and his people to know that what they were doing was of more than local significance. It was part of a great plan that would find its consummation in the work of the Messiah.

Of special significance is the fact that this vision comes immediately after a picture of forgiveness of sin through the priestly work of the Messiah, the "Branch," that is the new shoot from the rootstock of David (as in Isaiah 11:1, 53:1, Jeremiah 23:5; Ezra 3:1-10).

The vision itself is hard to picture. It speaks of seven lamps and indicates 49 lights. But God's word to Zerubbabel was



"Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts" (4:6). Might and power are used interchangeably, sometimes indicating inherent power or bravery; sometimes, the power of armies, riches, organization, or other external means. All human might and power put together are not enough to do God's work.

Zechariah 4:6 does not mean, however, that God was introducing a new way of doing things. His Spirit has been the means of carrying out His plan at every stage from Creation on. Even where God used armies, the victory was always the Lord's, as Moses and Joshua found out when Moses lifted his rod at Rephidim (Exodus 17:9-15).

The latter part of Zechariah also looks ahead to a time when the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of grace pours out the grace of God in full measure, and as the Spirit of supplications, moves on the people to respond to that grace and seek the favor God offers them (Zechariah 21:10). Grace also must be interpreted with respect to what Zechariah says about looking on the One whom they have pierced.

Near the end of the Old Testament period, Nehemiah recognized that God gave His good Spirit to *instruct* Israel (Nehemiah 9:20). Then, though the ministry of the Old Testament prophets came to an end with Malachi, the people continued to recognize the Spirit as the source of power, strength, miracles, and help, as well as of divine revelation.

The Old Testament kept before them the fact that wisdom and right training could not be had except through the Spirit. The prophecies of future outpourings kept before them the fact that there was still something ahead. What they had already received was not all God had for them. There was more. Thus, even after 400 years there were still priests like John the Baptist's father, Zecharias, and common people like Simeon and Anna who were open to the Spirit and who experienced His filling.

(1) God is radically one, not distinguishable within His being as three hypostatically distinct Persons. (2) God always reveals His Name by which He can be known and obeyed. In the Old Covenant the most distinctive Name was "Jehovah". In the New Covenant it is "Jesus". (3) Jesus Christ is the one, full revelation

David Arthur Reed is a Ph.D. candidate at Western University, and is an ordained minister in the Episcopal Church.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Th. C. Vriezen, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*. 2nd. ed., rev. (Newton, Mass.: Charles C. Branfor, 1970), p. 214.

<sup>2</sup>H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), I, 255, 256.

<sup>3</sup>William Barclay, *The Promise of the Spirit*, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), p. 11.

<sup>4</sup>Paulus Cassel, *Judges and Ruth* (Lange's Commentary; (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, reprint from 1865), p. 119).

<sup>5</sup>Gustave F. Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, reprint from 1883), p. 142.

<sup>6</sup>George Foote Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Judges*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), p. 87.

<sup>7</sup>George E. Ladd, *The Pattern of New Testament Truth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), pp. 100, 101. Also held by others as Ryrie and Babelein.

<sup>8</sup>Arno C. Gabelein, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (New York: Our Hope, n.d.), p. 34.

<sup>9</sup>Stanley Horton, *What the Bible Says About the Holy Spirit* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1976), p. 56.

<sup>10</sup>C. F. Keil, *The Minor Prophets* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954 reprint), I, 211.

<sup>11</sup>This is also the conclusion of Theo. Laetsch, *The Minor Prophets* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1965), p. 128.

<sup>12</sup>Keil, *op. cit.*, I, 204. See also Pusey, I, 193.



## ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEOLOGY OF ONENESS PENTECOSTALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

by David Arthur Reed

Oneness Pentecostalism is a movement which emerged in the period 1913-1916 as a schismatic element within the Assemblies of God strain of twentieth century Pentecostalism in the United States. This dissertation describes, analyzes and evaluates the distinctive theology of Oneness Pentecostalism as a sectarian form of a "Jewish Christian theology of the Name" as it emerges within the context of its American heritage in Jesus-centric Pietism and the early Pentecostal movement.

Oneness theology is characterized by the following beliefs. (1) God is radically one, not distinguishable within His being as three hypostatically distinct Persons. (2) God always reveals His Name by which He can be known and obeyed. In the Old Covenant the most distinctive Name was "Jehovah" In the New Covenant it is "Jesus" (3) Jesus Christ is the one, full revelation

---

*David Arthur Reed* is a Ph.D. candidate at Boston University, and is an ordained minister in the Episcopal Church.

of the one God, not the Second Person of the Trinity. As to his deity, he is the Father. In his humanity, he is the Son of God. (4) The cardinal tenet of Christian initiation or the "new birth" is summarized in Acts 2:38: (a) repentance, (b) water Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and (c) the receiving of the Pentecostal experience of the "Baptism of the Holy Spirit" with the accompanying sign of speaking in tongues.

Although the Oneness teaching was initially formulated by an early Pentecostal pioneer in California, Frank J. Ewart, there is no acknowledged dependence upon earlier writers or movements. Therefore, Part One of the dissertation explores the origins in terms of the religious and theological forces at work which made such a doctrine possible

The Oneness movement emerged within the Pietistic tradition. As a form of spirituality, it emphasized the personal, subjective and experiential in religion. This emphasis contributed in two ways to the Oneness doctrine. (1) it offered a personal and experiential devotion or piety that later Oneness believers applied to the Name of Jesus; and (2) it emphasized the existential and personal aspects of biblical and doctrinal truth, an "inner assurance" which Oneness followers later used to confirm their doctrine of the Name of Jesus.

The distinctive form of American Pietism bequeathed to Oneness Pentecostals was distinctively "Jesus-centric" Jesus-centrism is primarily a practical theology which truncates the whole range of God's activity into the person and work of the human Jesus, primarily his deity, atoning work and second coming. It tends to be devotional and inspirational rather than theologically abstract, resulting in a popular piety which finds in Jesus the source of salvation and object of devotion.

Jesus-centric piety is traced through revivalism into the late-nineteenth century. Here the major doctrines, including that of the Trinity, were believed but functioned primarily to defend the deity of Christ and his substitutionary atoning work. This tendency is seen particularly in the evangelical pietistic Keswick movement in England in the late-nineteenth century and in the teaching of A. B. Simpson (1844-1919), founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance denomination and one deeply influenced by the Keswick spirituality. Both were major influences on the Assemblies of God.

One can detect a strain in this Jesus-centric piety which freely used the designation "Jesus" only. It was evident in the



gospel songs, poems and spiritual writings. Two reasons are suggested for this popular usage: (1) three New Testament books which frequently used the designation "Jesus" only were gaining prominence during this period—Acts of the Apostles, Hebrews and Revelation; and (2) late-nineteenth century Protestant Christianity focused much attention upon the human Jesus, both in Liberalism and, perhaps as a reaction, in Fundamentalism.

From this Jesus-centric piety emerged a rudimentary theology of the Name of Jesus. Millenarians such as A. J. Gordon, Arno C. Gaebelin F. L. Chappell, A. B. Simpson, and later, Essex W. Kenyon and William Phillips Hall, contributed to the doctrine. They found that an analysis of the Name yielded a cogent biblical argument for the full deity of Christ and revealed the power made available through his atoning work on the cross. The New Covenant "Name" varied among the writers from various names to "Lord" and "Jesus"

The doctrine of the Trinity received little attention but generally functioned to defend the deity of Christ. When described, it often bordered on tritheism. In J. Monroe Gibson, an English Presbyterian, it was brought into harmony with a fully-orbed Christocentrism. In John Miller and Robert D. Weeks, both American Presbyterians, it was replaced by an evangelical unitarianism.

A distinctive Nestorian Christology emerges, made evident most clearly in the doctrine of the atonement. The Name is linked to the atonement through the model of a legal transaction.

The Name of Jesus is given to the Christian (1) as an object of adoration and worship, (2) as a source of power with God, and (3) in Miller, Kenyon and Hall, as the Name of invocation in Baptism.

Another ingredient in the roots of Oneness Pentecostalism is the persistent presence of Jewish forms of Christianity in the nineteenth century. It is evident in the emerging theology of the Name, in the Jewish hope shared by the millenarians and in the appeal to return from Greek philosophy to Jewish categories of thought, especially in certain reactions to the traditional doctrine of the Trinity.

Part Two explores the religious and theological forces of Jesus-centric Pietism and the early Pentecostal revival which ignited a spark at a Pentecostal camp meeting outside Los Angeles in April, 1913. This initial "revelation", as it was called, was the observation by a Canadian evangelist, R. E. McAlister, that the apostolic formula in Baptism was in the Name of the Lord



Jesus Christ, not the triune formula.

The issue of the baptismal formula in Baptism brooded for one year in the mind of one who heard, Frank J. Ewart, a former Australian Baptist minister. Exactly one year later he emerged with a new doctrine. The issue began and continued to be one of re-baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Name of God as "Jesus" and the denial of the Trinity were the theological supports for the baptismal practice.

The movement spread primarily along the West Coast, inland through the mid-West and south through Louisiana and Texas. Its impact was felt within the fellowship now to be identified as the Assemblies of God, a group having gone on record in 1914 as being opposed to legislation of doctrine.

The year of 1915 was one of deep controversy within the fellowship, especially with the re-baptism of E. N. Bell, Chairman of the Assemblies of God and editor of its publication. Bell's reaction is seen not as a conversion to the Oneness camp but as a personal response to the Jesus-centric and pietistic thrusts of the new message. He never denied the doctrine of the Trinity, although he became markedly more passionately Jesus-centered. He became interested in the "Name", but concluded that it is "Lord", a point overlooked by the Oneness proponents. He was open, conciliatory and refused to promote the radical Oneness program of necessary re-baptism, a stand which for months placed him in disfavor with both sides.

The Third General Council in October, 1915, was an experiment in liberality, allowing each minister to proceed according to his own conscience. However, another leader, J. Roswell Flower, emerged as a bitter opponent of the new doctrine, succeeding finally to regain Bell and helping bring the issue to a head at the Fourth General Council in October, 1916. The result was the expulsion of the adherents to the new doctrine.

The growing aggressiveness of the Oneness faction combined with the increased clarity of opinion due to months of study and debate brought about the schism. Had the issues of re-baptism and the Name of Jesus never been treated as an exclusive truth, there would probably have been insufficient sentiment to create the split.

The new doctrine, or "new issue" as it was called, often described itself as a new revelation. While it was a term of accusation by Trinitarians, it was used by Oneness exponents to describe the subjective confirmation of the objectively stated truth in the Bible, a mark of Pietism.



The four early leaders who made a contribution through their writings—Frank J. Ewart, G. T. Haywood (prominent black leader), Franklin Small, Andrew Urshan—are primarily used to outline the logic of the Oneness theology as it emerged in the earliest years.

The “Plan” in Acts 2:38 points to a singular dispensational Name of God. Exegetical undergirding is found in a study of the singular Name and nature of God in the Old Testament. The consequence is a rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity in defense of the monarchy of God. Jesus is human and divine, a human Son indwelt by the divine spirit of the Father. The issue is seen to be one of transcendence and immanence, not one of eternal distinctions in the Godhead. The Father can indwell the Son and at the same time be transcendent.

The Oneness movement took on organizational form immediately but soon merged under an older charter calling itself the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World. It continued as the only remaining fully integrated Pentecostal fellowship until 1924, at which time it split over the racial issue. It remains racially divided in a proliferation of more than twenty groups, the two largest of which are the United Pentecostal Church (white) and the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (integrated but predominately black). Its numerical strength is estimated at about 600,000 adherents, roughly one-fifth of the total Pentecostal movement.

In Part Three, Oneness Pentecostalism is theologically defined as a non-ethnic, sectarian expression of Jewish Christianity. Examining the doctrines of God, Christ and the Christian life, a model is suggested for understanding the movement as a Jewish Christian theology of the Name.

Three marks of Jewish Christianity are evident in the Oneness doctrine of God. First, the singular Name of God is revealed and given by God, indicating His presence and saving power, showing His eternal undividedness, and standing as His revealed proper Name, not a human appellation. Second, God is a radical monarchy in His being according to the *Shema*, His transcendence is never compromised by His presence in the world, and the relation of the Three-in-One is described in terms of a simple “transcendence-immanence” principle. One eternal Spirit indwells the one human “person” Therefore, there are three “manifestations” of the one Spirit. Third, the divine presence in the world is experienced more as a “dwelling” than as an indissoluble union, thereby retaining the integrity of the divine transcendence. Thus Oneness Pentecostalism may be classified as a “simultaneous” modal-



ism and in some cases reflects a pre-Nicene "economic Trinitarianism"

Four criticisms are as follows. (1) Oneness theology defines the doctrine of the Trinity exclusively in terms of the "social analogy" model. It needs to explore the "psychological" model for more fruitful dialogue. (2) It does not adequately maintain a unity in God between His eternal being and His revelation. (3) It fails to understand the trinitarian use of the term "Person", defining it in modern terms as an independent entity. (4) By reducing the Holy Spirit to that of an emanation from the Father, it loses the rich and distinctive role of the Spirit.

Oneness Christology applies the Jewish emphasis on the Name of God to the name "Jesus" as the revealed and proper Name for this age of the New Covenant. In his person, Jesus is both divine and human, being the presence of the "fulness of the God-head" (Colossians 2:9). The Oneness view is a "dwelling" Christology in which the one Spirit of the Father dwells in the human and sinless body of the Son. It is also a "glory" Christology whereby the Son reveals, manifests, is the form and face of, the Spirit of God. Historically, it conforms in many ways to an early Spirit-Christology in which the Spirit of God in Jesus is not the hypostatically distinct Logos of Greek philosophy. Pre-existence is described in Jewish terms as that which was in the mind of God prior to creation. Also, the Oneness view is clearly marked by Nestorian tendencies. The divine and human entities are quite independent, to the degree that for some the Spirit leaves the body on the cross at the point of death, thereby endangering the union of the two natures.

Three weaknesses in Oneness Christology are evident. (1) While there may in all probability be a strand of an early Jewish Christian Christology of the "Name of Jesus", it is impossible to generalize it from the New Testament. Other passages suggest that the Name is variously "Father", "Lord" and "Son" as well. (2) A real union of the two natures is questionable, especially in light of their separation on the cross. (3) A deeper study of the work of the Holy Spirit would be helpful in order to understand the unity of the two natures from the birth of Christ to the *eschaton*.

The Oneness view of Christian initiation is rooted in the believer's identity with the Name of Jesus. The Name is essential and efficacious for salvation, thereby according a "sacramental" status to Baptism. The Name of Jesus Christ in Acts 2:38 is interpreted by the singular use of the word "name" in Matthew 28:19



to be the proper and singular name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The new birth by water and Spirit in John 3:5 is interpreted to be Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ and the Pentecostal experience of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit. Thus Acts 2:38 is seen as the "Keys to the Kingdom"

The following criticisms are made. (1) While Acts 2:38 is an excellent statement of Christian initiation, Oneness theology distorts it by identifying the Pentecostal "second" work of grace with the gift of the Holy Spirit, thereby excluding all non-Pentecostals from the realm of the true Church. (2) Acts 2:38 would be best seen as facets in a unified experience of Christian initiation, not as an unalterable sequential pattern. (3) The Oneness distinction between "name" and "title" in the New Testament is questionable. (4) The insistence upon re-baptism with its implications for ecclesiology makes the Oneness view unrealistically sectarian and indefensible.

Oneness Pentecostalism is still in a period of theological isolation. We await a new stage of theological reflection, deeper mutual understanding and dialogue. In the meantime, one can give an appreciation for the distinctive Oneness spirituality of the Name as well as its place within Christianity as a Jewish Christian sect.

At the outset of the literary work of the Society for Pentecostal Studies it is prudent to take the issue of theological direction. What kind of theology characterizes us now, and how can we sharpen the focus? What traditions will we preserve, and what new ground will we break? What issues will permeate our scholarly craftsmanship? In short, *what kind of theologizing will we do?* This article proposes that as to our presuppositional stance and overall methodology we have an orientation unique and significant, not to be equated with the list of "biblical theology" (as developed in twentieth-century neoorthodoxy), nor the fowl of "systematic theology" in its dominical traditional forms. But first we must inquire as to the general nature of theology before we assess presuppositional types, and then put forth a presuppositional model of our own.

---

William MacDonald is professor of Bible at Gordon College, Beverly, Massachusetts. He received the Th.D. degree from Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. Dr. MacDonald is an ordained minister in the Assembly of God.





## TEMPLE THEOLOGY

by William MacDonald

At the outset of the literary work of the Society for Pentecostal Studies it is prudential to raise the issue of theological direction. What kind of theology characterizes us now, and how can we sharpen the focus? What traditions will we conserve, and what new ground will we break? What ethos will permeate our scholarly craftmanship? In short, *what kind of theologizing will we do?* This article proposes that as to our presuppositional stance and overall methodology we have an orientation unique and significant, not to be equated with the fish of "biblical theology" (as developed in twentieth-century neoorthodoxy), nor the fowl of "systematic theology" in its dominant traditional forms. But first we must inquire as to the general nature of theology before we assess presuppositional types, and then put forth a presuppositional model of our own.

---

*William MacDonald* is professor of Bible at Gordon College, Beverly, Massachusetts. He received the Th.D. degree from Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. Dr. MacDonald is an ordained minister in the Assemblies of God.

Truth is eternal. Theology is temporal and must be rethought in every generation or it will smell like another era. Truth is real. Theology is a *picture* of divine reality never quite able to encompass a 360° perspective on truth. Truth radiates life. Theology is alive only as it draws its breath from truth. Truth and theology are never the same, however much truth a particular theology may contain. Truth is God's understanding and theology man's.

Holy Scripture reduces truth revelationally to words for man to hear and see. In the greatest psalm pertaining to the word(s) of God (testimonies, ways, precepts, statutes, commandments, ordinances, and "wondrous things out of thy law") the climax is reached in the eighth and last of the *resh* lines.

"The sum<sup>1</sup> of thy word is truth; and every one of thy righteous ordinances endures forever" (Psa. 119:160 RSV). This means that biblical truth conveyed in words of revelation a sentence at a time is transcended by its own summation. Truth therefore is ultimately indivisible,<sup>2</sup> and characterized by wholeness. Truth always in some manner goes beyond the words in the mouth or on the page. That beyondness of truth above the truths consists not in well-worded philosophical constructs of unity but in the character of God. He is "the true God." He entered the flesh incarnately expressing "the truth," and he enters the believer's inner self as "the spirit of truth." Truth, then, cannot be defined in and of itself, but only in terms of the nature of God.

Truth has no lasting identity apart from God, although common parlance admits its usage as a term for factual correctness of data in the created order. "The truth" is always something more, because it is forever whole in God. That is, comprehensiveness characterizes truth/the truth so that one speaking as a finite creature can say properly that the source and end of truth is God. But to speak theologically of "the source and end of truth," while it may be true/correct for informing finite man who readily understands temporal language about sources and ends, is nevertheless not true the way God is true! Talk about source and end is nonsensical when one recognizes the eternal dimensions of truth. On earth it is proper to say: Truth originates in heaven. But in heaven truth simply is; it does not originate. The knowledge/experience of truth may be a proper fulfillment of the meaning of one's life, but human submission to the truth affords only a human "end" but no limit on truth.



It is because there is truth that most of us are believers—and not because there is theology. It is because there is truth that we never get bored with believing. True believers believe God. Believing beliefs is sometimes a struggle, sometimes a duty, sometimes satisfying to the temporal mind, but always a cut below—yes, a whole world below—believing God. Even “sound doctrine” is a means and not the end. Good theology is stultified if it peaks in doctrines, and does not lead beyond to God himself.

Truth is personal. Theology is propositional. Their unity can come only from the Word of God which is at once both personal, and for man’s sake, propositional. Truth is God’s to give. He reveals himself. Theology is man’s attempt to receive and digest that truth, to state it in forms understandable at a given time and culture, to integrate it with one’s total thinking, and to implement it with appropriate responses in the world. If truth is golden, good theology is shining brass, and the theologians must ever be polishing their articles.

Theologies may be judged by their degree of opaqueness. The best theology is that which is most transparent to the truth of God, although it will never be perfectly clear. For in this age we can know only “in part.” The worst theology is concerned with reversing the direction of light through the window, that is, with divulging itself and defending itself. Good theology is always vulnerable to more light streaming in to expose cloudy traditions, humble as the eyelids of a man facing the sun, and preoccupied with its object, the God of all truth, who makes himself objective to us in his Word and subjective in us by his Spirit. The posture of good theology was dramatically captured in the New Testament picture of Mary of Bethany sitting at the feet of Jesus focusing upon him and listening to his words.

Now we must ask: Is systematic theology the best pre-suppositional model for doing good theology? Systematic theology has been a standard term for centuries covering a broad mindset for theologizing, under which various theologies have been developed. This methodology assumes that theology must embrace the totality of relations of God and the world in a system. Not until modern times did philosophy abandon its quest to encompass all knowledge and reality in a systematic structuring of the whole. Theology to be respectable was queen of the sciences in the pre-modern times, who was king? (Just ask any philosopher contemporary to that period.) While the *goal* of being all-inclusive is commended by all who love the truth—they



want it all—the rational *need* to be all-inclusive can subvert that very theology from a biblical base. *There is indeed an intellectual frontier that is bridgeable only in worship.*

The nature of a system is the application of a philosophical principle to all the biblical materials and contemporary questions of man so as to explain everything or nearly everything. Once the philosophical principle is clearly understood one usually can extrapolate from there what the interpretation of a given passage of the Bible will be, if the systematician has proceeded consistently with his principle. Understanding is contingent upon preserving the simplicity of the system that holds everything together. Therefore passages of Scripture that conflict with the shaping principle must be sacrificed like pawns for the safety of the king principle. Sometimes the system itself spawns mysteries—unanticipated in the Bible—to ease the acceptance of certain of its systematic implications. The effect of these mysteries is ultimately to weaken the system. Why? The system is threatened by the ignorance implicit in the confession of any mystery, and the logic of the system, therefore, will seek to resolve the mystery eventually (often in the second generation), however far that resolution may take the theology from statements in Scripture antithetical to it.

Systematic theologians have not always been forthright in divulging the controlling principle of their system. For instance, the Manichaean principle of the dualism of good and evil seems to be basic to Augustine's theological thought even though he interpreted evil according to Neoplatonism as just the absence of good. Anselm began with Being and moved via his ontological argument to the existence of God. Aquinas quite openly sanctified Aristotelian forms of logic and used them to work his way from Nature to Grace. Calvin was deeply influenced by his reading of the works of William of Occam, whose concept of God was that of Absolute Will. Contemporarily we see systems being built by process theology on A. N. Whitehead's principle of "integral impetus," and by liberation theology on Karl Marx's principle of economic determinism.

For decades the theological world has been waiting to see if the Pentecostal movement would produce its own systematic theology in lieu of modifying or augmenting other theologies in the schools. While a creditable number of histories of the Pentecostal movement and the charismatic renewal have emerged, and a few good treatises on Pentecostal interests have appeared, nothing approximating a Pentecostal *system* exists (unless per-



chance one of our readers is sitting right now on a fat manuscript he is waiting to publish).

None of us, however, just yet should be shredding his garments and seeking sackcloth and the nearest ash heap to mourn this supposed deprivation. While we are relatively late as a movement in taking up the theological task, and while we have neither thought through nor published much of anything self-consciously theological in purpose and form as judged by the theological world, the absence of a system to represent us in the non-Pentecostal corridors of Christianity ironically may be most beneficial. It frees us from the obligation to accord deference to (non-existent) great systematic theologians of our tradition, and leaves open before us the possibilities of a humbler more biblical kind of theologizing.

The twentieth-century alternative to systematic theology has emerged as "biblical theology." Particularly during the second quarter of this century Karl Barth led the way in defining and doing what he called biblical theology. He had studied under some of the most notable liberals of his day. His conclusion was accurate that the systematic theology characteristic of the nineteenth century was in reality a thorough-going philosophical theology, and philosophical theology by its very essence is anthropocentric in starting point, values, and conclusion. The theology he found in Paul was, by contrast, a radically theocentric theology. To obviate the need for a controlling philosophical principle extraneous to the revelation itself he attempted to construct a theology of the Word of God.

The Swiss theologian's stance influenced many other Europeans, and especially through the theology of his Swiss contemporary, Emil Brunner, with whom he differed sharply on the place of natural revelation, "biblical theology" became popular in many American seminaries for much of the decade of the 50's. To the extent that Barth and Brunner succeeded in establishing biblical theology there should be no Barthians or Brunnerians around, but Word-of-God-ians, or those who are bent not upon creation of a faith to believe in but upon listening to the revealed Word. Today there are not many professed Barthians around partly because of the positive reason just stated but also because of the influence of Rudolf Bultmann (and his students) who began in company with the dialectical theologians as they were called in the early 30's, and then in the 40's Bultmann convinced a student generation that the New Testament is so heavily mythologized that it is irrelevant to twentieth-century man.



Consequently much of contemporary theology has marched off to the left of biblical theology, preferring existential prophets over the biblical ones.

The strengths and weaknesses of biblical theology as advocated by Karl Barth are worthy of consideration here briefly. First, the strengths:

- (1) The philosophical captivity of Christian theology was ended, temporarily, at least.
- (2) Revelation was rightly celebrated as the only way to know God.
- (3) It became respectable to read the Bible once more.
- (4) Whole areas of dogma encrusted with the philosophical overlays of Eastern theologians, Western popes, and Protestant creed-makers have now been reopened for biblical examination.

Weaknesses:

- (1) The task of importing truth into theology was made more difficult and uncertain by the carryover of Barth's old liberal views about the Bible. Only "what the Bible teaches as a whole" can be trusted and not every individual part, according to Barth.
- (2) In the end Barth's theology in spite of his intentions seems to succumb to the tyranny of a controlling philosophical principle by his making "Christ" that principle, which dislocates him from history (Christ was the first man and Adam the second), and resorts to mystery (Christ is the only rejected man). Furthermore, the fact that his theology does not seem to be going anywhere (He could not write an eschatology) is most indicative of the philosophic drift that it took in spite of his using for the most part biblical language instead of the catchwords of the great thinkers.

One can properly ask: Were not the conservatives/fundamentalists/evangelicals doing a "biblical" theology of their own during this century? To answer merely in the affirmative is really not to answer at all. For most were "systematizing" their way through the Bible rather than listening to the text and interpreting the Bible. They thought for the most part that they were biblical, because they did not self-consciously appropriate a philosophical principle. Instead they often used a theological giant of another century or a school of theologians of another time or a set of denominational creeds as the anvil on which they shaped their interpretations of biblical statements. At that distance, being



one step removed logically, and perhaps several or many generations, from the philosophical center around which everything is spoked in from the outer rim, the theologian may have thought in all sincerity that only the Bible was shaping his thought and that indeed his theology was resultingly "biblical."

Some non-Barthian "biblicists" adopted a "plan of the ages" hermeneutic consisting of a chronological chart emphasizing the future and used it "systematically" to formulate scriptural interpretation, just as the great systematic theologians would have used their cherished philosophical principle. We cannot say it too often: Whenever we come to the Bible with the cut cloth of our answers already in hand we are not doing "biblical" theology, no matter how many prooftexts we pin like carnations on the finished theological suit.

What kind of presupposition is requisite if we are to write what heretofore in this article has been referred to simply as good theology? David's words in the twenty-seventh psalm capture magnificently the human attitude and approach that best befits the pursuit of the theological task. His one burning desire was to " *dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to gaze upon the beauty of the Lord and to seek him in his temple*" (27:4). The right sphere in which to do theology is that of commitment to worship God (from the prolegomena right through to the consummation) in his temple! There God presents himself by his Spirit and expresses himself by his Word. Without this kind of revelation by the Spirit and the Word together as one God revealing himself there can be no good theological understanding. This is "temple theology" because it worships in order to know. Its epistemological starting point is patent: The only way to know (=experience) God is to worship him "in spirit and truth."

Much of the questing today in the liberal theological camps is concerned over the establishment of a proper starting point. Bultmann convinced this generation that no theology is presuppositionless, specifically, without a "pre-understanding." He was right in that. The theologian must start somewhere. He can begin with man's feelings of inadequacy (Schleiermacher), with some one all-important idea (as in the systems), with his total self (existentialism), with natural revelation alone (unitarianism), with an infallible teacher (older catholicism), with the sovereignty of reason (liberalism), with "the God above God" (i.e., Being-Itself) (ontologism), with words supposed to have "Being" in themselves (Gerhard Ebeling), with universal history (Pannenberg), with "times and seasons" (acute dispensationalism), or



with the Bible alone outside the framework of worship (scholastic biblicism). Or it is possible to begin with (worshipping) God in his temple (temple theology).

The best theology is not necessarily the most logical, nor the most crowded with biblical citations, but the most used and intimate and accurate in speaking of God. Whereas systematic theology has characteristically divided its subject matter into theology (proper) (the doctrine of God) and then all the other “-ologies,” theology done “in the temple” (i.e., under conditions of continuous adoration and getting still before God) perceives the enormity of theology (proper) to such an extent that every question of any lasting significance is determined by the question of the nature of God! Worship of God has so conditioned the worshipping theologian’s value system that he focuses again and again on the ultimate theological question: *What is God like?* or more succinctly, *Who is he?*

One can take any doctrine to illustrate the point. A biblical anthropology cannot be maintained without defining man in terms of God, contrary to the behaviorists, for instance, whose definition of man is irretrievably flawed by their failure to see man as one who faces God in the world and reflects his image in certain aspects. Or take the seemingly remote matters of eschatology. The real question is not whether outer darkness can be combined with unquenchable fire, or whether “eternal punishment” is eternal in its effect or in its duration (calculating in both instances from a perspective in time), but the real question is one of theology proper again. Is God: (A) soft; (B) severe; (C) sadistic? Or take the Calvinistic-Arminian debate within Reformed theology. The incisive question is not one of sequences in coming to faith, or even free will or determinism; it resolves to the question as to whether God is passible or impassible.

Or if one dares to touch the hot issue of bibliology, the issue is not so much about errors but about God himself. When the day’s battle in bibliology is over and soldiers of opposite conservative camps happen to sit around the same campfire together, they all concede the same thing. God inspired the “books” of the Bible and just as surely let all those originals pass out of existence when the materials on which they were written decomposed or were otherwise destroyed. There exist today numerous Hebrew manuscript copies and thousands of Greek biblical manuscripts. No two of these copies are identical. Was God busy with other things (we speak foolishly) when the first and third and twenty-third copies were being made? and the copies of copies?



and the translations of these copies? It is raw rationalistic theology that is *more* concerned (please note the italicized modifier) with the lettering in the now non-existent Originals than with the God disclosed in the Book, "who reigns over all" (except sincere copyists and translators??), and regularly uses the faulty manuscripts and fallible translations in speaking the Gospel.

Because theology may be done in the temple it does not mean that it therefore must be limited to devotional warm milk. It cannot renounce the obligation to be critical any more than it can take its eyes off God. God is the greatest critic of all. Within our view (that is, on the pages of the Bible) we see him assessing creation in stages as it progressed. We learn criticism from him. In fact, worship itself (at least in its mental aspect<sup>3</sup>) is a form of criticism. It consists of ascribing 'worth' (the etymological base) to God. Paraphrasing the teaching of Paul, any theologian who locates his study in the temple has a spiritual—and not just a written criterion<sup>4</sup>—for critical evaluations about God and everything else, but he himself is ultimately subject to no man's judgment but the Lord's.<sup>5</sup>

Some distinctions are in order now. Time spent "in the temple" invariably causes one to be more deeply concerned with the person than the principle, with God rather than a "system." This concern with God as the One who is there (both transcendently *and* in the temple) is not to be confused with an isolation of one's energies to proving the personhood of God. That idea in itself could become a philosophical principle around which one could shape a systematic theology without ever being in contact with the Person himself.

Concern with the Person, and therefore the Presence (for that is what is meant by the biblical figure of the "temple"), the "presented" Self of God, is but another way of asserting the role of the Spirit in temple theology. If God were only Truth, only Word, he might be reducible to a principle—alas, all natural theologies treat him as such—but God is spirit/Spirit and true theology cannot take the shortcut that bypasses the majesty of his Presence. Omnipresence is only part of the truth, temple-presence is the complement. God's truth is expressed in his Word and God's self in his Spirit. Yet God is one, and the Word and Spirit of God cannot be separated as we are forced to do in making statements. We have said that in order to say this: *Temple theology must be engaged with the Spirit as well as the Bible if the result is to be true theology.*

In the Revelation of Jesus to the Apostle John the Spirit

kept speaking to the churches with an individualized word to each community of faith. Unless we dare claim that Christianity was fossilized in the first century, we must contend that the Spirit is still speaking to the churches. Therefore let us commit ourselves and pray that this journal will be headquartered "in the temple," and resultantly the biblical theologizing we do will be consonant with what "the Spirit says to the churches" today.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Although *rosh* is generally translated by 'head', 'chief', 'top', its less frequent meaning, rendered in this context, "sum" by the RSV and NASB, is justifiable; compare Psalm 139: 17 for a similar use of *rosh*.

<sup>2</sup>Tim. 2:15 as read through the smoked glass of the KJV and thereby misconstrued in dispensationalism notwithstanding.

<sup>3</sup>There are emotional and volitional aspects as well.

<sup>4</sup>"Tell it not in Gath," where the witness of the Spirit is conceived of existing only in an apologetic certainty that the Bible is inspired—that, and nothing more.

<sup>5</sup>1 Cor. 2:15 and its preceding context.



## HE'S NOT ONE OF US - YET:

### RESEARCH IN A NEO-PENTECOSTAL GROUP

by Cecil D. Bradfield, Ph.D.

The purpose of this article is to discuss the usage of a combination of data gathering techniques in an exploratory and descriptive investigation of a neo-Pentecostal group. The article is more of a research diary than it is a systematic treatise on methodology.

The purpose of the investigation was to explore the emergence of sectarian beliefs and practices in the main line denominations. Neo-Pentecostal practices began to emerge in mainline denominations about 1955, and they have spread most rapidly in the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Lutheran and Roman Catholic churches. These churches are farthest removed from Pentecostalism historically, doctrinally and liturgically. The groups that have the most in common with Pentecostalism, such as the Holiness churches, have been least affected.

---

*Cecil D. Bradfield* is assistant professor sociology at James Madison University, Harrisburg, Virginia.

Neo-Pentecostalism has brought into question prior sociological approaches to Pentecostalism which emphasized socio-economic deprivation. Neo-Pentecostalism has emerged among those who are not economically and/or socially deprived in the conventional sociological sense. The socio-economic approach to Pentecostalism was closely associated with traditional sect-church theory. In the sociological literature, Pentecostalism was identified as sectarian and appealing primarily to the lower socio-economic classes of society.<sup>1</sup> Usually, these groups were portrayed as breaking away from a more church-like group and then evolving into a denomination similar to the one against which they originally protested.

Neo-Pentecostalism, however, does not fit this pattern. It is true that neo-Pentecostalism involves such sectarian behavior as speaking in tongues, laying on of hands and emotional expression in worship. But, neo-Pentecostals who engage in such behavior usually continue their affiliations with their mainline churches rather than breaking with them in protest. Also, neo-Pentecostals are not economically or socially deprived; it is definitely a middle class movement. These considerations reveal the need for new or modified approaches to neo-Pentecostalism.

This investigation tested such a new approach by applying Charles Glock's theoretical framework of deprivation to neo-Pentecostalism.<sup>2</sup> Glock retains the concept of socio-economic deprivation as important for understanding the emergence of sectarian groups, but extends it beyond sect-church theory to include other types of non-objective deprivation. Glock's framework allows for the emergence of a sectarian response at any socio-economic level, and so is most applicable to neo-Pentecostalism.

The basic research design used to test Glock's thesis was a deviant case analysis contrasting Pentecostalism and neo-Pentecostalism. As indicated above, there has been a distinct emphasis associating Pentecostalism with lower socio-economic status and social disorganization in the sociological literature. Neo-Pentecostalism does not fit well within these frameworks as its adherents are not economically or socially deprived relative to society at large. Therefore, neo-Pentecostalism presents itself as a deviant case.

The case analyzed for this investigation was a neo-Pentecostal group in western Virginia. These neo-Pentecostals live in six rural counties and five independent cities with a combined population of three hundred thousand.<sup>3</sup> The Full Gospel Business-



men's Fellowship International (FGBMFI) serves as a catalytic group for the neo-Pentecostals in the area.

The FGBMFI, Valley Chapter, meets twice monthly with an average attendance of three hundred and twenty-five. Many of these participants have received the "baptism of the Holy Spirit," others are seekers and some are just curious. The participants are about equally male and female and represent a wide range of ages. The meetings consist of testimony, singing, prayer, special announcements and a speaker who gives his personal testimony. After the speaker concludes, there is usually a special prayer meeting at which you "can give your heart to Jesus" or be "baptized in the Holy Spirit."

The deviant case approach to sociological research lends itself to a number of data gathering techniques. Sociology is noted for a host of "one methodology"<sup>4</sup> studies in which a combination or triangulation of several types of data gathering procedures would have been preferable. Although there are distinct advantages associated with each data gathering technique, each also involved weaknesses that are eventually reflected in the data. The triangulation of method is a means of correcting such deficiencies by combining and contrasting data gathered from several sources. The techniques used in this study were: observation, a survey of in-movement literature, and a mail questionnaire.

## ACCESS TO THE FIELD

Neo-Pentecostal groups are remarkably accessible to an investigator since the participants are motivated to share their "baptism in the Holy Spirit" experiences. This openness to the uninitiated and even the unsympathetic is a part of the neo-Pentecostal ideology since they believe the Spirit will work on all who are exposed to Him. In fact, part of the folklore of the movement has to do with skeptics who are converted to neo-Pentecostalism through attendance at the meetings. The example most often cited is the case of John Sherill who was converted to the movement while investigating it.<sup>5</sup> Thus, meetings are open to the public and to the non-participants so that questions of misrepresentation to gain entrance to this group were not raised.<sup>6</sup>

The data gathering part of the research began in September 1972 with the investigator attending the bimonthly meetings of the Valley Chapter and making field notes. While taking notes attracted some attention, the investigator's identity was "disguised" until the spring of 1974 when he introduced himself to



the president of the Valley Chapter and began discussions on the possibility of securing the mailing list. The nature of this procedure will be discussed later. Opportunities were given for the investigator to address the group and tell of his research project. Numerous participants offered to share their experiences.

The openness of the participants to the research project was highlighted by the investigator's first appearance before the group. The president introduced the investigator as a professor of sociology at a local college doing research on the charismatic renewal, and then added, "He's not one of us - yet." This was apparently a strong endorsement of the project and subsequent appearances at the meetings were equally warm and accepting.

The consistent presence of the investigator at meetings over a period of months had a number of positive functions from a research point of view. One, it allayed any underlying suspicions the participants may have had about the research and any attempt to ridicule or use them. Second, the trust fostered by meeting attendance was evidenced by the president's willingness to eventually provide the chapter's full mailing list. Third, meeting attendance provided most useful material in the form of field notes.

## DATA GATHERING TECHNIQUES

Observation has been used in research to gain insights which could not be gained by other techniques. The investigator, as has already been indicated, regularly attended meetings and participated in group activities such as hymn singing and prayer. There was no ethical problem in this as the investigator is an ordained Lutheran clergyman.

The problem of bias did present itself in the observation. After the investigator's identity became known, numerous participants sought him out to relate their positive experience in the charismatic renewal. A further element of bias in relation to observation was that the investigator was observing religious behaviour which was at variance with his own background and experience. He has attempted to state this difference when asked about his own views on the charismatic renewal. The data gathered by observation was used primarily for descriptive purposes and for comparison with data gathered from the in-movement literature and the questionnaires.

A second important source of data was the in-movement literature. Two magazines which were extensively read were *Voice* and *New Covenant*. *Voice* is published monthly by the Full



Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International. The major emphasis of the magazine is to provide an opportunity for persons who have received "the baptism in the Holy Spirit" to present their testimonies stating why they sought the Baptism and what it has meant to them. *New Covenant* is published monthly by the Charismatic Renewal Services of Ann Arbor, Michigan. Even though it is sponsored by Catholic charismatics, it also contains articles by and about Protestants.

There are some limitations to using in-movement literature for the study of religious groups. The major one is the possible bias in that literature. It was noted that there was a "celebrity syndrome" in the types of testimonies printed and recorded. The most highly regarded testimonies were those of the highly educated or the most successful in business and other prestige occupations. A case could be made that since these are printed and recorded for the purpose of persuasion that only the "virtuosi" of the group are included. This bias was dealt with by using three research techniques which could be compared and contrasted with each other.

The survey of the in-movement literature used in the investigation served several purposes. First, it provided background for the investigation. Some of the literature was of a historical nature which placed neo-Pentecostalism in the perspective of Christianity in general and Pentecostalism in particular. Secondly, the literature provided some of the themes that eventuated in seeing Glock's theoretical framework as potentially useful in understanding neo-Pentecostalism. Thirdly, it provided a piece of the data triangle and was used in a comparative manner with the observational and questionnaire data. Finally, this literature provided a wider scope for the study than would have been possible if only observation and questionnaire data from one group had been used.

The third data gathering technique employed was the mail questionnaire. The decision to use mail questionnaires instead of interviews was largely made on the basis of economy of time and money. This was a particularly acute problem due to the wide area covered by the sample. The sample area is approximately one hundred miles in length and eighty miles in width.

The actual construction of the questionnaire occurred over a period of approximately one year. As a result of a preliminary review of the in-movement literature and observation of neo-Pentecostals, the questionnaire began to take shape around Glock's types of deprivation. A guiding principle in the con-



struction of the questionnaire was that each question would relate directly to the theoretical framework. Another principle was to ask the questions in such a way that they would also relate to the respondent's frame of reference. To deal with these two principles, a "Preliminary Coding and Analysis Procedure" was prepared placing each question on the questionnaire into the theoretical framework along with its rationale for inclusion.

A pilot study was conducted by an extensive reading of the literature, listening to tapes, and observing. As a result of this procedure, the relevance of Glock's theoretical framework seemed valid. Initially, the questions were placed within the categories defined by the theoretical framework. When it was determined that the various types of deprivation defined by Glock were covered, an attempt was made to place the questions in a sequence logical for the respondent.

In mid-September 1974, twenty copies of the questionnaire were sent to members of a chapter of the FGBMFI in another state as a pre-test of the questionnaire. Ten of these were returned within two weeks. As a result of the pre-test, several of the questions were reworded and more space was provided for others. The pre-test also indicated that the questionnaire took anywhere from one to four hours to complete. Some respondents to the pre-test questionnaire reported that they spent "all afternoon" or "all evening" in answering the questions. This fact, along with a rather high rate of return for a mail questionnaire, indicated a high degree of motivation to cooperate in the investigation.

A major problem confronted in using this technique was securing a mailing list of members. The FGBMFI, Valley Chapter, has a mailing list of those who regularly participate in the monthly meetings, but this list is unavailable except for specific FGBMFI purposes. In order to secure the list, the investigator first contacted the chapter president in March, 1974. The president indicated a general interest in the proposed research but stated flatly that the mailing list was available only for the purposes of the local chapter. He did offer to check with other officers about the possibility of an exception. A short time later, he indicated that he could give several names of persons who would be willing to be interviewed. The investigator indicated that this was appreciated but that many more names would be needed for the purposes of the investigation.

In a telephone conversation about a week later, the president said that he could provide a list of about twenty-five names



of people "who knew what they were talking about" This raised the problem of bias. Again, he was told that while a list of twenty-five would be helpful, the research would require many more names. In retrospect, it seems that the president was attempting to determine the investigator's attitude toward neo-Pentecostalism. Parenthetically, the concern on the part of many neo-Pentecostals about being "persecuted" is quite real. Some of the respondents to the questionnaire indicated that they were ostracized in their churches and some had been asked to leave.

Apparently the president was reassured because a short while later, he offered a list of seventy-five names. Also, at approximately this time, the investigator spent an evening interviewing the president and at the end of the interview, he indicated that he would provide one hundred and fifty names. He also said that an opportunity would be provided at the meetings for the investigator to talk briefly and encourage the respondents to return their questionnaires. The meeting appearances usually involved a brief introduction and statement of support from the president. A report was then given on the number of questionnaires which had been returned and an expression of appreciation. This procedure was followed at five meetings with little variation. On two occasions, respondents "testified" that responding to the questionnaire had been a real "blessing" Many of the respondents personally expressed appreciation for the opportunity to give their "testimony".<sup>6</sup>

After the second mailing, some participants apparently expressed disappointment to the president that they had not received a questionnaire. These persons who were not on the official mailing list were given an opportunity to submit their names. The final mailing list contained one hundred and seventy names. About seven months passed between the president's initial resistance and his providing the final list of one hundred and seventy names. At no time during this process did the president or any of the officers ask to see a copy of the questionnaire as a condition for securing the mailing list. The final list consisted of virtually every neo-Pentecostal who participates in the Valley Chapter. While there is certain bias inherent in any pre-existent mailing list, securing the entire list was a step in the direction of reducing the bias.

Along with the problem of bias, a second major problem in the use of mail questionnaires is that of non-response. The investigator's personal contact with the Valley Chapter members, persistent meeting attendance, and public announcements at



meetings all encouraged a high rate of questionnaire return. The return rate on one hundred and seventy questionnaires was eighty percent. Thus, the problem of non-response can be reduced by following tested procedures in the construction and mailing of the questionnaires.

A related problem to non-response is expressed in the following question: Are persons who respond to mail questionnaires significantly different in ways relevant to the research problem from people who do not? A procedure which helps to deal with the assessment of the differences, if any, between respondents and non-respondents is to compare the first few respondents to the questionnaire with the last few respondents. The assumption is that those who respond last to a questionnaire are the most like those who do not respond at all. A comparison of the first five and the last five respondents to the questionnaire on the variable of education revealed that the median years of school completed for the first five respondents was seventeen and for the last five respondents was thirteen. This comparison would lend some credence to the assumption that non-respondents are less educated and are perhaps consequently less appreciative of the scientific method of inquiry. This consideration represents a bias in the data toward the more successful and/or more educated. This bias is true also for the testimony literature. However, this lends a modest degree of support to the assumption that if deprivation, as defined by Glock, exists among the more successful and educated, it probably exists to an even greater degree among those who are less successful and/or less educated.

The use of three data gathering techniques in this deviant case analysis had several purposes. One, it was a relatively simple and inexpensive means of obtaining more reliable data from a large group. The actual research was conducted by the researcher and one student assistant who worked on the coding of the literature and the questionnaire.

Secondly, the three techniques intertwined to provide a stronger data base than would have been possible by using only one of them. Both observation and the literature indicated a sense of non-objective deprivation on the part of the neo-Pentecostals, and this was substantiated by the questionnaire responses. Thus, the research led to the conclusion that neo-Pentecostalism represents a deviant case of Pentecostalism and that participants do have a sense of non-economic deprivation. These conclusions were supported despite the use of one study group and one re-



searcher due largely to the use of a combination of data gathering techniques.

## ENDNOTES

\*This is a revised version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Religious Research Association in Chicago, October 1977

<sup>1</sup>Anton J. Boisen, "Economic Distress and Religious Experience: A Study of the Holy Rollers," *Psychiatry* 2 (May, 1939), pp. 185-194; see also John Holt, "Holiness Religion: Cultural Shock and Social Reorganization," *American Sociological Review* 5 (October, 1940), pp. 740-747; Russell Dynes, "Church-Sect Typology and Socio-Economic Status," *American Sociological Review* 49 (October, 1955), pp. 555-560; H. Richard Niebuhr, "The Churches of the Disinherited," *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, H. Richard Niebuhr (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929), pp. 198-215; Liston Pope, *Millhands and Preachers* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942).

<sup>2</sup>Charles Y. Glock, "On the Role of Deprivation in the Origin and Evolution of Religions Groups," *Religion in Sociological Perspective*, ed. Charles Y. Glock (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973), p. 212.

<sup>3</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Virginia: General Population Characteristics: 1970* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 5-22.

<sup>4</sup>William F. Whyte, *Toward an Integrated Approach for an Organizational Behavior*; Industrial and Labor Relations Reprint Series No. 155 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1965).

<sup>5</sup>John Sherrill, *They Speak with Other Tongues* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1964)

<sup>6</sup>K. Erickson, "A Comment on Disguised Observation in Sociology", *Research Methods-Issues and Insights*, ed. Billy J. Franklin and Harold W. Osborne (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973), p. 66.

<sup>7</sup>D. P. Forcese and S. Richer, *Social Research Methods* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1973), p. 152.





## BOOK REVIEW SECTION

Harold K. Moulton, *The Challenge of the Concordance: Some New Testament Words Studied in Depth* (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1977), xv + 288 pp., 4.25 pounds, softcover.

Following citations in the Moulton-Geden *Concordance to the Greek New Testament*, grandson Harold, lecturer in New Testament in the University of London and Methodist minister, has compiled a set of eighty-six expository articles on the use of individual Greek words as they underlie the English New Testament text. The articles are brief, from three to four pages each, and were originally prepared for the *South India Churchman* during the author's twenty year missionary career in India. Every discussion deals reverently with an important New Testament noun, verb, adjective, or preposition as it has been Christianized by use in the New Testament. The challenge then is to view a certain word with an eye toward seeing its panoramic Spiritual meaning in its total context and the shades of meaning given by New Testament writers in various contexts.

Moulton sets out to treat words not as well covered as some of the greatest Christian words. He includes interesting studies of popular words like *amen* and *koinonia*. The topics of building, brotherhood, perseverance, partnership, perfection, opening and shutting, riches, care, each one, putting off and on, and He must reign are among topics chosen for individual attention based on underlying Greek words. Secular literature is not employed per se, although it is obviously in the background as in the papyri. Possible loss of rigor of a *TDNT* approach is compensated for at this level by a warm devotional touch given to the nuances, metaphors, and meanings involved in the use of each word in inspired Scripture. The thoroughness employed implies no difficulty at all for the general reader and care is taken to summarize the main points on many occasions.

An index of Greek words so considered is provided. However, the book can be easily and profitably used by readers with no knowledge of Greek! Once the word is identified at the beginning of each article and its frequency, distribution, and significance is noted, further reference to it is in the form of direct Scriptural citations where the word is used in the New Testament text. Focus is thereby helpfully maintained on the root word without the aid of a Greek text. There are articles under the headings of Jesus, Some Christian Beliefs, The Church, The Christian Year, Worship, The Christian Life, Christian Character, and The Scriptures. The Christian Life section claims the bulk of thirty-four articles. All the articles are very well done and contain numerous sermon ideas and correctly drawn parallel thoughts based on the underlying Greek word(s).

Minor quibbles are that the instructional anointing (1 Jn. 2:20, 27) is too readily subjectivized and limited by equation with the Word of God revealed in Christ (following Dodd); the thought of Paul in 1 Cor. 14:18 is that he thanks God he speaks in tongues more than all his readers, for reasons of edification and divine communication as implied by the context, not that he thanks God that he has learned to keep any gift of tongues under control; and that water baptism should not be automatically identified with the sealing in Eph. 1:13.

The sound scholarship displayed throughout spurs the reader not only to deeper understanding in the evangelical faith, but also to deeper allegiance to Christ. This concordance study volume will render valuable service for every Bible student, pastor, and teacher and every theological library should have a copy on the reference shelf.

Paul Elbert  
Christ College Irvine





The sound scholarship displayed throughout opens the reader not only to deeper understanding in the evangelical faith, but also to deeper allegiance to Christ. This concourse study volume will render valuable service for every able student, pastor, and teacher and every theological library should have a copy on the reference shelf.

Paul Sifton  
Clark College, Irvine









## SOCIETY FOR PENTECOSTAL STUDIES

### MEMBERSHIP

Members associate with the Society as individual scholars and not as representatives of their denomination.

Persons seeking or holding advanced degrees in any discipline, whose interests accord with those of the Society, are invited to apply for membership. The Society recognizes the suitability of certain non-degreed applicants of eminent literary or administrative attainment.

*Full members* pay annual dues of \$15.00. They affirm the doctrinal statement and may hold office.

*Associate members* may not have had advanced academic training but maintain deep interest in the purposes of the Society. They hold full voting privileges and pay annual dues of \$10.00.

*Student members* engaged in academic programs pay a reduced rate of \$5.00.

Application for membership may be made at any time: half-rate for dues applies for applications filed July 1 or later. Dues cover the calendar year.

The participation of scholars representing Neo-Pentecostalism and Catholic Pentecostalism is cordially invited.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Enclosed is a check made out to the Society for Pentecostal Studies for:

\$15.00 — Full Membership

\$10.00 — Associate Membership

\$ 5.00 — Student Membership

\$15.00 — Non-Member: Subscription Only.

\$ 5.00 — Non-Member: Student Subscription Only.

Send to:

**SOCIETY FOR PENTECOSTAL STUDIES**

**Dr. Horace Ward, Jr., Executive Secretary**

**6901 North Maple Avenue**

**Fresno, California 93710**

PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies  
6901 North Maple Avenue  
Fresno, California 93710

BULK RATE  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
Permit No. 1631  
Springfield, Mo.